مراجعة نقدية لنُهج التدريب على الترجمة

أحمد أرنب*، عبد الجبار العويد محيي الدين حميدي****

*طالب دراسات عليا (دكتوراه)، قسم اللغة الإنكليزية، كلية الآداب والعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة حلب

** قسم اللغة الإنكليزية، كلية الآداب والعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة حلب

الملخص

يهدف هذا البحث إلى مراجعة بعض النُهج الرئيسة المُتّبعة في التدريب على الترجمة، ومناقشة إيجابياتها وسلبياتها وإبراز تطبيقاتها الممكنة في مختلف مراحل التدريب. هذه المراجعة تغطي النهج القائم على الخطأ، الذي يعد حتى الآن النهج الأكثر شيوعاً في تعليم الترجمة ويرتبط ارتباطاً وثيقاً بتدريس اللغات الأجنبية. كما تشمل أيضاً النُهج الاستقرائية والاستنتاجية والوظيفية؛ بالإضافة إلى النهج القائم على المدوّنة والنهج الموجّه نحو المتعلم والنهج القائم على المشاريع. على الرغم من أن هذه النُهج تقدم مواقف محددة جيداً حول كيفية تعليم الترجمة، مما يجعل المدرسين والمنظرين يختارون أحدها دون غيره، إلا أنها جميعاً تتمتع بمزايا وتشوبها عيوب عندما يتعلق الأمر بالتخطيط لأرضية نظرية شاملة للأنشطة الصفية لطلاب الترجمة وتأسيس منهجية واضحة لتدريس الترجمة. غير أن ما لا يمكن إنكاره هو أن كلّ هذه النُهج هي نُهج صحيحة للتدريب على الترجمة بطريقتها الخاصة وفي مراحل التعلم المختلفة. أي أن الطلاب لديهم احتياجات مختلفة خلال مساقات الترجمة؛ وبالتالي، يجب أن تتكيف نُهج التدريس مع هذه الاحتياجات. على المستوى العملي، من المتوقع أن تظهر الفروض المقدمة خلال المساقات نوعًا من التقدم. الأمر الذي يوعز للمعلم بضرورة مواكبة التقدم الذي أحرزه طلابه وتطبيق منهجيات مختلفة في كل مرحلة من مراحل تقدم الطلاب. خلاصة القول هو أن المرونة المنهجية هي مفتاح الحل.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التدريب على الترجمة، النُهج التعليمية.

ورد البحث للمجلة بتاريخ 29\7\2018

قبل للنشر بتاريخ 16\9\2018

A Critical Review of Translation Training Approaches

Ahmad Arnab*, Abduljabbar Oweid, Moheiddin Homeidi****
*Postgraduate Student (PhD), Dept. of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Aleppo
** Dept. of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Aleppo

Abstract

This paper aims at reviewing some of the main approaches to translation training, discussing their pros and cons and highlighting their possible applications in the various stages of training. It needs to be said that, because of the traditional focus of scholars primarily on linguistics and translation studies, most of the approaches to translation teaching/training have been strongly influenced by more and better-developed models stemming from both study areas. This influence does not discredit the validity of traditional and existing educational systems but rather becomes a reflection of the changing trends of a world increasingly aware of the importance of designing pedagogical models for the training of future translators. Thus, this review covers the error-oriented approach, which is by far the most common approach in the translation class and closely linked to foreign language teaching (FLT). This also includes the inductive, deductive, and functional approaches; the corpus-based approach; the learner-oriented approach; and the project-based approach. Although such approaches present well-defined attitudes as to how translation should be taught, which makes teachers and theoreticians opt for one or another, they all have their pros and cons when it comes to planning a comprehensive theoretical backdrop to classroom activities for translation students and establishing a systematic translation teaching methodology. What is undeniable, however, is that all of them are valid approaches to translation training in their own way and at different learning stages. That is, students have different needs during the translation courses; thus, the teaching approach should adapt to these needs. On a practical level, the assignments submitted during the course are expected to show some kind of progress. What does this tell the teacher? Basically, it tells that he or she needs to catch up with his students' progress and apply different methodologies at every stage of the students' progress. The key phrase, thus, is methodological flexibility.

Keywords: Translation Training; Pedagogical Approaches

Received 29\7\2018
Accepted 16\9\2018

1- Introduction

Like translation itself, translation training has been going through a process of "professionalisation" since World War II, in response to a universal need for specialisation. Translation has been gradually evolving from piecemeal individual insights relevant to different immediate situations to explicit, empirical, and systematic procedures based on up-to-date data and theories from adjacent disciplines, aiming at certain degrees of universal validity.

