

# **Professionally oriented translation teaching in a modern-language faculty. An exploratory case-study**

COSTANZA PEVERATI

*Catholic University of Brescia, Italy*

*Professionalism has become a major trend in translator education in universities, even in contexts not primarily geared towards translator-training. The present paper discusses a study carried out during a profession-oriented workshop offered in a modern-language faculty at post-graduate level, with the aim of testing its appropriateness, effectiveness and impact on participants. Although all three research objectives were attained with overall positive results, some drawbacks lead to the conclusion that similar learning opportunities should be offered only as accessories to translation courses strongly geared towards education.*

*Keywords: translation teaching, translator training, professionalism, modern-language faculties.*

## **Introduction**

In recent years, the academic world has responded to the increasing demand for language mediation services with an unprecedented proliferation of training opportunities in translation (cf. Schäffner and Adab 2000: vii, Nord 2005: 209). This has partly happened in contexts not primarily geared to Translation Studies or translator training, like modern-language faculties. In these settings, translation has traditionally been taught as a language-teaching, learning, and testing device, with a predominantly philological and contrastive approach. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, under the influence of Communicative Language Teaching, translation was strongly criticized and sometimes rejected altogether as counter-productive to the acquisition process (Malmkjær 1998: 4, Colina 2002: 2). Around the mid-1990s, it was revalued in view of recent developments in Translation Studies, where translation was being conceptualized as essentially an act of communication. The advocates of translation teaching in language curricula suggested that this exercise could indeed be profitable for language-proficiency enhancement if focus were placed on its communicative dimension and on aspects characterizing professional practice (Fraser 1996, Sewell 1996). Moreover, they claimed that this approach could also help develop transferable and vocational skills (Klein-Braley 1996). This stance has gained prominence as more and more language teachers have become aware of the professional

relevance translation can have for their students as well (Ulrych 2005: 4). Although translation has continued to be taught for language purposes, this awareness has led to the setting up of special courses within the existing curricula, presenting translation as a skill in its own right and with a view to developing job-oriented abilities.

A similar situation obtains at the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures at the Catholic University of Brescia, Italy. Here translation has always been and is still largely taught for language acquisition and consolidation purposes within linguistics courses. Since the 2006-2007 academic year, however, the English Department has offered a specific two-semester course in Translation Theory and Practice for postgraduate students, with the aim of teaching translation as the main learning outcome, and more specifically as 1) a field of scientific research, 2) a situated act of communication, and 3) a professional activity.

In order to meet these goals, the course was organized around three components: an introduction to Translation Studies and its most relevant developments since the 1960s (15 contact hours), an applied 45-hour module of L1- and L2-translation exercises tackled with a functionalist approach (Nord 1997), and an intensive 20-hour module aimed at familiarizing students with professional translation. For this last component, we opted for a project-based workshop, centered on the scaffolded and collaborative undertaking of an authentic commission, along the lines of the model suggested by Kiraly (2000). We assumed that this instructional format would be viable for our environment. However, since it represented a first-time experiment, we proposed to test our assumption through an exploratory study. In what follows we will discuss the results of this investigation and the conclusions we were able to draw.

### **Setting the scene: The profession-based workshop**

The decision to implement the workshop was not taken uncritically. First of all, we were familiar with the “education vs. training” debate in translation pedagogy and with the objections raised with respect to Kiraly’s method (cf. Mossop 2003, Bernardini 2004, Kelly 2005, to name but a few). Second, we feared that our workshop could prove “out of place” since our faculty is oriented not towards translator training, but rather towards the preparation of language experts in the literary, business-managerial and media-related fields. Moreover, our students would be in their advanced stages of academic education but still inexperienced with respect to “extra-mural” translation. We thus considered the possibility that this lack of pedagogical progression would lead to surface learning only. We also had doubts about our students’ expectations and prospects regarding their professional life.

