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ABSTRACT

Previous studies flagged concerns about a communication gap between translator instructors and students in undergraduate translation practice classes without elaborating on the feedback component. Borrowing the notion of feedback culture (London & Smither, 2002), expanding on Hyland and Hyland’s conceptualization of feedback (2006), and utilizing the reviewed literature on effective feedback, the researcher developed an analytical framework to investigate how feedback was situated, shaped, and negotiated in translator education. Feedback is situated by its sociocultural context, shaped by the delivery and focus of its content, and negotiated through the interaction and reflection of its participants. In this qualitative multi-case study, a group of advanced translation practice instructors (n=8) and their students (n=58) were selected from two different university translation programs: one in Saudi Arabia (SA-CASE) and one in the United States (US-CASE). The qualitative data, which involved observations, interviews, and document reviews, were collected, analyzed, and reported using the research three-dimensional framework. Findings revealed that participants within and across the two cases differed in their perception and, consequently, in their practice of feedback. Collective and broad verbal discussions were the norm in the SA-CASE, while individualized and points-based written corrections occurred consistently in the US-CASE. Emerging themes included a pattern of error detection and rater variability, technology-facilitated feedback, market-oriented feedback, conflicting attitudes toward peer feedback, vague understanding of self-feedback, scarcity of feedback on feedback, and varying forms of dialogue. To enhance the feedback loop, the researcher proposes a model that gives students a more interactive role in the feedback process.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Overview

After analyzing the findings of 8000 studies, Hattie (1992) made it clear that “the most powerful single modification that enhances achievement is feedback” (p. 9). He asserted that “the simplest prescription for improving education must be ‘dollops of feedback’” (p. 9). This dissertation explores the feedback culture in two distinct university translation programs: one in Saudi Arabia and one in the United States. By doing so, it addresses some of the problematic issues reported in previous studies about feedback in translator education. In this chapter, the research background and problem are described in some detail. The chapter then describes the research questions and states why this research matters. The study’s key terms are defined subsequently, before the chapter ends with a concise summary.

1.1 Background

Effective formative feedback, according to contemporary educational researchers, is both a mindset and a culture within a given educational institution (e.g., Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Kung, 2008; Luque & Sommer, 2000), which means that the reception and implementation of such a tool may differ considerably from one institution to the next, let alone from one country to the next. The mindset that conceptualizes learning as a transmission of knowledge from the teacher to learner will most likely conceive feedback as a transmission of information to the students about their strengths and weaknesses. This is what Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2004) emphasize when they declare that “approaches to feedback have, until recently, remained obstinately focused on simple ‘transmission’ perspectives; teachers ‘transmit’ feedback messages to students about strengths and weaknesses in their work assuming that these messages are easily decoded and turned into action” (p. 1).
In a later publication, Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) identify several problems with the transmissionist view of formative assessment and feedback (p. 200). Firstly, it reduces the chance of empowering students and improving their self-regulation skills, which they will need when they graduate and start their professional careers. Secondly, unlike what many teachers think, these transmitted feedback messages are often complex and not easy to decipher for students, which makes the student’s job of constructing knowledge and improving performance enormously harder. Thirdly, viewing feedback as a mere cognitive ‘transfer’ of information overlooks the fact that external feedback regulates, and is regulated, by motivational beliefs and perceptions that in turn influence what and how students learn. Fourthly, the transmissionist view of feedback proves harder to apply in today’s circumstances of increased workload and large-size classrooms, which necessitates re-examining the nature and effectiveness of feedback and implementing more constructivist approaches. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick contend that “external feedback as a transmission process involving ‘telling’ ignores the active role the student must play in constructing meaning from feedback messages, and of using this to regulate performance” (p. 210). A constructivist mindset, on the contrary, as will be discussed in the Literature Review (Chapter 2), conceptualizes feedback as ‘dialogue’ that encourages students to enhance their own understanding of what is expected from them and to construct their own learning in an active manner.

The call for a ‘radical’ departure from transmissionist paradigms of translator education which emphasize teacher- and product-centeredness to transformationist paradigms which emphasize student- and process-centeredness has been overtly made by prominent translation pedagogy scholars, such as Kiraly (1995, 2000, 2003). The conventional ‘conduit’ approach to translator education, as described by Kiraly (2003), is the result of a transmissionist philosophy that views knowledge as a rule-based static entity that can be transmitted from one generation to the next (see Table 1). In such a prototypical teacher-centered setting, students often sit passively facing the teacher who “assumes responsibility for virtually everything that goes on in the
classroom—except for learning itself” (p. 27). An ordinary activity in a conventional class is to distribute a source text (ST) to students and ask them to read and translate then wait for the ‘ideal’ model answer from the expert teacher. The teacher is also in charge of preparing the syllabus, the texts to be translated, the in-class activities and homework, and the evaluation criteria and tasks, not to mention the assessment, which is used mainly to “determine whether or not the students have learned what has been taught” (p. 28). These prototypical transmissionist classes, according to Kiraly, are essentially based on a positivist epistemology that views truth as an objective reality that can be conveyed from the ‘expert’ teacher to the ‘novice’ learner who can verify that truth only by reproducing the teacher’s pieces of information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transmission Perspective</th>
<th>Transformation Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge is transferred</td>
<td>Knowledge is constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner is a student and client</td>
<td>Learner is a whole person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher should be in control</td>
<td>Student should be in control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge is public</td>
<td>Knowledge is private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation is extrinsic</td>
<td>Motivation is intrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning is molecular</td>
<td>Learning is holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning characteristics are shared</td>
<td>Every learner is unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning is individual</td>
<td>Learning is social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge is content</td>
<td>Knowledge is a process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Transmissionist vs. transformationist perspective of learning (adopted from Kiraly, 2000, p. 22, after Miller & Seller, 1985)*

Yet, Kiraly (2003) realizes the fact that translation is no longer a paper-and-pencil task. Rather, it involves a great deal of collaboration and teamwork. He asserts that “translators today cannot afford to be linguistic hermits, sitting alone behind a typewriter and surrounded only by dusty tomes” and that “translators are embedded in a complex network of social and professional activity” (p. 12). The kind of translation classes that Kiraly calls for are socio-constructivist, in which knowledge is constructed by recurring interaction with the world and continuous communication and negotiation with other people of various experiences and skills. Such a transformationist classroom facilitates the “collaborative undertaking of professional translation tasks, in all of their complexity, under the guidance of a professional translator” (p. 43). Today’s
world necessitates that translators work within a network of actors and with the help of technological and electronic tools and resources that were not popular—or in some cases even in existence—two decades previously. Only, authentic situated action can actually enable the construction of knowledge and allow the development of true expertise.

Kiraly’s socio-constructivist model (2000) has opened new horizons for researchers to explore further, adding their insight and clarification, all to depart further away from the transmissionist perspective of education. Baumgarten et al. (2010), for instance, discuss Kiraly’s model and highlight its useful applications, then attempt to expand it to include the notion of intellectual and professional transgression. By employing the concept of transgression, the writers claim that they make the technique of scaffolding more dynamic and clarify what they see as ‘uncertainties’ in the socio-constructivist approach. They find Kiraly’s transformationist model most suitable for their approach because they believe it does not only emphasize the competence-based professional training, but also offers a holistic outlook on the translator as a human being. However, the notion of transformationist approach, in their view, has to be clarified further; otherwise, it might be taken as a programmed, behavioral transformation that contradicts the empowerment principle of the constructivist approach (p. 8). The transformationist component should not be an end in itself, but rather a means to an end, and one of many ultimate goals. In order to achieve what they call ‘ideal’ classroom interaction, the transgressionist approach requires the development of critical social awareness amongst translator students (i.e., awareness of social power relations and educational hierarchies); a prerequisite condition that is missing in the hierarchical pedagogical approach of social constructivism, they claim.

In the systemic transgressionist philosophy, however, traditional educational hierarchy is dissolved and all participants in the arena of translator education are collaborators. Baumgarten et al. (2010) contend that teachers are not just facilitators but fellow collaborators with their students in creating and executing real-world projects, each influencing the other. Students are trained to intrinsically motivate and take control of their own learning process. Transgression, in
other words, is a “change that a person undertakes as a conscious action in order to develop in any aspect of their humanity” (p. 9). In this kind of classroom, assessment as a didactic tool is implemented more effectively, with the aim of “opening paths to students’ and educators’ further growth, rather than producing the statistical figures required by the formal framework of academic education” (p. 12). Students’ mistakes should be used “as a source of empowerment in contrast to the frequent practice of using marks to disempower students” by providing students with continuous feedback and taking their opinions on how useful the assessment has been intellectually and professionally (p. 19). As a way of helping translators understand the assessment, weekly meetings are held between the facilitators (instructors), team leaders (students), and client representatives to discuss the feedback.

Personal experience of the researcher recalls moments of frustration and demotivation from his own undergraduate translation education. “Just translate!” was the instructor’s catchphrase that students from the researcher’s cohort picked to describe sarcastically the most common teaching method implemented in those classes. They obviously were referring to what González Davies (2004, p. 3) named the “read-and-translate” conventional formula of translator education, or what Kiraly (2012b, p. 4) preferred to label the “who-will-take-the-next-sentence” technique. This method, in brief, consisted of instructors distributing a ST to students in class (or shortly prior to the class) then asking students to read the ST sentence by sentence and translate. Most students would then sit passively or even absent-mindedly until it was their turn to read and translate. The instructor would verbally correct students’ errors and give them the correct translation. This monotonous mechanism of class participation kept most students holding their pens and notebooks waiting for the instructor to ‘spoon-feed’ them with the ‘right’ answer to be written down and memorized for the final exam. Now, as a university lecturer and graduate student of translation studies, the researcher has come to realize that the positivist pedagogical thought that uses transmissionist, ‘chalk-and-talk’ techniques is still pervasive today in many translation classrooms (Kiraly, 2012a, pp. 84-85) and strongly affects the feedback culture in
translator education. This piece of research seeks to probe further into this problem and to shed more light on its various dimensions.

1.2 Research Problem

Providing translator students with constructive feedback and opportunities to improve their work are two fundamental conditions for the translator student to become a proficient translator. According to Shreve (2006), the transition from novice to expert translator cannot be achieved without *deliberate practice*, which he defines as the “engagement in specific activities directed at performance enhancement in a particular domain, where ‘domain’ is some sort of skilled activity” (p. 29). What makes practice deliberate, according to Shreve, is repetitively performing a task that is well-defined and of appropriate difficulty, and—more importantly for this study—receiving informative and corrective feedback on this performance.

Yet, scattered studies on translator education conducted in different countries have drawn attention to the communicative gap between translator instructor and student, and the passive role of students in undergraduate translation practice classes. Based on the results of a study he carried out at the English Language and Translation Department of Çukurova University in Turkey, Biçer (2003) indicates that translation students were mostly passive and participated little in class activities. Many students did not have positive attitudes towards translation courses and they found the atmosphere in such courses “partly boring” (p. 10). One of the reasons for students’ boredom in translation classes, according to Biçer, was that they often had no say in selecting the texts they had to translate or in deciding the level of difficulty of these texts. It was obvious, Biçer declares, that translation students were missing the constructivist, learner-centered kind of classroom where they are enabled to have more control over their own learning.

Similarly, Haiyan (2006) claims that students’ passive learning in the translation classroom is a problematic issue they faced perennially at the Business English Department of Shanghai Institute of Business Administration. The problem, according to Haiyan, was a result of
traditional translator education that placed more emphasis on the teacher than on students’ active participation (p. 1). The passive role of students was not only the result of ineffective classroom teaching, but also the result of an ineffective system of translation testing as well. Haiyan indicates that translation testing is traditionally summative in nature and is placed at the end of the course, which makes it of little help to students’ translation skills (p. 2). She asserts that the gap between translator education and translation testing may divert students from pursuing instructional objectives and may contribute to their passive attitudes in the classroom.

Criticism of traditional approaches was also raised by Jafari (2013) who affirms that translation was still being taught by ‘outdated’ approaches, as he put it (p. 1). According to Jafari, translator instructors in Iranian universities still used the ‘read and translate’ method that minimizes students’ participation to few students while the rest of the class stays in the shadows. Jafari indicates that the dominant teaching method in these classes was transmissionist in nature, in which the teacher does most of the talking and has the final ‘model’ answer to provide to the students at the end of each class. Instructors majored in English literature and linguistics, and lacked specialization in translation. Jafari, too, found the atmosphere in the translation classes ‘boring’ and ‘exhausting,’ unlike that he found in some Western universities where more innovative approaches were utilized to enhance students’ motivation and maximize their participation (p. 1).

The communication gap between instructor and students manifests itself noticeably through the practice of formative assessment and feedback, among other classroom procedures. In a recent study conducted by Alsahli (2012) investigating the perception of self-regulated learning by translation students at three language and translation programs in Saudi Arabia, feedback and assessment were among the course components perceived by translation students to be highly important. The lack of feedback was one of the sub-themes that Alsahli identified in his study. Alsahli’s student participants complained about not receiving constructive feedback from their instructors. Some students revealed that they lost interest in the translation class and
referred to class assignments as a ‘burden’ (p. 149). Furthermore, according to Alsahli, a number of students did not seek help from instructors because they felt that it would upset their instructors. Alsahli did not elaborate on why those students had this disinclination toward consulting with their instructors; neither did he take the perspective of instructors on why this disinclination existed. Alsahli did, however, make it clear that his original research design was to include the teachers’ point of view, but this proved to be problematic during the actual data collection process (p. 238).

Students’ reluctance to seek help from their instructors, which is especially relevant to the feedback culture, could be scrutinized further from both pedagogical and sociocultural angles. Alsahli’s conclusion about feedback matched some of the conclusions from an earlier study by Alfaifi (2000). Alfaifi evaluated the program curriculum of the Languages and Translation Department at Imam University in Riyadh. One of Alfaifi’s findings was students’ overall dissatisfaction with the quality of translator education in the Department. According to Alfaifi, 71.5% of the surveyed students believed that the method of translation teaching adopted in the Department was not suitable (p. 138). Alfaifi’s respondents clarified that they were rarely given the opportunity in class to defend their translations, and were not told why their translations were inadequate. Alfaifi found that most translation instructors in the Department held degrees in linguistics and literature, but not in translation per se, and that they had no professional experience in translation. Translation was taught as a general core course in a curriculum that largely concentrated on English linguistics and literature (p. 107). This, according to Alfaifi, may explain why most instructors, including those who taught translation, lacked academic and professional credentials in translation.

Certainly, many learners’ frustrations and failures in schools result from unsuccessful communication between the teacher and learner. As discussed earlier, traditional teaching methodologies are often criticized for accentuating the role of the teacher and requiring him or her to be a transmitter of knowledge, leaving the student with no choice but to be a passive receiver
of that knowledge. Modern approaches to effective formative feedback seek to provide solutions for the teacher-learner communicative gap, by placing the emphasis on learners and engaging them actively in the learning process (Kelly, 2005, p. 11). Learners are given more opportunity to work collaboratively in groups, lead discussions and negotiations, participate in the creation of their coursework, assess their own work and that of their peers’, and assume more responsibility for their own educational experience. This learner-centered philosophy has had an increasing influence on the research into translation pedagogy in the last three decades, and this has led to the emergence of various approaches to translator education such as Nord’s functionalist (1988, 1991), Gouadec’s situational (1994), Kiraly’s socio-constructivist (2000), Colina’s communicative (2003), González-Davies’ task-based (2003, 2004), and Baumgarten’s et al. transgressionist (2010).

These examples of modern approaches to translator education give an obvious indication that the field is progressing steadily, and sometimes radically, at the theoretical level. In actual practice, however, the progress seems to be lagging. Research on translation assessment becomes scarcer as the scope narrows from summative assessment, to formative assessment, and down to the critical component of feedback, particularly in a university context. Review of the literature (Chapter 2) revealed that few studies have attempted to examine the feedback perceptions and practices in translator education. There appeared to be a need for a study that involves both the translator instructor and student and analyzes their actual beliefs and attitudes toward feedback. The problematic issues about feedback in Eastern translator education raised fleetingly by previous studies might also be experienced elsewhere. Even in translator education programs that belong to Western educational cultures, such as the American, where active learning is encouraged in institutions of higher education (MacHemer et al, 2007, p. 10), there is no guarantee that formative feedback is practiced effectively and without challenges, since no research has yet proved that it is, or otherwise.
What this dissertation aspires to achieve, therefore, is to depict the picture of the feedback culture in university translator education as perceived and practiced by both the instructor and student. To capture a variety of samples, two distinct cases of undergraduate translator education are chosen: one at King Saud University, Saudi Arabia (SA-CASE henceforth) and one at Kent State University, United States (US-CASE henceforth). The two case studies represent two different educational views: one view emerges from a Middle Eastern, collectivist, high-context culture (i.e., Saudi Arabia) and the other emerges from a Western, individualist, low-context culture (i.e., the United States) (Hall, 1979; Hofstede, 1980). The comparative exploration will allow the researcher to identify consistent commonalities and differences within and across the two case studies, and reflect on salient themes and issues that emerged from the data. The characteristics of effective feedback reviewed in the literature, along with the notion of feedback culture (London & Smither, 2002) and Hyland and Hyland’s conceptualization of feedback (2006), all will assist the researcher in designing a dynamic analytical tool for the data collection and analysis. Using qualitative methods, the researcher will investigate three dimensions that (1) situate feedback (through the sociocultural factors), (2) shape feedback (through the delivery and content of feedback), and (3) negotiate feedback (through the interaction among participants).

1.3 Research Questions

To address the research problem, this dissertation investigates the feedback culture in two distinct cases of translator education at a university level. Drawing on triangulated qualitative data acquired from observations, interviews, and reviewed documents at the SA-CASE and US-CASE, the researcher seeks to gain insight into the following three specific questions:

1. How do instructors of translation practice classes and their students situate, shape, and negotiate feedback in the SA-CASE?
2. How do instructors of translation practice classes and their students situate, shape, and negotiate feedback in the US-CASE?
3. What emerging themes and issues can be drawn from the resulting findings?

   These broad questions will guide the researcher to examine comprehensively the perceptions and practices of translator instructors and students in the two examined contexts of SA-CSAE and US-CASE. The questions will lead to the identification of major commonalities and differences within and across the two cases, and the discovery of significant themes and issues that emerged from the data. The criteria of effective feedback drawn from the reviewed literature will be utilized in depicting the distinctive patterns of feedback practices that exist in the two examined cases of translator education. The criteria are especially useful in examining the roles and responsibilities of instructors and students in both cases and the extent of their use of feedback in promoting dialogic interaction in their translation practice classes. Based on the findings, the researcher will draw specific implications and recommendations for future researchers and practitioners.

1.4 Research Significance

Although there is a considerable body of research on feedback in other fields of study, such as education and second language instruction (SLI), little has been done in the field of translation pedagogy, as will be detailed in the Literature Review (Chapter 2). For years, research on translator education has focused on summative assessment, investigating the nature of errors and the design of grading rubrics. Relatively recently, formative assessment and feedback have begun to attract attention among translation researchers (e.g., Goff-Kfouri, 2004; González Davies, 2004; Južnič, 2013; Wang & Han, 2013; Washbourne, 2014). Still, more work on this area is required. Previous research on translator education in the Saudi context, for instance, underscored the pressing need for evaluating the effectiveness of Saudi university translation programs (e.g., Alfaifi, 2000; Alsahli, 2012; Al-Braik et al., 2007; Atari, 2005, 2012; Fatani, 2005, 2007, 2009). Several works specifically stated that there is a communication gap between translation instructors and students, and that traditional feedback practices need to be
substantially revised (e.g., Alfaifi, 2000; Alsahli, 2012; Atari, 2005, 2012; Fatani, 2007). These works pinpointed the feedback problem, yet because they were too broad in discussing the problem, they fell short of describing the full picture. As translator education in Saudi Arabia and worldwide advances in implementing new teaching methods and technologies, the need for deep and critical reflection on the feedback culture becomes more imperative.

To the researcher’s knowledge, no study has deeply investigated the perceptions and practices of both the instructor and students concerning formative feedback in their university translation classrooms. This dissertation seeks to contribute in this direction. Another importance of this study lies in its comparative mediation between two different educational cultures of university translation programs. Differences and commonalities across the two programs will be measured against theoretical characteristics of effective feedback. The comprehensive exploration of the feedback culture in this study is a step to inspect the teacher-student interaction and communication in translator education and to enhance the overall quality of educational instruction in the examined contexts. The study will reveal whether there are any distinct norms of feedback present in one context of translator education but absent in another, and whether such norms are influenced by any contextual factors. Discovering a pattern of common norms distinguishing one translator education program from the other will lead to examining whether these norms are accepted or unaccepted, challenged or obeyed, encouraged or discouraged.

This dissertation scrutinizes what previous studies recommended for further research: the viewpoint of translator instructors, who, in spite of their essential role in the feedback cycle, were not among the participants in most previous studies. Generally, there seems to be a lack of research addressing the feedback culture from the instructor’s perspective, as indicated by several researchers (e.g., Evans, 2013; Topping, 2010; Yorke, 2003). The need to involve instructors in the study is evident, especially when considering the three outstanding features highlighted by Black and Wiliam (1998, p. 20) in their review of the literature on classroom formative assessment:
• That formative assessment is not well understood by teachers and is weak in practice;
• That the context of national or local requirements for certification and accountability will exert a powerful influence on its practice; and
• That its implementation calls for rather deep changes both in teachers’ perceptions of their own role in relation to their students and in their classroom practice.

Research involving the instructors’ perspective is certainly scarce, and it is more so when it comes to the perspective of translator instructors. Thus, in addition to observing and analyzing the practices of feedback, the study will engage translator instructors in describing the scene. Translator instructors will be prompted to think about what it is that they sought to achieve in providing feedback to their students and to what extent their efforts match the expectations and preferences of their students. Translator students, too, will be involved and encouraged to have their voices heard and to help future researchers and practitioners to better understand their needs and propose informed solutions. Students’ active engagement in class can make the teaching effective and enjoyable, and this is why it is important to consider their perception, as stated by Bulut and Üğüten (2003, p. 90).

Indeed, greater understanding of a culture leads to the improvement and enhancement of that culture. As Aho (1997) asserts, “Changes in an educational culture must come from within, from critical reflection on existing practices” (as cited in Garant, 2009, p. 15). The implications and recommendations of this study will certainly be relevant to similar educational contexts around the world and can be used to evaluate and enhance the feedback culture in those contexts. The comparative exploration of this study, with its planned field observations, extensive interviews with both instructors and students, and careful review of relevant documents, is expected to generate a rich amount of data that addresses the research questions and provides deeper insight into the examined phenomenon. The study, hence, can be of interest to researchers and practitioners in the fields of translation pedagogy, sociocultural studies, and higher education in general.
1.5 **Definition of Key Terms**

1.5.1 **Feedback**

The concept of *feedback* has been defined in the literature in various ways (see Chapter 2, Section 2.2.1). Some researchers highlight its informative function (cf., Ende, 1983; Winne & Butler, 1994), some stress its link with learning objectives (cf., Ramaprasad, 1983; Sadler, 1989), and some emphasize its dialogical purpose (cf., Askew & Lodge, 2000; Nicol, 2010). In this study, feedback is used to refer to all comments (written or verbal) that are provided by the instructor, peer, or self to the student concerning his or her own work and performance.

1.5.2 **Feedback culture**

As a notion, *feedback culture* has been introduced relatively recently to the professional field by London and Smither (2002) to refer to the extent to which an organization encourages seeking, perceiving, proceeding, accepting, using, and reacting to feedback (Levy & William, 2004)—see Chapter 3, Section 3.3.2 for more details. In this dissertation, the concept of feedback culture is modified and expanded to denote how feedback is *situated*, *shaped*, and *negotiated* by the instructor and students in translation practice classes. Feedback is situated by the wider sociocultural context; shaped by the delivery and focus of its content; and negotiated through the interaction among its participants (Hyland & Hyland, 2006, p. 11). See section 3.3.4, Chapter 3 for more elaboration on the Analytical Framework of the study.

1.5.3 **Translator education**

The distinction between *education* and *training* has been debated at length in translation studies research (cf., Bernadini, 2004; Cui & Zhao, 2014; Kearns, 2008; Kiraly, 2000; Pym 2011). Translator education is often associated with long-term programs and focuses on a wider range of interpersonal skills and attitudes (Translation Competence), while translator training is associated with short-term programs and focuses on linguistic technical skills required to produce
an acceptable translation (Translator’s Competence) (Pym, 2009, pp. 6-8). Translator education may also be associated with the larger societal and humanistic issues of translation, while translator training is associated more with the vocational nature of translation (Cui & Zhao, 2014, p. 323). Since the contexts of this dissertation pertain to university, long-term programs (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4 for a description of the Research Contexts), the terms translator education, translator instructor, and translator student are conveniently used throughout the work to include translator training, translator trainer, and translator trainee respectively.

1.5.4 Translation practice courses

Both the SA-CASE and US-CASE offer a variety of courses in linguistics, literature, translation, and foreign language skills. Translation courses are either practice-oriented or theory-oriented. As indicated above, the focus of this study is on translation practice classes, where students have a greater opportunity to produce their own translations and have their work evaluated regularly throughout the semester (see Chapter 3, Section 3.5 for more elaboration on the selection criteria).

1.5.5 Dialogue / Dialogic feedback

The concept of dialogue is used on many occasions to denote the mere conversation and exchange of words among two, or a group of, people. In this project, however, dialogue specifically refers to the “interaction between parties with the intention of generating a shared understanding, i.e., something deeper than knowledge transmission” (Price et al., 2013, p. 43; emphasis in original). Feedback is, thus, conceptualized as dialogic, rather than monologic, and is compatible with socio-constructivism that sees “knowing-in-practice as an accomplishment negotiated between participants of socio-cultural communities who come to share a similar understanding of their practice and context” (p. 44). Dialogic feedback is elaborated more in Chapter 2, Section 2.4.3.
1.6 Organization of the dissertation

This dissertation consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 has presented a brief background on the research, along with a short discussion on the research problem, research questions, research significance, and definitions of key terms. Chapter 2 reviews the literature relevant to the study, which includes a general literature on the concepts of assessment and feedback, and a specific literature on assessment and feedback in translator education. A detailed presentation of the methodology and procedures of study is provided in Chapter 3. Included in this chapter is a description of the research contexts and participants, along with the research data collection and analysis. The results of analysis are presented in Chapter 4, addressing questions one and two of the study. Chapter 5 summarizes the major findings before delving into identifying emerging themes and issues, in so doing addressing the third question of the study. The chapter also draws specific implications and recommendations for enhancing the feedback culture in translator education, and discusses the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research. The chapter concludes with final thoughts that summarize what the study has achieved and propose a dialogic vision for the feedback culture in translator education.

Summary

In this chapter, the researcher introduced the research background and identified the research problem with some detail. The rational for this study was then provided, along with the theoretical support justification. The three major questions of the study were described next, followed by an elaborate discussion on the significance of this piece of research. Definition of the study’s key concepts came next, before the chapter closed with this concluding summary. In the next chapter, the researcher will review the literature on effective feedback by first discussing the overarching concept of assessment, the shift from summative to formative assessment, the concept and effectiveness of feedback, and the major works that have dealt with assessment and feedback in translator education.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This chapter provides a broad review of the literature on feedback in translator education. In order to draw a clear picture as to where the concept of feedback is embodied, it is imperative to start out by discussing the concept of assessment as defined by earlier scholars in the field of education. A crucial distinction between the two major purposes of assessment, the summative and formative, are discussed subsequently. The significant, often-overlooked role of formative assessment is highlighted next, which leads to focusing closely on its key component: feedback provision. The role of feedback in formative assessment is accentuated further by reviewing the various typologies of feedback proposed by several researchers. The characteristics of effective feedback are then discussed to provide the general guidelines for designing the analytical framework of feedback culture.

Having a general view of the existing research on formative feedback paves the way for reviewing the literature on formative feedback in translator education. Similarly, reviewing formative feedback in translator education starts by examining translation summative assessment, proceeds to translation formative assessment, and ends with feedback provision in translator education. The scarcity of research becomes more apparent as the focus of review narrows down, making the gap that this dissertation seeks to bridge more defined. As a note of caution, however, this literature review is not by any means inclusive. Debatable issues surrounding some components of feedback, such as the role of praise, are not discussed since they are outside the scope of this dissertation (for more comprehensive reviews of such debates, see for example, Evans, 2013; Kaufman & Schunn 2011; Rourke, 2012).
2.1 Assessment

2.1.1 The concept of assessment

When it is taken broadly, *assessment* may be seen as an umbrella term that covers a wide range of activities and testing that serve different purposes. Black et al. (2003) indicate that one of the purposes of assessment is to provide qualitative numerical results to rank academic institutions and help them become accountable (p. 1). Another purpose of assessment is to provide students with formal certificates, such as the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) and the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), credentials that can be used by the student to pursue future jobs or further education. This kind of assessment requires reliable and meticulous methods that can be comparable across academic institutions in the country and around the world. The above purposes of accreditation can be regarded as assessment *of* (rather than *for*) learning, or summative assessment, as they are often “infrequent, isolated from normal teaching and learning, carried out on special occasions with formal rituals, and [...] conducted by methods over which individual teachers have little or no control” (p. 2). When assessment serves the purpose of promoting students’ learning by providing information that can be used by teachers and students to modify the teaching and learning, then it becomes an assessment *for* learning. This developmental role of assessment is called formative, and it is usually embedded in the teaching and learning and used by teachers informally to motivate students and engage them in the lessons.