Nevertheless, the provision of institutionalised training for translators and interpreters is hardly a novel idea. Various methods were tried out in the training of the Egyptian dragoman, the Greek hermeneus, and the Latin interpres[1]. In the literature, at least three well-known schools for translators existed prior to modern times: (a) in Toledo during the Middle Ages, (b) in Bagdad in the Abbasid caliphate era, and (c) in Paris at the École d'Études Orientales[2]. In China, large-scale projects of translating Buddhist scripts imported from India were sponsored by succeeding governments between the first and the seventh century A.D. These projects involved hundreds, and at times thousands or more, of professional translators, and were accompanied by formal training[3]. However, there was little evidence of the legacy of these ancient programmes inspiring modern ones either in the West or in the East.

Moreover, a paramount contribution to the application of translation theory in translation teaching has been achieved by Chau[4] who classifies theories of translation into three models. Each model includes two methods which can function as a specific means of application of a particular model based on particular views or attitudes to the process of translating: (a) the grammatical model, which includes the traditional grammar method and the formal linguistic method; (b) the cultural model, which includes the ethnographical semantic method and the dynamic equivalence method; and (c) the interpretive model, which includes the hermeneutic method and text

[1] SCHMITT C., 1966 – **The Self-Taught Translator: From Rank Amateur to Respected Professional**. *Meta*, **11(4)**, 123-126.
[2] DUNLOP D. M., 1960 – **The Work of Translation at Toledo**. *Babel*, **6(2)**, 55-59.
[3] Ts'an H., 1951 – **The Number of Interpreters and Works Translated in the Translation of Buddhist Texts**. *Translation Bulletin*, **3(1)**, 22-25.
[4] CHAU S. S. C., 1984 – **Aspects of Translation Pedagogy: The Grammatical, The Cultural, and The Interpretive Models** (Doctoral dissertation, University of Edinburgh).

analysis method. Chau's classification is of great importance for its pedagogical implications, for it help translation students get exposed to a variety of approaches to translation which are inspired by and connect to different theoretical schools so as to make more flexible in their approach to texts and learn theory in practical application.

However, this paper endeavours to review some of the main approaches to translation training. It does so by discussing the pros and cons and the possible applications of such approaches in the various stages of training. Nonetheless, because of the traditional focus of studies on linguistics and translation studies, most of the approaches to translation teaching have been strongly influenced by more and better-developed models stemming from both study fields. This influence does not devalue traditional and existing educational systems but rather reflect the changing trends of the increasing awareness of the importance of designing pedagogical models for the training of future translators. The approaches covered in this review include the traditional error-oriented approach, which is by far the most common approach in the translation class and closely linked to foreign language teaching. It also covers the inductive, deductive, and functional approaches; the corpus-based approach; the learner-oriented approach; and the project-based approach.

2- The Review

2-1- The Error-oriented Approach

Since the early days of translation teaching at institutional level, there has been a strong connection between foreign language teaching and translation teaching. Amongst other things, FLT has traditionally concerned itself with looking for the reasons for and types of errors. Interestingly, translation teaching (independent of FLT) also has a long tradition of error analysis, whose main focus is the offence against linguistic conventions, in other words, the offence against the grammatical and lexical usage of the target language (TL) conventions[1]. This emphasis on the linguistic component of translation represented, for many teachers, one of the main indicators which distinguished good trainees from the rest. In order to avoid linguistic errors in translations, these teachers used to and still advise their students:

[1] NORD C., 1991 – **Text Analysis in Translation Theory: Methodology and Didactic Applications for a Translation-Oriented Text Analysis**. Rodopi, Netherlands.

To take courses in mother tongue usage in order to become more sensitive to the way they use their own language and prescribe a remedial course in the foreign language in order to improve their foreign language competence and prescribe a course in text analysis in order to improve their understanding of the source text [ST] and help them with their decisions when translating it[1].

