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Abstract

The second language learning by adult learners in a bilingual environment is hard to accomplish without the help of the native language though many teachers and experts believe that it is necessary to use the target language alone in genuine, natural communication for its quick and natural acquisition. Pragmatism, however, requires us to consider using the potentials of the native language to facilitate formal second language learning because creating genuine communicative situations in a formal instructional setting is next to impossible. Linguistic communicational acts are also culturally determined and the thought processes governing them have their roots in the native language structures. The process of translation occurs internally in the communication acts that aim to produce learning. In this kind of internal translation, the learners apply language codes translinguistically to comprehend and express meaning. In the post-globalization world, the use of language, whether the first or second, exhibits great fluidity in terms of the content, form and the conventions of use. The educated youngsters in India today switch and mix language codes freely in their communicative ventures and this trait indicates the way the mind deals with communication crises. This paper looks into how the L2 users can rely on their L1 knowledge in 'learning to use' or 'using to learn' situations and argues that the potentials of the native language can be used creatively in the second language instruction.
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1. Status of English and Preferences of Teaching Methods

One of the most distinguishing characteristics of our country is the multiplicity in terms of the languages, cultures and religions, and such diversities characterize our much acclaimed pluralism. The cultural, religious and linguistic diversities may have sociocultural advantages as well as disadvantages, but in the field of higher education, the merits seem to outweigh the demerits. Rejecting the view of it as a colonial vestige, the pluralistic Indian society has accepted English wholeheartedly, nurtured and nativized it, and has finally given it an important place among the indigenous languages. Whatever we may call it, however we wish to describe it, it has come to establish itself as one of the Indian languages which performs, among many other functions, the act of holding together our vast country as one nation.

It may be worthwhile to note that this spirit of pluralism and the trait of accommodativeness are inherent in the Indian society in the sense that it has accepted and nativized many things including the English language. This characteristic spirit of pluralism and accommodativeness is evident in other events and occurrences in our history too. For instance, even the monotheistic religions found it easy to come and settle comfortably here because the native polytheistic religion had no difficulty in accommodating them mainly because of their own polytheistic beliefs and pluralistic outlook. The same kind of attitudinal positivism can be the reason for the maintenance of a vibrant bilingual situation our country can boast of. There has always been this argument that our bilingual environment has been nurturing the growth of English although there are many people who subscribe to the contrary views. It may be beyond the scope of this paper to delve into the merits of these arguments, nevertheless, as learners belonging to a bilingual society who are engaged in learning an additional language, we need to think of the ways of turning the bilingual environment to our advantage.

English in our country now does not stand out as a foreign language. It has become an Indian language that has got integrated into our systems of education, business and administration. It plays a crucial role in providing educational and career opportunities to the average students beyond basic education. Hence, the lack of proficiency in English has been relegating an increasing number of students to the peripheries limiting the nation’s potential for economic competitiveness, innovation, productivity, and adversely affecting the quality of life. Their academic competence depends greatly on the English language skills; so does their professional competence after they take up jobs on completion of their education. Since the amount of training in the English language skills they receive confines strictly to the English classroom exposure, it is relevant to look into the ways of improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional procedures we employ in the classroom.

In our steadfast allegiance to the communicative methodologies, we are given to claiming that generating genuine, natural communication in the target language alone can do the trick. Overwhelmed by such conviction and passion for developing impeccable speaking skills, we pay little attention to the learner inhibitions resulting from learner diffidence and the contrivance and unfamiliarity of the learning environment. The argument favouring the use of English in meaningful contexts to learn it sounds logical, but for the same reason, it becomes impracticable in situations where the learners share the same native language. While I concede that the most basic and logically ultimate function of language is the exchange of meaning, I do not think that the learners are naïve enough to believe that they communicate in English in the classroom just for exchanging meaning or information without any conscious attempt to learn it. Here lies the implausibility of generating and sustaining genuine, natural communication in the target language in situations where all the learners share the same native language. Therefore, it is necessary to
look into such views of instructional communication and learning more critically, especially from the perspective of the learners belonging to rural and semi-urban areas.