The choice to opt for this instructional model was motivated by the following reasoning. Firstly, we claimed that professional translation need

not be considered a competence entirely alien to the profile of the language experts that our faculty trains. We resolved, however, to offer the workshop as optional activity, aware that translator skills might lie beyond some of our students' interests for their future jobs. Second, within the large demand for language mediation on the local market, especially in the thriving industrial and tourist sectors, the supply of translation services is very scarce. As a result, translations are often carried out by untrained individuals, including language students or recent graduates. In this context of widespread amateurish translation, our workshop and the main course were designed to prepare students for a more conscious application of their translation skills, in such a way that they can make a difference both in terms of quality of their product and status of the profession. Finally, the choice of the instructional model was motivated by practical reasons: we had a two-semester postgraduate course at our disposal, in which we wanted to offer not only education but also some training, in view of the students' imminent transition to the working world. This situation would not permit full compliance with sequencing criteria like the ones discussed, for instance, by Bernardini (2004: 28), who advocates education-oriented instruction at undergraduate and training-based instruction at postgraduate level, as two sequential wholes. Although we theoretically subscribe to these principles, in practice we were confronted with constraints that called for flexibility and adaptation to the local context. We therefore opted for a course design in which education and training are offered as two concomitant wholes. The pedagogical approach suggested by Kiraly, assuring a collaborative and scaffolded working environment, was expected to occasion active student involvement in critical reflection and responsibility for the decisional processes, thus fostering deep learning. It was also hoped to mitigate the possibly strong impact of the demanding task. An authentic project was privileged, instead of simulated activities, in order to guarantee a higher level of "professional empowerment". It must be underlined however that, unlike Kiraly—who operates in a translator-training institution—we could not and did not aim to provide students with full access to the translators' "community of practice". Our purpose was simply to help raise awareness of some behaviors and procedures that may contribute to better quality in any future translation work.

The translation commission for the workshop arrived through the faculty's Tourism Studies Center, a research body that, among other activities, keeps contacts with local tourist operators and offers translation services. The commission consisted in the English translation of a 3,000-word promotional catalogue about the province of Brescia, to be distributed at international tourism fairs. The workshop was held during the exam break (February-March) over two 2-hour and four 4-hour sessions, in a networked computer room. The team consisted of 25 students (out of the 31 attending the main course), divided into seven groups. A virtual platform was created

to support inter-group communications and basic online resources (i.e. search engines, encyclopedias, dictionaries, glossaries, press archives, professional mailing lists, translator resources websites). Class activities consisted in collaborative instructional sessions, group-work, mini-lectures and revision classes.

### **The exploratory study**

We assumed that the undertaking of an authentic task in a social constructivist framework would constitute a viable proposal also in the context of our modern-language faculty, although according to the literature this method has been devised and applied almost exclusively in translator-training institutes or full translation programs. In order to gain more insight into this issue, we decided to investigate a case of such methodology in its naturally occurring setting. In particular, we addressed the following research questions, or observation objectives: 1) appropriateness to our academic context, 2) effectiveness for the development of a professional approach to translation, and 3) impact on students.

The study was designed within the conceptual and methodological framework of evaluative qualitative research and Action Research. The data collection methods included researcher's participant observations of group-work (12 hours), observations of group-work (12 hours) and teaching practice by external observers (5 hours), corrections of first and second drafts for each group, audio-recordings (12 hours), as well as a typically quantitative measurement, namely a pre- and a post-questionnaire with 23 questions each (Appendix II and III). Group-work observation was carried out following a set of criteria heuristically designed by the researcher (Appendix 1).

### **Findings**

#### *Appropriateness*

Most findings seemed to support the initial claim that the method was appropriate to our context. For instance, data on student profiles gathered through the pre-questionnaire (Appendix II question 20, 20a-c) showed that 18 participants out of 25 (72%) had *already* carried out translation tasks outside the university, half of them for clients and for money. Moreover, as shown below, translation featured substantially in their career plans:

22. When you graduate, would you like to be involved in translation in any way?
- 1  yes, as a professional translator (ticked 6 times)
  - 2  yes, as part of my job (ticked 16 times)

- 3  yes, part-time, in combination with another job (ticked 11 times)
- 4  only occasionally, as a favor for a friend or relative (ticked 2 times)
- 5  not at all (-)
- 6  don't know yet (ticked 2 times)

The frequency analysis of the options selected in the above “tick-all-options-that-apply question” shows that no respondent excluded translation completely, 17 preferences were given to translation practiced as main professional occupation (options 1 and 3), and 18 to translation practiced as an occasional, side activity (2 and 4). These two sets of data indicate that translation is not an improbable job prospect for our students and ranks high in their professional expectations. Thus a course offering first-hand experience in this field appears pertinent and respectful of student expectations and extrinsic motivation (Kelly 2005: 49).