However, translation exercises based on error analysis do not seem to bear enough scientific credibility and objectivity probably because there is little agreement amongst researchers and teachers on how to define and classify errors[2]. The concept of error has frequently been used in all areas of humanities, especially those revolving around instrumental language. Nord reports on a series of linguists who have written extensively about defining and classifying errors:

In traditional philology, in foreign language teaching, and in other disciplines of applied linguistics, such as contrastive linguistics and psycholinguistics, the question of how to define a linguistic error, how to detect an error and, above all, how to develop efficient error therapy has been under discussion for quite some time (e.g.,[3]), whereas in translation studies error analysis has been dealt with only peripherally so far (e.g.,[4]). (p. 169)

In linguistics, it is fairly common practice to define an error as deviation from a certain norm, convention, or a system of rules[5]. In translation, because of the two languages involved in any translational process, errors may be linked either to the phase of text reception or to the phase of text production. Difficulties in translation do not only result from linguistic problems; they also depend on extralinguistic factors, such as knowledge of the source and target cultures, the stylistic, functional, and pragmatic qualities required of the target text, and the translation skopos or goal[6].

[1] KUSSMAUL P., 1995 – **Training the translator**. John Benjamins, Netherlands.
[2] NORD C., 1991 – **Text Analysis in Translation Theory: Methodology and Didactic Applications for a Translation-Oriented Text Analysis**. Rodopi, Netherlands.
[3] NICKEL G., 1978 – **Error Analysis**. Narr, Germany.
[4] WILSS W., 1982 – **The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods**. Narr, Germany.
[5] NICKEL G., 1978 – **Error Analysis**. Narr, Germany.
[6] NORD C., 1991 – **Text Analysis in Translation Theory: Methodology and Didactic Applications for a Translation-Oriented Text Analysis**. Rodopi, Netherlands.

Nord defines a translation error as an offence against (a) target text (TT) function, (b) textual coherence, (c) text-type norms, (d) linguistic conventions, and (e) culture-specific and situational constraints. Nord puts forward her own definition of what an error is in translational terms. She proposes a "functionalist view" of correctness and incorrectness, grounded in the idea that a particular expression or utterance does not in itself have the quality of being incorrect, but it is assigned that quality by the recipient in the light of a particular norm or standard.

Linked to the definitions and classifications of errors is the question of what causes errors. One of the most convincing classifications of reasons for errors is the one proposed by Kussmaul (1995), who distinguishes six types of problems that students may encounter during the translation process: (a) interference, (b) fear of interference, (c) faulty one-to-one correspondence, (d) misuse of bilingual dictionaries, (e) misuse of world knowledge and one's own experiences, and (f) incomplete paraphrasing. However, it must be said that they are not to be regarded as ultimate truths but rather as approximate diagnoses and symptoms to errors.

Finally, the concept of error generates in the student's mind negative connotations, which the teacher should try to minimise. Therefore, the definition of what a translation error is should be re-assessed by supplying students with unambiguous information of what error means to the evaluator. Apart from linguistic (also intralinguistic) criteria, extralinguistic criteria should also be included in the evaluation of the student's work. This indeed helps students better understand what the teacher would classify as an error.

2-2- The Inductive, Deductive, and Functional Approaches

Through the inductive approach, according to Klaudy[1], the teacher provides his or her students with a number of texts to be dealt with during the whole semester. The students translate these texts at home or in the class, then they discuss the translation problems they encountered with their teacher who corrects their mistakes and helps them reach a suitable and adequate translation. This approach is obviously based on the number, type, and quality of texts dealt with. The problems that the texts fail to show remain[2]. To reach good results

[1] KLAUDY K., 2003 – **Languages in Translation: Lectures on the Theory, Teaching and Practice of Translation**. Scholastica, Hungary.
[2] KUSSMAUL P., 1995 – **Training the translator**. John Benjamins, Netherlands.

with such a time-consuming approach, the learners have to be exposed to a multitude of texts of different types.

However, we believe that this approach can be enriched with the inductive approach to language learning. Through inductive instruction in language learning, the teacher makes use of students' "noticing." Thus, instead of explaining a given concept and following this explanation with examples, the teacher presents students with many examples showing how the concept is used. The intent is for students to notice, by way of the examples, how the concept works.

One example of the methods used following this approach is *the discovery technique*[1]. The discovery technique is a method of teaching in which students are not directly presented with a target grammatical structure or rule. Rather, students are given content in which the target structure is used[2]. Students then discover the grammatical rule or figure out the pattern for themselves. The teacher's role is to guide students to their own discovery, not to give students the information on the target rule.

Furthermore, we assume that the discovery technique has three primary benefits. First, since students are solving a grammar mystery, they tend to pay more attention and stay more engaged. They are not simply receiving information from the teacher; they are discovering it for themselves. Second, students who learn with the discovery technique tend to remember the rules of grammar better because they have played a part in discovering them. The final benefit might be the greatest of all. Because they have learnt grammar by figuring out the rules from context, students familiar with this technique find it easier to figure out unfamiliar grammar structures they encounter in the future. This makes them better able to cope when they are faced with some grammar point they have not already learnt in class.