2. Natural Communication versus Facilitative Bilingualism

English in our country operates in a bilingual/multilingual environment. The teaching of it to the learners in a bilingual setting is an exceptionally challenging task for the teachers in our country particularly since the amount of exposure that we can provide with the learners is marginal. It should be noted that the second language learners enter the classrooms with varying degrees of proficiency in their first language. This necessitates an enquiry into how the learners' first-language literacy can be put to use to facilitate their learning of English. According to (Bialystock 2001), the students are able to take advantage of higher order vocabulary skills in the first language in developing the ability to provide formal definitions and interpreting metaphors while using a second language. Further, they can also take advantage of cognate relationships between their first language and English to develop an understanding of the contextual meanings of English words, an important precursor to comprehension. If this is so, the versatility and pliability of their mother tongue should be handy for them in their understanding of the target language structure.

In second language learning, Bialystock (2001) argues further, first-language oral proficiency influences developmental patterns in second language speech discrimination, speech production, intra-word segmentation, and vocabulary, which may often reflect the patterns of the first language. Research has confirmed the influence of the first-language literacy on the literacy development in English by means of drawing comparisons, juxtaposing strategic applications and structural patterning. Those students who are literate in their first language are likely to be advantaged in the acquisition of literacy in English. The optimum knowledge of a language and the insufficient knowledge of another language being acquired, provide ample room for translinguistic applications of language codes to get activated. It is, therefore, important to take into consideration the transferability of certain literacy skills, when planning and providing second language literacy instruction to students who already possess their first language.

Self-initiated explorations into the linguistic systems take place by way of comparisons, contrasts and other associations we make under the compulsion to use two or more languages simultaneously for communication. It is also commonplace that instructional programmes work better when they provide opportunities for students to simultaneously develop proficiency in their first language. Studies that compare bilingual instruction with English-only instruction show that bilingual students who receive instruction both in their native language and English show better proficiency in English than those students who have been instructed only in English (Bialystok 2001). This finding gets ample support from bilingual education scheme in our Central Schools where English and Hindi were simultaneously implemented as media of instruction for Science and Humanities disciplines respectively. This is largely stated to be a successful experiment probably because it gives the students opportunities for the simultaneous application of both the languages and this should essentially serve as a cue that makes us consider the prospects of implementing and encouraging bilingual communication activities in the second language instruction.

However, in the second language classroom context, the idea of bilingual communication has few takers. There are many who subscribe to the view that genuine, natural situations for language use should be provided in the classroom since language is acquired in actual communication. Though it seems ideal or
logical this type of communication activity is hard to materialize and it is natural for it to take a different course or shape, as its guiding motive is entirely different. The S L learners communicate not always to say what they want to say, but to structure language in view of producing its learning. We want the learners to free their communication process from the participation of consciousness, but it is not as easy as it sounds. Since promoting interaction is our major concern, we may have to shelve our idealistic notions and look forward to pragmatic solutions. In this context, it is worthwhile to build on what Leontiev (1981) calls 'monological discourse' in a foreign language that involves the participation of consciousness with the perception of utility as its guiding motive. Therefore, the nature of the world around us is the key factor determining our communicative preferences. When asked to communicate 'naturally' in a situation in which everyone's L1 is the same but not the T L that needs to be practised in communication, where is the scope for 'natural' T L communication? Even if some such communication occurs, it is prompted by the need to learn the T L, not by the genuine necessity to communicate. In such communicative acts, conscious application of knowledge is inevitable.

It is not my intention to devalue the arguments for genuine communication in the target language outright, but to point out the impracticability of such attempts. It does not seem to be wise to expend so much time and energy on unproductive pursuits; instead, we may well look into how we can turn the learners' knowledge of their native language into a system of scaffolding. While using languages in real life communications, it is the users' awareness of the linguistic background of the participants that determines the choice of language; not any desire to practice a particular language to promote its learning. Precisely for this reason, we can rule out the possibility of 'genuine, natural target language communication' in the S L classroom which would naturally be viewed by the participants as simulated and contrived. No amount of persuasion or cajoling would help the learners shed the impressions they have gathered from their surroundings to believe that what they experience in the classroom is genuine, natural target language experience.

How can then we insist on 'naturally' applying the target language for all communicative purposes? How is it possible for us to expect the learners to come out of their comfort zones and use the T L for all communicative purposes when they are instructed to make it meaning focused? Can we expect them to ferry meanings across in situations that 'naturally unwarrants' the use of the T L, while being aware that they are inflicting heavy casualties on it in the process? So, such risk taking can be expected of them only when they realize that there is no way out of the communication tangle they are in because of the different linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the participants. Such an encounter is nearly out of the question in the English classrooms we have, especially in our rural areas. Hence we need to consider using the processes involved in translation and bilingual communication in the second language instruction.