A further indicator of appropriateness is attendance level. Considering that this was an optional workshop, requiring responsibility and intensive work in a laden period of the academic year, the average turnout of 91% indicated that participants considered professional translation not only as a useful skill but also a teaching in short supply, hence strongly needed.

An important factor for the assessment of appropriateness was compatibility with the students' prior knowledge, in particular language proficiency, L2-translation competence, tourist translation competence, and computer literacy. The experience of group-work observations and translation revisions showed that, against a generally high level of compatibility, the workshop activity required translation skills that students were still in the process of acquiring (i.e. top-down approach, paraphrasing, adaptation to TL conventions and textual features, parallel-text use). This aspect is strictly linked to the debate over professionalism in translation pedagogy applied to modern-language faculties, in other words the core of the whole discussion about appropriateness. While our students seemed to master quite skillfully profession-related procedures such as time-management, coordination with other team-members, use of IT-resources, and interaction with the client, their performance still showed the imprints of language-oriented translation exercises, especially at the beginning. Against this background, our workshop could end in a “cumulative” experience (Bernardini 2004: 19) where the participants collect a set of procedural pieces of knowledge surrounding the translation process, without making much progress in the development of translation-specific abilities.

What helped to avoid this risk was the teaching method adopted, in particular scaffolding during group-work and the revisions of translation drafts. The latter provide interesting points for discussion. For these corrections, I resorted to what Kiraly calls “proleptic feedback” (2003: 21). Using Word's “insert comment” and editing functions, I would draw the students' attention to infelicitous renderings or translation problems through awareness-raising questions, suggesting possible ways to improve and solve

them or indicating resources where interesting alternatives were available. Ready-made solutions or model versions were not provided, but only signposts, aimed at stimulating students to recognize the weakness, reflect on it and then construct their own improved version. This type of support saw the students engaged in a very active and reasoned process of problem-solving and progressive refinement of their drafts in quasi-autonomy. In other words, this method created the occasion for education to take place alongside training, thus turning a potentially inappropriate experience into a pedagogically acceptable one.

### *Effectiveness*

Our study aimed to explore how effectively our workshop contributed to the emergence of a professional approach to translation. This was undoubtedly the most difficult research question to address, mainly because there is no agreement on what constitutes “professional translation competence” or on how it is acquired. Second, effectiveness is not easily measurable. And third, we lacked a control group working under different conditions to compare our observational data with. These difficulties notwithstanding, we proceeded to the design of a heuristic model deemed desirable and plausible for our students’ profile. It is based on Kelly (2005: 32-33) and includes skills and procedures in four main areas of competence: textual-translational, instrumental, interpersonal, and strategic (Appendix I). This was used as a checklist for group-work observations.

Student-recorded interactions, group-work observations as well as the comparison of the two translation drafts indicated a gradual development of many of the competencies indicated in our heuristic model. This progress was not necessarily dependent on the authentic project. The same results could probably have been achieved with an activity carried out in simulation. What on the other hand profited a lot from the authenticity was the textual-translational competence itself. The genuine translation situation made concepts like target readership and target-text function more immediate and easier to take into account in all decision-making than was the case during the main course, which tackled texts more “in the void”, not directly linked to real and clearly identifiable referents in reality. In particular, the fact that our translation would have slightly different end-users<sup>1</sup> made the notion of contextual factors and translation brief tangible, whereas during the main course it had remained largely on a theoretical level.

---

<sup>1</sup> The ST was primarily directed to local tour operators while the TT would be used in British tourist fairs (e.g. WTM, DolceVita) where it would be distributed mainly to single visitors and future tourists. A greater reader involvement and in general a more marked appellative tone was thus required.

As for instrumental competence, observations showed that students grew more familiar with the electronic resources made available through the virtual platform, becoming quite skilful in background reading, ad hoc information retrieval and occurrence checks. These are all procedures that constitute the basis of professional translation. Due to the relative novelty of these resources and processes, some participants tended to be uncritical of their use and of the interpretation of search results.