Thus, we suggest the use of this technique in translation teaching. Students can be exposed to various linguistic items embedded in a text. Exposure can be through parallel bilingual passages in which the passages are provided in both the foreign language and the mother tongue. Students can then be asked to compare both the original text and its translation to figure out the

[1] COLINA S., 2003 – **Translation Teaching from Research to the Classroom**. McGraw-Hill, USA.

[2] HUDSON R., 2010 – **Grammar**. In: Berns M., Ed., Concise Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics, Elsevier, UK, pp: 126-129.

target linguistic items and how they are translated.

In the deductive approach, however, students are invited to deal with specific problems of translation, on the basis of which a text is chosen for translation in the classroom. During the translation activity, techniques are proposed by the teacher to suggest solutions for the recurrent translational problems such as the translation of geographical names, institutions and measurements, and translation of some grammatical structures in a given language pair. The advantage of such an approach is that the teacher is free to decide on what problems to cover during the semester with regard to students' level and immediate needs and according to what he or she judges as being important. Then, the teacher proceeds to prepare a list of problems to be tackled during the semester or during the whole year, and to find illustrative examples in texts to be dealt with and discussed in the classroom.

Finally, teaching is organised through the functional approach around particular skills to be developed in learners. Teachers decide what skills are necessary for the translation competence of their learners and devise appropriate activities or tasks subsidiary to the translation activity per se. For example, to meet the need of making students able to distance themselves from the source text, the teacher may encourage them, through specific tasks, to use intralingual transformation or paraphrasing within the same language, be it the source or the target. Teachers can also help students with summaries and semantic mappings to increase their ability in analysing and comprehending a source text.

2-3- The Corpus-based Approach

According to Munday[1], the corpus-based approach has become known as a new paradigm in translation studies, as it draws on the tools and techniques of corpus linguistics that had initially been developed in the early 1980s by John Sinclair and his team working on the COBUILD English Dictionary project at Birmingham, UK. This approach has been used for other languages since then, its application in Arabic is long overdue and the only bilingual English–Arabic dictionary that is based on a corpus is *Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic: Arabic-English*[2]. Amongst the few Arabic grammar books reliant on

[1] MUNDAY J., 2016 – **Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications**. Routledge, 4th Ed, UK.

[2] BADAWI E. S., & Hinds M., 1986 – **A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic: Arabic-English**. Librairie du Liban, Lebanon.

corpora is *Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar*[1]. Generally speaking, The Arabic corpora fall into one of two broad types: news corpora and conversational corpora (e.g., Leeds Arabic Corpora http://corpus.leeds.ac.uk/query-ar.html and the International Corpus of Arabic http://www.bibalex.org/ica/en/). However, the Corpus of Contemporary Arabic (http://shachi.org/resources/4051), is an Arabic corpus of legal data and computer science. It has about two million words, yet it makes up for this small number by including technical subcorpora[2].

The approach was then adopted by a considerable number of scholars (e.g.,[3] [4] [5]) until it became a fully-fledged new paradigm in translation studies. Different types of corpora are available to meet several pedagogical needs:

1- Monolingual comparable corpus consists of texts originally written in a particular language and similar texts translated into the source language from different languages[6]. Such corpora can be very helpful as it helps students investigate the linguistic nature of translated text, independently of the source language.

Although it can be used as a reference tool, as complement to dictionaries and grammar books, a monolingual corpus unlike the dictionary, leaves it to the user to figure out how an expression is used in context from the data, thereby increasing the probability of learning[7]. A consultation of a corpus (e.g., the British National Corpus (BNC) or COBUILD Bank of English), can provide the student or the translator with a large number of collocations in one click. Going through the results from the corpus can then enhance incidental and

[1] BADAWI E. S., CARTER M., & GULLY A., 2013 – **Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar**. Routledge, UK.

[2] HUSNI R., & NEWMAN D. L., 2015 – **Arabic-English-Arabic Translation: Issues and Strategies**. Routledge, UK.

[3] KENNY D., 1999 – **Cat Tools in an Academic Environment**. *Target,* **11(1)**, 65-82.

[4] MUNDAY J., 1998 – **A Computer-Assisted Approach to the Analysis of Translation Shifts**. *Meta,* **43(4)**, 542-556.