2.1.2 Summative versus formative assessment

The distinction between summative and formative assessment was first suggested by Michael Scriven (1967), who coined the two terms more than 30 years ago on the subject of evaluations of curriculum and teaching methods (Hattie, 2003; Looney, 2011; Taras, 2005; Wiliam & Thompson, 2007). Scriven (1967) differentiates between the two functions of evaluation in terms of interpretation and timing (p. 40). He sees evaluation as a single methodological process that
serves a summative function in making a judgment against specific standards, goals, and criteria, encapsulating all the evidence up to a certain point. It also serves a formative function in indicating the existence of a gap between the desired goals and the actual performance, and in providing guidance on how such a gap can be bridged. What distinguishes summative from formative assessment, according to Scriven, is that the former stops at the judgment, whereas the latter takes another step by providing feedback to both the teacher and learner to improve their performances.

Summative assessment can stand without the formative, but not vice versa (Taras, 2005; Wiliam & Black, 1996). Wiliam and Black (1996) state that “all assessments can be summative (i.e. have the potential to serve a summative function), but only some have the additional capability of serving formative functions” (p. 544). Scriven’s idea of formative evaluation was incorporated in the years to follow by Bloom (1968) who applied the concept to student evaluation in his model of “learning for mastery” (Allal & Mottier-Lopez, 2006; Guskey, 2005; Looney, 2011). Bloom (1968) proposed a specific instructional strategy in that the course’s concepts and skills can be broken down into successive smaller instructional units; after each unit students are given a brief, formative evaluation administered by their teacher (p. 9). The teacher then would make use of the evaluation results in providing students with feedback on their learning to help them improve and reach the desired mastery level. Bloom’s model, which drew on Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (see Chapter 3, Section 3.1.1, for more elaboration on Vygotsky’s ZPD), was developed further in later publications (e.g., Bloom, 1971, 1976; Bloom et al., 1971, 1981) and had its name shortened to mastery learning (cf., Allal & Mottier-Lopez, 2006; Guskey, 2005; Looney, 2011).

The distinction between summative and formative assessment continued to be part of numerous debates on formative evaluation, and the dividing line between the two has not been necessarily clear. Several researchers argue that summative assessment, as the name indicates, sums up the learner’s level of achievement and is often provided at the end of a course for
certification purposes (Bloom et al., 1971; Sadler, 1989). Wiliam and Black (1996) notice that most of the earliest use of the terms summative and formative were not applied to the assessments themselves but rather to the functions they served (p. 538). In a later publication, Black and Wiliam (1998b) specify that assessment becomes formative “when the evidence is actually used to adapt the teaching to meet student needs” (p. 2).

Stressing the same idea, Biggs and Tang (2007) state that formative assessment occurs during learning, telling students how well they are doing and how they can improve, whereas summative assessment occurs after learning, informing how well students did and what they had learned. The authors summarized the difference between the two types by means of analogy: “When the chef tastes the sauce it is formative assessment; when the customer tastes, it is summative” (p. 164). According to the authors, these two functions of assessment have one thing in common: Both “match performance as it is, with performance as it should be” (p. 164). Biggs and Tang, however, note that the comments provided to students by the teacher on their final assessment tasks can hardly be considered formative because students rarely pay attention to such comments or incorporate them in future courses (p. 97).

These views echo Sadler’s (1989), who states that the use of summative judgments “to shape and improve the student’s competence by short-circuiting the randomness and inefficiency of trial-and-error learning” is the essence of formative assessment (p. 120). Sadler contends that summative assessment differs from formative mainly in purpose and effect but not in timing. He points out that formative assessment has a distinct conceptualization and technology that are not found in the summative, such as the provision of feedback to the learner, whereas summative assessment is essentially passive and does not have a direct impact on student’s learning. Yet, Black and Wiliam (1998b) rightly observe that formative assessment as a term has been drawn ‘loosely’ and that it encompasses “all those activities undertaken by teachers—and by their students in assessing themselves—that provide information to be used as feedback to modify teaching and learning activities” (p. 7).
In his book *Assessment and Learning*, Gardner (2012) emphasizes that the phrase *assessment for learning*, which came into use in the late 1980s and early 1990s, is a new concept that comprises the same established practices as the term *formative assessment*. Yet the former is more accessible and less technical than the latter, especially for the wider educational and policy-making audiences. Gardner indicates that in the above-mentioned book he follows the Assessment Reform Group (2002) in its definition of assessment for learning, which refers to “the process of seeking and interpreting evidence for use by learners and their teachers, to identify where the learners are in their learning, where they need to go and how best to get there” (p. 3).

### 2.1.3 The rise of formative assessment

Noticeably after Scriven (1967) and Bloom (1968), an increasing number of articles defended the greater importance of formative assessment for student learning over summative assessment and advocated a move from summative to formative assessment (e.g., Cauley & McMillan, 2010; Gardner, 2012; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Irons, 2008; Tarsa, 2005; Wiliam & Black, 1996). The informal formative role of assessment that takes place inside and outside the classroom to direct learning has become an important aspect of effective pedagogy and several researchers have called for its integration or at least alignment with the formal assessment practices (e.g., Allal, 2006; Wiliam, 2000; Wininger, 2005).

In an effort to investigate whether there is evidence that improving formative assessment raises standards, Black and Wiliam (1998a) conducted an extensive review of the research literature written on educational assessment over nine years, from more than 250 articles by researchers from several parts of the world. Black and Wiliam found that improving the practice of formative assessment resulted in “significant and often substantial learning gains” (p. 9). Similarly, Miller and colleagues (1998) criticize educational institutions at which students receive only grades or marks and indicate that this has little use to students’ learning process. The authors argue that for assessment to be useful, it has to be visible and related to the learning goals of
participants who not only must know and understand it, but also accept and agree with its relevance and applicability (p. 209). Black el al. (2003) believe that formative assessment should be taken seriously because there is compelling evidence that formative assessment can feasibly raise students’ scores and make teaching and learning more enjoyable and rewarding; “the message is not about working harder, but about working smarter” (p. 2).

Hattie (2003) assumes that assessment is about providing feedback information to teachers and students. He argues that perceiving formative evaluation as “less rigorous” or “more informal” than summative, which is often the case, “undermines the accuracy of the mid-course corrections” and consequently “send the mission in the wrong direction.” He goes further to claim that effective learning and assessment is a result of integrating assessment into the “cycle of challenging goals” and “feedback,” rather than concentrating on the testing itself (pp. 6-7). In a later publication, Hattie and Timperley (2007) reiterate that the usual (summative) definition of assessment places more emphasis on the adequacy of scores by considering assessment as merely “an activity used to assess students’ levels of proficiency.” The writers suggest instead that assessment is viewed (formatively) as an activity that provides both teachers and students with feedback information. It should addresses the three major questions of “where am I going, how am I going, and where to next,” at the levels of task, processing, self-regulation, and personality. Hence, they place the emphasis on providing information about the “discrepancy between current status and the learning goals” (p. 101).

Irons (2008) stresses the idea that the effectiveness of summative assessment is a concern at several levels related to its accuracy, reliability, and—more importantly—usefulness in improving learning and teaching (p. 17). Citing several works to support his position (e.g., Gibbs, 2005; Knight, 2001; Torrance & Pryor, 2002), Irons advocates formative assessment and considers it a “powerful contributor to student learning” because it can make the learners more open about their problems, more aware of their strengths and weaknesses, and more motivated about improving their performance (p. 17). Formative assessment, according to Irons, also
enhances independent learning by encouraging students’ self-assessment and reflective practice (p. 18).

More emphatically, Taras (2005) affirms that formative assessment needs to be given priority because it incorporates summative assessment and justifies its parameters by clarifying how they have been addressed and what can be done to improve them (p. 470). In the same way, Cauley and McMillan (2010) argue that students can learn more through formative assessment for four main reasons:

- Frequent, ongoing assessment allows both for fine-tuning of instruction and student focus on progress.
- Immediate assessment helps ensure meaningful feedback.
- Specific, rather than global, assessments allow students to see concretely how they can improve.
- Formative assessment is consistent with recent constructivist theories of learning and motivation” (p. 2).

2.2 Feedback

2.2.1 The concept of feedback

It can be plainly recognized that formative assessment relies heavily on the provision of feedback to both teachers and students. Sadler (1989) theorizes about the nature and function of formative assessment in the development of expertise and maintains that feedback is a key element in any formative assessment. He argues that most physical, intellectual, or social skills “require practice in a supportive environment that incorporates feedback loops” (p. 120). Highlighting the characteristics of formative assessment, Wiliam and Black (1996) identify successful adaptations of the teaching based on the evidence of various assessment processes, such as the use of a ‘reference group’ of students to judge the pacing of the lessons, and emphasize that the common element in all of these processes is feedback (p. 538). In their seminal survey of the evidence that
improving formative assessment contributes strongly to learning progress, Black and Wiliam (1998a) indicate that successful formative assessment depends largely on:

- Providing effective feedback to students,
- Involving students actively in their own learning,
- Adjusting teaching according to the results of assessment,
- Recognizing the strong influence of assessment on students’ motivation and self-esteem, which in turn have a vital role in students’ learning, and
- Enabling students to assess themselves and know how to improve their own performance.

Black and Wiliam (1998a) affirm that all innovations in formative assessment involve “some degree of feedback” between the teacher and the learner, and that “for assessment to be formative, the feedback information has to be used” (pp. 16-17). Biggs (1999) contends that the results of formative assessment are used for feedback, unlike the results of summative assessment that are used to grade or credit students at the end of a unit or program (p. 142). While summative assessment has a feed-out function, according to Knight (2002), which certifies or warrants an achievement of some sort, formative assessment has a feed-back function that evokes information to help further learning (p. 276). Wiliam and Thompson (2007) conceptualize formative assessment as consisting of five key strategies, one of which is “providing feedback that moves learners forward” (as cited in Black & Wiliam, 2009, p. 8). In 2008, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), which seeks member consensus on major educational issues, identified five attributes from the literature as critical features of effective formative assessment, and listed descriptive feedback as the second attribute. CCSSO expounds that “students should be provided with evidence-based feedback that is linked to the intended instructional outcomes and criteria for success” (p. 4). Irons (2008) makes feedback the focus of his definition of formative assessment when he defines the latter as “any task or activity which creates feedback (or feedforward) for students about their learning” and “does not carry a grade which is subsequently used in a summative judgment” (p. 7).
As revealed in the literature, if formative assessment is crucial to effective learning, feedback is crucial to formative assessment (Brookhart, 2008, p. 1). Feedback plays a central role in students’ development of learning and achievement of desired skills (Bandura, 1991; Fedor, 1991; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Hounsell, 2003; Shute, 2008; Weaver, 2006). An important question to ask here is, what is feedback, and how is it defined in the literature? In fact, the nature of feedback has been interpreted by researchers in several ways. Feedback is seen by Ende (1983) as “information describing students’ performance in a given activity that is intended to guide their future performance in that same or related activity” (p. 777). Knowledge transmission is also stressed in Ramaprasad’s definition (1983), where feedback is seen as “information about the gap between the actual level and the reference level of a system parameter which is used to alter the gap in some way” (p. 4). A similar understanding of feedback is provided by Sadler (1989), who holds that feedback “requires knowledge of the standard of goal, skills in making multicriterion comparisons, and the development of ways and means for reducing the discrepancy between what is produced and what is aimed for” (p. 142). Stressing the cognitive impact, Winne and Butler (1994) see feedback as “information with which a learner can confirm, add to, overwrite, tune, or restructure information in memory, whether that information is domain knowledge, metacognitive knowledge, beliefs about self and tasks, or cognitive tactics and strategies” (as cited in Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p. 81).

A broader, reciprocal conceptualization of feedback is given by Askew and Lodge (2000), who define feedback as “all dialogue to support learning in both formal and informal situations” (p. 1). A more detailed, regulatory understanding of feedback is provided by Hattie and Timperley (2007), who see feedback as “information provided by an agent (e.g., instructor, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one’s performance or understanding” (p. 81). The influence of behaviorism and humanistic orientations (behavior modification), as well as more growth-orientated theories (focus on individual attainments) on those views of feedback seems apparent. Yet, contributions like Nicol’s (2010) propose a dialogic, interactive conceptualization
of feedback, by defining it as a “dialogical and contingent two-way process that involves coordinated teacher–student and peer-to-peer interaction as well as active learner engagement” (p. 503). Here, the movement from the cognitivist paradigm that sees learning as a commodity to be transmitted, to a socio-constructivist that sees learning as purposeful participation in a social context, becomes more apparent (see Table 2). Evans (2013), who recently wrote a comprehensive review on feedback in higher education from 2000 to 2012, rightly observes that assessment feedback was often conceived as an ‘end product’ and a consequence of a performance, while it should be an integral part of learning and a supported, ongoing process. Evans uses the term assessment feedback as an umbrella term to capture the diversity of definitions and typologies of feedback found in the literature. She elaborately states that assessment feedback “includes all feedback exchanges generated within assessment design, occurring within and beyond the immediate learning context, being overt or covert (actively and/or passively sought and/or received), and importantly, drawing from a range of sources” (p. 71).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Behaviourist</th>
<th>Cognitivist</th>
<th>Humanist</th>
<th>Social/Situational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning theorists</strong></td>
<td>Thorndike, Pavlov, Watson, Guthrie, Hull, Tolman, Skinner</td>
<td>Koffka, Kohler, Lewin, Piaget, Ausbel, Bruner, Gagne</td>
<td>Maslow, Rogers</td>
<td>Bandura, Lave and Wenger, Salomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>View of the learning process</strong></td>
<td>Change in behavior</td>
<td>Internal mental process (including insight, information processing, memory, perception)</td>
<td>A personal act to fulfill potential.</td>
<td>Interaction/observation in social contexts. Movement from the periphery to the center of a community of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of learning</strong></td>
<td>Stimuli in external environment</td>
<td>Internal cognitive structuring</td>
<td>Affective and cognitive needs</td>
<td>Learning is in relationship between people and environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose in education</strong></td>
<td>Produce behavioral change</td>
<td>Develop capacity and skills to learn better</td>
<td>Become self-actualized, autonomous</td>
<td>Full participation in communities of practice and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 Typologies of feedback

Various typologies of feedback have been proposed in the literature of formative feedback to serve various purposes. In their review of formative feedback, Lipnevich and Smith (2008) emphasize the idea that researchers categorize feedback in various ways based on different purposes. In terms of intentionality, feedback can be either intentional, designed explicitly to inform learners about the quality and correctness of their performance, or unintentional, resulting from natural, incidental interaction with the surrounding environment, such as that which occurs in unguided, unstructured peer interactions and simulations. The intentional type of feedback can be classified further as direct, delivered to learners from the instructor or peers through interpersonal communication, or indirect, delivered to learners through mediated artifacts, such as the Internet and computer tools. Both direct and indirect feedback can be distinguished further according to load of information and type of information. The former concerns the amount of feedback
information, which ranges from a single letter grade reflecting students’ performance to a detailed narrative description. The latter can be either *evaluative* (product-related), providing learners with information about the correctness of their performance of a certain task, or *descriptive* (process-related), providing learners with information about how to perform a task. The former is appraising, whereas the latter is illustrative. Some researchers such as Bangert-Drowns et al. (1991) suggest that the category of feedback information can be broken down further into error correction, presentation of prototypical responses, display of the consequences of responses, and explanation of the appropriateness of responses. Other researchers (e.g., Tunstall & Gipps 1996) classify the feedback message based on the two broad categories of socialization and assessment. The two categories serve the functions of rewarding/punishing, approving/disapproving, specifying attainment, specifying improvement, constructing achievement, and constructing the way forward.

Putting emphasis on the focus of feedback, Hattie and Timperley (2007) claim that the feedback focus plays a critical role in influencing the effectiveness of feedback. The feedback focus has four major levels. First, the task level that concentrates on the quality of the learner’s product, how well it is being accomplished, and whether it is correct or incorrect. Second, the process level that concentrates on the learner’s procedures and strategies in developing a product, including the learner’s approach for error detection and correction. Third, the self-regulated level that concentrates on promoting the learner’s self-monitoring, directing, and managing of actions, including the learner’s self-evaluation and confidence in handling the task. Fourth and last, the self level that concentrates on the learner’s ego and personal traits, such as intelligence and character, rather than the learner’s actual performance on the task. In task-level feedback, the learner is provided with information that distinguishes correct from incorrect answers, provides additional explanatory details, and builds more on the surface understanding of learning, which involves acquisition, storing, reproduction and use of knowledge. This kind of feedback, according to the writers, is often called corrective feedback and is the most common in teachers’ written and
verbal questions in classrooms. In feedback about the processing of the task, the learner is provided with information concerning relations in the environment, relations in the learner’s perceptions, and relations between the environment and learner’s perceptions. This level of feedback information seeks to enhance the deep understanding of learning that involves construction of meaning, association of relationships, and experimentation with difficult and untried tasks.

Hattie and Timperley (2007) indicate that students’ cognitive skills, such as strategies of error detection and problem solving, are also encouraged by feedback information at the process level. Feedback about self-regulation aims to put students in control of their own learning and development, leading them to “seeking, accepting and accommodating feedback information” (p. 94). Learners who benefit from this level of feedback become more capable of creating internal feedback and self-assessment, more willing to invest effort into seeking and dealing with feedback, more engaged and active in performing a task, and more committed to improving their performance on a task. Students who ask for hints and advice on a given task (instrumental help) rather than direct answers or solutions to escape work (executive help) are principally seeking feedback at the self-regulation level. When students avoid seeking help from their teacher, there are often emotional factors preventing them from doing so, such as perceived threats to self-esteem or social embarrassment. The last level of feedback, and least effective according to Hattie and Timperley, focuses on the learner’s self as a person. It tends to be more generalized and rarely tied to specific tasks. It contains more personal remarks, such as “Good” and “Great job,” and less task-related information that can be translated into further engagement in the class, commitment to the learning goals, higher self-efficacy, or understanding of the task (pp. 96-97). Self-efficacy refers to the “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3).

In a comprehensive study, Shute (2008) reviews the literature on feedback, focusing on its formative function, which she defines as “information communicated to the learner that is
intended to modify his or her thinking or behavior to improve learning” (p. 154). Based on a large corpus containing more than 100 documents of journal articles, books and book chapters, conference proceedings and others, Shute examined formative feedback in terms of purposes, cognitive mechanisms, specificity, complexity, and timing. The main purpose of formative feedback is to increase student knowledge, skills, and understanding in any given subject area. Learners use formative feedback utilizing several cognitive mechanisms. One of these is signaling a gap between the current level of performance and desired level of performance, which motivates higher levels of effort. Another cognitive mechanism that formative feedback encourages is reducing the learner’s uncertainty about the quality of his or her performance, thus helping the learner stay focused and eliminating any distraction that this negative state of mind may cause. Formative feedback can also reduce the (extraneous) cognitive load that novice and struggling students may experience due to high demands and complex problem-solving tasks. It provides supportive and explanatory information that decreases such cognitive load and corrects procedural errors and misconceptions. Feedback can be specific, merely indicating whether a given answer is correct or incorrect, or elaborated, providing details on how to improve an answer in the form of response-specific, error flagging, and strategic hints, among others. The former is more directive than facilitative, while the latter tends to be the other way around. Directive and facilitative are two functions of feedback. In the directive feedback, the teacher tells the learner specifically what needs to be corrected or revised, whereas in the facilitative feedback, the teacher provides the learner with general guidance on how to correct and revise (p. 157).

Shute indicates that effective provision of feedback should include elements of both specific and elaborated feedback, varying in degree depending on different variables such as learner characteristics (e.g., ability level and motivation) and learning outcomes (e.g., retention and transfer tasks). Feedback can also be looked at based on its complexity (i.e., what and how much information should be delivered in the feedback messages), which may vary from too short, directly stating the correct answer; to too long, providing lengthy informative tutoring that
includes verification, correct answer, and explanation of why a given answer is incorrect. The nature and quality of the content of lengthy feedback is primarily what determines its efficiency. For example, feedback that provides the learner with information on his or her progress toward a desired goal tends to be more effective and motivating. Goal-oriented feedback can be enhanced using other teaching techniques such as scaffolding, which may include models, cues, prompts, hints, partial solutions, and direct instruction. Here, discussion of the timing of feedback is necessary. Feedback can be immediate, delivered to students as soon as they complete a certain task, or delayed, delivered hours, days, or even weeks after students’ completion of a task. Both have positive and negative impact on learning. According to Shute, immediate feedback facilitates the decision and motivation for practice and associates learning outcomes to causes, yet it may encourage dependence on information that is not available during task transfer, hence promoting less careful and attentive behavior. Delayed feedback, on the other hand, may encourage student engagement in active cognitive and metacognitive processing, thus enhancing self-autonomy and -efficacy, yet it may frustrate struggling and less-motivated students and impede their knowledge and skill acquisition (pp. 161-167).

Several typologies of feedback have also been developed by researchers in the field of SLI (e.g., Chandler, 2003; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lalande, 1982; Robb et al., 1986). One important contribution in this regard is Ellis (2009). In an attempt to provide a basis for a systematic approach to investigating the effects of written corrective feedback, Ellis presents a typology of the different types available to teachers and researchers, distinguishing two sets of options: a) teachers’ strategies for providing feedback and b) students’ response to such feedback (pp. 96-97). Focusing on the correction of linguistic errors in students’ written work, Ellis argues that identifying the options in a systematic way is essential in order to determine first whether or not written corrective feedback is effective, and then what kind of corrective feedback is most effective. Based on his analysis of teacher handbooks and published empirical studies of written feedback, Ellis categorizes teachers’ strategies for feedback provision into six types:
• *Direct*, whereby the teacher gives students the correct answer in a straightforward manner;
• *Indirect*, whereby the teacher indicates that an error exists without correcting it;
• *Metalinguistic*, whereby the teacher gives communicative cues on the nature of the error;
• *Focused*, concerns whether the teacher corrects all errors or only selects certain types of errors;
• *Electronic*, whereby the teacher indicates an error and provides a hyperlink to a website that gives examples of correct usage; and
• *Reformulated*, whereby a native speaker revises the student’s whole text and revises it in a way that preserve its original ideas yet making it read more natural and fluent.

Indirect corrective feedback can be broken into two types: The first involves indicating the existence of an error and locating where it is in the text, and the second involves indicating in the margin that an error has been made without locating it in the text. Likewise, metalinguistic corrective feedback might include use of an error code in the margin or brief grammatical descriptions at the bottom of the text for the errors in the text. The focus of the feedback, according to Ellis, applies to the previous three types of feedback, and it highlights the teacher’s choice of either extensively correcting all errors in the student’s work, which becomes in this case unfocused corrective feedback, or intensively correcting specific error types, which becomes in this case focused corrective feedback. As for students’ response to the teacher’s feedback, which is an essential feature of corrective feedback, the teacher might ask students to (1) simply study the corrections, (2) study the corrections and revise the text, or (3) study the corrections, revise the text, and return a corrected text. Ellis’ typology of corrective feedback can be quite useful for the design of experimental studies, as well as for descriptive research that examines, for instance, how teachers carry out their corrective feedback and how students respond to the feedback they receive. Ellis also suggests that further studies can benefit from the typology by examining actual practice of corrective feedback and observing how accurate the typology is and whether it needs any modification (p. 106).
2.2.3 Effectiveness of feedback

Numerous studies have investigated the question of what makes feedback practice effective (e.g., Bangert, 2004; Black & Wiliam, 1998; Carless, 2006; Hattie & Jager, 1998; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Wolsey, 2008). Building on the conceptual design of Sadler (1989), Hattie and Timperley (2007) argue that feedback cannot achieve an instructional purpose unless the information provided is directly tied to the task or learning process, and that fills a gap between what is understood and what is aimed to be understood (p. 82). The writers clarify that this instructional purpose can be achieved through affective processes such as increased effort, motivation, and engagement, as well as cognitive processes such as restructuring understanding, confirming students’ answers, and directing students to alternative strategies of problem solving.

For Hattie and Timperley (2007), as discussed earlier, effective feedback must answer three questions: Where am I going (feed up), how am I going (feed back), and where am I going next (feed forward). The first looks up to the goals desired to be achieved, the second looks back to the progress that has been made to achieve the goal, and the third looks forward to the activities that are needed to achieve the goals. After modeling feedback into four major levels, namely the task, process, self-regulation, and self-levels, the writers caution that the level at which the feedback is directed can have a great impact on the efficiency of the feedback. The writers review the evidence related to the influence of feedback on learning and achievement and argue that the self-level feedback is often present in class situations, yet is usually the least effective since it contains little task-related information and hardly leads to student’s engagement or commitment to the learning goals. Hattie and Timperley believe that this level of feedback can have a positive impact on learning only if it causes changes in students’ effort, engagement, and self-efficacy in learning and attempting to understand tasks, and this is likely to happen when the above three questions are adequately addressed.

Thus, if a teacher, for example, gives a praising remark such as “You’re really great,” followed by further explanation such as “Because you’ve diligently completed this task by applying
this concept,” the teacher is actually directing the student’s attention away from the self to the task, hence providing information value to achievement and learning (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p. 96). The process and self-regulated levels of feedback, according to the writers, are the most effective in terms of deeper processing and mastery of the task. As for the task-level feedback, the writers argue that it is powerful only when the task information is consequently useful for enhancing strategy processing and self-regulation skills, which, for Hattie and Timperley, is rarely the case. The writers note, however, that a combined form of process and task levels of feedback can have an “interactive effect” in that the task-related information assists in improving task confidence and self-efficacy and, at the same time, paves the way for the process-related information to provide resources for effective and innovative strategy searching (p. 93). Hattie and Timperley argue that their four-level and three-question model can be used to address debatable issues on feedback such as the timing of feedback. It is recommended, for instance, that an immediate error correction be used during task acquisition so that faster rates of acquisition are obtained, whereas delayed error correction is used during fluency building so that learning automaticity and associated strategies of learning can be achieved. Therefore, immediate feedback is more beneficial at the task level, while delayed feedback is more beneficial at the process level (p. 98).

After reviewing a variety of types and features of formative feedback in the research literature, Shute (2008) cautions that these types and features can be influenced by different variables. These variables include learner ability level (e.g., high achieving vs. low achieving), learner response certitude (i.e., confidence about one’s own performance and answer), learner goal orientation (i.e., disposition toward developing one’s own ability and skills), and feedback normativity (i.e., norm-referenced, comparing student to other class members, and self-referenced, comparing a student to his or her own known level of ability). In general, formative feedback should be non-evaluative, supportive, timely, and specific. If the feedback is used to serve a corrective function, it should, according to Shute, a) verify whether the student’s answer
is correct or incorrect and b) provide directive or facilitative information about the correct answer (p. 95). When considering influencing variables, Shute gave a list of guidelines on what to do and what to avoid to make formative feedback effective:

On things to do, she recommends that:

- The feedback focus on the task rather than the learner;
- It be elaborated in manageable units;
- It be specific and clear;
- It be suitable for the learner's level;
- It remove uncertainty between the learner’s performance and learning goals;
- It be unbiased and objective;
- It promote a learning goal orientation; and
- It be provided after the learner has attempted a solution.

On things to avoid, she recommends that:

- The feedback avoid (normative) comparison with other students or drawing attention to ‘self’ during learning;
- It avoid providing overall grades but rather information on how to improve;
- It avoid discouraging the learners or threatening them;
- It avoid praise that directs the learner’s attention to the ‘self’ rather than the task and learning;
- It not be delivered verbally as it is usually interpreted as unbiased;
- It not be delivered while the learner is actively engaged in a task;
- It avoid providing the correct answer directly but rather uses prompts and cues that scaffold learning;
- It avoid limiting the mode of feedback presentation to text, and instead use alternative modes such as the audiovisual (via multimedia); and
- It avoid conducting extensive error analyses and diagnosis.