Our workshop also fostered interpersonal competence through substantial work within small groups, with the class as a whole, a project-manager and a proofreader. Observational data and recordings showed that all groups engaged in very cooperative problem-solving and decision-making, in a relaxed but productive atmosphere. We have no evidence to judge whether and how collaborative and constructivist dynamics affected the translation product, since we could not compare it with that of a control group. Analyzing our single context, however, we can say that these dynamics promoted meaningful interaction with the task at hand and an incipient acquisition of what Pym (1992: 281) defines the “specifically translational part” of translation competence, i.e. the generation of more than one viable solution and the ability to select one that suits a specified purpose and reader. These working conditions also familiarized students with a common scenario in today’s translation industry, i.e. coordinated teamwork. Our workshop thus prepared them for the fact that, to cite Pym (2003: 493), “individual translators have to be able to generate and decide between alternatives, but it is rarely true that they have to do so entirely by themselves”. On this issue, it must be added however that cooperation and mutual help remained within the boundaries of our team, as shown by the fact that no participant resorted to the translator mailing list we subscribed to. This can be explained in different ways: either students did not feel the need (although I believe that some translation problems could have been effectively submitted to the outside community, but I did not insist), or they were reluctant to try new tools, or alternatively they felt uncomfortable about contacting professionals, perceiving it as something “beyond” themselves. I suspect that introducing this tool was asking too much. However, towards the end, I noticed that one student was profitably using a similar resource, a different forum he was already member of. So I concluded that the general reluctance to use this tool was linked not so much to difficulty or inaccessibility as to non-familiarity. This means that students need more preliminary training in these tools, given their general reluctance to try uncharted grounds autonomously.

Strategic competence was less operationally defined and hence difficult to study. We can nonetheless conclude that through the workshop schedule and activities, students were made to plan their work and monitor their progression so as to meet specific deadlines (i.e. first draft, second draft, final version). Moreover, proleptic feedback made them revise and assess

their drafts before submission to the mother-tongue. Organizational and self-monitoring skills are essential for the profession but conventional instruction does not generally give them prominence.

### *Impact on students*

After the workshop, students were administered a post-questionnaire (Appendix III) aimed at obtaining a course evaluation and insights into the impact this type of activity had had on them. Important indicators, besides responses about general course setup, teaching performance and group-work experience, were expected to be responses about the acquisition on translation-related skills. The data presented below provide insights into this issue:

Question 14: <i>The workshop helped you acquire new translation methods.</i>				
strongly disagree	disagree	Undecided	agree	strongly agree
-	-	4	6	15

Question 15: <i>The workshop helped you acquire new translation resources.</i>				
strongly disagree	disagree	Undecided	agree	strongly agree
-	-	2	5	18

The free responses to question 22 (*What have you learnt from this workshop?*) confirmed the above results and added more details. As for translation methods, 14 respondents (56%) acknowledged the acquisition of a “different” approach, explained as a shift away from the old notion of mere interlingual transfer, towards the concept of a complex decision-making operation, a highly creative process, heavily dependent on social and cultural factors. As for the acquisition of new resources, 18 respondents (72%) mentioned the familiarization and fruitful usage of reference tools other than dictionaries, especially search engines and online encyclopedias. In 10 cases (40%), respondents appreciated the advantages of teamwork. Awareness of the different aspects of a professional translation task was also mentioned (3 cases, 12%), with particular reference to the importance of working with a brief and to the relationship with the client. Considering that the workshop’s intended outcomes also included familiarization with job-related know-how, this last percentage could be perceived as quite discomfoting. The following responses, however, provide more positive feedback on this issue:

Question 20: <i>Do you feel more self-aware about the translation process and the translator job?</i>		
yes	No	more or less
21	-	4



Another indicator expected to be quite telling was the respondents' feedback about the nature of the task, as given below:

Question 16: <i>How do you feel about participating in an authentic task for a real client?</i>				
very dissatisfied	dissatisfied	Undecided	satisfied	very satisfied
-	-	-	10	15

Question 17: <i>How difficult did you find working on an authentic translation project?</i>				
very easy	easy	Undecided	difficult	very difficult
-	2	7	16	-

Question 19: <i>An authentic translation task carried out collaboratively is an appropriate way to develop professional translation competence.</i>				
strongly disagree	disagree	Undecided	agree	strongly agree
-	-	3	12	10

The difficulties of the task concerned the ST's poor quality at some points and the need to give the TT a more persuasive touch (q.18).