[5] ZANETTIN F., 1998 – **Bilingual Comparable Corpora and the Training of Translators**. *Meta*, **43(4)**, 616-630.

[6] BAKER M., 1995 – **Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and Some Suggestions for Future Research**. *Target,* **7(2)**, 223-243.

[7] HULTSIJN J. H., 1992 – **Retention of inferred and given word meanings: Experiments in incidental vocabulary learning**. In: ARNAUD P. J. L., & JOINT H. B., Eds., Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics, MacMillan, UK, pp: 113-125.

unpredictable learning by acquiring new collocations which, although look unfamiliar, may be noticed and explored by the user who is prepared to go off at a tangent to follow them up[1].

2- Bilingual comparable corpus includes sets of texts which belong to genres sociolinguistically similar in the two languages[2]. That is, texts are selected based on similarity of topic, communicative function, variabilities from different sources (e.g., online or scanned materials).

The emergence of this type of corpus is an extension to the traditional use of parallel texts in translation[3], which are "typically unrelated except by the analyst's recognition that the original circumstances that led to the creation of the two sets of texts have produced accidental similarities"[4]. A bilingual comparable corpus can be used by students or translators in their attempt to identify the prototypical features of a particular text, features of register, and text structure.

3- Parallel corpus consists of texts in one language and their translations into two or more languages. They can be directional (i.e., they have texts in one language along with their translations in another language or languages) or bidirectional (i.e., they include source texts in language A and their aligned translations in language B, and source texts in language B and their aligned translations in language A)[5]. One of the innovative projects in this respect is the English Norwegian bidirectional corpus.

The use of parallel corpus can help students or translators determine the equivalence of particular expressions. Aligning the texts in a corpus gives students of translators the chance to examine different translations of a particular expression and perceive general patterns. In addition to its use to achieve a great degree of precision in terms of terminology and phraseology, parallel corpora, especially with one source text and many translations, can offer a systematic

[1] BERNARDINI S., 1997 – **A Trainee Translator's Perspective on Corpora**.
[2]ASTON G., 1999 – **Corpus Use and Learning to Translate**. *Textus,* **12(2)**, 289-314.
[3] SNELL-HORNBY M., 1988 – **Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach**. John Benjamins, Netherlands.
[4] HARTMANN R. R. K., 1980 – **Contrastive Textology: Comparative Discourse Analysis in Applied Linguistics**. Julius Groos, Germany, p. 38.
[5]ASTON G., 1999 – **Corpus Use and Learning to Translate**. *Textus,* **12(2)**, 289-314.

translation strategy for linguistic structures which have no direct equivalents in the target language.

A parallel corpus can also be used to investigate a broad array of translation problems. Bowker[1] suggests that translation teachers can use parallel corpora to document the translations of students to detect their translation problems or to guide teaching practices. He adds that a teacher can pick up a text of a particular genre, collect the translations of the text by students, align them with the help of a concordance to see whether certain problems affect the class as a whole or individual students alone.

In case of specialised translation courses, a teacher can make use of a corpus of domain-specific translations (e.g., medical) to investigate whether the problems that students experience are genre-specific or recur in other genres. Besides, a longitudinality of the translations of a group of students can help the teacher gauge the progress of students over a semester or a whole programme and examine which problems seem to have been resolved and which are still posing some problems[2].

Apart from the particular uses of the corpuses given above, corpus-based translation models have, to a great extent, changed the roles of the teacher and students and contributed to their autonomy. The teacher is no longer the sole authority and the ultimate source of all the data but a guide to translation students who are actively involved in seeking knowledge. Whenever there is a task, a teacher can refer to a corpus and encourages students to make use of it to do the task and search for solutions for any problems they may face. Even if they do not find an exact solution to a particular problem, they benefit a lot from their query in the corpus[3].

This enhances learner-oriented learning and motivates students to look for translation problems without the need to rely upon the teacher totally. Moreover, this can minimise the pressures on the teachers in the sense that they are not required to translate the text word-for-word in the classroom.

[1] BOWKER L., 2002 – **Computer-Aided Translation Technology: A Practical Introduction**. University of Ottawa Press, USA.
[2] ibid
[3] VAEZIAN H., 2009 – **Corpora in translation classrooms**. In: OMAR H. C., HAROON H., & ABD. GHANI A., Eds., The Sustainability of the Translation Field: The 12th International Conference on Translation, Malaysian Translators Association, Malaysia, pp: 242-249.