In terms of the timing of feedback, Shute (2008) recommends that the timing be designed in alignment with the desired outcomes. Immediate feedback, for example, is generally used for fixing instant task errors, solving difficult and new tasks, and promoting verbal, procedural, and physical skills, while delayed feedback is used for promoting process and transfer task
performance and for solving relatively simple tasks. In terms of learner characteristics, it is recommended that delayed, facilitative and verification feedback be used for high-achieving learners, while immediate, directive, specific, scaffolded and elaborative feedback be used for low-achieving learners. Shute indicates that the list is a point of departure for future systematic research. By use of analogy, Shute reiterates that:

Formative feedback might be likened to ‘a good murder’ in that effective and useful feedback depends on three things: (a) motive (the student needs it), (b) opportunity (the student receives it in time to use it), and (c) means (the student is able and willing to use it) (p. 175).

Drawing from the conclusions of several works on formative feedback (e.g., Bangert Drowns et al., 1991; Butler & Winne, 1995; Black & Wiliam, 1998a; Brookhart, 2004; Crooks, 1988; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Kluger & DeNisi, 1996), Brookhart (2012) proposes a comprehensive conceptual model on how to provide learners with influential feedback that facilitates their regulation of learning. She rightly stresses that teacher feedback is “part of the external regulation of learning” which “helps increase the chances that the student will learn and that the student will want to learn” (p. 227). Brookhart builds her model around teachers’ decisions concerning feedback strategies and content, and gives relevant recommendations on each type of decision to assist teachers in making their choices more intentional and informed.

Feedback strategies, according to Brookhart, include:

- Decisions about timing (immediate or delayed),
- Decisions about amount (whether it is prioritized and appropriate to learner’s level),
- Decisions about mode of expression (written, oral, or demonstration), and
- Decisions about audience (individual or group)

While feedback content includes:

- Decisions about focus (process, product, or learner’s self-regulation),
- Decisions about function (descriptive or evaluative),
- Decisions about comparison (criterion-, norm-, or self-referenced),
- Decisions about valence (positive or negative),
- Decisions about clarity (in terms of vocabulary, concepts, and content),
Decisions about *specificity* (specifies tasks, errors, and solutions), and
Decisions about *tone* (word choice and message expressive quality)

In a previous publication, Brookhart (2008) indicates that many of the issues discussed about written feedback can be applied to verbal feedback. She points out that the suggestions she made about focus, function, comparison, valence, clarity, specificity, and tone apply to verbal feedback as well as to written feedback (p. 47). Discussing the importance of engaging students in dialogic feedback, Irons (2008) maintains that teachers should clarify the concept of feedback to their students who may fail to realize that verbal discussion on their written work is also a form of feedback (p. 49). For Brookhart (2008), decisions about which mode of feedback is more effective depends on the kind of assignment as well as on the student’s academic level. Written feedback is usually better with written homework and with advanced students, while verbal feedback is usually better for in-class activities and beginning students. Written feedback has the advantage of being a more permanent record than verbal feedback, while verbal feedback can usually lead to a conversation between the teacher and students (p. 15). Verbal feedback can be provided to an individual in a formal/structured or an informal/unstructured format, or to a group in the form of in-class or out-of-class conferences. Brookhart suggests that group feedback can be used at the start of a lesson to summarize teachers’ observations from a previous lesson or to reemphasize previous learning objectives and to link to new objectives. It can also be used during class activities and after the completion of a test or assignment to summarize overall strengths and weaknesses (p. 54).

A crucial constructivist quality of effective feedback is that of engaging the learners in purposeful dialogic discussions and ensuring that they understand the teacher’s response and make sense of it. Promoting confident dialogue in the classroom is an educational feature for which many researchers have called to help students move from passive recipients of information to interactive generators of information (from knowledge reproduction to knowledge production) (e.g., Adcroft, 2011; Beaumont et al., 2010; Bloxham & Campbell, 2010; Carless, 2006; Maclellan,
Emphasizing the importance of engaging the learner in a discussion about the feedback, Nicol (2010) proposes the conceptualization of feedback as a two-way dialogue rather than as mere transmissionist monologue. Various surveys on feedback reflect a great deal of dissatisfaction from both students and teachers concerning feedback. This, according to Nicol, is a direct result of “impoverished and fractured dialogue” (p. 503). Nicol hence recommends a dialogic feedback in which meaning is constructed through active interactions between the teacher and learners and among learners themselves. Stressing the need for recasting the role of students as “active constructors” of feedback information, Nicol contends that the learners must do something with the feedback they received: They must analyze its message, inquire about it, discuss it with others, build it on prior knowledge, and use it to make changes in their actions. Considering that “the overall purpose of the feedback process in higher education is to help students develop the ability to monitor, evaluate and regulate their own learning,” Nicol specifies that the kind of feedback activities he calls for should be adaptive, discursive, interactive, and reflective (p. 504). It is highly important that a context of understanding be shared between the teacher and learner so that no misinterpretation of the conveyed feedback occurs.

Shared understanding between the teacher and students cannot be achieved by only providing the learners with a list of printed criteria, but by also continuously ensuring that learners understand the list and know how to use it in enhancing their own learning. Students should also be encouraged to take the initiative in requesting feedback based on their own concerns, and to engage in peer discussions about their teacher’s feedback comments. Nicol (2010) suggests that instructor’s written comments should be:

- Understandable (to students)
- Selective (in providing manageable comments)
- Specific (in pointing to precise instances)
- Timely (provided in appropriate time)
- Contextualized (referenced to the learning outcomes)
• Non-judgmental (descriptive rather than evaluative)
• Balanced (indicating positive and negative aspects)
• Forward looking (indicating how to improve)
• Transferable (focused on processes not just content)
• Personal (referring to what is known to students)

One of the seven principles that Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) identify for ‘good feedback practice’ is that of encouraging teacher-and-peer dialogue around learning. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick argue that dialogical feedback helps students take control of their own learning and become self-regulated. This principle can be implemented through several techniques; for example:

• Providing feedback in class using one-minute writing assignments, reviewing feedback with students in tutorials;
• Asking students to talk to the class about what feedback they find useful and why; and
• Having students discuss task criteria and standards before starting a group project and provide each other with descriptive feedback based on the agreed-upon criteria after completing the project (p. 211).

The effectiveness of formative feedback can be enhanced by self-assessment that primarily encourages students to take a proactive role in the management of their own learning (e.g., Black & Wiliam, 1998b; Boud, 1995; Nicol, 1997; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Sadler, 1989). The process of self-assessment requires the learner to make decisions about the expected standards of performance and then make judgments about the quality of his or her performance against the stated standards. “Whenever we learn, we question ourselves: How am I doing? Is this enough? Is this right? How can I tell? Should I go further? In the act of questioning is the act of judging ourselves and making decisions about the next step; this is self-assessment” (Boud, 1995, p. 1). Self-assessment is the type of feedback that addresses how the learner monitors, directs, and regulates his or her actions toward the learning goal. It fosters the learner’s autonomy, commitment, confidence, self-control, self-direction, and self-discipline, and consequently reduces
the learner’s dependency on the teacher. It is what Hattie and Timperley (2007) label as feedback about self-regulation. Instead of relying merely on external factors such as teacher and peer feedback, students reflect and create internal feedback and self-regulation strategies while they are engaged in academic coursework (p. 49).

Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) believe that good feedback practice facilitates the development of self-assessment in learning and moves the student’s role from proactive to reactive in generating and using feedback, thus empowering students and enhancing their self-regulation skills. In order for students to be able to self-assess, they need to be given clear objectives and criteria of what is expected from them (p. 205). Students have to be able to judge the quality of their own work and regulate their level of performance. This necessitates, therefore, that the learner (1) understands the stated standards, (2) compares the actual level with the standard level, and (3) engages in an action that leads to closing the gap between the current and desired levels (Sadler, 1989, p. 121). Furthermore, students need a specific task or performance to assess, a model of self-assessment, an instruction in and assistance with self-assessment, a practice session on self-assessment, an opportunity to revise and improve their task or performance, and, above all, an awareness of the value of self-assessment (Goodrich, 1996, in Andrade & Cizek, 2010, p. 93). Evans (2013) emphasizes the same idea when she indicates that focused interventions that include activities such as “discussion groups, workshops on writing, self-checking feedback sheets, rubrics, discussion of criteria, marking workshops, reflective writing tasks, writing frameworks, coaching, and testing,” can make a real difference to the learning outcomes (p. 88). She necessitates, however, that the value of these focused interventions in the learning process is made explicit and perceived as valuable by both the students and instructors. She asserts that in order to develop self-assessment skills, students need time to first grasp instructions then apply them properly in learning contexts.

Peer assessment is another dynamic resource of effective formative feedback as demonstrated by many researchers (e.g., Black & Wiliam, 1998b; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Nicol
Mutual exchange of feedback with fellow classmates, according to Sadler (1989), has the advantages that:

- Students work on the same task and activity;
- Students attempt to find solutions to the same problems, which exposes students to each other’s weakness and strengths and expands their own horizons; and
- Students are less defensive and committed emotionally to other students’ works, which achieve some objectivity.

Sadler (1989) indicates that traditional approaches to formative assessment miss the chance to reduce the assessment workload for teachers which practical use of peer appraisal can provide (p. 140). One of the seven broad principles that Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) identify for effective feedback practice based on their conceptual model of self-regulation and research literature on formative assessment is that of encouraging what they call *peer dialogue* around learning. The writers argue that peer dialogue enhances students’ self-control over their learning in various ways. For instance, students sometimes are better than their teachers at explaining things they have just learned to their classmates who in turn may also find their peers’ critiques easier to accept. Through peer dialogue, students can be exposed to alternative perspectives that enable them to revise and construct new knowledge and meaning, and provide them with an important source of motivation and persistence (p. 210).

Furthermore, Nicol (2010) holds that not just the receiving of feedback from peers is beneficial for the student, but so is the giving of feedback from the student to his or her peers. “When students regularly give feedback on the assignments of peers,” Nicol argues, “they develop the ability to recognise what characterises a quality assignment and about the different ways it can be produced: They learn that quality does not come in a pre-defined form; rather, there is a spectrum of possibilities” (p. 510). Black (2007) notices, however, that for peer assessment to be valuable, students should work as a group not in a group. Drawing on empirical studies by Dawes et al. (2004) and Johnson et al. (2000), Black maintains that groups in which students collaborate...
yield greater learning gains over either individual study or group work in which students compete against each other. Black concludes his point by emphasizing that “it is its quality (i.e. group work) and not its mere existence, which determines the help it will give to pupils’ learning” (p. 3). Having students take part in the process of peer assessment also requires plenty of practice and teacher’s support. Teachers should provide their students with clear structure and guidelines so that they learn how to give constructive and meaningful reflection on their own work as well as on that of their peers (CCSSO, 2008, p. 5).

2.3 Assessment In Translator Education

2.3.1 Summative assessment in translator education

Translation has long been seen as a subjective exercise (Hönig, 1998; Horguelin, 1985; Toury, 1999); the evaluation of which was done arbitrarily based on general and vague criteria (Reiss, 2000; Bowker, 2000; Colina, 2003). And despite the fact that the assessment of translator performance is a long-standing activity, the area of translation assessment has been generally regarded as under-researched and under-discussed (Cao, 1996, p. 525; Hatim & Mason, 1997, p. 197). It is noticeable that most studies on translation assessment have been descriptive or theoretical in nature, and that they lay more emphasis on the summative function of assessment than the formative function. These studies, as reviewed by Waddington (2001), seek to establish a criteria for ‘good’ translations (e.g., Darbelnet, 1977; Newmark, 1991), define the nature of translation errors (e.g., Kussmaul, 1995; Nord, 1993), categorize possible translation errors (e.g., Gouadec, 1981), determining the relative versus absolute nature of translation errors (e.g., Pym, 1992; Williams, 1989), assess quality at the pragmatic level rather than just the linguistic level (e.g., Hatim & Mason, 1997; Sager, 1989), assess quality through text linguistic analysis (e.g., House, 1981; Larose, 1989), determine the impact of errors based on hierarchical textual levels (e.g., Dancette, 1989; Larose, 1989), assess quality psycholinguistically (e.g., Dancette, 1989;
Snell-Hornby, 1995), and expand scales to describe different levels of translation competence (e.g., Mahn, 1989; Stansfield et al., 1992).

2.3.1.1 Theoretical approaches

According to House (1997), different approaches and schools of thought have tried to assess translation and translation quality. They have done so by addressing the nature of (1) the relationship between STs and their translations, (2) the relationship between (features of) these texts and how they are perceived by authors, translators, and end users, and (3) the consequences of these relationships that determine the borders between a translation and other textual operations. House reviews and critically examines these schools of thought and categorizes them into the following:

2.3.1.1.1 Anecdotal, biographical and neo-hermeneutic approaches

Scholars in this line of thought (e.g., Kupsch-Losereit, 1994; Stolze, 1992) emphasize the belief that translation quality relies on the human factor, i.e. translator’s “subjective” and “intuitive” interpretation of the texts based on his or her linguistic and cultural knowledge and experience, rather than on a transparent, empirically based set of criteria for evaluating translations. Notions such as “faithfulness to the original,” “retention of the original’s flavor,” “preservation of the spirit of the source language,” and “translation as an individual’s creative act” resulted from this line of rationale. This perspective of translation quality, thus, concentrates largely on the intuition of the translator and features of the ST, and rarely considers the circumstances of the target text (TT) and of receiving culture.

2.3.1.1.2 Response-oriented, behavioral approaches

Scholars in this line of thought (e.g., Nida, 1964; Nida & Taber, 1969) emphasize the manner in which the TT audience responds to the translated text, and necessitate that the text must produce a response ‘equivalent’ to the one the ST audience has to it. This view of translation quality
assessment also requires efficiency of the communication process and comprehension of the ST intention. Influenced by American structuralism and behaviorism, approaches in this school regard global behavioral criteria such as *intelligibility* and *informativeness* as basic elements of assessment. They are also influenced by Nida’s ideas in the 1960s, particularly his *equivalence of response* based on the principle of *dynamic equivalence*. Thus, the translator is expected to produce an ‘adequate’ text that can be comprehended and appreciated by the target readership whose reaction to the text is the cornerstone for assessing the translation’s quality, hence largely ignoring the ST and its relationship to the TT.

2.3.1.1.3  *Literature-oriented approaches (descriptive translation studies)*

Scholars in this line of thought (e.g., Bassnett & Lefevere, 1990; Toury, 1995) emphasize the forms and functions inside the *system* of the target culture and literature. In these approaches, the ST occupies a subordinate position, serving as a basis for the actual translation and the textual phenomenon that will be introduced to the target environment. Toury’s notions of norms and equivalence stress a set of relationships that distinguish appropriate modes of translation performance from non-appropriate in a particular culture, rather than adhere to a fixed relationship between a ST and its translation. House (1997) argues that the solid contextualized and empirical-descriptive work that these approaches present is a major strength in their theory, yet the absence of clear criteria for judging the positive and negative aspects of a given translation is their essential weakness.

2.3.1.1.4  *Functionalist, skopos-related approaches*

Scholars in this line of thought (e.g., Kussmaul, 1995; Reiss & Vermeer, 1984) emphasize the *skopos* (or purpose) of a translation and view the target culture norms as a critical element in evaluating a translation. The commissioner’s translation brief decides the function that the translation is to fulfill in the target context, an implicit function that the target reader postulates based on contextual features. In these approaches, *equivalence* occurs between a ST and its
translation only when both have the same communicative function, whereas adequacy is applied when no functional match is obtained in such a relationship. House (1997) finds vague the criteria by which the skopos and adequacy/equivalence of a translation is to be determined and linguistically realized. Hence, she declares that the skopos theory is not adequate for assessing the quality of a translation.

2.3.1.1.5 Post-modernist and deconstructionist approaches

Scholars in this line of thought (e.g., Arrojo, 1994; Venuti, 1992) emphasize the socio-philosophical and political stance of a translation in order to expose unequal power relations and reveal ideological and institutional manipulations. Such manipulations start from the process of selecting what gets translated and in twisting the ST to satisfy certain agendas. In so doing, these scholars attempt to make translators more visible and draw attention to their influential role. Although House (1997) assumes that such approaches may yield results that highlight the translators’ influence on the target culture and literature, she doubts whether their inspections are worth the effort and, more importantly, whether they can determine when a text is a translation and when it is a different textual operation.

2.3.1.1.6 Linguistically oriented approaches

Scholars in this line of thought (e.g., Hatim & Mason, 1990; Reiss, 1971) emphasize the ST's linguistic and textual structure and meanings at various levels, and focus strictly on the relationship between the ST and TT quite. They account for features of the text and examine how it is perceived by language users, especially when the context of situation is explicitly examined. These approaches, however, differ in their capacity to provide comprehensive procedures for translation analysis and evaluation. House (1997) sides with this school of thought and indicates that her own contributions of designing and revising a model for translation quality assessment have been built on this linguistically oriented approach.
2.3.1.2 Analytical frameworks

House (1997) builds her revised model (1997, first proposed in 1977) on a systematic comparative analysis between the ST and TT on three different levels, namely Language (text), Register (field, tenor, and mode), and Genre (generic purpose), to identify both the translation method and translation errors. Adopting a *functional equivalence* approach to translation, House claims that the function of the translated text should match that of the ST. She also argues that this function of the text depends on the type of the translation, which can either be *overt* or *covert*. Overt translation is particularly tied to explicit source culture and addressees (e.g., Winston Churchill’s Second World War political speech), thus does not address the target audience directly. It, more importantly, cannot have a “direct match” with the original text function or be treated as a second original (pp. 66-67). Covert translation, on the other side, is not particularly tied to the source language and culture. It targets an audience that has an “equal concern” and equivalent purposes as the ST addressees (e.g., scientific and journalistic texts), and can possibly and preferably have a direct match with the ST’s function. It is reproduced in its own right as a second original (p. 69).

In a covert translation, the translator might have to apply a *cultural filter* to adjust cultural elements and make the TT read as an original (p. 70). The overt-covert translation distinction is one of the aspects in House’s model that has been criticized as being a “cline rather than a pair of binary opposites” (Munday, 2001, p. 94).

Based on the literature, discussions of translation evaluation occupy a central place in three areas of translation, namely *published translations, professional translation practice*, and translator training. According to Melis and Hurtado Almir (2001), evaluation of published translations has been traditionally associated with literary and sacred texts, for the purpose of judging a translation, discussing its strengths and weaknesses, and proposing solutions for its translational problems. Debates around notions of fidelity and quality were common with this type of evaluation, and assessment criteria changed based on different variables such as aesthetic taste, literary conventions, and prevailing translation method. Melis and Hurtado Almir explain
that the academic world, however, has contributed immensely to introducing more objective criteria for assessing the translator competence. The progress that the discipline of Translation Studies has witnessed also enhanced the understanding of how translation works. It led to the development of new analytical frameworks of translation assessment, such as the technical procedures proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995), the dynamic equivalence criteria proposed by Nida and Taber (1969), the situational dimensions proposed by House (1981), the contextual dimensions proposed by Hatim and Mason (1990), the categories derived from the polysystem theory proposed by Toury (1980), the integrated peritexual and textual model proposed by Larose (1989), the sociocultural norms and parameters proposed by Hewson and Martin (1991), and the relationship between intratextual and extratextual factors proposed by Nord (1988). Among these frameworks, only House (1981) and Larose (1989) were developed explicitly for translation evaluation. In the professional world, evaluation of individual translators is carried out for such purposes as to assess their cost-effectiveness and consider them credentialing.

Research in this area of evaluation has led to developing marking scales to determine error types and rating scales to measure translation quality. A significant contribution here is Gouadec (1981, 1989), which proposes a complex scale that identifies 675 linguistic and syntactic error types. In the context of translator education, researchers reflect on the notion of translation problem (Nord 1988), theorize on how errors in translation operate (e.g., Pym 1992), and propose correcting and rating scales for evaluating the translator student’s work (e.g., Delisle 1993). After discussing the definition and functions of evaluation, Melis and Hurtado Albir (2001) argue that the object of research in translation assessment is translation competence, which, according to the PACTE (Process of the Acquisition of Translation Competence and Evaluation) research group, consists of six sub-competencies: (1) communicative competence, (2) extra-linguistic competence, (3) transfer competence, (4) instrumental/professional competence, (5) psychological competence, and (6) strategic competence (p. 280). Understanding the concept and process of translation competence has a vital significance in translation pedagogy as it guides the
design and development of teaching and learning objectives. Melis and Hurtado Albir also define the concept of translation error, and point out that it is important to differentiate between translation problems and translation errors, ST and TT errors, functional and absolute errors, systematic (recurrent) and random (isolated) errors, and product and process errors. Overall, Melis and Hurtado Albir (2001, p. 283) suggest that translation assessment should:

- Use objective criteria with clearly defined error types,
- Establish error seriousness based on functionalist reasoning,
- Consider the good translational solutions,
- Adopt a flexible view of assessment that allows partial evaluation as needed,
- Develop a database on current assessment practices in curricula translator education centers, and
- Carry out surveys with teachers and students in order to know their views on the three areas of assessment.

### 2.3.1.3 Empirical studies in university contexts

Although most of the research that has been conducted in translation assessment has been descriptive or theoretical in nature, one can still find some empirical contributions (Waddington, 2001, p. 311). One of these contributions is Campbell (1991), which sought to examine the extent to which translation tests evaluate translation competence through translation processes rather than through the ST and TT products. Another example is Stansfield et al. (1992), which attempted to identify the variables that influence translation ability. Empirical studies become even fewer when narrowing the scope to summative assessment within the context of university translation programs (Beeby, 2000, p. 187).

A distinct study in this respect is Waddington (2001), which investigated the tests and methods of criteria that were commonly used in translation programs at 48 European and Canadian universities. Surveying a total of 52 teaching faculties from 20 of these universities reflected the existence of two major situations. First, all teachers required their students to
translate a text, and over half also included other complementary tests. Second, 36.5% of the teachers used a method based on error analysis, 38% used a holistic method, and 23% combined error analysis with a holistic appreciation. To ascertain the criterion-related validity of these methods of assessment, Waddington trained five examiners and employed them in assessing second-year university exams of translation into the foreign language (Spanish-into-English) using the following four methods of assessment:

- **Method A** analyzes errors based on their negative impact on: understanding the ST, expressing the target language (TL), and transmitting either the main or secondary functions the ST. It distinguishes between serious and minor errors and awards extra points for good or exceptionally good solutions to translation problems.

- **Method B** analyzes errors based on their negative impact on the overall quality of translation, and determines whether errors are translation or language mistakes by deciding if the error affects the transfer of meaning, in which case it is a translation error, otherwise it is a language error.

- **Method C** treats translations holistically by examining translation competence as a whole and considering three aspects of student’s performance: accuracy of transfer of the ST content, quality of expression in the TL, and degree of task completion.

- **Method D** combines the error analysis approach of method B and the holistic analysis approach of method C, using 70% error analysis, and 30% holistic analysis.

The four methods of assessment were used in different order to assess the translation of 64 students with a month’s interval between each method. To verify the criterion-related validity of these methods of assessment, Waddington used 17 external criteria which can be grouped under (1) knowledge of languages, (2) results in intelligence tests, (3) students’ self-assessment, (4) teachers’ assessment of the students, (5) students' average mark in their translation course, and (6) marks on other translation exams. The factor analysis indicated that there were four factors underlining the external criteria, namely translation competence, native language competence, self-assessment, and mathematical intelligence, with translation competence being noticeably the
main factor. The results suggested that there was a moderately high, statistically significant correlation between the examiners’ application of the four methods and the three factors of translation competence, native language competence, and self-assessment. These results meant that “all four methods have proved to be equally valid in spite of the considerable differences that exist between them” (Waddington, 2001, p. 322).

Another empirical study on translation assessment within university translation programs is Garant (2009), which also represents an attempt to move from error-based approaches to holistic approaches. Garant presented his linear investigation of assessment practices in the English Translation Department at a Finnish university in 1997, 2001 and 2008, using a qualitative methodology that involved semi-structured interviews and open-ended questionnaires. The study, which focused on grading students’ translation assignments in translation practice courses, aimed to describe assessment practices from the instructors’ perspective and to examine the backwash effect (the impact of testing on learning and teaching) that such practices might have had on the translation program as a whole. The results indicated that points-based error grading methods were replaced by holistic grading methods over time, which suggested that a paradigm shift had occurred in the field of Translation Studies during the examined period, as stated by the researcher (p. 14). Most participants in the past used to assess students’ work on a pass/fail basis, giving less attention to the details of quality, unlike recent participants who, by spring 2009, all assigned grades to their students’ assignments. Grading used to vary from one instructor to another, but generally, there were two distinct approaches: The first assigned grades based on a clear, explicit point system for translation errors, while the second assigned grades based on holistic evaluation of translation quality.

Garant (2009) cautioned that “holistic” here was not synonymous with “unsystematic,” but was rather a “systematic way in which the teacher arrive[d] at an overall impression of the text as opposed to relying on a discrete points-based scale” (p. 10). Points-based systems used to be the norm around the turn of the millennium. Translation instructors believed that this system
provided clearer and more objective criteria and made assessment more transparent. Gradually, however, instructors began to adjust the old point scale to fit their own purposes. By 2008, all participants indicated that they no longer used the points-based system in grading students’ translations. Instead, they used (narrative) holistic approaches of assessment. Participants indicated that they evaluated students’ translations at the discourse level rather than the sentence or word level. Recent translation instructors explained that the popularity of holistic assessment was due to its relevance to translator education and its fulfillment of the needs of the translation market. Further, all participants stressed the importance of ‘positive’ grading in that good performance should have also been rewarded, so that students not only avoided common errors but also made intelligent decisions.

Garant (2009) found that while all instructors used holistic assessment and had similar views about the role of assessment in translation courses, instructors differed considerably in the details of their grading instruments. It was found that older and more experienced instructors favored a teacher-centered perspective of assessment, while younger instructors preferred a learner-centered approach (e.g., portfolio assessment). Again, this difference might have revealed a paradigm shift in Translation Studies toward socio-constructivist methodology, according to the researcher. Variation in testing practices within a translation program could be useful, in that it introduced students to different aspects of the translation profession and encouraged them to focus on long-term goals instead of focusing on passing a particular course (p. 14).

2.3.2 Formative assessment in translator education

2.3.2.1 The shift from summative to formative assessment

The shift of focus in academic research from assessment on learning (summative) to assessment for learning (formative) can also be observed in the field of translation pedagogy as well. Even though the overwhelming emphasis is on summative assessment, one can still find voices that call for more utilization of formative assessment and feedback in translator education. In their book,
The Translator as Communicator, Hatim and Mason (1997) point out that in any translator education program, a distinction between formative and summative assessment has to be made. Hatim and Mason maintain that the aim of summative assessment is to provide “evidence for decision-making” at the end of an instructional unit to measure a student’s abilities and potential capabilities. Formative assessment, on the other hand, aims at using tests or other forms of assessment to provide a “source of continuous feedback” to the teacher and learner on the progress of learning to enhance the learning process (p. 166).

Likewise, for Kelly (2005), formative assessment is “any marking, correction, or comment which gives students feedback on their learning precisely in order to help them learn more, or better” (p. 133). The summative and formative functions are not mutually exclusive, in that “even final examinations used for summative assessment may have a formative role if marked and returned to students with comments (written or oral) on how to improve” (p. 133). For the same reason, Hatim and Mason (1997) caution against conceiving translation formative exercises as a “series of mini-examinations of a summative kind,” and argue that a variety of such exercises can be introduced into the curriculum to serve a heuristic approach to the development of translation skills (p. 166). These formative exercises, according to Hatim and Mason, may include both discrete-point testing (e.g., multiple-choice and cloze deletion tests) and discrete-skill testing (e.g., translation-commentary tasks) to assess specific abilities and provide feedback to students at the same time. In this way integrating both the summative and formative functions. Hatim and Mason argue that this approach to assessment meets Hurtado’s (1995) requirement that test design should be driven by learning objectives (pp. 166-167).

Another voice advocating formative assessment in translator education can be heard in Colina (2003). Colina criticizes traditional methods of assessment and recommends that more emphasis be placed on process-oriented evaluation. She points out that “translation evaluation and testing today is done on an asymptomatic basis” and that “the numerous translation textbooks on the market rarely devote any time to a systematic study of error evaluation and grading
Colina advocates grading criteria that are based on descriptive profiles and componential ratings to assess the specific skills that a test attempts to measure. She underscores the importance of formative assessment in translator education and considers excluding formative assessment as “neglect of our duties as educators” (p. 129). Colina is also a strong advocate of communicative, student-centered and teacher-guided classrooms in which the learners interact meaningfully with the teacher and learning environment around them. Facilitating the acquisition of communicative translational competence is the main goal of translator education, according to Colina. It is important to go beyond merely evaluating the translation product (i.e., translation quality assessment) to using the product as an indicator of cognitive skills and translator competence (i.e., translation skills evaluation) (p. 130).