The fact that the proposed activity was viewed positively and considered useful for the envisaged learning outcomes also by its final recipients can partly be taken as further support for the appropriateness claim. On the other hand, the fact that the workshop was largely perceived as demanding is certainly not an indicator of its inappropriateness, but rather of the way translation would best be taught in our institution: the aspects reported as "difficult" and "very difficult" (question 18) were those most specifically related to translation, namely the ST's sometimes poor quality, the need for rewording, and the constraints implied by the new communicative situation (see footnote 1), and not those pertaining to the authentic task and its dynamics. This seems to suggest that students need in-depth education in the core aspects of this craft. All the rest is useful but probably incidental.

## Conclusions

The study leads to the following general conclusions. Our workshop certainly did not provide students with ready-to-use translator competence, but raised their awareness of certain behaviors and procedures that can prove empowering for a quality application of their translation skills on a local market much in need of mediation services. Although the social constructivist approach added a valid educational component to an essentially training-based activity, in our environment such initiatives are best offered as accessories to translation courses strongly geared towards education, where a

conscious and analytical approach to general translational abilities is fostered, especially in light of the need to eradicate ineffective imprints of previous language instruction. Thus, for a renewal in translation teaching in our modern-language faculty—and in many similar others—changes should be introduced much earlier, starting from the undergraduate level, offering a gradual acquisition of communicative translation skills. Only then could the value of job-oriented initiatives be fully exploited.

## References

- Bernardini, Silvia. 2004. "The theory behind the practice. Translator training or translator education?" In Kirsten Malmkjær (ed.) *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmes*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 17-29.
- Colina, Sonia. 2002. "Second Language Acquisition, Language Teaching and Translation Studies". *The Translator* 8 (1): 1-24.
- Colina, Sonia. 2003. *Translation Teaching. From Research to the Classroom. A Handbook for Teachers*. New York and San Francisco: McGraw Hill.
- Fraser, Janet. 1996. "Professional Versus Student Behaviour". In C. Dollerup and V. Appel (eds.) *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 3. New Horizons*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 243-250.
- Kelly, Dorothy. 2000. "Text Selection for Developing Translator Competence: Why Texts From The Tourist Sector Constitute Suitable Material". In C. Schäffner and B. Adab (eds.) *Developing Translation Competence*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 157-167.
- Kelly, Dorothy. 2005. *A Handbook for Translator Trainers*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Kiraly, Donald. 2000. *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education. Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Kiraly, Donald. 2003. "From instruction to collaborative construction. A passing fad or the promise of a paradigm shift in translator education?" In B. J. Baer and J. S. Koby (eds.) *Beyond the Ivory Tower. Rethinking Translation Pedagogy*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 3-27.
- Klein-Braley, Christine. 1996. "Teaching Translation, a Brief for the Future". In P. Sewell and I. Higgins (eds.) *Teaching Translation in Universities. Present and Future Perspectives*. London: AFLS and CILT. 15-30.
- Malmkjær, Kirsten. 1998. "Introduction: Translation and Language Teaching". In K. Malmkjær (ed.) *Translation and Language Teaching. Language Teaching and Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome. 1-11.

- Mossop, Brian. 2003. "What should be taught at translation schools?" In A. Pym, C. Fallada, J. R. Biau, J. Orenstein (eds.) *Innovation and E-Learning in Translator Training. Reports on Online Symposia*. Tarragona: Universitat Rovira i Virgili. 20-22.
- Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Nord, Christiane. 2005. "Training functional translators". In Martha Tennent (ed.) *Training for the New Millennium. Pedagogies for Translation and Interpreting*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 209-223.
- Pym, Anthony. 1992. "Translation Error Analysis and the Interface with Language Teaching". In C. Dollerup and A. Loddegaard (eds.) *Teaching Translation and Interpreting. Training, Talent, and Experience*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 279-290.
- Pym, Anthony. 2003. "Redefining translation competence in an electronic age. In defence of a minimalist approach". *Meta* 48 (1): 481-497.
- Schäffner, Christina and Beverly Adab. 2000. "Developing Translation Competence: Introduction". In Christina Schäffner and Beverley Adab (eds.) *Developing Translation Competence*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. vii-xvi.
- Sewell, Penelope. 1996. "Translation in the Curriculum". In P. Sewell and I. Higgins (eds.) *Teaching Translation in Universities. Present and Future Perspectives*. London: AFLS and CILT. 135-159.
- Ulrych, Margherita. 2005. "Training translators. Programmes, curricula, practices". In Martha Tennent (ed.) *Training for the New Millennium. Pedagogies for Translation and Interpreting*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 3-33.