2-4- The Learner-oriented Approach

The majority of translation teaching literature is, in fact, more concerned with what to teach (i.e., syllabus, process vs. product, theory vs. practice, translation competence, etc.) but not how to teach. In the simplest sense, "how to teach" deals with interpersonal relationship, encompassing specific approaches, methods, and techniques that are meant to effectively deliver content, whereas "what to teach" refers to the content to be taught[1].

Therefore, it can be argued that the most prominent theme of translation teaching in terms of approach is the advent of the learner-oriented approach as an alternative to the traditional teacher-centred approach[2] [3] [4]. These two approaches differ particularly in the roles of teachers and learners as well as in the assumption of knowledge construction.

Teacher-centred approaches reflect a transmissionist view of knowledge acquisition during which teachers play the role of an authority for imparting knowledge. As a result, learners are not expected to assume any responsibility for their learning. The consequence is that the subjectivity of each individual is not acknowledged or respected, and learners' autonomy is not likely to be encouraged and developed. It could result in a lack of engagement from learners. Thus, the classroom dynamic could be quite different from that in which learners are allowed more participation.

The learner-oriented approach, on the other hand, assumes that knowledge is constructed by means of interaction, and the role of the teacher is closer to that of a facilitator who supports learners' learning processes. Learners are seen as active agents who are in charge of their learning. What they have learnt or are learning is an outcome of constant engagement with their peers and their teacher. In the learner-oriented classroom, learners are encouraged to voice their opinions,

---

[1] YAN X. J., PAN J., & WANG H., 2018 – **Research on Translator and Interpreter Training: A Collective Volume of Bibliometric Reviews and Empirical Studies on Learners**. Springer Nature, Singapore, p. 43.

[2] COLINA S., 2003 – **Translation Teaching from Research to the Classroom**. McGraw-Hill, USA.

[3] GONZÁLEZ DAVIES M., 2004 – **Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom**. John Benjamins, Netherlands.

[4] GONZÁLEZ DAVIES M., & SCOTT-TENNENT C., 2005 – **A Problem-Solving and Student-Centred Approach to the Translation of Cultural References**. *Meta,* **50(1)**, 160-179.

and the teacher's responsibility is to manage an interactive platform for open negotiation and discussion, rather than providing correct answers for them[1].

Therefore, the rationale behind the learner-oriented approach might be that it can be used at different learning stages, as it benefits from other approaches. More precisely, the learner-oriented approach puts the inductive, deductive, and other approaches in one melting pot with the aim of benefiting from their pros (in terms of encouraging learners to use their cognitive abilities: promoting learners' competence) and providing practical recommendations regarding certain cons or problems (by clarifying the roles of the various players in the learning process). Table (1) below can be used to illustrate this approach. The characteristics provide a useful checklist for teachers designing a learner-oriented syllabus that requires evaluation criteria[2].

Table (1) Traditional vs. Learner-oriented Translation Teaching

	Traditional	Learner-oriented
Learning situation	Focused on the teacher's performance and content	Focused on the learners' needs and performance
The teacher's role	The teacher dispenses information.	The teacher diagnoses, organises, motivates and provides resources
Objectives	Normally, objectives are not clearly defined.	Objectives are formulated in terms of learners' behaviour and are presented at the beginning.
Activities	Lectures	Varied activities aimed at helping learning
Participation	Sporadic	Active
Evaluation	Usually one type at the end of the course	Frequent tasks applied soon after a teaching unit

[1] COLINA S., 2003 – **Translation Teaching from Research to the Classroom**. McGraw-Hill, USA.

[2] GONZÁLEZ DAVIES M., & SCOTT-TENNENT C., 2005 – **A Problem-Solving and Student-Centred Approach to the Translation of Cultural References**. *Meta,* **50(1)**, 160-179.

Tests	Students attends the course and then takes an exam for which a single grade is given.	Tests are prepared to measure the acquisition of the objectives established at the beginning of the course.
Interpretation of results	Tests are normative (i.e., following a normative graph in relation to the rest of the class to give a grade).	The tests are based on objective criteria, and a learner's success is not related to the rest of the class.
Mastering objectives	The teacher assumes one third of the class will be good, one third average, and one third will fail.	The teacher assumes that with time all the learners will be able to master the objectives.
The success of the course	Usually the success of the course is evaluated subjectively by the teacher.	The objectives and the evaluation help the teacher improve teaching materials and know if the learners have mastered the objectives.