Although Colina indicates that formative assessment should be given a “more prominent position because of the educational purpose underlying translator training,” she contends that both summative and formative assessment must be taken into consideration when developing the translation curriculum. She sees the translation test that is connected with the course objectives as a learning experience for the student and a source of motivation for learning. The provision of quality feedback on these summative tests is a constituent part of the learning process, and the tests themselves can be a source of motivation for students (p. 133). It is clear that also Colina advocates integrating formative and summative assessment in teaching translation and keeping evaluation closely connected to explicit and well-developed grading criteria of translation competence.

Elaborating on testing and evaluation in the translation classroom, Goff-Kfouri (2004) indicates that formative assessment is the most common form of assessment in higher education and the most time-consuming. She discusses two types of tests that serve a formative function: diagnostic and progress tests; the former is used to identify students’ areas of weakness and facilitate improvement, whereas the latter is used to determine students’ mastery level of the taught materials and adjust the teaching accordingly. Progress tests can be ‘open book,’ where
students have access to notes, databases, and dictionaries. Formative assessment and feedback should be communicated to students in a timely manner in order to obtain best results. Besides instructor assessment, Goff-Kfouri refers to self- and peer assessments as other forms of assessment that improve student learning. Self-assessment is one way of enabling students to take control of their own learning and see their work objectively. Translation students may be asked to respond to statements about their learning in a simple Likert-Scale format: statements such as “I understood the text the first time I read it,” “I had to consult resources minimally,” “I devoted a lot of time to documentation,” and “I felt as ease translating the subject” (p. 9). Goff-Kfouri believes that students are also effective revisers of each other’s work, and can be more effective when they participate in deciding the criteria for the given assignment. Peer assessment can be an extremely useful experience, according to Goff-Kfouri (2004, p. 9), especially if the instructor allows students to:

- Choose the partners with whom they feel comfortable working,
- Complete the translation they are evaluating first,
- Change their partners occasionally to be exposed to other sorts of problems, and
- Explain their reactions to others’ work verbally and in writing

2.3.2.2  **Self-assessment: Taras’ study (2001, 2002, 2003)**

After conducting a number of empirical studies on self-assessment and its influence on students’ performance in higher education, Taras (2001, 2002, 2003) proposes integrating instructor feedback in the student self-assessment process and declares that even final-year undergraduate students can benefit from this sort of feedback supporting self-assessment. In an attempt to examine students’ perceptions of self-assessment involving different levels of feedback, Taras (2003) had 34 final year degree students (17 home students and 17 exchange students in an advanced translation and interpreting course at a British university) respond to a survey after being trained to carry out self-assessment under two conditions. The first is self-assessment prior
to peer and tutor feedback; and the second is self-assessment with integrated tutor feedback as part of the self-assessment process. It was found that the overwhelming majority of both home and exchange students favored the latter type and found it most useful to them.

The strategy of withholding grades until students have read and reflected on the feedback comments, then talked about their work to potentially earn a higher grade, showed positive results. By concentrating more on the work and less on the emotional interference of the grade, students had a better chance of exploring the contents, making errors, and identifying the gaps in their understanding without fear of affecting their final mark. With minimal integrated tutor feedback, students achieved a high level of independence in reviewing their errors and understanding the assessment criteria and procedures. Student self-assessment with integrated tutor feedback helped students “overcome unrealistic expectations and focus on their achievement rather than on the input required to produce their work” (p. 562). Students became better self-assessors by optimizing their use of external feedback and their comparison between external and internal feedback. Without tutor feedback, Taras determined, self-assessment cannot help students identify and correct all their errors. It was demonstrated, therefore, that the efficiency of self-assessment depends largely on the quality and technique of the feedback provided to the student.

2.3.2.3 Corpus-assisted assessment: Bowker’s study (2001, 2003)

The use of electronic resources and computer programming has allowed researchers to develop assessment models that are more flexible and comprehensive (e.g., Baker, 1995; Bowker, 2001, 2003; Fictumova, 2004; López-Rodríguez et al., 2007; Uzar, 2003; Wakabayashi, 2002). Translator instructors, according to Bowker (2001), are responsible for providing students not only with grades but, more importantly, with useful feedback on translation errors and difficulties. Instructors are supposed to determine why an error has been made and how it can be corrected so that it can be avoided in the future (p. 353). Advances in computer technology have
led to the development of tools and resources that can make translation evaluation in highly specialized subject fields more practical and objective. A suitable electronic corpus in a translation context is one that contains a large body of texts in a specific subject area. This corpus can be processed by computerized tools, such as word frequency lists and concordancers.

Bowker proposes a specially designed Evaluation Corpus that can be used by translator instructors as a benchmark against which student translations can be compared at both conceptual and linguistic levels. Translator instructors can have access to a wide range of authentic and appropriate texts that provide tangible evidence for instructors’ correction and constructive comments. This “common evaluative framework” can also be consulted by students who would see for themselves that the feedback they have received from their instructor is based on objective corpus justification rather than simply on the instructor’s personal opinion (p. 361). Integrating corpora into the translation classroom “raises students’ interest in and awareness of specialized language” and helps them become autonomous learners (p. 362). Bowker cautions, however, that this electronic approach to evaluation should not be seen as a replacement for the evaluator’s competence and critical judgment, but rather as an aid to facilitate the process of evaluation and make it more concrete and constructive. The approach, in other words, is corpus-based, not corpus-bound (p. 361).

2.3.2.4 Electronic mailing lists: Wakabayashi’s study (2002)

In the same vein, Wakabayashi (2002) discusses the potential of using electronic mailing lists and other computer-mediated communications within formal training courses, affirming that such tools can be “a new avenue for acquiring some of the knowledge and skills required by professional translators” (p. 47). Translators’ mailing lists on the Internet are so popular that they, according to Wakabayashi, cannot be overlooked in any discussion that involves how translators become socialized into the profession. Among the benefits that translators’ mailing lists provide is expertise resulting from experts and novices working together and negotiating meaning. Another
benefit is the new learning opportunity that is manifested in the fact that novices have access to a wide range of peer mentors who are knowledgeable in numerous subject areas, including native competence of SL and TL, something that is certainly not available in the classroom. A third benefit is that these translators’ mailing lists provide a model of professional behavior and norms through its “expert community of practice” which promotes an attitude of professionalism in translation and business relations and helps novices model the speech and behavior of professionals and facilitate their own transition to the profession (p. 47). The fourth benefit of these mailing lists, as stated by Wakabayashi, is psychological, in that the participants of these online communities acquire over time a sense of belonging, which some freelance translators often miss due to the isolated nature of their profession.

Other benefits of these mailing lists include accessibility, speed and frequency, and low cost. On the other hand, the writer cautions of some drawbacks of this tool, which include the fact that there is no guarantee on the quality of the answers provided. In the translation classroom, the instructor can utilize translators’ mailing lists by introducing students to the subscribers and asking the latter to post pieces of advice on the profession to the students who in this way would become familiar with this tool and interact with the experts. Wakabayashi (2002) elaborates on the pedagogical implications by stating that the use of computer-mediated communications in teaching translation is not limited to translators’ mailing lists. It can also include electronic bulletin boards, chat groups, e-mails, e-tutorials, and online course delivery through the Internet. All of these resources provide valuable opportunities for a teacher-student and student-student interaction and encourage a great deal of discussion in the translation classroom, which is sometimes characterized by a large number of students. These new technological potentials, however, should be exploited by translation instructors only if clear benefits can be seen from them concerning learning, assessment, time, and cost (p. 54).
2.3.2.5 Open Source Systems: Fictumova’s study (2004)

Utilization of technology in translator education is also underscored by Fictumova (2004) who affirms that technology has become indispensable for translators nowadays (p. 31). Like translation itself, translator education has also become computer-bound, expected to teach students how to use the necessary tools that improve the quality of translation (p. 32). The use of electronic corpora, Internet search engines, and online dictionaries and term bases can provide considerable help to translators. Technology, however, should be used to enhance the teacher-student and student-student interaction in the classroom rather than replace them. In her study, Fictumova presents an Open Source Learning Management System (OSLMS) for creating courses in translation theory and practice, which allows online collaboration as a supplement to classroom education.

After introducing the course management software Moodle (Modular Object-Oriented Dynamic Learning Environment), Fictumova (2004) explains that the software allows creating course activities that include: forums which display students’ contributions and simulates discussion, journals which allow students to describe their task procedures, and quizzes which test students’ progress and mastery of translation skills. The software also allows the instructor to add resources of various file formats, as well as assignments with due dates and grade requirements. Additionally, and more pertinent to this dissertation, the software enables the instructor to correct students’ assignments using track changes which is sent afterward with a notification to students in a feedback file. After submitting their assignments, students can read their peers’ translations in preparation for class discussion, and can re-submit their own assignments after the class, having made necessary changes and improvements. Fictumova concludes by admitting that creating authentic web-based materials can be a laborious endeavor for any instructor, yet it is exceedingly rewarding when considering the great enhancement it has brought to her own experience in teaching translation (pp. 33-35).
2.3.2.6 Task-based formative assessment: González Davies’ study (2004)

Going further away from conventional models, and drawing her ideas from humanistic, communicative, cooperative, and social constructivist teaching principles, González Davies (2004) proposes a task-based approach to the education of translators and asserts that “evaluation is always a tricky matter” (p. 31). In a university context, González Davies believes that evaluation has a twofold purpose: “to orient students as to how they are performing at each stage (pedagogical assessment) and to prepare for official accreditation or professional translator standards (professional assessment).” Among the different formative objectives that assessment has, according to González Davies, is:

- To obtain information needed to offer students academic and professional guidance,
- To compare students’ performance with that of the rest of the group and encourage remedial work if necessary,
- To classify problems which helps the students improve their self-monitoring skills, and
- To adjust the syllabus and teaching methods according to the observed results (p. 31)

González Davies (2004) raises four questions that translation evaluation should address for pedagogical purposes: (1) what to evaluate, (2) who evaluates, (3) when to evaluate, and (4) how to evaluate. In a conventional classroom, students undertake a final exam or a serious translation test that would all be evaluated by the teacher. In a task-based classroom, however, the teacher may use other procedures in addition to the exam. The teacher, for example, may systematically observe and analyze students’ participation and attitudes in class (e.g., in brainstorming sessions and observation sheets) or students’ work (e.g., monographic assignments and research projects). Students can also participate in the evaluation process by means of self- and peer assessment through dialogue between participants in group discussions, debates, round tables, and peer editing. Formative assessment of the product, process, and students’ progress should be provided continuously, in numerical and holistic ways, and by the teacher, student peers, professional practitioners, and field specialists. Instead of an error-based assessment,
González Davies suggests a success-based assessment in which “points should be awarded for above average performance” (p. 33).

2.3.2.7 Corpus-based tools: Baer and Bystrova-McIntyre (2009)

Another relatively recent contribution in this respect is Baer and Bystrova-McIntyre (2009) which seeks to provide an empirical ground for translation assessment and bridge the gap between its formative and summative functions by using corpora. The study proposes an assessment tool that provides ‘objective’ data, rather than assumptions, on both linguistic and stylistic norms of given languages using empirical systematic measurements across ‘real-world’ writing (p. 160). Pedagogically, this instrument enables translator instructors to encourage their students to go beyond local textual features of the TT and examine global textual features such as discourse organization and textual cohesion. The proposed assessment tool treats three significant features of textual cohesion, namely punctuation, sentencing, and paraphrasing, using comparable corpora organized by text type. The two researchers claim that these three textual features are easily isolatable, yet frequently overlooked by translation assessors and students. To demonstrate the benefits of their method, the two researchers compiled two untagged comparable corpora of Russian and English texts and used them for analysis.

Baer and Bystrova-McIntyre (2009) found that punctuation marks were used with higher frequency in Russian than in English in two text types: newspaper editorials and literary texts, and that the frequency was higher in literary texts than in newspaper editorials. Significant differences between Russian and English in terms of sentence and paragraph length were also found across text-types and languages. The simplicity of the tool, which employs statistical analysis rather than tagged corpora, would allow translator students themselves to design an assessment tool that was based on empirical data obtained from bilingual corpora. Thus, in addition to studying punctuation and segmenting, students could also collect and analyze other linguistic and textual elements that had certain implications in the examined pair of languages.
This would consequently allow translator students to produce more communicative and natural-sounding translations, and improve the speed and efficiency of their work (p. 160). This ‘formative’ advantage of the corpus-based tool would enable novice students to become autonomous learners and develop the translator-expert skill of consulting and generating empirical data, instead of solely relying on the expert knowledge of translator instructors. The corpus-based assessment tool, according to Baer and Bystrova-McIntyre, would challenge the popular dichotomies of global- versus discrete-item assessment and formative versus summative assessment that long have been provoking heated debates in translation assessment research (p. 179).

2.3.2.8 Meaning-oriented assessment criteria: Kim’s study (2009)

Kim (2009) notices that teachers of translation courses face a tremendous challenge in providing formative assessment to their students, due to the lack of ‘universal’ systematic criteria of translation assessment as indicated by a number of scholars (e.g., Bassnett-McGuire, 1997; Hönig, 1998; Sager, 1989). Teachers of translation practice courses at Macquarie University, Australia, were required to use translation-grading criteria accredited by the National Authority of Accreditation for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI), and most teachers used the criteria for formative purposes as well. The NAATI criteria (as cited in Kim, 2009, pp. 125-126) are based on the following error categories:

- Too free a translation in some segments
- Too literal a translation in some segments
- Spelling
- Grammar
- Syntax
- Punctuation
- Failure to finish a passage
- Unjustifiable usage
- Insufficient understanding of the ethics of the profession
Kim (2009) found it difficult to use the NAATI criteria as a formative assessment tool for several reasons. Firstly, she found some descriptors in the criteria, such as *too free, too literal*, and *unjustifiable omission*, to be too general and lacking sufficient details (p. 126). Secondly, the criteria seemed to focus on the experiential aspect of meaning at the word and sentence level and did not go beyond that to include interpersonal and textual meaning such as the natural flow and coherence of translation. This made the teachers, for example, focus on the syntax and grammar of the sentences, but not on the purpose and function of the text as a whole. Moreover, the criteria did not provide clear guidelines regarding point deductions and/or additions for overall impression of quality and naturalness of translation. This often ran the risk of having teachers pass ‘subjective’ judgments on students’ work without providing ‘systematic’ evidence (pp. 126-127). Thus, in an effort to address this challenge, Kim developed meaning-oriented assessment criteria in teaching English to Korean translation over several years. The criteria were formulated primarily using a text analysis approach based on systematic functional linguistics (SFL).

Both teachers and students at Macquarie University were familiar with SFL since it was taught in a core course called *Introduction to Text Analysis*. The criteria, which included experiential, logical, interpersonal, textual, and graphological error categories, were then implemented as a formative assessment tool with which constructive and detailed feedback was provided to students. The criteria enabled both teachers and students to identify translation errors, choices, and strategies at various levels of meaning and to become more competent in defending their translational decisions. Students gradually became autonomous learners, as they analyzed their own translation and did further research which enhanced creative and critical thinking. Kim pointed out that the SFL criteria worked perfectly with translation assessment since translation is, after all, a discourse that fulfills a function in a certain context. Therefore, translation assessors should not ignore this essential aspect of translation when providing formative assessment and constructive feedback (p. 134).
The above studies are examples in the literature that have identified a communication gap in the training of translators and called for exerting more effort to improve the formative function of assessment. Conventional approaches to assessment that emphasize the summative function of assessment at the expense of formative function have been criticized of creating a sort of mismatch between students and their translator instructors that negatively affects students’ learning achievement. Moreover, traditional criteria of assessment have been described as being unrealistic, obscure, non-transparent, and non-standardized, and sometimes even non-existent (Kelly, 2005, p. 133). As approaches to translator education implement more collaborative, student-centered models, use of formative assessment methods and tools attracts more attention. The next section of the literature (2.3.3) delves further into formative feedback and highlights the few research contributions in translation pedagogy that have specifically examined this narrow area of formative assessment.

2.3.3 Feedback in translator education

2.3.3.1 Earliest study: Dollerup’s study (1994)

While research on formative feedback occupies an important place in many areas of education and SLI, as noted above, it has not received its due attention in the research into translation pedagogy. Perhaps the earliest descriptive study that drew attention to the role of feedback in translator education was conducted by Dollerup (1994). Driven by the need to distinguish translation work from foreign language learning, Dollerup proposes a systematic approach to feedback provision for Danish university students of English in their first three years at university. He points out that the feedback system he developed is influenced by his view that translation is a social, communicative activity, which necessitates that the societal parameter of translation is taken into account in any assessment feedback, not merely the textual and semantic parameters (p. 124). Dollerup descriptively illustrates his own way of handling assessment feedback in translation classes. At the beginning of the each semester, a booklet that contains a one-page
correction rubric, a sample of a feedback sheet, and all texts to be translated are distributed to students. The texts gradually get longer and more difficult each class; both ways from Danish to English and vice versa, but in the finals, easier texts are given. The feedback system starts with (1) written corrections on students’ individual work, (2) verbal discussions in class on adequate and inadequate renditions and solutions, and (3) a feedback form evaluating students’ strengths and weaknesses.

Dollerup stresses that he rarely suggests alternatives to students’ problems unless he knows they will not be discussed in class. When he suggests solutions, he strives as much as possible to retain students’ phrasing so that students’ personality appears in their translations. During in-class discussions, a chart illustrating all students’ suggestions is presented, with the adequate renditions first, as a guide for discussion rather than an exemplary model. After the discussion, students receive the feedback form, which consists of 40 problem areas, ranging from formal and interlingual errors to stylistic and idiomatic errors, on a five-scale differential, to be kept by students throughout the semester to monitor their own progress. Dollerup expresses his preference of “old-fashioned hands-on models” of feedback that makes no use of computers, arguing that translation specialists should be trained on managing their own creativity without access to tools, exactly as they do in ‘real life.’ He also acknowledges that each translation class has its own identity, which necessitates that teachers change their procedures, advice, and performance to match the “subtle interplay between teacher personality, teacher feedback, student personality, teacher and student idiolects and sociolects, class size and general knowledge of the languages used and the translations done” (p. 132). This remark leads Dollerup to rightfully conclude that:

It would be presumptuous to suggest that the procedures presented in here are applicable in other classrooms than mine. On the other hand, some of the features and some of the ideas may inspire others operating with other language pairs to do something, either along the same lines or in radically different ways, to improve feedback in translation classes possibly in different climes and under foreign skies (p. 132).
2.3.3.2 Peer (online) feedback: Wang and Han’s study (2013)

In their empirical study of online peer feedback in translator education, Wang and Han (2013) assert that peer feedback has received very little attention in the literature on translation pedagogy, despite the tremendous amount of research written on the benefits of peer feedback in other areas of language education. The two researchers had 17 Chinese-speaking students, who were enrolled in an interpreting and translation program at an Australian University, translate a 250-word text then mark and provide anonymous peer feedback on another fellow student’s translation. Original translations along with their anonymous peer feedback were uploaded onto an online forum. Students were encouraged to download and peruse their own translation along with its feedback, and to download other students’ reviewed translations for comparisons. The researchers found that online peer feedback was highly appreciated by translation students. Students reported that peer feedback was a valuable activity that gave them the opportunity to examine alternative approaches and perspectives on the translation task. Some students noted that peer feedback enabled them to assume elevated roles as markers and quasi-teachers, which gave them a sort of empowerment and responsibility (p. 68). The correction of careless errors/mistranslations, as well as errors at lexical and discourse levels, were also noted by students as obvious benefits of the activity. Students indicated that among the three processes of (1) providing feedback, (2) receiving feedback, and (3) perusing other classmates’ reviewed work, the second and third processes were the most beneficial and rewarding.

Wang and Han (2013) cautioned though that while the majority of participants found the peer feedback activity beneficial, two participants indicated that their classmates’ feedback were not sufficiently useful because it lacked the quality, authority and definitiveness that were usually found in teachers’ feedback. This study was innovative and well-motivated, according to Wang and Han, due to several reasons. Firstly, it applied peer feedback to a new learning context, which was the translation classroom. Secondly, the participants of this study were translation students providing peer feedback on their partners’ versions of the same ST, which meant that both their
partners’ work and their own had a strong resemblance. In other language education contexts such as L2 writing class, on the contrary, participants provide peer feedback on works that usually do not mirror their own. Thirdly, the implementation of computer-assisted environment and online forum that was made easily accessible to all learners, added further value to the experiment. Moreover, the online feedback design of the study ensured anonymity of both the feedback provider and receiver, reducing the chance of any reluctance or embarrassment that some students might experience when criticizing others or being criticized by others in face-to-face interactions.

2.3.3.3 Teacher-student perceptions: Južnič’s study (2013)

The claim of the present dissertation that little attention has been paid to feedback in the literature of translation pedagogy has also been echoed in a recent study conducted by Južnič (2013). Južnič sought to find out how teachers’ feedback was being viewed by translation instructors and their students at the University of Ljubljana in Slovenia. Južnič developed a brief survey questionnaire in two versions, one for teachers and the other for students, based on the literature on translation quality assessment as well as on her personal experience and academic workshops. The respondents were 16 teachers along with 100 students attending bachelor’s and master’s and bachelor’s and master’s degree courses in interlinguistic communication and translation with a focus on Slovene (first language), English (second language), and a third language choice of German, French, or Italian. The survey analysis revealed that the perceptions of students on teachers’ feedback were mostly not in harmony with those of the instructors. Most teachers and students agreed that verbal comments were a more common form of feedback than written comments, that summative assessment were clear and objective, and that assessment system generally was comparable at the bachelor’s and master’s levels. Yet, teachers differed on the frequency, length, and valence of comments.
While teachers felt that they provided frequent, extensive, and positive comments, the majority of students did not feel the same. The views of teachers and students also did not match regarding the contents of feedback; students thought that most of their teachers’ comments were on grammatical, lexical, and stylistic errors, while teachers claimed that they also commented on metalinguistic features such as text function and text type. Students felt that their teachers focused exclusively on negative aspects of their work, while teachers believed they also commented explicitly on positive aspects and good solutions made by their students. Južnič (2013) concluded that the teachers seemed to be familiar with some of the current approaches to translation quality assessment and exerted some effort to implement them. Yet, they needed to improve their communication with students, especially concerning the criteria of assessment, as there existed some discrepancy between the teachers’ responses and the students’, which could be attributed to students’ lack of understanding of error types and measures of correction.

2.3.3.4 Dialogic feedback: Washbourne’s study (2014)

Another study in the literature of translation pedagogy that focuses solely on the role of feedback in translator education was carried out by Washbourne (2014). The study, adapting and expanding Ellis’ model (2009), analyzes written comments provided to undergraduate translator students in view of three broad kinds of corrective feedback, namely direct, indirect, and metalinguistic. Washbourne indicates that feedback was essentially perceived in modern pedagogy as a reinforcer and motivator for learning, but over time cognitive and constructivist views began to focus on the effect of feedback on students’ processing and construction of information. Washbourne calls for promoting discussions of feedback in translator education environments arguing that it “supports and extends the goals, models and practices that contemporary theory has identified as conducive to active learning” (p. 1). Conceiving written feedback as “one component in an array of potential feedback sources and phases that the
translation student or trainee seeks, constructs, and learns from actively,” Washbourne contends that written corrective feedback can serve 11 learner-centered purposes. It potentially:

- Models drafting as an iterative and recursive process,
- Prompts the translator to read his or her work as an interlocutor (a reader or user),
- Assists the learner via guided revision and builds capacity for self-directedness and self-assessment,
- Reinforces translating as a goal-oriented, strategic activity for different professional situations,
- Scaffold a cognitively complex task,
- Promotes reflective practice,
- Is consistent with the field’s movement away from instructionist practices,
- Adds a dimension of authenticity, as reception occurs outside the teacher-learner confines as well as within them,
- Engages the student with a problem-posing, collaborative format that respects the learner’s emerging agency and encourages the democratization of the translation classroom,
- Harmonizes with what is known about expertise acquisition, especially the role of feedback and corrective action in deliberate practice, and
- Provides opportunities for defending translation choices and using the metalanguage of the field to negotiate meaning (pp. 1-2)

Washbourne explores the potentialities of “multi-channeled talks” between the student and instructor, and the student and peers, highlighting the dialogic principle of pedagogy and proposing a typology of translation feedback methods. He expands Ellis’ three broad types of written feedback (discussed earlier in section 1.2.3) to include narrower subtypes for translation tasks. Direct feedback can be with or without explanation; indirect feedback can be indicating and locating the error or indicating only; and metalinguistic feedback can be response requested, which may call for documentation, discussion, challenge, or elicitation, or no-response requested, which offers guidance or learning extensions in the form of marginalia, elaborated critique, criteria clarification, or further learning. These feedback types may be used individually as well as in combination. Emphasizing the formative and student-centered function of feedback, Washbourne maintains that the corrective kind of feedback he advocates is more facilitative than corrective; the former has the sense of non-evaluative responses, while the latter has the sense of authoritative evaluation (p. 6). Washbourne concludes by stressing the need for experimental studies on feedback that go beyond the error-correction mechanism to include looking deeply into
the impact of different forms and functions of feedback on various aspects of students’ learning (p. 13).

**Summary**

In this chapter, the researcher reviewed some of the literature conducted on feedback, by first looking at how scholars defined the overarching concept of assessment. It was important to differentiate between the summative purpose of assessment from the formative, and to trace the rise of formative approaches in the educational field. The researcher then looked into feedback, being the most vital component of formative assessment, and reviewed the research on its typologies and effectiveness. Research on translation assessment was reviewed afterward, again tracing the shift of focus from summative to formative applications. Finally, the researcher examined some of the research contributions that specifically addressed the component of feedback in translator education. This review of the literature facilitated the design of the analytical framework of feedback culture that was used in the data collection and analysis, as will be explained in detail in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Overview

This dissertation aims at describing the feedback culture in translator education. To do so, two distinct cases of undergraduate translation programs were selected (the SA-CASE and US-CASE). The study used sociocultural philosophy (Vygotsky, 1978) as a theoretical basis, and took a qualitative approach for data collection and analysis. While the notion of feedback culture (London & Smither, 2002) initiated the bird’s-eye-view perspective of feedback, Hyland and Hyland’s conceptualization of feedback (2006) inspired the analytical framework of this research. Reviewing the literature on effective feedback facilitated the design and expansion of the analytical framework. In the following sections of this chapter, the research questions are first restated. Then, a general description of the research theoretical foundation, the conceptual understating, and the research design are provided. The research contexts of the SA-CASE and US-CASE are described next along with the research participants. The research procedures, including the data collection and analysis, are discussed lastly, before the chapter concludes with a brief summary.

3.1 Research Questions

Research has established that effective feedback is particularly essential in promoting formative assessment and enhancing learners’ achievement (e.g., Brookhart, 2008; Evans, 2013; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Knight, 2002; Sadler, 1989; Wiliam & Black, 1996). Several previous studies raised alarming concerns about the effectiveness of feedback provision in several cases of translator education (e.g., Alfaifi, 2000; Alsahli, 2012; Biçer, 2003; Haiyan, 2006; Jafari, 2013). Yet, those studies did not elaborate on this critical issue. Moreover, a review of the relevant literature revealed a scarcity of research in this specific area of inquiry. This dissertation, hence, sought to promote our understanding of, and research into, the feedback culture in translator
education. More specifically, the study focused (as noted in Chapter 1) on addressing the following major questions:

1. How do instructors of translation practice classes and their students situate, shape, and negotiate feedback in the SA-CASE?
2. How do instructors of translation practice classes and their students situate, shape, and negotiate feedback in the US-CASE?
3. What emerging themes and issues can be drawn from the resulting findings?

These three questions were deliberately designed to be broad to allow the depiction of a detailed descriptive picture of the studied phenomenon. This breadth in the research questions matched the breadth of the research purpose, which is to describe the feedback culture in the two examined cases. The feedback culture, as the notion implies, encompasses various beliefs, attitudes, norms, and traditions. Without such wide-ranging questions, a probing narrative of the feedback culture might be difficult to attain.

### 3.2 Theoretical Foundation of Research

#### 3.2.1 Sociocultural theory

This research drew on a sociocultural epistemology of learning. From a sociocultural perspective, learning is perceived as a social process that occurs through social and cultural interactions. More specifically, it occurs in the cognitive area between where a learner is capable to perform on their own and where they need others to assist them, what Vygotsky (1978) called the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). In Vygotsky’s words, ZPD is “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 86). Social interaction, then, is vital to the development of cognition. For Vygotsky, learning begins first on a social level between people, then on an individual level inside the learner’s mind. Learning precedes development, in other words. It transforms from an
interpersonal, interpsychological process into an intrapersonal, intrapsychological process, allowing lower forms of thinking (elementary perception, involuntary attention, and natural memory) to progress into higher forms of thinking (voluntary attention, intentional memory, logical thought, planning and problem solving) (p. 57).