If these are the processes a second language user employs while using it to communicate, it is not hard to imagine what s/he could have done to a second language while trying to acquire it. There could be an elaborate application of code transferring and such processes of code transference can be considered as a secondary manifestation of a natural tendency that develops at the learning stages of a second language. The multilingual transactions take place not only in classrooms but also in non-academic business exchanges. Thus, in our S L classroom, it is time we considered using the potential of multilingual and multicultural interactions that have become the hallmark of the modern world of academic and business activities. It is worthwhile to examine the ways of using the existing systems of knowledge to develop other systems which might be of use to the learners. In recent times, the learners' accessibility to English
newspapers, magazines and other reading materials has considerably improved compared to the students of yesteryears. This has opened up the possibilities of using the materials available in English as well as vernacular languages in the improvement of English, which still remains dormant in our rural classroom instructional context.

3. Cultural Undertones in Linguistic Communication

Second language learners are not blank slates. They not only enter the classrooms with varying degrees of proficiency in their first language but also carry a cultural legacy that can decisively influence their views of language learning and communication. Coupled with the learners' first-language proficiency, the sociocultural perceptions interfere with their acts of communication and the choice of language. Questions about individuals' second language learning cannot be understood without simultaneous attention to the larger sociocultural and sociolinguistic framework within which the learning of a second language occurs. There are cognitive challenges associated with second language acquisition; it is hard to learn new phonological, grammatical, semantic, and interactional rules. Such difficulties can best be surmounted by wisely taking the help of the native language the learners are proficient in.

The Russian social psychologists who have made significant contributions in the field of language study in relation to thought and culture consider language learning, like any other forms of human behaviour, as a dynamic intentional activity. They maintain that people do not produce speech in response to external acts, but perform a speech act directed towards the solution of some practical or theoretical problems they face. (Leontiev 1981). He underscores Vygotsky's (1962) view stating that speech is identical to any other form of human behaviour that has a definite aim and is impelled by a system of motives. These motives may be internal or external in the sense that they may be directed at either satisfying a physical or personal need or giving social control by maintaining one's position or prestige in society. The acts of natural communication concern problem solving and social functioning. However, the formal learning of a second may not always be directed at an immediate sense of purpose. On the contrary, they are concerned more with the problems they are required to solve at some point of time for which they engage themselves in contrived acts of communication in the classroom. In their classroom environment, the real and culturally relevant tool of communication is the native language to which their identity is inevitably linked.

The epistemological view of the sociocultural theory considers human learning as a dynamic social activity that is situated in physical and social contexts, and distributed across persons, tools, and activities (Vygotsky 1978, Wertsch 1991). It argues that the development of human consciousness depends on the specific social activities of the people. Theories of situated cognition argue that knowledge entails hands-on experience, not just accumulated information; the processes of learning are negotiated in what people experience in the social practices associated with particular activities (Wenger 1998). Similarly, a community of practice regulates social activities by normative ways of reasoning and using tasks and other resources in collective activity (Lave and Wenger 1991). Johnson (2006: 237) views this as the knowledge the individual “constructs through the knowledge of the communities of practice” within which s/he participates.

The sociocultural theory, thus, supports the notion that humans develop as participants in cultural communities who want to function in society as efficient individuals. This means that in order to understand human learning, or higher cognitive development, it is necessary for us to look into the social
activities that the individuals engage in as part of their social living (Leontiev 1981, Vygotsky 1978). Learning, therefore, is not a straightforward appropriation of skills or knowledge, but a “progressive movement from external, socially mediated activity to internal mediational control by individual learners, which results in the transformation of both the self and the activity” (Johnson 2006: 238). Since social activities, and the language used to regulate them are structured to gain meaning in historically and culturally situated ways, both the physical tools and the language practices used by communities gain their meaning from those who have come before.

These tenets of the sociocultural theory convincingly establish that language learning is predominantly a social process and the internalization processes involved in the acquisition of interactional patterns provide a foundation for the internalization of linguistic knowledge. Thus, it is not hard to conclude that the native language provides the basic framework for communicative acts for the adult second language learners. The learners invariably rely on translanguistic code transferring acts while trying to communicate in the target language, and hence, it is difficult for them to conceive of natural communication sans the applications of their native language structures in the developmental stages. Therefore, the attempts to preempt the native language use during instructional target language communication have the potential to be counterproductive in the second language learning situation.