2-5- The Project-based Approach

Along with the increasing interest in learner-oriented constructivist approaches to translator training, there have been proposals to introduce project-based learning, popular in education, to the teaching of translation. Typical of this approach is that students are usually invited to complete an authentic practical translation project either in small groups or as individuals. According to Blumenfeld et al.[1], project-based learning is seen as a comprehensive perspective focused on teaching by engaging students in investigation. Within this framework, students pursue solutions to nontrivial problems by asking and refining questions, debating ideas, making predictions, designing plans or experiments, collecting and analysing data, drawing conclusions, communicating their ideas and findings to others, asking new questions, and creating artefacts.

[1] BLUMENFELD P. C., SOLOWAY E., MARX R. W., KRAJCIK J. S., GUZDIAL M., & PALINCSAR A., 1991 – **Motivating Project-Based Learning: Sustaining the Doing, Supporting the Learning**. *Educational Psychologist*, **26(3-4),** 369–398.

To successfully complete a project, students will need to effectively coordinate their work, communicate with each other and external institutions, critically evaluate their findings, and solve problems arising during their work. It requires critical thinking, problem solving, collaboration, and various forms of communication to achieve their goals. In addition, project-based learning has a particularly important role for technology[1]. Students are encouraged to take full advantage of information technology (IT) tools in their investigation of the driving questions as well as representing their findings.

Therefore, students are allowed some degree of voice and choice in making plans of enquiry and construction of their findings or knowledge gained as the result of the project. They might even be allowed to choose their own research questions within a specified scope, especially in a higher education context. Additionally, project-based learning stresses learning by doing. It begins with a driving question or challenge, which creates a need to know essential content and skills and requires in-depth investigation to get to the answer and develop the skills.

However, project-based learning transforms the role of the teacher from content provider to learning coordinator. As a result, teachers spend less time lecturing and leading and more time planning, observing, listening, coaching, and facilitating. Yet, this does not mean that the teacher completely relinquishes control over the class but rather creates an environment of shared responsibility. The teacher will help students set up interim goals, monitor their progress to ensure they are getting in-depth and proper understanding of the concepts being investigated, and advise them when they encounter difficulties or issues.

Finally, it is also important to point out that there are no definite criteria regarding what makes an acceptable project for project-based learning. But a well-thought-out project will not only help students learn key academic content and develop new knowledge, but also practise various social skills such as collaboration, communication and critical thinking.

[1] KRAUSS J., & BOSS S., 2013 – **Thinking through Projects: Guiding Deeper Inquiry through Project-Based Learning**. Corwin Press, USA.

3- Summary and Conclusion

So far, some of the main approaches to translation training have been presented and discussed. Although they present well-defined attitudes as to how translation should be taught, which makes teachers and theoreticians opt for one or the other, they all have their pros and cons when it comes to planning a comprehensive theoretical backdrop to classroom activities for translation students and establishing a systematic translation teaching methodology. What is undeniable, however, is that all of them are valid approaches to translation teaching in their own way and at different learning stages. That is, students have different needs during the translation courses and therefore the teaching approach should adapt to these needs. On a practical level, the assignments submitted during the course are expected to show some kind of progress. What does this tell the teacher? Basically, it tells that he or she needs to catch up with his students' progress and apply different methodologies at every stage of the students' progress. The key phrase, thus, is methodological flexibility.

Therefore, translation trainers should try to apply the pedagogical approach, or mix more than one approach, that meets their trainees' need and improves their competence. Each of the approaches reviewed can play a role and can contribute to the promotion of the translation competence of future translators. This can only be achieved if the focus is on the students' needs not on the teachers' constraints, so teachers should focus on ways to develop students' ability to use what they learn effectively in real-life contexts rather than their ability to simply reproduce it.

4- Recommendations

The following considerations can be suggested with some implications for translation training:

1- Error analysis might be a significant teaching resource; teachers can provide guided practice to improve the acquisition of intuitive skills and then teach conscious strategies as methods for problem resolution and the production of translation alternatives;
2- As students advance, skills are less likely to be acquired by repeated practice, less likely to develop naturally without specific training and pedagogical intervention, and more likely to involve learning by doing; and
3- Training should be re-organised around a learner-oriented theoretical framework that allows the identification of cognitive

resources that translation students should acquire and improving the skills they already have.

References

1- ASTON G., 1999 – **Corpus Use and Learning to Translate**. *Textus,* **12(2)**.

2- BADAWI E. S., & Hinds M., 1986 – **A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic: Arabic-English**. Librairie du Liban, Lebanon.