Social interaction plays an essential role in shaping higher forms of thinking and performing a complex set of skills, according to sociocultural theory. Unlike interactionists, socioculturalists do not see this ‘interaction’ as a mere exchange of information between the learner and the environment, whereby the learner picks from that information what suits him or her and processes it alone. Rather, as Villamil and Guerrero (2005) noted, socioculturalists believe that the external dialogue of this social interaction becomes an internal dialogue, and from that a “socially constructed dialogic mind emerges” (p. 24). In order for the human intellect to reach higher levels of functioning, it has to be ‘mediated’ by three sociocultural forms: by others, by the self, and by artifacts. These means of mediation are all sociocultural in origin and nature. Learners then go through an ‘internalization’ process during which they incorporate the tasks they learned to perform with the help of others and carry them out independently. Schools and educational institutions are examples of the places where social interaction needed for this internalization can take place, according to socioculturalists.

Through ZPD interactions, learners become autonomous in problem solving and move from other-regulation (interpsychological activity) to self-regulation (intrapsychological activity). But for such a transformation to take place, a form of ‘scaffolding’ must intervene. Scaffolding is another key concept in the sociocultural school of thought. It is traditionally defined as “the supportive behavior by which an expert can help a novice learner achieve higher levels of regulation” (Villamil & Guerrero, 2005, p. 25). This supportive behavior (scaffolding) can be provided to the learner by a teacher or a more experienced peer. All forms of human interactions nonetheless are always governed by the particular cultural, historical, and institutional setting in which they take place. In order to understand these interactions fully and appropriately, one must
examine the tools, strategies, values, and practices indorsed in the communities where such interactions occur. People’s particular motivations and goals, as well as their capacity to establish their own learning needs are part of this activity setting and should also be examined. This necessarily means that activity settings are quite multifaceted and that they vary greatly both within and between cultures.

### 3.2.2 Sociocultural conceptualization of feedback

The analytical framework used in this study is inspired by Hyland and Hyland’s sociocultural conceptualization of feedback in second-language writing instruction (2006). Perceiving feedback as an “act of communication,” Hyland and Hyland argued that “feedback occurs in particular cultural, institutional, and interpersonal contexts, between people enacting and negotiating particular social identities and relationships, and is mediated by various types of delivery.” Researchers, thus, should “go beyond the individual act of feedback itself” and “consider the factors that influence feedback options and student responses” (p. 10). Bringing together theoretical understandings and practical applications, Hyland and Hyland classified state-of-the-art theoretical, empirical, and case study research on feedback in second-language writing instruction according to the following three wide-ranging dimensions.

#### 3.2.2.1 Situating feedback: Sociocultural dimension

Feedback is situated by its wider sociocultural context. “All acts of communication,” according to Hyland and Hyland (2006), “are embedded in wider sociocultural beliefs and practices that selectively activate knowledge and prompt specific processes” (p. 11). Individuals’ personal educational experiences and cultural backgrounds are likely to have a direct influence on their teaching and learning, and consequently on how they give and receive feedback. The dominant ideologies of a given institution also contribute in shaping the views and attitudes of its teachers and learners, at least partly. Such ideologies, Hyland and Hyland contend, play a role in
maintaining cohesion and mutual understanding within the walls of that institution. Cultural variations, however, may still exist in the classroom with every teacher’s and learner’s own understanding and expectation of instruction and feedback (p. 12).

According to the renowned anthropologist E. T. Hall (1959), the notion of culture refers to “the way of life of a people; it is the sum of their learned behavior patterns, attitudes, and material things” (p. 31). Hofstede (19980) defines culture as “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another” (p. 25). A broader definition provided by the American Psychological Association (2003) views culture as “the belief systems and value orientations that influence customs, norms, practices, and social institutions, including psychological processes (language, caretaking practices, media, educational systems) and organizations” (p. 380). Still, as a notion, culture is controversial. Overdependence on culture as an explanatory tool may lead to excluding other complex factors such as individual identities that may resist cultural patterns. Hyland and Hyland (2006) argue that painting teachers and students with one brush and labeling them as typical of a given culture is inaccurate. Even though “language and learning are inextricably bound up with culture” and “human cognition is rooted in cultural environments and influenced by the discursive practices of their social groups,” teachers and students always have the choice of withstanding the norms of communities in which they were born and raised” (p. 12). If examining the wider culture helps in understanding the behavior of a specific group of individuals, examining the behavior of a specific group of individuals helps likewise in understanding the wider culture.

3.2.2.2 **Shaping feedback: Delivery and content dimension**

Feedback is also shaped by the context of its delivery and the focus of its content. This dimension examines the substance of feedback and the means with which it is delivered. In other words, it investigates what is delivered and how it is delivered. Hyland and Hyland (2006) indicate that the various ways in which feedback is provided to students have a great impact on the meaning
and value of feedback to students. Presenting feedback in a form that is verbal, written, computer-mediated, or a blend of all these three, may target different aspects of students’ learning. Similarly, the content of feedback in terms of error correction and included resources plays a part in achieving varying levels of effectiveness.

This dimension also examines highly debatable topics that question the effectiveness of teacher-written feedback. It goes further to explore other feedback delivery systems such as software-generated feedback and corpus-based portfolios. Research has shown that technology can give novice learners and their teachers access to essential language resources, reduce the monotony of error correction, identify and prioritize errors, and increase the timeliness of feedback (Milton, 2005, p. 123). The use of portfolio makes feedback a central aspect of teaching and learning, according to Liz Hamp-Lyons (2005), and encourages students to reflect on the feedback side by side with the criteria before resubmitting their work (p. 140).

### 3.2.2.3 Negotiating feedback: Interactional dimension

Feedback is ‘negotiated’ through interaction among its participants. This interpersonal dimension is a crucial stage in the feedback process. Researchers demonstrate that the feedback process does not stop at correcting and delivering back the learner’s work. When students engage actively in the process of feedback, they “construct, confront, and deal with” a unique kind of relationship. Within this dimension, researchers examine how individual students interact with the feedback. They also study the factors that influence the learner’s reception positively or negatively. Factors may include classroom attributes, the leaner’s purpose in learning, and the leaner’s level of proficiencies.

Teacher’s comments are analyzed and explored further in this dimension. Teachers’ praise, criticism, and types of suggestions can reflect various pedagogic and interpersonal motivations. Students’ reaction and response to the feedback may likewise reveal significant aspects about the feedback effectiveness. Ilona Leki (2005), for example, explored the perceptions
of 20 graduate students concerning discipline-based written feedback. Her results led to her conviction that students’ individual encounters with faculty and peers are vital to the effectiveness of feedback, and that written feedback is a “socioacademic interaction” that students “want, need, and deserve” (p. 282).

As illustrated in the next section 3.3.4, Hyland and Hyland’s conceptualization of feedback in SLI (2006) was utilized in this study to serve the exploratory purpose of its questions. Expanding this three dimensional conceptualization of feedback further by identifying narrower categories to examine under each dimension provides an effective tool for data collection and analysis. By drawing from second language (SL) research, this dissertation emphasizes the relationship between SL theory and translation pedagogy. It follows in the footsteps of active translation scholars who drew, and encouraged researchers to draw, from SL research in order to establish a systematic translation teaching methodology (e.g., Angelelli, 2000; Beeby, 2004; Cao, 1996a; Colina, 2002; Kiraly, 1990; Kussmaul, 1995; Laviosa, 2014).

3.2.3 Effective feedback culture

The notion of feedback culture seems to have been used first by London and Smither (2002) in the professional field to denote “the organization’s support for feedback, including non-threatening, behaviorally focused feedback coaching to help interpret and use feedback, and a strong link between performance improvement and valued outcome” (p. 81). London and Smither indicate that major components of an effective individual’s feedback orientation include (1) liking feedback, (2) propensity to seek feedback, (3) propensity to process feedback mindfully, (4) sensitivity to other’s views of one’s self, (5) belief in the value of feedback, and (6) feeling accountable to act on the feedback (p. 83).

In the field of education and translation pedagogy, as reviewed in the literature (Chapter 2), researchers stipulate that for feedback to be effective, it should be contextualized, specific, balanced, transferable, forward-looking, personal, motivating, supportive, unbiased, dialogic,
interactive, and timely. It should use explicit grading criteria, avoid extensive error analysis, avoid normative comparisons, use technological modes, increase cognitive processes, use cues to scaffold learning, and facilitate self, peer, and teaching assessment (see Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic of effective feedback</th>
<th>Examples of supporting research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextualized</strong> (linked to the learning objectives and outcomes)</td>
<td>Brookhart, 2012; Nicol, 2010; Nicol &amp; Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Shute, 2008; CCSSO, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific</strong> (specifies tasks, errors, and solutions)</td>
<td>Brookhart, 2012; Cauley &amp; McMillan, 2010; Hattie &amp; Timperley, 2007; Nicol, 2010; Shute, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balanced</strong> (provides negative and positive aspects)</td>
<td>Brookhart, 2012; Nicol, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transferable</strong> (focuses on the process not just the content)</td>
<td>Hattie &amp; Timperley, 2007; Lipnevich &amp; Smith, 2008; Nicol, 2010; Shute, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forward-looking</strong> (states how to improve rather than giving an overall grade only)</td>
<td>CCSSO, 2008; Hattie &amp; Timperley, 2007; Nicol, 2010; Shute, 2008; Wiliam &amp; Thompson, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal</strong> (refers to what is known to students)</td>
<td>Hattie &amp; Timperley, 2007; Nicol, 2010; Shute, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivating</strong> (increases effort and motivation)</td>
<td>Black &amp; Wiliam, 1998a; Brookhart, 2012; Hattie &amp; Timperley, 2007; Irons, 2008; Nicol &amp; Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Shute, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive/non-evaluative</strong> (avoids judgmental comments)</td>
<td>Nicol, 2010; Shute, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unbiased/impartial</strong> (avoids preconceived opinions that are not backed up with evidence or reason)</td>
<td>Bowker, 2001; Shute, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialogic/engaging</strong> (engages learners and facilitates dialogic interaction between participants)</td>
<td>Brookhart, 2012; Irons, 2008; Nicol, 2010; Nicol &amp; Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Sadler, 1989; Washbourne, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive</strong> (helps move students from passive recipients to interactive participants)</td>
<td>Black, 2007; Carless, 2006; Hattie &amp; Timperley, 2007; Laurillard, 2002; Nicol, 2010; Wakabayashi, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timely</strong> (communicates to students in an appropriate time)</td>
<td>Goff-Kfouri, 2004; Nicol, 2010; Shute, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses explicit grading criteria</strong> (uses explicit, specific, comprehensive grading criteria)</td>
<td>CCSSO, 2008; Evans, 2013; Nicol, 2010; Nicol &amp; Macfarlane-Dick, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoids extensive error analysis</strong> (allows learners to attempt a solution)</td>
<td>Nicol, 2010; Shute, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoids normative comparisons</strong> (focuses on the task and avoids comparison to other students or drawing attention to ‘self’ during learning)</td>
<td>Hattie &amp; Timperley, 2007; Shute, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses technological modes</strong> (implements alternative audiovisual/computer tools)</td>
<td>Bowker, 2001; Fictumova, 2004; Baer &amp; Bystrova-McIntyre, 2009; Wakabayashi, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increases cognitive processes</strong> (such as restructuring, confirming student’s answers, and directing students to alternative strategies of problem solving)</td>
<td>Colina, 2003; Hattie &amp; Timperley, 2007; Shute, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses cues to scaffold learning</strong> (provides answers indirectly by using prompts and cues to scaffold learning)</td>
<td>Hattie &amp; Timperley, 2007; Shute, 2008; Washbourne, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitates peer-assessment</strong> (encourages peer assessment/discussion around learning)</td>
<td>CCSSO, 2008; Dick, 2006; Black, 2007; Lipnevich &amp; Smith, 2008; Nicol, 2010; Sadler, 1989; Wang &amp; Han, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitates teaching-assessment</strong> (provides information to teachers that helps them modify their teaching)</td>
<td>Black &amp; Wiliam, 1998b; Black et al., 2003; Wiliam &amp; Black, 1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Characteristics of effective feedback as reviewed in the literature*

Introducing the notion of feedback culture to the field of translation pedagogy, the researcher investigated how feedback was conceived, defined, and understood by translator instructors and students, and whether it was sought after, valued, and acted upon. The researcher went beyond the individual act of feedback to examine sociocultural factors that affected feedback, such as participants’ previous experiences, their preferences of cultural and institutional practices, and the mode and type of feedback they delivered. The immediate interpersonal context in which participants interacted, interpreted, and made use of feedback, was highlighted. To achieve the aspired objective of study, a detailed analytical framework was designed and utilized thoroughly in this work.
3.3 Research Design

3.3.1 Analytical framework

Initiated by London and Smith’s notion of feedback culture (2002), inspired by Hyland and Hyland’s sociocultural conceptualization of written feedback (2006), and guided by the reviewed literature on effective feedback (Chapter 2), the researcher proposed an analytical framework that consists of three dimensions and 15 categories (five categories in each dimension) to make the data collection and analysis more focused. The framework can be illustrated as follows:

1. **Situating feedback: Sociocultural dimension**
   a. Concept of feedback
   b. Importance of feedback
   c. Objectives of feedback
   d. Systematicity of feedback
   e. Instructor-student roles

2. **Shaping feedback: Delivery and focus dimension**
   a. Mode of feedback
   b. Error treatment
   c. Use of technology
   d. Timing of feedback
   e. Regularity of feedback

3. **Negotiating feedback: Interpersonal and interactional dimension**
   a. Feedback seeking
   b. Peer feedback
   c. Self-feedback
   d. Feedback on feedback
   e. Feedback loop

Analyzing the feedback culture through these dimensions and categories (Figure 1) emphasizes the conceptualization of feedback as a dialogic, ongoing process rather than a monologic, finished product. The first dimension situates feedback, in that it describes how feedback is conceived and systematized before it is delivered, underlining the participants’ roles in the feedback process. The second dimension shapes feedback, in that it describes the content
of feedback *while* it is delivered, stressing the timing and regularity aspects of delivery. The third dimension negotiates feedback, in that it describes the action *after* feedback is delivered, when feedback is being discussed, reflected, and looped among involved parties.

![Diagram of analytical framework for exploring the feedback culture](image)

**Figure 1: The analytical framework for exploring the feedback culture**

The categories in the first dimension examine the wider border of the feedback culture, the location of the feedback notion in the rational of the members in the examined society. It investigates how research participants define the **concept** of feedback, what attributes they associate with feedback, and what makes feedback an effective tool in their hands. Research participants’ belief in the **value** of feedback is investigated further, along with the specific **objectives** that participants link to feedback directly or indirectly. The dimension probes further to address the **systematicity** of feedback, which in this project refers to the clarity and specificity of the criteria and standards on which feedback is established. The investigation in this dimension concludes by analyzing the nature of the participants’ **role** in the feedback process, as perceived and experienced by participants themselves.
In the second dimension, the categories seek to determine the nature of feedback in terms of content and means of expression. The **mode** of feedback: whether it is written, verbal, or audiovisual demonstration, and whether it targets individuals, pairs, groups, or the whole class, is the first category to be investigated (Brookhart, 2012). The next category in this dimension looks deeper into instructor’s comments, examining whether errors are treated directly, indirectly, metalinguistically, or electronically (Ellis, 2009). The use of Internet, computer, interactive whiteboard (IWB), or any form of **technology** in the feedback process is a vital component that is investigated in this dimension. The last two categories in this dimension address the **timing** of feedback (i.e., whether it is immediate or delayed, timely or late) and **regularity** of feedback (i.e., whether it is provided on a regular basis and consistent quantity and quality).

The narrower context in the framework investigates how members of the culture interact over feedback: how they **seek** feedback and act on it. The category of **peer feedback** looks into teaching and learning activities that are carried out in pairs or groups, where fellow learners provide any form of assessment to their peers. This dimension narrows down to examine **self-feedback**, which, in this project, refers to the teaching and learning activities that specifically require learners to reflect on their own performance and analyze their own strengths and weaknesses. Self-feedback is included under this dimension to emphasize Vygotsky’s proposition (1978) that learning occurs first on a social level before becoming an internal process in the learner’s mind. It also emphasizes the interactional role of the instructor in this self-regulating process. Without the guidance, support, and follow-up from the instructor, self-feedback loses much of its effectiveness. **Feedback on feedback** is a category that denotes students’ response to the (written/verbal) feedback they receive from instructor and peers. It further explores what students do with the feedback after they receive it. The dimension ends the analytical exploration by examining the **feedback loop**: whether the process of feedback produces a productive dialogue and follow-up interaction (see Chapter 1, Section 1.5.5 for a definition of dialogue).
The framework’s categories are not mutually exclusive, as they inevitably overlap and interrelate in a systematic way. Yet, the framework offers a thematic, research-informed foundation for the data collection and analysis, and eventually enables the researcher to capture the key components of the feedback culture in the examined cases.

3.3.2 Qualitative approach

This dissertation took a qualitative approach to address the research questions. It adopted a constructivist paradigm in assuming that knowledge is socially constructed by those who are actively involved in the research process. The complex world of lived experience should be understood through the point of view of those who live it (Schwandt, 1994, p. 118). Concepts could mean different things to different people, which inevitably results in multiple mental constructions of reality and, sometimes, conflicting views of truth (Mertens, 2005).

In this study, select samples of instructor and student participants were recruited from two different universities to compare perceptions and practices of feedback. The researcher attempted to understand the multiple social constructions of meaning and knowledge within those two contexts. He sought to listen to the unheard voice of translator instructors and students and enable them to express their views concerning the studied phenomenon. The data were collected, reported, and interpreted by the researcher himself; thus, the research also reflected the researcher’s values and could not be independent of him (Mertens, 2005, p. 14). Therefore, confirmability, rather than objectivity, was claimed in this project. This means that the data, interpretation, and outcomes were rooted in the examined contexts and individuals, and could be tracked to their narrative and resources (Lincoln & Guba, 2000).

Qualitative methods were particularly appropriate for this project because of the nature of the latter’s research questions (Mertens, 2005, p. 233). This dissertation sought detailed, in-depth information about the feedback culture in translator education. It focused on “diversity among, idiosyncrasies of, and unique qualities exhibited by individuals” in the examined cases of
translator education (p. 233). It intended to understand the *program theory*; the “participants’ beliefs as to the nature of the problem they are addressing and how their actions will lead to the desired outcomes” (p. 233). The researcher had kept in close contact with the participants and his procedures of observation and interviewing relied on the participants’ ideas and opinions as the main source of data. Participants were observed while performing their everyday, ‘real-world’ roles, giving and receiving feedback in their translation practice classes. Social interaction occurred naturally “with minimum intrusion by artificial research procedures;” participants spoke freely without restriction of “pre-established questionnaires” or “laboratory-like setting” (Yin, 2015, p. 9).

Capturing the participants’ perspectives is an essential purpose of a qualitative inquiry. It provides explanation for social behavior and thinking, through existing or emerging concepts. And this is why qualitative researchers explicitly attend to and account for contextual conditions, such as social, institutional, cultural, and environmental conditions, which often have a strong influence on human affairs (Yin, 2015). To do so, qualitative researchers seek various sources of evidence. “The complexity of the setting and the diversity of its participants are likely to warrant the use of interviews and direct field observations as well as the inspection of documents and artifacts” (p. 11). Qualitative researchers are ‘experiential’ in that they use “personal judgment as the main basis for assertions about how something works” (Stake, 2010, p. 62). Such personal judgment relies heavily on both the participants’ and the researcher’s personal experience (p. 63). Due to its comprehensiveness in representing the participants’ perspectives and capturing their contextual conditions, the qualitative approach is considered quite appropriate for this project.

**3.3.3 Case-study design**

This dissertation used an exploratory comparative *case study* design (Creswell, 2012; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2015). Case study research is defined by Gall et al. (1996) as an “in-depth study of instances of a phenomenon in its natural context and from the perspective of the participants involved in
the phenomenon” (p. 545). A comparative case study, according to Goodrick (2014), is an in-depth examination that involves the “analysis and synthesis of the similarities, differences, and patterns across two or more cases that share a common focus or goal” (p. 1). Goodrick indicates that the specific features of each case should be described, and the rationale for selecting the cases should be linked to the research questions and to what needs to be investigated (p. 1). Case study projects by their nature can be “simplistic in that they look at only one or a few classrooms, but they can look most carefully at levels in test emphasis and teaching” (Stake, 2010, p. 27).

This dissertation examined the feedback culture in the SA-CASE and US-CASE because of their “potential applicability to other like-situations” (Yin, 2015, p. 310). Hence, the use of the case study in this project was instrumental (as opposed to intrinsic) in that it examined the particular cases of the SA-CASE and US-CASE to provide insight into the research questions (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2015). Studying the participants of each case was a way (or an instrument) to understand the feedback culture in translator education. Choosing to examine four instructors and their students to represent each case made it a collective case study design; the researcher conducted analysis within and across the two individual cases, and used them as instrumental to gain a broader understanding of the examined phenomenon (Stake, 1995, pp. 3-4).

The use of a multiple-case study, as Yin (2015) suggests, can strengthen the external validity of the results, or what qualitative researchers call ‘transferability’ (p. 226). Transferability refers to “the degree of similarity between the research site and other sites as judged by the reader,” and it can be assessed by “the richness of the descriptions included in the study as well as the amount of detail provided regarding the context within which the study occurred” (Lodico et al., 2006, p. 275). To enhance transferability, the following sections of this chapter provide a detailed description of the research contexts and participants, as well as the process and procedure of study. Data collection and analysis are also discussed afterward in some detail. It should be noted that further description of the context and participants is provided in the Results (Chapter 4).
3.4 Research Contexts

3.4.1 The SA-CASE

The College of Languages and Translation at King Saud University (the SA-CASE) was established in 1977 as a small language institute branching from KSU College of Arts, with the main aim of providing “(Saudi) citizens with the language skills necessary to support the communicative needs of the economic, scientific, and intellectual sectors of the country.” In 1994, the institute was expanded and transformed into the College of Languages and Translation (COLT), offering Bachelor’s degrees in ten modern languages, namely English, French, German, Spanish, Russian, Italian, Turkish, Hebrew, Persian, Japanese, and Chinese. Each language module provides undergraduate “theoretical and pragmatic training in written and oral translation at four levels: bilingual, consecutive, simultaneous, and visual” (COLT, 2015).

According to COLT’s official website, this expansion was carried out to address “the actual needs of the public and private sectors inside Saudi Arabia.” This is COLT’s vision as stated in its website, while its mission is given as follows:

The College of Languages and Translation assumes the responsibility for providing theoretical and applied knowledge in the fields of modern languages and translation, and of supplying the job market with specialists in the fields of modern language and translation. (COLT, 2015)

This general mission of COLT is elaborated further by the following specific goals—again as listed in COLT’s official archive:

• Preparing specialists in modern languages and translation,
• Developing students’ skills in language learning and training them on translation in all fields,
• Coordinating between the majors offered at the college and the requirements of the job market and development,
• Encouraging research in modern languages and translation,
• Participating in international conferences in the fields of modern languages and translation, and holding specialized symposia,
• Providing consultancies for both public and private sectors,
• Providing the community with translation services,
• Preparing, designing, implementing, and revising programs of modern languages and translation as required and in accordance with KSU regulations,
• Holding training courses for all sectors in the community, and satisfying the training needs of governmental bodies in the fields of modern languages and translation,
• Forming a chain of communication with several institutes, colleges, and other bodies worldwide in order to benefit from their expertise in the fields of modern languages and translation, and
• Enriching translation from and into Arabic (COLT, 2015)

COLT’s goals emphasize the college’s focus on training specialists in languages and translation, and show readiness to provide the market with language and translation services. COLT’s undergraduate curriculum interprets the school’s vision, mission, and goals. It shows the college’s strong emphasis on translation practice classes as the level advances. In addition to the language and linguistics courses, COLT’s five-year curriculum requires 41 effective hours of translation-related courses.

In the English module’s curriculum (Appendix C-1), for example, one notices that translation practice is introduced in the 6th semester, third year of the program, with a course in *Translation of Humanities Texts*. The fourth year introduces four translation practice courses in the fields of Economics and Administration, Islamic Studies, Medicine, as well as Military and Security. In the fifth year, students have to pass translation practice classes in the fields of Literature, Engineering and Petroleum, Law, Science and Technology, in addition to a Graduation Translation Project. Students are also introduced to different types of interpretation classes such as Bilateral, Consecutive, and Simultaneous.

### 3.4.2 The US-CASE

Through its Institute for Applied Linguistics, the Department of Modern and Classical Language Studies at the College of Arts and Sciences at Kent State University (the US-CASE) offers four-year programs leading to the Bachelor of Science degree in translation. This degree offers concentrations in four world languages, namely French, German, Russian, and Spanish. According to the department website and online catalogue, these ‘pre-professional’ programs provide intensive study of language and culture, translation theory and practice, and language for business. They prepare students for graduate work in professional translation and software
localization, and facilitate the development of language and translation skills in a subject area specialization such as business, technology, science, pre-medicine, criminal justice, computer science, and fashion.

The undergraduate translation program curriculum consists of 18-27 hours in French, German, Russian, and Spanish, and includes courses in language, conversation, composition, phonetics, and civilization, in addition to 25-28 hours of translation-related courses and 27-39 hours required in a subject area specialization. If recommended by their advisor, students may take up to 17 hours in an SL. All students in these programs are recommended to spend their third year abroad in a country where their foreign language is spoken. The Spanish module’s curriculum is provided as an example of the four language modules (see Appendix C-2).

The Department of Modern and Classical Language Studies also offers other four-year programs leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree in American Sign Language, Classics, French, German, Latin, Russian, and Spanish. The department offers selected courses in Arabic, Chinese, classical Greek, Italian, and Japanese, as well as language and literature courses ranging from antiquity through to the modern era. It also offers classes in translation and SL pedagogy.

The career-oriented majors offered by the department prepare students to pursue careers in foreign language teaching, translating, interpreting, government and international relations, tourism, and guided travel and international business. Graduates of the programs can also work for translation agencies or as freelance translators. The majors give students an opportunity to continue their studies at graduate level and seek careers in college teaching and research in their area of academic concentration.

3.4.3 Why the SA-CASE and US-CASE?

The researcher’s choice of the SA-CASE and US-CASE to be the context of this study was deliberately made. These two cases of translator education provide a full undergraduate translation program at a public university, where a blend of educational and professional
objectives is targeted. Both cases have long been developing and expanding their programs. They both are industry leaders in translator education and have achieved competitive success in their chosen markets. Their academic curricula provide a firm foundation for skill development in translation studies and translation practice. They both introduce basic theories of linguistics and translation as they apply to translation practice.

In the SA-CASE, students are required to take practice classes in specialized translation in a wide spectrum of subject areas such as medicine, engineering, law, economics, and humanities. Likewise, the US-CASE requires students to take five core courses in translation during the junior and senior years, in addition to language skill courses. Core courses include classes in Translation Practice (beginner and advanced) as well as Business and Special Texts. The US-CASE also features a subject-area specialty requirement that facilitates acquiring a level of expertise in a specific subject area such as business and medicine. The combination of theory and practice courses in these two cases and their market-oriented nature make them suitable for the purpose of this dissertation.

The obvious differences between the two cases also made them appropriate for the study. The SA-CASE is located in Saudi Arabia, and it belongs to a wider Eastern educational culture, whereas the US-CASE is located in the United States, and it belongs to a wider Western educational culture. Each case works within a specific language industry and aims to meet the needs of a specific market and consumer. Each case has its own unique vision, mission, and goals, and each implements a unique curriculum to achieve such objectives. While the SA-CASE population consists of predominantly Arab (mostly Saudi) males, the US-CASE’s population is predominantly Western (mostly American) males and females. The classes that were observed in the SA-CASE were largely homogeneous in terms of gender, nationality, and age, whereas in the US-CASE, classes were largely heterogeneous in these aspects. Examining two distinct cases of translator education provides a broader comparative analysis of the feedback perceptions and practices that translator instructors and students have today.
A practical reason for selecting these two particular sites of translator education was the researcher’s *ease of access* to them (Creswell, 2012). The researcher is a teaching faculty member at the SA-CASE and a doctoral fellow at the US-CASE. Affiliating to these two communities and interacting closely with their members made the researcher a ‘cultural insider,’ gaining convenient access to information and overcoming several cultural and bureaucratic barriers. Time and access for fieldwork should always be considered, especially with research projects that have limitations of time and place. Stake (2010) indicates that researchers need to pick cases that are “easy to get to” and are “hospitable to inquiry” (p. 4). To address the research questions, a sample of both instructors and students in these two cases needed to participate. Involving these two groups of participants, especially the former, in the study required appropriate contact with them—a procedure that proved difficult for previous studies (e.g., Alsahli 2012) considering participants’ heavy teaching/studying loads.