4. Translation in Second Language Development

The knowledge of a language involves not only the knowledge of what form it takes but also how it functions in communicative environments. Similarly, human linguistic communication is considered to be the strongest possible form of communication because we are capable of assigning semantic interpretations to verbal representations. New concepts give rise to words; our need to express ideas and emotions results in the creation of words, and then they gain new dimensions of meanings in the course of their use and function. In situations where multilingual applications occur, the meaning codes get transferred amidst comparisons and considerations of sociocultural appropriateness. It has been found that the learners’ frequent applications of code-switching and code-mixing also have a positive effect on the learner’s knowledge of the languages involved, particularly on the recessive one (James 2010). If this is so, there is no reason why we should not consider bilingual interactions as an opportunity that can provide occasions for the learners to put to use their code-switching and code-mixing mechanisms to promote the learning of the target language.

In the process of second language learning, the adult learners are believed to develop cues to comprehend a new language based on their mother tongue principles. The concept of interlanguage (Selinker 1972), the internal system that a learner constructs in the process of learning, explains the mental processes responsible for second language acquisition. These, according to Selinker (1992), are language transfer, transfer of training, strategies of second language learning, communication strategies, and generalisation of rules and principles. They are externally manifest in translation, code switching, code mixing and other cross-linguistic applications the learners resort to in the acts of communication.

In all these cognitive processes, translation involving code-transferring and meaning-construction using different code-systems plays a no less significant role. If we are to concede that there is some kind of connection between language and thinking, then the process of translation involving code-transferring and structural comparisons will have to be considered as an integral part of the communication process. This is not to justify the concept of linguistic relativity formed out of overstretching the Sapir-Whorf
hypothesis (1949), but there is sufficient reason to think that language and thinking influence each other in some tangible way. Thinking presupposes the existence of the mental entities of representations and these representations are compared and contrasted in the translation process.

Language not only enables communication, but also reflects the conceptual world of its users by means of mental representations. Mental representations involve the structure of knowledge as perceived by the individuals. They are patterns of organization that comprise the knowledge of the individual, processes of changing this knowledge, deriving new knowledge through conscious and unconscious inferences and generating new plans of action. In translation too, the cognitive processes that determine the learning outcome play a similar role since it involves transferring of mental representations using the framework of a different linguistic system. Therefore, we need to recognize the importance of translation as a process assisting language learning and communication.

While learning a second language, the learners build up an internal system for themselves, which is different in some way from their first language and second language systems. Selinker (1972) describes this system as interlanguage that has a structurally intermediate status between the mother tongue and the target language. He bases his theory of interlanguage on the assumption that there is a 'psychological structure latent in the brain', which is activated when one attempts to learn a second language. He proposes the theory of interlanguage and argues that the utterances produced by the learners will be different from those that the native speakers would produce if they had attempted to convey the same meaning. This clearly indicates the development of an intermediate linguistic system that is markedly different from the target language. Selinker's theory of interlanguage formation points to the occurrence of active mental processes within the learners in the course of language learning. These processes involve language transfer from previous learning experience, employing strategies for second language learning, strategies of second language communication, and finally, overgeneralization of elements of the target language system. The strategies of learning and communicating are particularly important since they decisively influence the nature and type of the interlanguage. When a learner realizes that he has no linguistic competence for handling a target language material, he evolves some strategies to overcome the situation. One of the strategies that probably works at the conscious level may be the learners' attempt to reduce the target language to a simpler system by means of oversimplification. This act of oversimplification includes word and structure replacements with the help of their native language repertoire. This can be observed in their simultaneous use of the L1 and T L structures in the course of communicating. It thus becomes evident that the learners resort to oversimplification, code mixing and code switching in order to maintain fluency in communication.

The theory of interlanguage formation seems to be in tune with the concept of input hypothesis proposed by Krashen (1982) who argues that when the learners are exposed to a particular language, they do not assimilate the grammar of that language straight away. They process the input data, form certain hypotheses and test them before forming their own grammar. They may use and discard a number of systems in the process of learning which is an evidence for the active mental operations going on in the learners' mind. Since the concepts and ideas are largely structured by the first language, it exercises a lot of influence on the patterns and structures the learners finally construct. Hence, it is natural for them to view the second language through their first language and arrive at a system that is midway between their first and second language. The formation and execution of this interlanguage system reiterate the presence of an independent assessment system prompted by the self-directional orientation of the learners.
5. Second Language Use from the Post-structuralist Perspective