### **Appendix I. Model of professional translation competence—Checklist for group-work observation**

#### TEXTUAL-TRANSLATIONAL COMPETENCE

1. ST processing: critical reading; identification of message/function beyond the linguistic/textual make-up.
2. Communicative/functionalist approach to translation: deverbalization of ST concepts and rendering in TL in compliance of TL stylistic and textual conventions, target readership, TT function.

#### INSTRUMENTAL COMPETENCE

3. Preliminary documentary research in TL quality sources (i.e. online encyclopedias, newspaper archives, search engines) for both background reading and equivalents retrieval.
4. Use of parallel texts.
5. "Intelligent" use of dictionaries: from the bilingual to the monolingual for checks on the semantics and syntactic "behavior" of terms.
6. Check of actual occurrence of terms and expressions in the language in use (Google, newspaper archives).

## INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

7. Ability to work in team and with a project-manager. Negotiation skills.  
Collaborative problem-solving and decision-making.
8. Use of LANGIT.

## STRATEGIC COMPETENCE

9. Organizational and planning skills.
10. Self-assessment and revision.

**Appendix II. Pre-questionnaire**

1. Name:
2. How would you judge your knowledge of English?  
1  basic 2  sound 3  proficient 4  native
3. Have you obtained your ECDL qualification?  
 yes  no
4. Do you know how to:
- a. apply the English dictionary to a file?  yes  more or less  no
- b. run a spell-check?  yes  more or less  no
- c. use track changes?  yes  more or less  no
- d. use comments?  yes  more or less  no
- e. use a basic style-guide in Word?  yes  more or less  no
- f. run a search on the Internet?  yes  more or less  no
5. Besides this course, have you taken any courses entirely devoted to translation theory?  
 yes  no
- 5.a. If yes, in which department(s)? (tick all boxes that apply)  
1  English dept. 2  French dept. 3  German dept. 4  Spanish dept.  
5  Russian dept.
6. Besides this course, have you taken any courses entirely devoted to translation practice?  
 yes  no
- 6.a. If yes, in which department(s)?  
1  English dept. 2  French dept. 3  German dept. 4  Spanish dept.  
5  Russian dept.
7. Have you ever done translation exercises within your language courses?  
 yes  no (if not, skip to question 15)
- 7.a. If yes, in which department(s)? (tick all boxes that apply)  
1  English dept. 2  French dept. 3  German dept. 4  Spanish dept.  
5  Russian dept.
8. The aim of those translation exercises was (tick all boxes that apply):

- 1  language consolidation    2  learn how to translate    3  exam preparation  
4  unknown    5  other (please specify)
- 
- 

9. In which language did you translate during those exercises?

- 1  only into Italian    2  only into L2    3  50-50    4  mainly into Italian  
5  mainly into L2

10. The texts to be translated were about (tick all boxes that apply):

- 1  literature    2  tourism    3  law    4  medicine    5  technology  
6  economics    7  science    8  business    9  current affairs    10  culture and  
entertainment    11  other (please specify)
- 
- 

11. How was a typical translation exercise class? (match the relevant options. For example, if it was “group-work at home” + “common correction in class”, write “2A” on the given line. More combinations possible).

Work	Correction
1 individual work at home	A teacher asks students to read transl. sentence by sentence
2 group-work at home	B teacher corrects individual transl. at home and returns it
3 individual work in class	C teacher corrects group translation at home and returns it
4 group-work in class	D teacher uploads feedback on the web

---

other combinations:

---



---

12. How do you feel about the teaching method adopted during those translation exercises?

- 1  strongly dislike it    2  dislike it    3  neutral    4  like it    5  like it very much

13. If translation exercises involved individual work, how do you feel about it?

- 1  strongly dislike it    2  dislike it    3  neutral    4  like it    5  like it very much

14. If translation exercises involved group-work, how do you feel about it?

- 1  strongly dislike it    2  dislike it    3  neutral    4  like it    5  like it very much

15. Do you prefer translating on your own or with others?

- 1  on my own    2  with others    3  no preference    4  it depends (please specify)