These two contexts of the SA-CASE and US-CASE are unique and remarkable in their own right. They are not particularly representative of other cases of translator education in Saudi Arabia or in the United States, but each case works as a random sample that shares fundamental characteristics with many cases within its surrounding milieu. They helped the researcher understand and contribute to the growth and advancement of these two cases in particular, and of translation pedagogy in general, and achieve the overall purpose of the study. Ultimately, the researcher was an integral part of these two contexts. He had been immersed in both educational cultures and had a first-hand experience of interacting with their elements. His method, analysis, judgment, and—in the first place—selection of topic and cases were inherently subjective.

**3.5 Research Participants**

The study focused specifically on instructors and students of advanced translation practice courses that were offered in the senior year of each translation program in the SA-CASE and US-CASE during the time of the research. Participants were the “experiential experts on the
phenomenon being studied”; thus, the sampling (or selection of participants from within the target population) were not drawn randomly (Rudestam & Newton, 2007, p. 107). Participants in the study had to meet the following criteria:

- Being an instructor/student in the SA-CASE or US-CASE during the time of research.
- Being an instructor/student in a translation practice course during the time of research.
- Being an instructor/student in a translation practice course at an advanced level (senior year of the program) during the time of research.

These selection criteria reduced the population size and narrowed down the purposive sampling, making the choice of qualitative approach more appropriate. In each examined language module at the SA-CASE and US-CASE, there was only one instructor teaching advanced translation practice courses during the time of data collection. The English language module at the SA-CASE was the only exception since it was the largest, offering at the time the research was carried out three translation practice courses that met the selection criteria. There were three instructors teaching those courses, so the researcher selected the one whose teaching hours were more convenient to the researcher’s observation schedule. Eventually, a total of 8 instructors and 58 students participated in the study. Again, the sample size of participants did not necessarily represent the whole population. It did, however, represent variety in terms of instructor’s age, gender, academic degree, professional experience, teaching experience, language module, and number and gender of students, which will be detailed in the Results (Chapter 4).

Unlike theoretical classes, practice classes require students to produce their own translation work and receive some kind of critique on it. Students are expected to encounter and solve various translation problems and difficulties in the particular subject area of their translation. It was anticipated that translation practice courses at this advanced level would be taught by experienced instructors, rather than beginners, and attended by advanced-level students who had completed most of their required course work. Instructors teaching these courses were expected to have sufficient knowledge and experience in translator education, and,
therefore, adopt particular beliefs and attitudes of their own. Similarly, students at this level were
naturally more capable of expressing their views on the researched topic, having attended several
classes and engaged with several instructors. Student group interviews facilitated recruiting
students of different levels within each observed class, resulting in different and sometimes
opposing viewpoints among student participants.

The participants’ confidentiality, anonymity, and privacy were strictly maintained
throughout the study. Taking part in this project was voluntary, and withdrawing from
participation was allowed at any time without any penalty or loss of entitled benefits. Participants’
audio-recorded voices were secured in an encrypted folder in the researcher’s PC. All data (written
and audio) were used exclusively for the academic purpose of this research. Participants were
given the option of hearing the recordings prior to their use, and all recordings were to be disposed
of upon completion of the project. Confidentiality was further assured by keeping the participants’
identity hidden and never disclosing it in any publication or presentation of results. Participants
signed a written Informed Consent (Appendix D-2) in which a detailed explanation of the study’s
purpose, procedures, benefits, and risks were provided, along with participants’ legal rights. All
procedures of this research project were consistent with those stated in the protocol application
of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Participants.

3.6 Research Procedure

To enhance transferability further, it is important to give a detailed description of the process and
procedure of study. The research procedure was started by reviewing the literature on feedback
in translation pedagogy and designing the analytical framework. This was followed by developing
the research instruments (interview and questionnaire questions, the latter were discarded in a
later stage) and planning the field trip to the sites of investigation (i.e., SA and the US). Before
carrying out the data collection process, the researcher made sure that the research instruments
were appropriate for the study. Developing the research instruments included writing different
types of questions, using strategies for good question construction, and performing a pilot test of the questions (Creswell, 2012, p. 358).

The interview questions were divided into three sections; each section addresses one dimension of the analytical framework. All questions were coded by the researcher to address the various categories of the analytical framework (see Appendix B-1 and B2). All research instruments were reviewed and cross-checked by three research experts: two professors of empirical research studies and one doctoral candidate in experimental psychology, in addition to the researcher’s dissertation advisor. Research instruments were written in English for the US-CASE, then translated into Arabic for the SA-CASE. All translated documents, including instruments and consent forms, were revised by a licensed English-Arabic colleague translator who had recently earned a doctoral degree in translation studies.

A pilot test was then conducted to determine whether any issues needed to be addressed before putting the instruments in the field such as clarity and intelligibility of questions (Cohen et al., 2013; Creswell, 2012; Gill et al., 2008; Yin, 2015). The researcher involved five participants in the field pretest: three Saudi doctoral students of translation studies who had graduated and taught at King Saud University, and two American professors of translation studies who were faculty members at Kent State University. The researcher then met with every participant in the pilot study and received their feedback, which contained valuable insights and suggestions. The researcher paid several visits to the sites of investigation during this stage to see if the research would be possible. Continuous feedback and communication were provided to the researcher by his direct advisor before, during, and after the process of data collection.

The next step in the research procedure was to seek the approval of the IRB. Obtaining the approval of IRB at Kent State University required the IRB’s review of the research methodology and all activities involving human participants. The researcher first had to complete the required training of the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI). Next was to complete the IRB application and submit it electronically to the IRB discipline-specific reviewer, and attach
research instruments, consent forms (Appendix D-2), permission letters from the examined locations, and all applicable documents. The researcher communicated with the IRB reviewer to revise the application and make any necessary changes. The IRB committee met afterward to review the application for completeness, methods, and adherence to ethical standards, and sent it to Office of Research Compliance for final review and inclusion into IRB meeting material. The committee gave the research Expedited Review (Level 2) in which protocols were reviewed by the IRB Chair and at least one other IRB member; a review that was required for studies that involved minimal risk and fit into the expedited review category of research as defined by 45CFR46. The data collection was given approval on March 20, 2014 (see Appendix D-1). The research procedure, thus, involved the stages illustrated in Figure 2.

3.7 Research Data Collection

The data were collected over a period of 6 months. The process began with a trip to King Saud University (the SA-CASE site) on December 4, 2014, and ended with the last student group interview at Kent State University (the site of US-CASE) on June 4, 2015. To increase
confirmability, the data were collected from a variety of classes in 8 different language modules. The overall fieldwork involved conducting 8 classroom observations, 8 instructor interviews, and 8 student group interviews, in addition to gathering available samples of written feedback and grading rubrics. The total number of instructor participants was 8 \((n=8)\) and of student participants was 58 \((n=58)\). The four qualitative phases of data collection went as follows:

### 3.7.1 Classroom observation (Phase 1)

The researcher observed and audio-recorded one class period (approximately 90 minutes long) of a translation practice class in 4 language modules in the SA-CASE, namely English, Spanish, Russian, and French and 4 language modules in the US-CASE (namely Spanish, Russian, French, and German, which constituted Phase 1 of the data collection. The four SA-CASE instructors were all males, while the US-CASE instructors were 3 females and 1 male. The total number of students in the observed classes were 37 in the SA-CASE \((EN=19, \ ES=8, \ FR=6, \ RU=4)\) all of who were males, and 21 in the US-CASE \((ES=12, \ FR=3, \ RU=2, \ GR=4)\) 16 of who were females and 5 were males. The fact that the researcher was affiliated to both the SA-CASE and US-CASE facilitated his contact with participants. By coordinating with each class instructor, the researcher attended a class period in which feedback on a recent translation task was provided to students. The researcher took reflective field notes containing his personal thoughts and questions that emerged during each class observation. These field notes allowed the researcher to ask further specific questions to the participants later in the interviews (Phases 2-3). The notes included description of the content and materials of the delivered lesson, in addition to comments about various class events. The class’ verbal discussion was recoded and later transcribed for analysis (see Appendices A-1 through A-8 for selected excerpts).

### 3.7.2 Instructor semi-structured interview (Phase 2)

A semi-structured, in-depth interview was conducted with each instructor of the observed translation practice class period in the SA-CASE and US-CASE. These eight instructor semi-
structured interviews consisted of several key questions that helped to “define the areas to be explored,” and allowed both the interviewer and interviewee to “diverge in order to pursue an idea or response in more detail” (Gill et al., 2008, p. 291). In addition to the semi-structured questions (Appendix B-1) that were based on the reviewed literature, the interview included unstructured questions about each observed class. Time and place of interviews were arranged according to the participants’ convenience, and, as an added incentive, coffee and treats were served during the interviews. Establishing rapport with participants was important as it had a positive effect on the interview development. The interview was ‘conversational’ in the sense that it allowed discussing relevant issues that were raised during the interview, which were of use in gaining a deeper understanding of the instructor’s views. To ensure consistency of data, all interviews and observations were conducted by the researcher face-to-face with the participants. All instructor interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed for analysis.

3.7.3 Student semi-structured group interview (Phase 3)

Two to three students from each observed class in the SA-CASE and US-CASE participated in a semi-structured interview that was arranged following their class observation. Participant instructors introduced the researcher to their students as a friend and colleague whose research project aimed at improving the program and translator education in general. Students were encouraged to cooperate with the researcher and were genuinely helpful and outgoing during the interview session. The total number of students was 21: 12 from the SA-CASE (EN=3, SP=3, FR=3, RU=3) and 9 in the US-CASE (SP=3, FR=2, RU=2, GR=2). All 8 student group interviews (Appendix B-2) were audio-recorded and transcribed for accurate data capture. Recording interviews and transcribing verbatim afterwards protected against bias and provided a documented record of the participants’ exact wording (Gill et al., 2008, p. 292). Participants had the opportunity to clarify, extend, qualify, and challenge data collected in other phases. They also were encouraged to interact with one another during the interview and comment on each other’s
ideas. This method helped the researcher generate a deeper understanding of the participants’ perceptions on the various issues addressed in the study.

3.7.4 Document review and analysis (Phase 4)

The researcher benefited from instructors’ written documents such as course syllabi, grading rubrics, and, most importantly, samples of written feedback. Specific data about each translation program’s curriculum and academic standards were also obtained to support the data analysis. All instructor participants who indicated that they provide written feedback to their students were kindly asked to provide samples of their written feedback, and they did gladly. Students’ written self-feedback did exist in certain classes, samples of which were also collected for analysis. Participants were informed about the study procedures prior to their participation, and they were assured concerning ethical principles. This essential part of the informed consent process gave the participants an idea of what to expect and increased the likelihood respondents would answer honestly (Cohen et al., 2013; Gill et al., 2008; Stake, 2010; Yin, 2015). Participants’ contact information was obtained for follow-up questions or clarification. The phases of research data collection can be summarized in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Phases of the research data collection
It is also worth mentioning that the researcher initially had used a ‘quantitative’ survey prior to conducting the above-mentioned ‘qualitative’ procedures. This survey took the form of an online closed-ended questionnaire. The questionnaire was supposed to be completed by at least 16 instructors of translation practice courses and 80 students in 4 different language modules at both the SA-CASE and US-CASE. It was hoped that combining (or mixing) qualitative and quantitative data would yield complementary strengths to the study (Yin, 2015). Upon scrutinizing the questionnaire responses, however, the researcher found that the number and distribution of participants were not sufficiently representative of the target population. The quantitative data were of less value to the study, thus the researcher decided to discard them. Still, the triangulation of three qualitative instruments (i.e., observation, interview, and written documents) satisfied the purpose of study, leaving quantitative elaboration for a potential future project.

3.8 Research Data Analysis

All observation and interview sessions were audio recorded, resulting in 36:07 audio hours (over 2200 minutes), the verbatim file of which was manually transcribed by the researcher into a Microsoft (MS) Word text of 119084 words. Manual transcription of the data required listening attentively to the recordings, as there were instances of barely audible voices of some participants particularly during class observations. Listening multiple times to several parts of the recordings and re-reading the transcripts enabled the researcher not only to overcome incomprehensibility challenges, but also to immerse further in the data and comprehend the participants’ viewpoints. The recordings and collected documents, along with the researcher’s reflective field notes, were then revised and analyzed using the analytical framework. The data collected from the SA-CASE required translation from Arabic into English while reporting the results. While preliminary data analysis occurs throughout the collection and transcription of the data, the extensive data analysis was conducted after the completion of the data collection.
To ensure **credibility** of the findings, the researcher employed a **triangulation** of sources (Stake, 1995; Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Yin, 2015). Triangulation was accomplished by scrutinizing the study’s multiple sources of data: class observations, instructor interviews, student interviews, reflective field notes, and samples of written feedback and grading rubrics. Corroborating the findings of those sources ensured comprehensiveness of the account and provided more validity to the results. The analytical framework of this study was used to map the participants’ perceptions and practices of feedback and assess them against the reviewed characteristics of effective feedback. This analysis of participants’ perceptions and practices in the two examined cases enabled the researcher to provide a comparative picture of the feedback culture, hence addressing the study questions one and two.

The results were reported (in Chapter 4) in a **narrative format** where participants occupied a central part (Yin, 2015, p. 235). To set the scene, the narrative account started with a description of the instructor participants’ ethnographic information that included their age, gender, degree, professional translation experience, academic experience, language module, and number of students in class. Student participants’ interest in translation and expectations of practice courses were also discussed. All participants were identified by pseudonyms, and direct quotations were frequently incorporated in the narrative to clarify the participants’ viewpoints and emphasize their voices. The narrative of the results contained a blend of participants’ perceptions and practices, extracted from the multiple qualitative instruments employed in the study. Even though both the instructors and students were equally investigated, students’ views that agree with their instructors’ were described briefly to avoid redundancy.

After reporting the results, the researcher conducted another round of coding and analysis to discover emerging themes and issues, hence to address the third question of the study. While the results were reported **deductively** based on the researcher’s prior theoretical understanding and analytical framework (in Chapter 4), emerging themes and issues in the Discussions and Conclusions (Chapter 5) were identified **inductively** based on the resulting findings. A **theme** here
refers to a “major dimension, major aspect, or constituent of the phenomenon studied; expressed more simply, a partial descriptor of the phenomenon” (Tesch, 1987, p. 230). Immersion in the data and rereading of the results focused the researcher’s attention on those meaningful details that could be linked under one theme. To recognize a theme, the researcher looked for repetitions, indigenous categories, metaphors and analogies, transitions, similarities and differences, and even missing data (Ryan & Bernard, 2003). By use of a cutting and sorting technique, the researcher identified quotes and expressions that stood out (called exemplars), and arranged them into piles of similar ideas, giving each pile a distinct name. Later, the researcher addressed those piles (themes) that were most important and worthy of further discussion (Ryan & Bernard, 2003, pp. 94-95).

**Summary**

This dissertation aspires to provide a detailed description of the feedback culture in translator education. In this chapter, after restating the research questions, the researcher provided a description of the theoretical foundation on which this research project was based. The researcher then moved on to illustrate the analytical framework design and the sociocultural conceptualization that inspired it. The qualitative methods and procedures implemented in this study were discussed, and a description of the data collection process and data analysis was provided in some detail. The next chapter will report the results of the data collection in a narrative format, responding to the research questions one and two, followed by the final chapter that will discuss the thematic patterns drawn from the results, hence addressing the third and last research question.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Overview

In this chapter, the results of the collected data are reported using the study’s conceptual framework, which analyzed how feedback was situated, shaped, and negotiated in the SA-CASE and the US-CASE. As discussed in the Methodology (Chapter 3), the data collection involved eight class observations, eight instructor interviews, and eight student group interviews, in addition to samples of instructors’ written feedback and grading rubrics. The narrative account of this chapter lays out the results yielded from the collected qualitative data; and, in so doing, describes in detail the feedback culture in the SA-CASE and US-CASE. The content of this chapter reflects the participants’ perceptions and practices, and does not involve any evaluation or commentary from the part of the researcher.

4.1 The Feedback Culture in the SA-CASE

4.1.1 Setting the scene

As a start, it is useful to review some background information about the participants of the SA-CASE, the first examined location. Demographic information for the instructor participants, which includes their age, gender, degree, years of professional experience, teaching experience, language module, and number and gender of students, is summarized in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Academic Degree</th>
<th>Professional experience</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
<th>Language module</th>
<th>No./gender of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bader</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>PhD in Comparative Linguistics</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>AR-RU</td>
<td>4 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>PhD in Computational Linguistics</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>AR-FR</td>
<td>6 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>PhD in Spanish Literature</td>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>26 years</td>
<td>AR-ES</td>
<td>8 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>PhD in Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>29 years</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>AR-EN</td>
<td>19 (M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Demographic information of the SA-CASE instructor participants*
Bader and Omar had relatively similar length of experience in translator education. Bader’s translation experience began when he was a college student. Back then, he participated in the interpretation and escort interpreting services of several international conferences held in Riyadh. After graduation, he worked for one year as a translator/interpreter in Moscow, Russia, before completing his graduate studies and joining KSUSA as an assistant professor. Aside from his college degree, Bader had not enrolled in any form of training in teaching translation. Omar started teaching translation classes right after he earned his doctoral degree, but he generally did not prefer to teach these classes because translation is not his area of specialty. He had not worked as a professional translator before, but had recently started a part-time career as a legal translator.

Zaid and Ali were apparently experienced in both translation and translator education. Zaid was a literature and discourse analysis major, and was not trained specifically as a translator or translator instructor. His early secondary school teaching of language skills, and his second master’s degree in teacher education, both had helped him significantly in developing his skills as an instructor. Teaching numerous undergraduate translation courses had enhanced his translator training skills further. Ali benefited from a couple of teacher training diplomas he took during college, in addition to his years of ESL teaching first at a teacher college and then at KSUSA. His 20 years of professional experience in interpreting, which involved simultaneous and consecutive interpreting at more than 53 conferences, also had made him a confident translator instructor.

Their students’ interest in translation varies as well. Bader and Zaid’s students revealed that the translation major was not their first choice when they applied to college. Their interest in Russian and ES, respectively, grew after completing their first semester and receiving encouragement and support from instructors. On the contrary, Omar and Ali’s students were interested in French and EN, respectively, before joining the department. Most of them spent some time in a native-speaking country of their target language, which seemed to increase their awareness and competency in the language. Omar and Ali’s students believed that, for them, learning an SL could open wide doors to culture and business.
All instructor participants considered translation practice classes to be highly important. Bader saw these courses as an opportunity for students to practice what they have learned in previous classes. Omar stated that practice classes are the ‘core’ part of training that could prepare specialized, competent translators. Practice classes can be most effective when they are taught by instructors who have both academic and professional experience in translation. He maintained that translation practice should be integrated into English for Specific Purposes (ESP) classes early in the program to achieve optimal outcomes. Zaid drew attention to the same point and emphasized that “effective language practice leads to effective translation practice.” The fourth participant instructor, Ali, cautioned against turning practice classes into lectures about translation, centering on the instructor. Instead, he supported a class where students take the lead by doing and discussing as much translation work as they can, with the instructor simply facilitating.

Student participants were not far from their instructors in perceiving the importance of translation practice classes. For Bader’s students, these classes allow greater room for discussions on students’ own translations, and accept differences of opinion. Students assumed that such classes require textual analysis and memorization of terminology. Omar’s students considered these classes to be the ‘gist’ of the translation program. Students’ vocabulary and understanding of the target culture are put to test when they translate. Zaid’s students noted that the hardest part in these courses is that they do not have a specific textbook, and that students continuously translate texts they have never seen before. Ali’s students, who appeared to be the most competent among student participants, observed that richness of vocabulary is essential but not sufficient to translate competently. Students need a deep understanding of the ST subject matter, cultural elements, and textual features.
4.1.2 Situating feedback: Socio-cultural dimension

4.1.2.1 Concept of feedback

Bader perceived feedback as a process of commenting on students’ errors in assignments and midterm exams. For him, effective feedback takes into consideration the psychology of students who, naturally, do not find it easy to accept criticism. It is delivered to students indirectly through general class discussions, not only by their instructor, but also by classmates. Students sometimes listen to their classmates more openly than they do to their instructors. His students at first did not seem to have a clear idea of what ‘feedback’ is. One assumed that feedback is “studying at home and doing the assignments,” another defined it as “giving students specific information repeatedly so that students can easily remember,” and a third student saw it as “whole-class review of translation and vocabulary!”

Feedback is one form of communication between the teacher and learner, according to Omar. It starts from the student and returns back to the student, perhaps more than one time. Effective feedback does not stop at underlining the student’s error, but goes further to clarify the type of error and how to correct it. For Omar, there should be individualized feedback, enabling each student to know his or her own errors, as well as collective feedback, where students’ common areas of difficulty are identified in class along with suggested solutions. Omar’s students found the word ‘feedback’ to be ambiguous as a concept, and more so its (closest) Arabic equivalence *attaghtiah arraji‘ah* (التغذية الراجعة) which literally means ‘returned feeding.’ When slightly clarified to them, they supposed that it should be a two-way process where both the instructor and students collaborate actively to make it work.

For Zaid, feedback is a means to assess students’ achievement of the course objectives. It should serve two purposes: (1) it helps instructors evaluate the success of their own teaching, and (2) helps students evaluate the success of their own learning. Feedback can be continuous or periodical; the former is achieved through weekly assignments, and the latter is achieved through
quizzes and midterm exams. Effective feedback starts and ends with students. Students do the assignment, discuss it in class, and use the discussion to improve their work and learning overall. Zaid's students also were not sure what the word ‘feedback’ could mean early in the interview, but assumed that it denotes corrección de errores (correction of errors).

Ali’s understanding of feedback seemed to evolve around the instructor rather than the student. For Ali, feedback is a source of evaluation of the instructor’s work throughout the semester. It informs instructors of how well they do and what aspects of their teaching need to be improved. Students’ verbal and non-verbal reaction in itself is feedback that tells the instructor if he or she is on the right track. Students’ misunderstanding and recurring errors could be a sign of the instructor’s ineffective teaching strategies, thus should drive him or her to modify these strategies in the future. Ali’s students were baffled somewhat with the term ‘feedback,’ but agreed eventually that it is “the instructor’s explanation, criticism, analysis, and correction on student’s work.”

4.1.2.2 Importance of feedback

Bader saw feedback as a major component of any teaching process. Students at this stage should be responsible for their own learning. They should come to class prepared to participate actively in workshopping (intensively discussing) a translation. Instructors are supposed to provide a welcoming environment and help students understand what they fail to understand at home. Feedback plays a crucial role in students’ learning when it comes from a different source such as their peers. Bader’s students also acknowledged the importance of feedback in improving their translation skills. They saw it as a vital means that ‘conveys’ the instructor’s experience to students, and clarify any misconceptions that students may have about language and translation. Feedback helps the ‘novice’ students learn from the ‘expert’ instructor, in their opinion.

“There is no teaching without feedback,” Omar affirmed. Feedback is most useful when the instructor has the communication skills that every teaching process requires. Omar’s students
found that feedback differs considerably among instructors, making students’ learning experience differ accordingly. For students, feedback can be effective only if the instructor has the subject matter expertise and knows how to get the message across. Students, on the other side, should be interested in discovering their own errors and making some effort in learning from them.

Zaid considered feedback to be the ‘backbone’ of the teaching process. Through feedback, instructors can determine what students’ needs are and how these needs can be addressed. Students should take part in the feedback process by indulging in class discussion and thereby revealing their own skills. In this way, they indirectly allow the instructor to see faults in their performance and give them appropriate advice. In addition, quizzes and exams can be great opportunities to diagnose areas of weakness and provide further treatment to them. Zaid’s students acknowledged the importance of feedback in helping them find their own errors and, more importantly, avoid making them in the future.

Ali had no doubt that both the instructor and students benefit immensely from the feedback. “No teaching process can hold its ground without feedback,” he assumed. Feedback makes instructors aware of the flaws in their own teaching and leads them to fix these flaws along the way. It also helps instructors identify the nature of students’ mistakes and focus their efforts on eliminating those mistakes. Ali recalled that he and a group of researchers designed an effective early education curriculum based on the feedback of 400 teachers, students, and parents. Ali’s students considered feedback essential in helping them realize their own errors, avoid making them again, listen to different opinions and improve their work and learning as a whole.

4.1.2.3 Objectives of feedback

Bader uses feedback to educate students and improve their translation skills. He emphasizes verbal communication during translation workshops and leads a weekly discussion on students’ translation assignments. All students, including the weaker ones, should be encouraged to take part in the discussion by translating and commenting on their peers’ work. Such an approach, he
believed, helps him explore various levels of students’ weakness and treat them accordingly. He uses feedback to open students’ eyes to the differences between SL and TL and provide cultural elaboration when the text requires. Students also need feedback on how to use specialized dictionaries of both L1 and L2. Bader rarely discusses theoretical concepts, and if he does, he puts them in the form of general guidelines that can be used in practice. Names and details of theories should not be provided to undergraduate students, he maintained. He uses Arabic for the feedback because students’ Russian is not strong enough. He personally prefers to use Russian to help students get extra practice in the L2, but would not jeopardize students’ comprehension of the feedback to achieve such a goal.

Omar’s feedback does not stop at lexical and syntactic issues, but also includes pragmatic and cultural remarks. “Students won’t be able to render the L2 properly if they did not comprehend it sufficiently,” he argued. Students’ comprehension and transfer errors can be so extensive sometimes that Omar ignores grammatical and stylistic errors. Omar does not see himself competent enough to introduce translation theories to students whether directly or indirectly. He mostly focuses on language skills such as reading comprehension, textual analysis, and use of e-resources. He makes sure to evaluate each translation as a unique case in its own right, and avoids comparing it to other translations or even looking at students’ names. Omar uses Arabic to deliver his feedback. This is because the majority of the translation tasks are into Arabic, and because students’ L2 is not strong enough to help them fully comprehend the feedback if it is in French. Students assumed that using French in class should be a priority, but agreed that the feedback part has to be in Arabic so that they can fully absorb it.

Zaid declared that his class depends largely on students’ errors. Students learn from their wrong solutions more than right solutions, he believed. Discussing simple phrases that the whole class translated correctly can be a waste of the workshop time. He makes sure that students understand the lexical and cultural aspects of the ST before they start translating the ST. Students should be introduced to different text types in a gradual variation of difficulty. In a previous theory
class, he introduced Jacobson’s and Saussure’s ideas to students, and was not sure if they grasped them. This class is exclusively for practice. Zaid noted that the feedback has to be directed by the course objectives, which are described in the syllabus in detail. The syllabus is verbally discussed at the beginning of the semester, but students are supposed to get their copy of the syllabus from the university website. Zaid uses Spanish mostly for the feedback, and uses Arabic only if he notices that students did not get the message. Students have little exposure to ES, and he notes the classroom is their only opportunity to practice their L2. Students are able to translate into Arabic even at beginning levels, but they struggle with Spanish even at advanced levels.

Ali indicated that the general notes he takes on students’ translations help him study students’ challenges and modifies his teaching strategies the following semester. Class discussions help the instructor write research papers that address the actual problems of students. Ali never discusses translation theories in his class. He assumed that theories are discussed in different classes, such as *Introduction to Translation*, but in this class only practice is what students need. “Practice doesn’t happen by theorizing about translation, but by doing translation,” he asserted. Practice means that students are intensively exposed to as many texts and ‘new vocabularies’ as possible. Ali gives positive remarks to students as groups but rarely to individuals. He believed that praising individuals in front of the class produces negative results overall. He contended that translator instructors should use both L1 and L2 equally in their classes. As a professional interpreter himself, he is already in the habit of switching between English and Arabic. Doing this in the classroom exposes students to L2 and guarantees their understanding of the feedback, he suggested. Students indicated that they prefer the use of English in class, but conceded that some Arabic is certainly needed especially when translating into Arabic.

### 4.1.2.4 Systematicity of feedback

Bader indicated that he evaluates students’ translations according to five basic levels: morphologic, syntactic, semantic, stylistic, and cultural. There is no specific description of these
measures provided to students in the syllabus or in any written form. Those five levels were taught in previous theoretical classes, and students are reminded of them frequently in this class, according to Bader. In this class, Bader instructs students to be aware of the five levels and make sure to fulfill them in every translation task. On the weekly assignments, students receive verbal comments from Bader, and grades for attendance and participation. On the midterm exams, Bader gives one point for every correct sentence, and takes out a fragment of a point for each error they make. Students indicated that they care about the grade because it reflects how well they performed, but asserted that instructor’s comments are no less important, especially on the weekly assignments.