The post-structuralist conceptions of language and its use seem to explain such linguistic intersections occurring in the processes of communication in the light of the users' attempts to adapt to varying communicative demands. In the post-structuralist perspective, texts are not, strictly speaking, monocultural manifestations with an intrinsic textual identity, but are as amorphous as the conceptions of linguistic identity and social distinctions. Peim (2000:171) states that post-structuralism does not recognize texts as discrete units with fixed meanings: they rather 'operate with dynamic language codes' that keep mixing up with other codes and conventions in their effort to create meaning in the amorphous, multicultural environments. In this process, they also keep referring to the things outside the immediate context. Meanings, in this view, are not free productions of personal response, but are constructed under the influence of a variety of social and contextual factors as Vygotsky (1978) postulated earlier. The contexts for the meaning are created by not only the learners' ways of thinking and cultural perceptions, but also the socio-political environment in which they are positioned.

The post-structuralists reiterate the instability of meanings which drift and realign in its meanderings in the multilingual, multicultural streams. Alongside grows the same kind of instability with regard to the use of uniform codes and structures. English in our country is now rapidly getting adapted to the way of life and culture of specific areas and it is manifest in code-switching and other multilingual applications. As Crystal (2004) suggests, when people rely on two or more languages simultaneously there will be all sorts of translinguistic applications. In such processes, the institutionalized practices including the teaching of second languages need to accommodate these harsh realities, and adopt more flexible ways of making the practices meaningful. In this perspective, the idea of creative individuals mastering a second language in a self-directed manner using whatever resources they can comfortably employ appears conducive to the tenets of post-structuralism. While thinking of practical ways of developing a teaching programme that incorporates these ideas in an institutionalized setting we need to essentially consider the potential role the kind of 'impure English' the youngsters of the post-globalization era employ in their conversation.

This reiterates the need for accommodating multiple new varieties of English formed out of hybridisations at various levels of use. They are manifestations of a transplanted, indigenized, reincarnated language (Patil 2006). In the processes of transplantation and indigenisation, a great deal of interaction takes place between English and native languages. This interaction is believed to result in interlanguage formation (Selinker 1972) and other kinds of linguistic hybridisation. In these prototypes, we can see the streaks of the processes of translation and transcreation. Thus, in any multilingual country, English is a twice born language in the socio-cultural contexts that fall outside the inner circle and such non-native varieties of English are characterized with socio-linguistic and pragmatic transfer (Patil 2006).

Language, thus, takes on new forms and functions to carry the weight of new cultural experiences. In their interactions with the language forms, the non-native speakers and writers transfer to English the rules of use and usage from their own speech communities. There are learners of English who unconsciously transfer the rules and norms of use from their native language and apply them to English. Such internally activated linguistic exchanges characterize the second language users' language corpus from which his model of the target language is evolved. Such natural formations need not be looked down upon, for they indicate creative application of internalized conventions acquired by the learners in the
course of their encounter with the languages operational in the environment. This is precisely the reason why we cannot conceive of a plan to teach it without the assistance of the native language to the adult second language learners.

6. Bilingual Interactions and Bilingual Strategies

Code-switching is the alternation between two codes of languages seen in the language use of people who share those particular codes. Choices about how code-switching manifests itself are determined by a number of social and linguistic factors. It is quite common in multilingual and multicultural societies. Code-switching can take on several forms including alteration of sentences, phrases from both languages, and switching in a long narrative.

Gumperz (1982) puts forth the idea that code-switching could be seen as a real, specific discourse strategy employed by bilinguals who are able to use at least two languages to communicate with varying degrees of proficiency. The frequency of code-switching seems to be greater in a second language learning situation. He argues that there is a relationship between code-switching and general conversational functions. Code-alternations possibly occur when the speakers develop a feeling of slipperiness resulting from misfired communication that pushes them out of their comfort zones. Therefore, code-mixing and code-switching should be seen as normal and natural attempts on the part of the users to repair communication breakdowns in bilingual settings.

Bilingual speakers very often tend to use code-switching for making modifications and clarifications in their communication acts that are more meaning focused by nature. It is also linked to reiteration in which a particular message, or a part of it, is repeated and translated into the other linguistic code. This kind of replication can be used to clarify the meaning of the message or to give emphasis and more strength to what is being conveyed. On the whole code-switching is a natural communication strategy that is employed to maintain and enhance the efficacy of communicative interactions.