---



---



---

16. Have you ever taken part in a collaborative project in any of your courses (i.e. whole class working on a single task for common purposes)?

yes no

17. What resources did you use for translation work?

1printed bilingual dictionary 2printed monolingual dict. 3on-line bilingual dict. 4on-line monolingual dict. 5specialized dict. 6encyclopedias 7parallel texts 8Internet 9computer-aided-translation tools 10other (please specify)

---



---



---

18. Have you received any training on translator's resources?

yes no

19. Have you ever taken translation courses outside the university context?

yes no

20. Have you ever done any translations outside the university context?

yes no

If yes:

20.a. it was in the field of (tick all boxes that apply):

1literature 2tourism 3law 4medicine 5technology  
6economics 7science 8business 9current affairs 10culture and entertainment 11other (please specify)

---



---



---

20.b. who did you translate for? (tick all boxes that apply)

1a direct client 2a translation agency 3family and friends 4other (please specify)

---



---



---

20.c. did you get paid?

yes no

21. Have you ever learnt about translation as a profession?

yes no

22. When you graduate, would you like to be involved in translation in any way? (tick all boxes that apply)

- 1  yes, as a professional translator
- 2  yes, as part of my job
- 3  yes, part-time, in combination with another job
- 4  only occasionally, as a favor for a friend or relative
- 5  not at all
- 6  don't know yet

23. Do you agree for the workshop data to be used anonymously (i.e. without your name or personal information being mentioned) for research purposes?

- yes    no

Signature:

### Appendix III. Post-questionnaire

1. Name

2. In general, are you satisfied with the workshop?

very dissatisfied 1  2  3  4  5  very satisfied

3. Were the objectives clear from the beginning?

yes    no    more or less

4. Were the contents presented in class relevant for the task at hand?

yes    no    more or less

5. Are there contents you expected to learn but that were not taken into consideration?

yes    no

5.a If yes, which of the following categories do they belong to? (tick all boxes that apply)

1  linguistic issues   2  cultural issues   3  the translation process   4  translator competencies   5  translation resources   5  other (please specify)

6. The time allocated to the workshop was:

too short    just right    too long

7. How do you feel about the way your instructor presented contents?

very dissatisfied 1  2  3  4  5  very satisfied

8. How do you feel about the assistance your instructor gave you during group-work?

very dissatisfied 1  2  3  4  5  very satisfied

9. How do you feel about your instructor's feedback on your translation?

very dissatisfied 1  2  3  4  5  very satisfied

10. Did your instructor provide you with useful resources for the task at hand?

yes no more or less

11. How do you feel about the way your group worked on the joint translation?  
very dissatisfied 1  2  3  4  5 very satisfied

12. What aspect(s) of your group-work were you most satisfied with?

13. What aspect(s) of your group-work were you most dissatisfied with?

14. This workshop helped you acquire new translation methods.  
strongly disagree 1  2  3  4  5 strongly agree

15. This workshop helped you acquire new translation resources.  
strongly disagree 1  2  3  4  5 strongly agree

16. How do you feel about participating in an authentic task for a real client?  
very dissatisfied 1  2  3  4  5 very satisfied

17. In general, how difficult did you find working on an authentic translation project?  
very easy 1  2  3  4  5 very difficult

18. How difficult did you find the following aspects of our authentic translation project?

a. ST features

very easy 1  2  3  4  5 very difficult

b. constraints imposed by the client

very easy 1  2  3  4  5 very difficult

c. constraints imposed by the TT communicative sit.

very easy 1  2  3  4  5 very difficult

d. group-work

very easy 1  2  3  4  5 very difficult

e. workload

very easy 1  2  3  4  5 very difficult

f. translation method adopted

very easy 1  2  3  4  5 very difficult

g. resources used

very easy 1  2  3  4  5 very difficult

19. An authentic translation task carried out collaboratively is an appropriate way to develop professional translation competence.

strongly disagree 1  2  3  4  5 strongly agree

20. Do you feel more self-aware about the translation process and the translator job?

yes no more or less

21. When you graduate, would you like to be involved in translation in any way?

1 yes, as a professional translator



- 2  yes, as part of my job
- 3  yes, part-time, in combination with another job
- 4  only occasionally, as a favor for a friend or relative
- 5  not at all
- 6  don't know yet

22. What have you learnt from this workshop?

23. Any other comment or suggestion?