In his written feedback, which he provides only in midterm exams, Omar underlines students’ errors and uses specific correction codes (see Figure 4). In the first class of the semester, Omar explains to students these codes along with the course objectives and procedures early in the semester. He makes it clear to students that this brief error typology covers the basic error types, and that verbal discussion in class can always provide more details. Omar considered his grading measures to be rudimentary but still helpful in providing detailed verbal comments. He noted that errors may sometimes overlap, making him unable to identify the exact type of error. He admitted that a more sophisticated grading rubric is certainly needed, but he has not reached the level where he can build one himself. “Students perhaps care about grades more than the discussion,” he speculated. Students, on the other side, indicated that they fully understand Omar’s method of correction to the extent that they themselves use it in group and class discussions. They pointed out that they had studied translation error types in theoretical classes, but had never analyzed them in practice except in Omar’s class. These codes of correction make the feedback clearer and more organized, students argued. Omar’s grading procedure is clearly detailed to students, who all agreed that feedback is more important than the grade. Although they had higher grades with other instructors, Omar’s students found his feedback more useful and effective.
Zaid grades students’ exams and quizzes based on clear criteria, he assumed. Students’ translation has to meet the following attributes: (1) cleanness and clarity of handwriting, (2) correctness of punctuation and grammar, (3) correctness of sentence structure and verb tense, (4) appropriateness for the target readership, and (5) faithfulness to the ST’s form and ideas. Zaid explains these measures to students in theoretical and practice classes, but noticed that students always have difficulty comprehending them. “Students constantly make the same basic errors, no matter how much you elucidate the criteria to them in class.” From their perspective, Zaid’s students did not see any need for a specific grading rubric in this class because translation errors are simply ‘limitless.’ They argued that they had already studied the types of translation errors in a previous theoretical course (*Introduction to Translation*), so there is no need to discuss them again. At this advanced stage, they wanted to practice translation and nothing else. The instructor has extensive experience in translation teaching and his measures are clear to him, and, to Zaid’s students, that is what matters most. Zaid’s students were not quite sure what those measures are, but they trusted their instructor’s opinion nonetheless. Further, they felt that asking instructors about the grading criteria would not be appropriate as it may imply suspicion toward the
instructor’s judgment. Periodically, Zaid displays students’ detailed grades (with names hidden) so that every student sees his grade in comparison with those of the whole class. For the final exam, students’ translations are graded by more than one grader to promote reliability.

Ali believed that translation is subjective by nature. “If I was in a bad mood that day, I’ll give my students a bad grade,” he jokingly emphasized. In the final exams, he asks colleague instructors to assist him with the grading process by reviewing his evaluation. He gives students two individual translation exams during the semester to assess students’ progress and give general advice in class. For the weekly workshops, he gives participation grades for every student group that handed in their translation. He naturally compares groups’ translations while assessing them, but delivers whole-class verbal comments in class. He addresses groups and avoids highlighting individual students’ errors. “Focusing on students individually makes each one feel as if he was the weakest link in class, which negatively affects his psychology,” Ali argued. He does not use any specific written rubrics or criteria; however, he always reminds students (verbally) to pay attention to “punctuation, spelling, word order, conjunctions, cohesion, coherence, target culture, etc.” All of these measures, which have been studied in other theoretical classes, are touched upon indirectly in this practice class whenever needed. Ali’s students did not remember any sort of criteria or standards to be followed in Ali’s class. They have different views on this matter:

S1: Most instructors don’t use any rubrics. Some, though, have clearer broad concepts than others. I think it’s important that students are given detailed written measures to be easily understood and followed.

S2: I kinda disagree with you. I don’t think there should be any ‘restricting’ measurements. Translation depends largely on personal opinion; it differs from one text to another, and from one evaluator to another. We kinda implicitly understand those measures.

S3: Instructors talk a lot about cohesion and coherence, etc., but they rarely link them to the practice of translation. I think it’s important that they link theory to practice.

S1: Exactly! As students, we need to see these measures in front of our eyes each time we translate. We lose plenty of grades because we forget to implement those things.
4.1.2.5 Instructor-student roles

Having taught the same group for several semesters, Bader seemed quite acquainted with his students that he jokes with them and always calls them ‘friends.’ He assumed that this helps in building rapport with them. Students had conflicting views on their instructor’s role in the feedback process. One assumed that the instructor should provide written comments on weekly assignments, in addition to the verbal, because written comments help students retain important remarks. Another student disagreed and considered it the student’s responsibility to take notes of the verbal comments provided in the workshop. The third student concurred and argued that students should be independent enough in finding a way to learn from the verbal feedback. He, for instance, audio records certain classes so that he does not miss valuable information. Overall, all students agreed that the most useful source of feedback is the instructor, since he naturally has wider knowledge and experience. They, however, wished they had more opportunity to discuss and defend their translations in the midterm and final exams.

Omar believed to some extent in ‘democratic’ classrooms where students are treated as partners. This makes students more eager to participate, which eventually results in a greater learning experience. Democratic classrooms should not be at the expense of mutual respect between the teacher and learner or of understanding of each other’s roles. Omar recalled when he was a college student how some instructors had no specific strategy of teaching translation, making him feel lost, as he put it. He now tries to avoid what he saw as deficiencies in his instructors’ teaching method. He cautioned, however, against misusing student-centered philosophies and turning education into a form of business. This is why Omar reproached students (during the class observation) for laughing at some of their own translation errors, and asked them to take learning seriously. “Democracy had to stop there,” he said. Omar’s students, on the other side, saw Omar as an ‘older brother’ who removes the barriers between him and students. They found him supportive and caring when they have personal circumstances. They quoted him saying “I’ve been paid to help you learn, make the most of me!”
In the feedback process, Zaid saw himself as a ‘traffic police officer’ regulating students’ participation, so to speak. It is the instructor’s responsibility to assign the ST, facilitate class discussion, open students’ eyes to their errors, and eventually give a grade. Establishing course objectives, procedures, and methods of assessment are all on the instructor’s shoulders alone. According to Zaid, students are responsible for the learning part; they study the ST, look up difficult words, do the translation, and discuss it collectively in class. They have to take notes in class and figure out how to make the best of them. The instructor should help students analyze the ST and translate part of it in class, students should finish the rest of the translation at home applying what they have learned. The instructor cannot nurture students at this age; they should be self-disciplined and motivated. The class is a ‘democratic’ environment in the sense that both the instructor and students work together in producing an improved translation:

Z: The instructor should ‘squat down’ to students’ level of understanding and elevate it bit by bit. This cannot be done by ‘dictating’ a ‘correct’ translation to students, but by having students translate, make mistakes, and talk about their own mistakes, until their translation gets better and better. The instructor’s role here is simply to watch and guide.

For Ali, students are ‘partners’ in the educational process. The classroom should be centered around the student, while the instructor plays the role of a knowledgeable ‘facilitator’. Ali informs students early in the semester of the topics and terminology to be covered in his class. He lets them know that he would do his best to select appropriate STs, and as students, they may suggest any ST of their liking. Ali assumed, however, that students would still select what is ‘easier’ for them, not what is appropriate for the class. From their side, Ali’s students saw the instructor as someone who should have more experience and knowledge. This makes the instructor responsible for teaching students how to translate without ‘imposing’ his or her translation choices on students directly or indirectly. Students, according to Ali, deserve to understand why a given translation is or is not acceptable. They have the right to present their own translation, defend it, and listen to what others think of it. Ali’s students had no doubt that the instructor should always have the last ‘say’ in class, but should also benefit from students’ perspectives.
4.1.3 Shaping feedback: Delivery and focus dimension

4.1.3.1 Mode of feedback

The most common mode of feedback in Bader’s class is whole-class discussion. Every week, students are given an ST (in RU) and expected to be prepared to workshop it in class. They are not supposed to submit any written drafts. Bader starts the workshop by asking students about the ‘general idea’ of the ST. After a quick discussion of the ST, he asks a random student to read the first sentence, identify ‘unfamiliar’ words and try to translate them. If the student fails to give an appropriate answer, the other classmates should try, one after the other. The instructor would be the last resort to clarify the meaning of these ‘difficult’ words. Occasionally, Bader uses the whiteboard to explain certain grammatical rules. Once all unfamiliar words are cleared up, Bader returns to the first student and asks him to give a suggested translation for the whole sentence. The instructor then would turn to the rest of the class to see what they think of their classmate’s attempt. He always assures students that they are free to comment on each other’s translation even if they are not sure of their answers. It happens frequently that a student starts by giving an acceptable translation, then a classmate comments by suggesting an unacceptable translation. A student might make a mistake, then a classmate comments and makes a worse mistake. Bader deliberately asks weaker students to comment first and returns to stronger students later to involve all students and make them learn from each other’s mistakes. Only when all students try and fail does Bader step up and correct the errors. This is the only form of activity he applies in class (see Appendix A-1). Bader suggested that if he had a larger class, he would have implemented pair and group work. In the midterm exam, students are given one of the STs that were ‘covered’ during the semester, and will be asked to translate it using a pen and paper. After the midterm exam, each student sits one-on-one with the instructor to discuss their errors. Students can see the instructor’s written comments and marks on their papers and may take notes if they wish, but the original exam paper stays with the instructor for official use. After grading students’ midterm
translations, Bader spares few minutes of the following class to discuss the exam’s common errors using the whiteboard if needed.

Omar believed that teaching strategies should be diversified, which appears clearly in his teaching of translation practice. The usual translation assignment starts in class, with students receiving a text in French and translating it into Arabic. They work individually for 30-45 minutes, with no help from the instructor whatsoever. Occasionally (once or twice a semester), they might get in groups or pairs once translation time is over to briefly discuss their individual translations before the whole-class discussion begin. During group/pair work, Omar sits in the back near enough to listen to their discussions, and evaluates their understanding of the ST. He writes down notes for the whole-class workshop that would follow shortly. Omar would then go to the IWB and ask group leaders to dictate him their translations sentence by sentence. The whole class would then address the problematic issues in the suggested translation, along with the issues that Omar noted down during group work. This whole-class ‘chat’ would lead students to come up with an improved version of translation, which Omar types down as students give their suggestions. Each time students finish discussing and re-translating a sentence, Omar gives them his own ‘suggested’ translation which itself may start a new conversation. They would end up with two versions of each sentence, the instructor’s version and students’ improved version. Omar would then give students the option of accepting either version (see Appendix A-2). After the workshop, students would go home and finish translating the whole text individually and send it back to the instructor, who would come next class to comment on students’ common errors and continue discussing the rest of the text. Each text may take up to three weeks to be fully workshopped, then the instructor would email students the final two versions of the TT (the one collectively workshopped in class and the instructor’s suggested translation). After the midterm exam, Omar normally displays students’ exam papers on the IWB (with their names hidden) and starts a whole-class discussion on the errors that he has already underlined and coded (see Figure 5). The
discussion involves workshopping the whole text in the same way translation assignments are workshopped.

Zaid often gives students a new ST at the start of the workshop and leads a brief whole-class seminar that includes reading the ST, discussing its purpose and general ideas, and identifying ‘difficult’ words. In teams of three, students look up challenging words in their paper

Figure 5: Selected samples of Omar's (midterm) written feedback
dictionaries which are mandatory to bring to class for every workshop. The instructor would be monitoring the process closely and providing individual assistance to students. Shortly after, Zaid would start discussing students’ suggestions and rereading the ST for the last time to get a fuller understanding of it. Translation then starts with a random student going to the IWB and typing his suggestion for the first sentence. It is students’ job to correct their classmate and comment on his translation attempt. Meanwhile, Zaid would be sitting in the back listening to students’ conversation and making sure they are on the right track. He would intervene with questions and comments that open students’ eyes to an error, only when all students seem to overlook the error (see Appendix A-3). If it appears to be a complex problem for all students, the instructor might stop and provide detailed elaboration using the whiteboard. Occasionally, students may be asked to translate the ST at home to gain more time for the workshop. When this happens, Zaid uses the first ten minutes of the workshop to thank and give extra credits to those who did the translation at home, which indirectly reproaches those who did not. For midterm translation, Zaid underlines students’ errors and workshop the exam ST in class in the same way translation assignments are workshopped. Zaid found that it is impractical to provide written feedback to students because time does not allow, and, more importantly, translation itself does not allow:

Z: Translation, by its nature, calls for multiple opinions none of which is perfect! There’s no such thing as perfect translation. It’s through collective discussion that the instructor can ‘hunt’ for students’ flaws and publicly address them so that everybody learns from them. Individual written feedback doesn’t serve the collective interest of students. I don’t write anything in this course; it’s students’ responsibility to write their translation in front of the class and justify it. In this way, all students engage involuntarily in the feedback and learn from one another.

Ali described his feedback mode as ‘totally collective.’ At the start of every workshop, Ali distributes a new ST to students and asks them to translate it in groups of four. While students get ready for the task, Ali gives them a broad idea of the ST and a short explanation of unfamiliar terminology. This is to help each group get started and work alone until the end of the workshop. During the workshop, students may consult their smartphone dictionaries and ask questions to the instructor. Students’ questions normally elicit brief, quick answers from the instructor. Ali
rarely moves around the class, which, he believes, gives students more autonomy and makes them work ‘at ease.’ By the end of the class period, each group of students must hand in their translation with the names of group members (see Appendix A-4). The instructor takes a look at groups’ translation and make notes of distinct negative or positive aspects. Next workshop, Ali starts with a broad mini lecture on the issues he noticed in students’ work and tries not to spend much time on them. Shortly afterward, students would get in groups and start a new translation task and go through the same procedure as that of previous week. There is a new ST every week. Ali normally gives slightly longer comments after midterm exams and uses the whiteboard to elaborate on students’ common errors and misconceptions. Thus, writing on the whiteboard might be the only written form of feedback students receive in Ali’s class.

4.1.3.2 Error treatment

Bader believed that most of students’ weakness in translation is a result of lack of interest in the field. They struggle with basic language skills in both L1 and L2, and make all kinds of basic language errors repeatedly. Since it is a small program, it admits students with lower grades and tries to encourage them gradually. As an instructor, Bader tries his best to motivate students and educate them about the great opportunities in the translation market. He succeeds with few students and notices remarkable improvement in their learning, but the majority of students are not willing to make an effort. To improve students’ translation, Bader exposes students to different text types and provides continuous feedback on students’ errors. He involves stronger students in giving feedback and encourages discussion in the classroom. He advises students to write down the Arabic translation of the difficult words in the margin or in a separate notebook. During class discussion, he asks each student to translate a sentence, but moves on to the next sentence once an acceptable answer is delivered. He tries to strike a balance between discussing students’ suggestions and covering as many STs as possible throughout the semester, which may explain his frequent use of direct corrections (see Note 2, Appendix A-1). Bader’s handwritten
feedback on students’ midterm exam mostly involves direct comments, locating the error by underlining or circling, and writing (what he described as) the ‘right answer’ above the error. It also involves rhetorical questions, such as “Where’s the rest of the sentence,” which are usually listed in handwritten footnotes (see Figure 6). One student suggested though that more feedback is needed on why it is an error and how to fix it, as opposed to what and where the error is.
Omar indicated that students’ weakness in translation is either language- or culture-related. Language-related weakness can be treated by including translation practice early in the program, he believed. Students find difficulty in rendering an L2 text into acceptable Arabic even if they understand the L2 text, because they are not used to the process of translation itself. The cultural challenge exists because of students’ lack of immersion in the L2 speaking society. A temporary solution for this challenge is to assign STs on topics of students’ interests or on topics that are widely discussed. Students then would likely have a rudimentary background that assists their understanding when translating an L2 text. Omar treats students’ errors by providing immediate extensive feedback in the form of verbal conversation using the IWB to display the ST and the suggested translations. He never gives direct answers; he instead gives cues that stir discussion. Even the suggested translation he gives after students discuss and improve their own translation, he presents as ‘food for thought’ (see Excerpt 2, Appendix A-2). It happens that he even improves his own version after further discussion with students. Students acknowledged their preference of Omar’s feedback over that of other instructors:

S1: Omar’s feedback is so engaging and dialogic that we feel very encouraged to make mistakes and correct them ourselves.
S2: Yeah, other instructors, on the contrary, would ‘dictate’ us the answer straight off once they spot an error in our translation. Omar lets us practice it ourselves and think in various ways while translating.
S3: Even when he gives us his suggested translation, he makes it clear that it is just an option that we can take or leave, and assures us that his translation and ours are both ‘correct.’
S1: True, and that’s why we feel that we learn more with him.

Zaid claimed that he does not interfere in correcting students’ errors except by posing questions about problematic issues in their translation. He plays the devil’s advocate, in other words. He first asks the student translating what he thinks of his own translation, and then directs the question to the rest of the class to start giving their opinions on their classmate’s translation. Zaid’s questions get more specific when students do not seem to notice the problem, only would then he ask them to pay attention to the awkward part and think about it. He ‘beats around the
bush’ until students correct themselves by themselves. When a student asks him a question, he returns the question to the rest of the class to help their classmate, or asks the student to refer to the dictionary and see what the dictionary says (see Excerpt 1, Appendix A-3). Zaid may even suggest a ‘wrong’ translation and ‘add insult to injury’ to stimulate students’ thinking and heighten their discussion.

Z: Students become lazy and dependent on the instructor if he continually hands them the answer on a plate. Students have to exert some effort to get what they need. If they get it easily, they lose it easily; easy come, easy go!

Zaid’s students expressed their satisfaction with his ‘dialogical’ approach to feedback, and described it as ‘the best’ they have experienced in translation practice classes. Zaid does not provide any written feedback to students. After quizzes and exams, students get a grade and collective verbal comments in class. They are always welcome to see their papers and have a one-on-one conferencing with the instructor about their errors.

Ali found that students do not feel comfortable translating into their L2 because they lack L2 vocabulary. He believed that they need a stock of vocabulary at their disposal if they want to specialize in narrow subject domains. This is why Ali provides students with a list of specialized terminology early in the semester and encourages students to be aware of it. He deliberately selects texts that contain some of the vocabulary and issues with which students have difficulties so that they resolve those issues. He occasionally writes common errors on the whiteboard and asks students to identify the error and discuss it collectively. He draws up some principles from common errors and writes them on the whiteboard; for example, “AR verbal sentences start with a verb, nominal sentences start with a noun, adjectives always follow the noun they modify, etc.” Ali’s students conveyed that writing in L1 (AR) is their real challenge, especially when translating into a specialized subject area such as medicine. “More feedback on LSP writing skills is what we need, and it’s what instructors rarely focus on,” they emphasized. In addition to being too brief
and unelaborated, students saw Ali’s feedback as too direct and ‘un-dialogical’ (see Note 2, Appendix A-4).

### 4.1.3.3 Use of technology

Bader does not use any form of technology for his translation practice classes. In the past, he used the IWB to display students’ midterm translations, but he does not do so anymore. Although he is a tech-savvy himself, he found that the use of IWB is impractical and time-consuming. He noticed that it constantly has technical issues that waste valuable time. He used to use the Blackboard system, but he stopped using it after a recent update that caused all his course materials to be lost. Now he uses the regular whiteboard even though it is more tedious, he admitted. He still believes that technology can be tremendously helpful, and frequently asks students to consult their electronic resources in their smartphones during translation workshops. He even developed a RU-AR dictionary for smart phone applications with 120000 words, and encouraged students to use it. Further, he is currently working on a project that will allow students and instructors in each language module to connect through an online utility. His students were not quite excited about the use of technology in this class, and indicated that they have had an annoying experience with it. Using Blackboard and communicating via university email were not so appealing. However, students eventually agreed that if any means of technology is implemented effectively, it would help greatly in making the class more ‘lively.’

For Omar, who is a computational linguistics expert, the use of technology in delivering feedback is necessary. He uses MS Word and PowerPoint to discuss students’ errors through the IWB, and provides students with a plenty of e-resources. During class discussions, he frequently refers to the Internet to check parallel texts or give students few research tips. He used to implement Blackboard and discussion forums and found them highly effective, but had stopped using them because of their constant technical issues. He encourages students to contact him whenever they need through his email and social media accounts. Students acknowledged that
Omar is one of few instructors who respond promptly to their electronic messages. They found the use of technology helps immensely in making translation classes interactive and motivating.

Zaid considered technology essential in regulating feedback in his classes. Students must use the IWB to type in their suggested translation and have it critiqued by the whole class. Zaid uses the IWB to display the ST and analyze it, and to display students’ grades. The Internet is used frequently during workshops to check lexical and cultural elements of the texts. The Internet is also used to teach students how to use online resources effectively, including automated translation tools. Zaid constantly reminds students to be as insistent as ‘professional detectives,’ searching everywhere to find reliable answers. Zaid admitted that he finds it harder to teach without these technological tools, which he feels thankful to have available in all classrooms. Likewise, his students found the use of IWB enormously helpful. It makes their task of grasping the verbal feedback considerably easier.

Ali uses a form of technology in interpretation classes by asking students to send him their recorded interpretation and sending them back his recorded comments. In translation classes, however, Ali does not use any form of technology other than the Internet for selecting the STs. IWBs could have been more helpful had they involved fewer technical issues, he surmised. Students also play a role in Ali’s refrain from technology, Ali argued, as many of them constantly have excuses when assignments involved any use of technology. Ali’s students, on the contrary, wished that IWBs were implemented in translation workshops because it makes it easier for them to follow the discussion, something that they had experienced with other professors. They found that concentrating with the instructor while he reads the ST from a paper can confusing sometimes. They guessed that the instructor’s unfamiliarity with technology could be the cause of the persistent technical issues they face, especially with the IWB.
4.1.3.4 Timing of feedback

In Bader's class, students are assigned a text to translate usually a week before the workshop. The majority of Bader's comments on students' assignments occur through class discussion during the translation workshop. In other words, he provides students with in-process verbal comments. This in-process feedback does not come only from the instructor, but from classmates as well. A post-process feedback happens once during the semester, particularly a week or two after the midterm exam. The instructor first gives every student verbal one-on-one comments about their individual translation errors, then gives a brief whole-class commentary on common errors using the whiteboard if need be. His students appreciated the instructor's instant verbal feedback they get every week, but wished that the midterm feedback arrived sooner while the translation was still fresh in their memories.

Omar noted that Higher Education regulations necessitate that grades be given to students maximally within two weeks of their exam. He believed that it is important that students not only know their grade but also get sufficient feedback as soon as possible. “Students relate to the feedback better when the text is still fresh in their mind,” he asserted. Students indicated that Omar rarely gives them any feedback while they are translating. “Give me all you've got, then we'll talk,” is Omar's catchphrase that encourages students to try, err, then have their errors corrected. Once they are done translating, an immediate verbal feedback is provided. The midterm written and verbal feedback takes 1-2 weeks to arrive, depending on the instructor's academic and administrative schedule.

In Zaid's class, students often receive verbal feedback from the instructor and classmates while they type their suggested translation on the IWB. Feedback on exams is delivered a week later, in the form of verbal discussion as well. Zaid is a strong opponent of late feedback. Students are usually eager to know how well they did and what grade they deserved, while late feedback deters this enthusiasm. Students indicated that they were pleased with the timing of feedback in Zaid's class. They assumed that late feedback accumulates ungraded work and makes students
proceed to new tasks without knowing their errors in previous tasks. Some students may care about the grade more than the comments, Zaid conceded, but there are a few students who take the feedback seriously. Still, feedback should be timely because it is one of the instructor’s responsibility.

Ali’s brief comments occur in process while students are workshopping a translation every week. He occasionally roams around the class and provides assistance to whoever asks for it. He might join a random group for few minutes to listen to their discussion and facilitate it further, but spends most of the time away from groups to give them their space. Rarely, he might draw attention to specific errors without giving an answer. His students found Ali’s method of monitoring group work to be insufficient. They felt that more involvement from the instructor in such activities is needed. His quick verbal remarks on their translations are delivered at the start of next workshop (a week later) before they start the new task. Ali gives relatively longer comments on the midterm translation, but would also start a new translation task soon afterward. Students appreciated the immediate verbal responses of their instructor, but found them short and insufficient.

4.1.3.5 **Regularity of feedback**

Bader claimed that he delivers the same quality and quantity of feedback in all the classes he teaches. To reduce subjectivity and the effect of ‘first impression,’ he makes sure to grade attendance, participation, homework, and exam as soon as he can, and never delays it until the end of the semester. Bader’s students noticed though that he uses the whiteboard more often in previous theoretical classes, such as *Introduction to Translation*, to explain theoretical concepts. In this practice class, they agreed that verbal discussion is the norm and written comments are the exception. They also noticed that Bader’s way of teaching has changed as they proceed to advanced levels, in the sense that he pushes them to rely more on themselves. They noticed that the other instructor who teaches another practice class also concentrates on verbal feedback, yet
he stops at every sentence and fully discusses it with a student, then gives students a chance to comment and write down the full translation of the sentence before moving on to the other sentence. They complained that Bader discusses each sentence with all students and moves faster in workshopping the text, leaving them few moments to annotate difficult words, rather than write the whole translation of sentences. They found the other instructor’s method to be ‘easier.’

Omar believed that feedback should be delivered on a regular basis no matter how hectic the instructor’s schedule is. He was confident that he provides the same quality of feedback to all students on every assignment throughout the semester. His approach to feedback is the same in all the practice classes he teaches. He is aware that his approach is different from other instructors’ in that they rely heavily on verbal, rather than written comments. He tries to avoid the shortcomings he notices in others’ approaches and benefit from their strong points. Omar’s students appreciated that he provides regular feedback:

S1: It’s impossible that he lets an ST passes by without fully workshopping it. He once decided not to include an ST in the exam because we didn’t fully workshop it. For exams, he assigns an ST similar to one of the STs that has been covered during the semester.

Students noted that Omar assigns shorter translation assignments over the semester but allows students to discuss them thoroughly, while other instructors seem to value quantity (of assignments) over quality. Some instructors would listen to few ‘samples’ of students’ translations, then give his translation of the whole text. They want to cover as many texts as they can, regardless of how in-depth they workshop the translation.

Zaid supposed that diversifying the source and manner of feedback makes it more effective. In every class, students have to practice translation and get immediate verbal feedback on their contribution. Unlike theoretical classes where most of the class period is spent on discussing concepts and applying them on ‘tailored’ (pedagogically manipulated) short texts, practice classes require students to produce their own texts and engage in a discussion that rarely contains theoretical notions. “Students at this stage don’t need theory,” Zaid asserted. Zaid follows
the same approach to feedback regardless of class size. He admitted though that smaller classes give students more opportunity to present their own translation and lead class discussion. Zaid’s students indicated that other instructors have different approaches to feedback. “If you give the same translation to two different instructors, you’ll return with two different feedback outputs.” Zaid’s consistent use of IWB in delivering the feedback was highly admired by his students, who did not hesitate to ask other instructors to do the same as Zaid.

Ali stated that his quality and quantity of feedback depends greatly on the ST, but the manner of feedback delivery always remains the same. He uses the same approach, which stresses group work, in theoretical classes as well. Students are always responsible for taking notes of the verbal comments that are delivered in class. Ali admitted that he would give more individualized feedback to students has it been a smaller class. Ali’s students found his feedback to be consistent, yet extremely lacking in elaboration and dialogue. They have had other practice classes with other instructors, and noticed that each instructor had a different method of feedback. Naturally, they thought, some instructors are more organized and analytical than others. They preferred those instructors who give detailed, written and verbal feedback; instructors who fully analyze each ST and critically discuss every detail of students’ translations; instructors who do not mock a student in front of the class for a silly mistake or stupid question; and instructors who are extremely picky about students’ errors, yet not at the expense of students’ marks and personal ego.

4.1.4 Negotiating feedback: Interactional dimension

4.1.4.1 Feedback seeking

Bader allows sufficient time for his four students to comment or ask questions. Students indicated that they never hesitate to contact their instructor if there is a need. They noted that there is sufficient time in the class period to ask for clarification or elaboration, especially in the last part of the class, which is often devoted to student’s questions and inquiries. Students seemed to have no difficulty receiving general verbal feedback in class, and more individualized and written
feedback for the midterm exam (though they are not allowed to take their papers back). The one-
on-one meeting with the instructor after exams leaves students no excuse for not getting sufficient feedback, Bader reasoned.

Omar stated that there is a stereotypical impression about university instructors being in an ivory tower secluded from students. He supposed that instructors should change that idea by being approachable to students. Instructors should create a friendly environment that inspires students to become productive participants in this educational institution. He believed that he succeeds largely in creating that environment. He found students to be open and outgoing in his class, thanks to the friendly, conversational atmosphere he provided in every class. Students confirmed Omar’s words by expressing their admiration of his friendly attitude. They indicated that he invites them to negotiate their grades and ask for more feedback whenever they want. “It is about instructor’s personality,” students asserted. “Some instructors may say that they welcome questions and comments, but their constant ‘negative’ attitude makes students think twice before going near them!”