Since code-switching is a natural, unpremeditated and involuntary action taking place in the course of normal communication in bilingual environments, it can never be considered undesirable in second language classroom communication. When it naturally evolves in the classroom without invoking rebuke or ridicule, much of the learning tension is eased out and the possibilities of learning by comparison and contrast open up. How then can we say that free code-switching is detrimental to the second language being learned? On the contrary, the whole process enhances cognitive processes that will result in better learning.

It is therefore necessary to consider S L classrooms as discourse communities where learners get involved in discourse making as part of their interactive learning activities. In such activities, social structures and linguistic forms get intertwined to make the communication process meaningful as well as complex. It is in the light of this view that we need to think of a classroom communication policy that takes into consideration the socio-cultural factors in addition to the need for using the target language in communication for the sake of acquisition. Bilingual communication that can accommodate comfort zones for each learner seems to be a reasonable option, and more over, this appears to be in tune with the learners' psychological orientation.

7. Conclusion

To exploit the possibilities offered by the bilingual situation in the learning of English as a second language, we need to stop insisting on the 'English only approach' based on the view that it is possible to
generate genuine, natural S L communication in the classroom. This may sound a bit absurd to those purists who fallaciously think that it will result in limiting the learners' practice and exposure to a considerable extent. On the contrary, if they are given the freedom to simultaneously use both the languages holding firmly onto their comfort zones, they will get more inclined to involve themselves in the classroom activities. Moreover, the liberty to freely switch codes will work on their creativity as the situation can cut down their anxiety and inhibitions to a considerable degree.

However, it is important to clearly instruct them to use the target language whenever and wherever they think they can, and switch over to the native language the moment they feel it is hard to carry on. This is to avoid situations where there is a breakdown of communication in terms of its content and flow, and the resultant shattering of the learners' confidence. It is necessary for us to keep in mind the fact that the learners carry with them a lot of 'dormant English' which gets activated only when the mechanisms of code-switching and code-mixing leading to structural and semantic comparisons and contrasts are activated. To facilitate this, activities involving the application of both the languages could be considered.

Bilingual reading could involve simultaneous reading of the two texts expressing the same content in two languages. English and vernacular dailies may be put to use in this activity. The learner first reads the native language newspaper and understands the content without difficulty, and then moves onto read the same item in the English newspaper. In the second phase of reading, the learners will have a smooth going since the already assimilated content appears before them in its new apparel. After a few such sessions, the reading order may be reversed; reading in English takes the first turn followed by the reading of the same content in the native language. In the second phase of this activity, imperfections are removed and consolidation takes place.

In bilingual listening, simultaneous listening to news broadcasts in the aforementioned manner could be tried out. Listening to the news broadcast of English and the vernacular news channels airing the same news content could improve the prospect of sustaining learner interest just for the reason that the learners needn't put in so much of effort to make sense of what they listen to. In addition to the information they gather, they get to know the way in which the same content is expressed in each language, and with the exposure spreading out to longer durations, the internal processing of the language structure results in more effective learning.

When it comes to speaking, bilingual applications can occur in the classroom activities intermittently and they are determined by the comfort levels on which each learner places himself/herself. If they are given the freedom to switch and mix codes freely with a view to making their communication flow in an unhindered manner, they will be able to ward off their anxiety and inhibitions to a considerable extent. Though there is a danger of the learners keeping their English use to a minimum level at the initial stages, things might look up in due course because of the extended possibilities of code-switching and code-mixing. In due course, their comfort levels get altered and they will show greater confidence in speaking the target language.

Bilingual exercises in writing closely resemble translation in which the learners try to translate what they have expressed through writing in their native language into English. In all the other activities, there is no use of translation which is a more painstaking and time consuming activity. The learners deal with original creations in the first three activities mentioned above. But in bilingual writing, translation, with
all its potential for review, reconsideration and subsequent fine-tuning of the language structures, serves to consolidate the theoretical back up the learning process essentially requires.

All this indicates that an alternative environment conducive to generating dialogue can be created if we resort to the possibilities of bilingual communication. The communication using the target language should be made intermittent, letting the learners communicate alternately using both the languages taking their own comfort zones into consideration. The learners are likely to experience less strain if they are allowed to freely switch codes in the communicative process and exchange the same information simultaneously exploiting the potential of both the languages. The success of communication in terms of the unhindered meaningful exchange of ideas is likely to have a rejuvenating influence on the learner.
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