3- BADAWI E. S., CARTER M., & GULLY A., 2013 – **Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar**. Routledge, UK.

4- BAKER M., 1995 – **Corpora in Translation Studies: An Overview and Some Suggestions for Future Research**. *Target,* **7(2)**.

5- BERNARDINI S., 1997 – **A Trainee Translator's Perspective on Corpora**. Retrieved from http://www.sslmit.unibo.it/cultpaps/trainee.htm

6- BLUMENFELD P. C., SOLOWAY E., MARX R. W., KRAJCIK J. S., GUZDIAL M., & PALINCSAR A., 1991 – **Motivating Project-Based Learning: Sustaining the Doing, Supporting the Learning**. *Educational Psychologist*, **26(3-4)**.

7- BOWKER L., 2002 – **Computer-Aided Translation Technology: A Practical Introduction**. University of Ottawa Press, USA.

8- CHAU S. S. C., 1984 – **Aspects of Translation Pedagogy: The Grammatical, The Cultural, and The Interpretive Models** (Doctoral dissertation, University of Edinburgh). Retrieved from https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/7443

9- COLINA S., 2003 – **Translation Teaching from Research to the Classroom**. McGraw-Hill, USA.

10- DUNLOP D. M., 1960 – **The Work of Translation at Toledo**. *Babel*, **6(2)**.

11- GONZÁLEZ DAVIES M., 2004 – **Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom**. John Benjamins, Netherlands.

12- GONZÁLEZ DAVIES M., & SCOTT-TENNENT C., 2005 – **A Problem-Solving and Student-Centred Approach to the Translation of Cultural References**. *Meta,* **50(1)**.

13- HARTMANN R. R. K., 1980 – **Contrastive Textology: Comparative Discourse Analysis in Applied Linguistics**. Julius Groos, Germany.

14- HUDSON R., 2010 – **Grammar**. In: Berns M., Ed., Concise Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics, Elsevier, UK.

15- HULTSIJN J. H., 1992 – **Retention of Inferred and Given Word Meanings: Experiments in Incidental Vocabulary Learning**. In: ARNAUD P. J. L., & JOINT H. B., Eds., Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics, MacMillan, UK.
16- HUSNI R., & NEWMAN D. L., 2015 – **Arabic-English-Arabic Translation: Issues and Strategies**. Routledge, UK.
17- KENNY D., 1999 – **Cat Tools in an Academic Environment**. *Target,* **11(1)**.
18- KLAUDY K., 2003 – **Languages in Translation: Lectures on the Theory, Teaching and Practice of Translation**. Scholastica, Hungary.
19- KRAUSS J., & BOSS S., 2013 – **Thinking through Projects: Guiding Deeper Inquiry through Project-Based Learning**. Corwin Press, USA.
20- KUSSMAUL P., 1995 – **Training the Translator**. John Benjamins, Netherlands.
21- MUNDAY J., 1998 – **A Computer-Assisted Approach to the Analysis of Translation Shifts**. *Meta,* **43(4)**.
22- MUNDAY J., 2016 – **Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications**. Routledge, 4th Ed, UK.
23- NICKEL G., 1978 – **Error Analysis**. Narr, Germany.
24- NORD C., 1991 – **Text Analysis in Translation Theory: Methodology and Didactic Applications for a Translation-Oriented Text Analysis**. Rodopi, Netherlands.
25- SCHMITT C., 1966 – **The Self-Taught Translator: From Rank Amateur to Respected Professional**. *Meta,* **11(4)**.
26- SNELL-HORNBY M., 1988 – **Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach**. John Benjamins, Netherlands.
27- Ts'an H., 1951 – **The Number of Interpreters and Works Translated in the Translation of Buddhist Texts**. *Translation Bulletin*, **3(1)**.
28- VAEZIAN H., 2009 – **Corpora in Translation Classrooms**. In: OMAR H. C., HAROON H., & ABD. GHANI A., Eds., The Sustainability of the Translation Field: The 12th International Conference on Translation, Malaysian Translators Association, Malaysia.
29- WILSS W., 1982 – **The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods**. Narr, Germany.

30- YAN X. J., PAN J., & WANG H., 2018 – **Research on Translator and Interpreter Training: A Collective Volume of Bibliometric Reviews and Empirical Studies on Learners**. Springer Nature, Singapore.

31- ZANETTIN F., 1998 – **Bilingual Comparable Corpora and the Training of Translators**. *Meta*, **43(4)**.