Zaid saw the best form of feedback as one that is initiated by the student rather than the instructor. Students should be allowed to ‘lead’ the process of feedback by presenting their work and asking the rest of the class (including instructor) to comment on it. Students should be responsible for doing the assignments and coming to class with ‘problems’ to discuss. Zaid’s students felt that the ‘dialogical’ method in class allows them to ask questions about their own translation whenever they need. The class period has always been sufficient for them to get the feedback they needed. Students have never asked for individualized written feedback from the instructor, and had conflicting views about it:

S1: I wished there were something written in this class so that it sticks to our minds, because spoken words can easily be forgotten!
S2: I have to disagree with that. I think there’s no need for written comments, I just need the instructor to correct me verbally and I can take care of the rest.
Ali assumed that his students are quite interested in the feedback and grade. They are always eager to know what he thinks of their translation and in knowing why they get a certain grade. His students, on the contrary, thought that Ali is a welcoming instructor, but his sort of ‘hasty’ and ‘spare’ feedback makes them hesitate to ask him for elaboration inside or outside the class.

4.1.4.2 Peer feedback

Bader believed firmly in the importance of peer feedback. He assumed that it is even more important than the instructor’s feedback. Students find their classmates’ feedback less intimidating than the instructor’s, therefore easier to accept, he supposed. This is why Bader asks students in a direct manner to comment on their classmate’s translation during workshops. He directly asks them, “Are there any errors in your classmate’s translation? Are there any mistakes you would like to comment on?” While sitting at his desk, he asks students one by one and listens to what they think. If he an error is made, he does not show any sign until each student takes his turn. Only when all students try and fail that Bader intervenes to correct their errors by giving an acceptable answer. The more errors students make, the more comments the instructor provides.

In general, Bader moves on to the next sentence once an acceptable translation is given, to make use of time. Occasionally another student might stop them and suggest another acceptable translation. Bader welcomes this kind of participation and assures students that “sometimes there could be more than one right translation; it’s a matter of taste!” Students wished that there were pair or group projects in this class, but assumed that those activities are not applicable in small size classes such as theirs.

For Omar, peer work helps in breaking the ice between students, especially at the beginning of the semester. He once divided students in groups based on their favorite soccer team to relieve the tension of formality. He often implements pair and group activities once or twice a semester depending on how successful they have been. He contended that not any group of
students can work together; the instructor should assess the chemistry among students before deciding whether peer activities are worth the class time. When applying peer work, the instructor should monitor their discussion and ensure that every student is involved in some way. “Group work is doomed to fail if I neglect my duty as a director and a facilitator of learning,” Omar asserted. To enhance students’ involvement in group work, Omar mandates that each member of the group have his own individual translation ready before starting the team work. Omar’s students also found peer work to be useful. They indicated that they meet even outside the class to discuss their translation issues, and believed that they are capable of benefiting one another. “My classmates may know a term or concept that I haven't come across, so I’d definitely learn from them,” one student reported. Students admitted that Omar’s dialogic method promoted their self-confidence in giving feedback to their classmates and in applying his correction codes while giving peer feedback.

Peer feedback occurs directly and indirectly in Zaid’s weekly workshops. Each workshop often starts with a terminology search in which students work in teams of two or three using their own printed dictionaries. Throughout this activity, which may take up to 30 minutes, Zaid roams around the room giving assistance to students as needed. A volunteer student would then start the discussion by typing his own suggested translation of the first sentence on the IWB and receiving his classmates’ comments and suggestions. Zaid found this kind of peer discussion to be highly effective as it motivates students and increases their engagement in the task. He noticed, however, that students tend to comment on their classmate’s translation by giving another suggestion, instead of first analyzing the translation then giving their own suggestion. He believed students need to be trained on how to listen to each other and critique each other’s opinion, instead of simply giving another suggestion and waiting for the instructor to comment. Although Zaid assumed that students at this stage are incapable of assessing each other’s work, he believed they still can learn greatly from collective practice. Students indicated that they appreciate giving and receiving criticism from their classmates, but noted that it should not be mandatory for
students to comment on every classmate’s work. Some students may feel uncomfortable receiving criticism from specific students in class. One student expressed his discomfort with the indirect comparison that occurs in the class, and found that an instructor’s “exaggerated praise” of certain students may have negative consequences.

Ali considered peer feedback to be highly useful. It gives students confidence in discussing their own translation choices with their colleagues. He was aware that some students may not take group work seriously, and saw this as a major drawback of this teaching method. It is the instructor’s responsibility, he believed, to take an active role in group work by monitoring groups and ensuring involvement of its members. The instructor should also prepare students for group activities by educating them about the value of collaborative learning. Ali’s students also found group work to be useful only if it is done properly. They, however, did not think that it was done effectively in Ali’s class. Often times, weaker students deliberately join stronger students to ‘hide behind them.’ Group activity consumes almost the whole class period (over 90 minutes), most of which occurs in isolation from the instructor. This makes many students lose interest in the activity and consequently indulge in anything but the translation task. The instructor’s brief answers to the few scattered questions can hardly salvage the situation. Some students agree on each other’s suggestions even if they are personally not convinced. Serious students also feel upset seeing the instructor eventually overlook their specific individual contribution.

4.1.4.3 Self-feedback

Bader seems to focus intensely on ‘collective’ translation practice, where he and the whole class translate and discuss translation together as one group. This is exclusively the only type of activity in Bader’s class. He never assigns any form of self-feedback tasks. He noted that he tried once to allow students to evaluate themselves, but they did not have a positive reaction. He averred that students are incapable of doing such activities because they are not trained to do so. Students often think highly of themselves, which makes them unable to see their own shortcomings. Bader
is the one who selects the STs and never allows students to participate in the selection process. He is not ready to waste a class period on an inappropriate text poorly selected by a student, from his point of view. Once in a while, he might select a text then change it when realizing it is too difficult for students. Occasionally he would select a ‘tough’ text only to introduce new linguistic and cultural concepts, but such a text would not be included in the exam. Same rule goes for the assessment process; Bader prefers not to take students’ opinions on any part of this process, because he believes students will naturally choose what is easier even if it is less useful. Students indicated that they generally do a sort of self-reflection at home when they study their notes and compare their own translations to the instructor’s. One student prepares for the final exam by reviewing the notes he takes in class; another by reviewing his notes and audio recordings; and the third (who had the lowest GPA) relies on his memory in studying the STs and TTs covered throughout the semester.

Omar reminds his students to revise the whole translation critically when they finish translating. Sometimes during exams, he may ask a student to go back and revise a certain sentence and read it analytically. He had in mind several ideas to enhance self-reflection (e.g., the use of a portfolio), but he has not had the time to apply them. Still, he assumed that students are incapable of assessing themselves, let alone giving opinions in assessment criteria. Designing the course components, including the grading procedure, is strictly the instructor’s responsibility. The instructor should be flexible, however, in allowing students to improve their grades by giving extra-credit tasks and redistributing grades, which he often does. Similarly, Omar’s students believed that self-evaluation might be helpful as long as the instructor’s feedback is provided first. “Students often are incapable of spotting their own errors,” they claimed. Students also do not have the competency to select appropriate texts for translation assignments. Omar tried once but found weak response from students. This probably was because the task was optional rather than mandatory, Omar supposed.
When a student suggests a translation solution during workshops, Zaid often confronts him with the question, “You, yourself, what do you think?” The student then may respond by saying, “I’m not sure, I feel there’s something awkward about it, but I can’t quite put my finger on it.” Zaid would then assist him in this sort of ‘think-aloud’ dialogue: “Read your translation out loud. Listen to it as if you’re listening to a piece of music. Then tell us what you think.” Further instruction in this path may include asking the student to back-translate his translation and see if the ST meaning is still preserved. Zaid still assumed that self-feedback is the least effective source of feedback in his class, because students’ language proficiency at this stage does not help much. “No matter how much you encourage students to practice outside the class, they rarely follow the advice,” Zaid asserted. Students, on the other hand, indicated that they spontaneously reflect on their own translation while studying at home. They realized that self-feedback is vital to their success as translators, but wished that there were specific exercises to enhance this skill.

Ali always encourages students to practice translation on their own outside the class and look at every pieces of translation critically. In class, he may occasionally give students an ‘ideal’ translation to compare with their own and to discuss in groups. Ali believed that students’ translations over the semester give an indication of how much students reflect on their own errors. Students who keep making the same error types may have done less reflection in their work. Ali theorized that portfolio projects and similar tasks can enhance self-feedback immensely, but he never finds time for them because of his heavy teaching load. Ali’s students indicated that they generally reflect on their own translation when they revise and proofread at home. A student noted that he often returns to the ST after completing the translation and compares it with the TT line by line. Another student revealed that he leaves the TT aside for few hours then reads it as a target reader who knows nothing about the ST. This helps him detect overlooked errors of structure and style. Ali’s students admitted that they learned such strategies cumulatively through various instructors, but not deliberately in this class.
4.1.4.4 Feedback on feedback

The only form of feedback that Bader receives on his teaching is the formal (standardized) course evaluation that students fill out electronically to get their final grades. Bader does not take such assessment seriously because he believes that most students are incapable of evaluating their instructor. Only a handful of excellent students would be honest in giving their views, the rest would likely be biased. Bader has not received any feedback from his peer instructors. He believed it would be a great idea if it were conducted objectively, which he doubted it could be. When instructors meet, they often discuss students’ lack of interest in learning and ways of motivating them; discussing feedback and assessment is a luxury in their case, he concluded. Bader’s students judged that they are not in a position to give feedback to the instructor because of the huge gap between them in terms of knowledge and experience. They indicated that it is students’ responsibility to adapt to their instructor’s approach to teaching, not vice versa. The first 2-3 weeks are often the hardest, but as students advance, they become more acquainted with the instructor’s style. Students thought that the assigned texts are often picked ‘haphazardly’ by the instructor, and wished that there were a specific textbook to follow.

Omar believed that students’ feedback on the instructor’s teaching is highly important. Students are capable of expressing views that could help improve the teaching. Occasionally throughout the semester, Omar asks students about the kind of topics they wish to translate, and takes their views seriously. In the middle of the semester, he further asks students to write the positive and negative aspects of his teaching approach, and to suggest ways to improve the course. He does not find the standardized course evaluation he receives at the end of the semester to be useful, because students fill it out merely to proceed to their course results. Omar’s students acknowledged their instructor’s interest in improving the course, and emphasized that students’ opinions could always be useful to the instructor as long as the instructor is willing to listen. They thought that instructors should get feedback from each other and learn from each other’s experience. Omar maintained that the culture of instructors giving feedback to one another is
almost absent among teaching faculties. The university started to provide an optional Peer Consultant who visits instructors upon their request and gives them feedback. Unfortunately, few instructors make use of this service, Omar noticed.

Zaid stated that he seeks students’ feedback only if he notices discomfort among students, which rarely happens in his class, he assured. “Students’ faces can tell if the teaching method is working or not.” Zaid sets aside a class period to discuss students’ issues with his approach to teaching if he perceives a need for it. He believed that students are capable of expressing their views and improve the course once their instructor gives them the confidence to do so. Students often take a passive attitude if they feel unsure about the instructor’s reaction. Zaid indicated that he rarely gets any feedback from peer instructors either, and assumed that this is the case for most university professors worldwide. He proposed that there should be some kind of research groups where instructors meet and discuss pedagogical concerns and learn from one another. Unfortunately, this rarely happens. Zaid revealed that he is quite content with the feedback he provides in this class in terms of quantity and quality, taking into consideration the low language proficiency of students. Zaid’s students likewise were pleased with the feedback provided in this course, but not so much with the grades. They confessed that the instructor knows best when it comes to the criteria, but wished they knew why they deserved a certain grade. “Simply knowing your errors isn’t enough; you have the right to know why those errors add up to a certain total,” they argued.

Ali could not think of any form of feedback that he gets from students other than the electronic students survey after the final exams. He held that not all students are capable of providing impartial evaluation of their instructors. Ali, however, believed that instructors should meet and agree on general guidelines and procedures that enhance their feedback practices. He was certain that some instructors, let alone their students, are not aware of the great value of feedback. Ali’s students, by contrast, believed that students can always provide useful suggestions to the instructor. They indicated, however, that they are rarely asked to give feedback on the
instructor’s feedback aside from the standardized survey at the end of semester. In that survey, students noted that there used to be a commentary question, which they found somewhat useful to provide specific details. The survey now, however, is simply a list of general statements with response points that indicate agreement. Students felt that such a survey, even though comes late in the semester, could be useful if it is taken seriously by instructors, but unfortunately it is not. Students found that instructors vary (sometimes drastically) in their evaluation of students’ translations. It happens that one instructor may give positive remarks on a given translation, while another gives negative remarks on the same translation. Students understand the inevitability of such differences, but wished that there could be, at least, general guidelines on feedback that instructors follow.

4.1.4.5 Feedback loop

Creating a friendly atmosphere in the class is Bader’s first step of involving students in the feedback process. He has taught the same group of students several courses over several years, which made students quite familiar with his teaching style. Verbal discussion occurs in every translation workshop, and students are encouraged to debate and even disagree with the instructor and express their views. Students acknowledged that interaction is an obvious feature of the class. “I’ll come back to you,” is Bader’s catchphrase that keeps students attentive and prepared to participate in the discussion. He urges students to ask questions about the feedback both inside and outside the classroom, and often devotes a whole class at the end of the semester only for students’ questions and queries. He found, however, that serious students have never felt timid or reluctant to ask about or discuss any concern they have. Lazy students would not care about the feedback and the course as a whole no matter what the instructor does. Bader recalled that he once offered to give them an extra tutoring class for free, yet no one showed up! The weaker students are often not serious about improving their translation skills; they merely want to pass.
Students indicated that it is their responsibility to decide how and what they should do with the feedback.

Omar saves midterm corrected papers and all the PowerPoint presentations on common errors, but has never re-used them in any way. He thought that they might be useful for research if his research interests were in translation. He does not know what students do with the feedback. He indicated that it is pedagogically essential to survey students and be aware of their study habits, but he has not done so yet. Omar asserted though that he is still experimenting new translation teaching strategies, and is quite flexible about changing his method to meet students’ needs and expectations:

O: Students today have definitely changed! Everyone comes to class with 3 smartphones and a portable wireless modem, but not with their pens and notebooks! They need to be approached differently for sure. I always wonder how elder professors deal with such a thing and whether or not they’ve changed their approach to cope with the change!

In Omar’s class, students have to return the midterm papers after reading them and making note of the errors. Students indicated that they keep all the side notes they make in class and review them for the final exam.

Zaid encourages students to express their opinion even if they contradict his. To achieve this, he builds a friendly rapport with students and assures them that making mistakes is the way to learn. During workshops, he avoids giving students a final translation and interferes only to accelerate the feedback loop. Weaker and timid students could be a hindrance to the flow of the feedback, so Zaid makes stronger and outgoing students in charge of typing translations on the IWB and leading the workshop. Zaid’s students affirmed that the instructor engages in the discussion by ‘showering’ them with questions, which necessitates that students interact actively with one another. Respecting the instructor does not mean agreeing with him, they emphasized. Before joining college, they heard of students who failed a course because they disagreed with an instructor, but in their experience they have not dealt with any instructor of that sort. Students revealed that they take notes of all the comments they get in the workshop and use them to rewrite
their own translation drafts. They also take notes of their individual meetings with the instructor after the midterm exam. All these notes are collected and reviewed regularly in preparation for the final exam.

Ali claimed that he reviews students’ common problems and uses them to adjust his teaching strategies. The few verbal comments he gives to students at the start of each workshop, however, seem to end there. Although he may use the whiteboard to clarify certain points, students shortly receive and start to work on a new ST, forgetting a great deal of the previous translation task. Ali assumed that students are responsible for taking notes and self-regulating their own learning. He found that few students seem to benefit from the feedback because the majority of students keep falling into the same error types. Ali’s students, on the other hand, saw their instructor’s scarce feedback as a lack of interest in the course on the part of the instructor. This, consequently, made them lose interest in discussing his brief feedback, let alone seeking further feedback. Listening to almost the same comments, in almost the same manner, makes Ali’s verbal feedback monotonous and unappealing to his students. “As students, we could easily tell whether or not the instructor enjoys having a conversation with us on our work.” They also asserted that the lack of individualized, written feedback worsens the situation and widens the gap between them and their instructor.
4.2 The Feedback Culture in the US-CASE

4.2.1 Setting the scene

Before proceeding to the results of the data conducted at the US-CASE, a general background about US-CASE participants may provide a deeper understanding of the examined context. The following table displays information about the instructors, which includes their age, gender, degree, professional experience, teaching experience, language module, and number and gender of students (see Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant (pseudonym)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Academic Degree</th>
<th>Professional experience</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
<th>Language module</th>
<th>No./gender of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>PhD candidate in Translation</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>EN-RU</td>
<td>1 (F) 1 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>PhD candidate in Translation</td>
<td>7 year</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>EN-ES</td>
<td>9 (F) 3 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>PhD in French Literature</td>
<td>34 years</td>
<td>22 years</td>
<td>EN-FR</td>
<td>3 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>PhD in Historical Germanic Linguistics</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>21 years</td>
<td>EN-GR</td>
<td>3 (F) 1 (M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: Demographic information of the US-CASE instructor participants*

It is worth mentioning that the nature and length of translation experience differs from one instructor to another. For instance, Thomas and Kate had their own translation businesses and had been managing translation projects in various subject domains. Sarah and Emily’s experience in translation had mostly been in the form of sporadic freelancing; Sarah had not been doing professional translation recently since she was too busy with teaching and doctoral researching, while Emily was a literary translator whose translation projects were mostly part of her academic publications.

The teaching experience of instructors varies as well. Kate had taught several language courses at undergraduate and post-college levels, but this was her first year to teach a translation course. Sarah had less experience in teaching than Kate overall, but Sarah had been teaching translation practice courses ever since she started teaching, while this is Kate’s first time to teach translation. Both Emily and Thomas' long experience in teaching had recently included teaching...
translation practice courses at the graduate level in addition to their various undergraduate translation courses. Kate and Sarah both had their bachelor’s and master’s degrees in translation studies, and they are currently pursuing their doctoral studies in the same field. They attributed most of their knowledge in translator education to their graduate education where they were exposed to a variety of subfields in translation studies, some concentrated specifically on translator pedagogy.

Emily, on the other hand, complained that she did not have a chance to attend any form of training in translation teaching since translation classes were not so popular when she carried out her academic studies. She had been trying to catch up through conferences and seminars that were held irregularly on translator training. Likewise, Thomas admitted that he was hired to teach translation “as a risk!” since he had no professional experience in translation, and his academic background had nothing to do with translation, as he put it. He had to train himself in the first year by shifting his research to translation studies and exerting extra effort in preparing the courses. At the end of his first year in teaching, Thomas started his own translation business in order to obtain the professional experience he needed. Further, he has been an active member at all ATA conferences, and since joining the professoriate, he earned certification in German-EN translation, giving him a further professional credential in translation.

For most students in this study, learning a foreign language was a passion they had since childhood. Some expressed a keen interest in grammar and the ‘music of words’, others focused more on the cross-cultural communication that language learning facilitates. Language also meant a great asset that could provide more opportunity in the market. Several students admitted that the translation major was not in their plan when they joined college, but chose it in a later stage as a double major to enhance their qualifications. Two students indicated that they initially applied to a scientific college, computer science, and pre-mid chemistry, but decided to transfer to the translation program after one semester. They revealed that this brief experience in a scientific field made them determined to focus on scientific translation when they graduate. A
French translation student indicated that graduating as a translator could also help her work from home as a freelancer.

All participants, instructors and students, agree on the importance of translation practice courses. For Kate, translation workshops represent the ‘core’ of translator education and the ‘real’ preparation for the translation industry. Sarah asserted that these courses provide an opportunity for students to be exposed to different text types and be able to read, understand, and analyze such texts in their SL. Students then can identify problem areas and find ways to solve them. Emily believed that translation cannot be simply theoretical. She saw practice courses as an opportunity for young translators to apply some of what they have learned in theoretical classes and take into consideration the specificity of every text they attempt to translate. Along the same lines, Thomas considered practice courses as the most important in their translation program, which is supposed to train professional translators. A certain amount of theory is important, according to Thomas, and can result in reflective practice, but if students do not have an experience in a number of text types and cannot translate fast enough, they will not be effective in the marketplace. That is why Thomas was firmly convinced that their translation program should increase the number of hours of practice classes in a wider variety of areas.

Kate’s students saw translation practice courses as an ‘open window’ to the translation market. In these classes, they translated for actual clients and had an expert instructor monitor the process. One student asserted that he had a hard time retaining information unless he practiced what he knew. He argued that the few examples that they took in theoretical classes ‘went over his head’ because they were delivered in several languages that he could not fully comprehend. For Sarah’s students, practice classes simply meant an opportunity to actually translate and learn how to solve problems, which is what they will do professionally after they graduate. Emily’s students found practice classes quite helpful because of the weekly workshops where students learn by seeing how others translate. Thomas’ students had been waiting eagerly for the practice classes after spending the first two years of the program in the language classes.
They saw translation practice courses as the most important in the program since they demonstrate how students fare in becoming translators.

4.2.2 Situating feedback: Socio-cultural dimension

4.2.2.1 Concept of feedback

Kate prefers to use the word ‘review’ or ‘proofread’ instead of ‘feedback’ or ‘grade,’ since the former two are more relevant to the professional world, she argued. Kate clarifies that in the so-called ‘real world,’ companies take the translator’s translation, give it to a proofreader, then may or may not send it back to the translator. In other words, there is no feedback in the ‘educational’ sense of the word. The translator may or may not accept the proofreader’s corrections, Kate philosophized, and likewise the student translator should be permitted to agree or disagree with the proofreader. Students can also disagree with the instructor as long as they justify their translation choices and present a solid argument. For Kate, effective feedback is presented to the learner in the form of a suggestion rather than a clear-cut answer. It is best when it provokes thoughts and solutions. ‘Communication’ was the word Kate’s students picked as synonymous with feedback. The kind of communication they expected to see in this context is guiding learners to find their own answers, rather than telling them what is right or wrong. One of Kate’s students believed that “any kind of feedback is effective.” He meant that the mere existence of feedback indicates that there is some sort of communication going on between the parties involved. The other student agreed and added that effective feedback should also be clear enough since feedback is of no use if the receiver does not understand it.

Sarah perceived feedback as a way that helps learners know where they stand, and motivates them to improve on their existing skill set. Feedback goes further to state what the learner needs to do to achieve the desired objectives. Echoing Kate’s perspective, Sarah suggested that effective feedback is both constructive and suggestive, in that it does not only comment on
what is wrong but also gives suggestions on what can be done to take it a step further and improve. Sarah’s students saw feedback as a tool through which learners see their mistakes and know how to correct them. They agreed that effective feedback avoids using a negative or ‘mean’ tone that discourages the learner from revising and fixing their mistakes, and that is how feedback becomes ‘constructive.’ One student pointed out that effective feedback also depends greatly on the person giving the feedback; for him, the instructor’s feedback is naturally much more authentic and reliable than the classmate’s feedback.

Emily indicated that she always thought of feedback as how she reacts to students’ translations in terms of how accurate they are, what problem areas they have, and whether they serve the established needs of the target reader. Emily perceived effective feedback as an activity where every student gets to contribute (in translation workshops) by sharing his or her knowledge and experience. When students sit passively during a workshop, Emily tries to involve them by asking direct questions. The least students can do in Emily’s class is to read part of their translation and listen to the comments from the instructor and classmates. For Emily’s students, feedback is showing the learner other examples and ways of doing the task in order to help the learner improve their work. Students get to hear different viewpoints from the instructor and classmates, and this helps students revise their work and turn in a modified version. For Emily’s students, effective feedback is one that is ‘straightforward,’ telling students what is wrong and how to fix it.

“Negative feedback amplification” was the phrase Thomas chose to describe feedback. He was clearly not in favor of highlighting the positive aspects or giving plenty of praise, as it is not common in the marketplace. “The client doesn’t care whether you’re really great at 90% of the translation, if the 10% sucks!” asserted Thomas. In translator education, therefore, effective feedback has to be linked in some way to the professional standards of the translation marketplace. It should be based on a grading scale that categorizes errors and ranks them in order of severity. The written form of feedback has to be enhanced with verbal feedback in class.
Thomas’ students perceived feedback as ‘guidelines’ that learners can follow to understand whether they are going the right way. Having the professor and classmates review their work and compare it to theirs is the essence of feedback, according to Thomas’ students. One student insisted that effective feedback does not stop at telling the learner what is wrong and how to correct it, but goes deeper to explain why it is wrong; in other words, stating why the student’s answer is wrong as opposed to why the instructor’s answer is right.

4.2.2.2 Importance of feedback

Kate contended that feedback is crucial in any educational setting. Students attend school because they want to learn, and they cannot learn unless they are given sufficient feedback on their work. Without feedback, students can hardly learn from their mistakes. For Kate, feedback is used not only to correct students’ mistakes, but also to make students feel confident by giving them positive remarks. Giving students extra points for a smart solution is a form of positive feedback. In translator education, students should be given a chance at least once during the course to receive a ‘professional feedback’ by outsourcing their translations to working professional proofreaders. Kate argued that no matter how excellent the instructor’s feedback is, it would not be as authentic and industry-reflective as the professional proofreaders’. For Kate’s students, feedback in translator education is especially important because translation mistakes in the professional world can be fatal. A translation error in the medical field, for example, may lead to a medical error and consequently end up in court! It is during translator education where students should be allowed, or even encouraged, to make mistakes and correct them. “If we form bad habits now when we’re learning,” a student emphasized, “they’re going to be cemented and it’s going to be very difficult to fix them later on.”

Sarah believed strongly in the importance of feedback in translation practice courses. She reasoned that it is only in academia that students have a chance to get feedback, revise, and resubmit an improved work. In the market, translators often have tight deadlines and do not
always have the ability to have their work edited by someone else and sent back to them. Therefore, ‘deliberate practice,’ where novices continuously get feedback that helps them reach expert level, should be facilitated in translator education. This is where the instructor determines the difficulty level of the text, how much feedback should be given to students, and how much opportunity should be provided to students to revise and resubmit their work. This last step, often neglected by instructors, is vital because it shows if students really considered the feedback, read it, processed it, and provided the instructor with a modified version of their work. Sarah’s students also considered feedback essential to their learning in translation practice courses. One student stressed the great impact of what she described as the ‘mandatory’ part of feedback, where the learner takes a further step and actually reads the feedback and makes the corrections. The other two students agreed and admitted that they rarely revise their work (post-delivery) unless their instructor demanded that they turn in a revised version.

Emily’s perspective on feedback in her workshops often revolves around the translation brief (specific instructions about the target audience and purpose of the translation task). She indicated that for every translation task, she gives her students a brief in which the purpose of the translation and its target readership, among other issues, are clearly specified. Emily believed that feedback is an essential process in making students aware of the characteristics of the text they translate. When students read their translations during the weekly workshop, Emily makes sure to correct students’ grammatical and stylistic mistakes. More importantly, she draws their attention to the importance of meeting the needs of the intended audience. Students are required to produce a translation that is culturally acceptable, and they should use all resources at their disposal to achieve that goal. Feedback was highly important to Emily’s students, as well. They pointed out that, as students, they write their first draft of the translation and feel quite confident about it. Yet, when they discuss it in the workshop with the instructor and classmates, they see many flaws in their drafts and figure out various ways to improve it. Thus, without feedback, students can hardly know what their errors are, let alone how to correct them.
Thomas affirmed that feedback is extremely important in his translation practice courses. Every student should get a turn to show their work, and should have a chance to comment on others’ work as well. Thomas believed that there should be flexibility in translation workshops in terms of time allocation. There is no harm if a text takes two or three workshops as long as it is fully discussed and all students’ issues are addressed. Also, part of the flexibility is to avoid asking a weaker student to do a complex translation, and move on to a stronger student. This makes it less embarrassing for the weaker student and more productive for the class as a whole, Thomas argued. Thomas’ students agreed that feedback is vital to their progress especially in translation practice, arguing that it is hard for students to judge any translation, much less their own. They confessed that they often feel lost and frustrated when they receive the feedback late or, worse, when they receive no feedback at all. They noted that they cannot see how ‘faulty’ their translation is while they translate, and that all they need is a third party who queries or challenges them about their texts, to make them realize the kind of errors they made and lead them to solutions.

4.2.2.3 Objectives of feedback

Kate divides her class into three parts: (1) theoretical, where she discusses general theories on translation, (2) practice, where she discusses students’ translations, and (3) thematic, where they discuss Russia’s business and culture. Students are required to read a few pages from the textbook each week and write a three-sentence reflection on what they have read. Kate considered theory a ‘must learn’ for a translation student. She cautioned though that all the theory she teaches must be relevant to practice, and, therefore, must be implemented by students in the practice part in some way. “Theory is great, but what’s the point of theory if a translator can’t use it!” She tells her students that all they need to know about Schleiermacher’s article, for instance, is his famous quote about bringing the reader to the writer and vice versa. When discussing students’ translations in class, Kate refers to theoretical concepts quite often (see Excerpts 1-2, Appendix A-5). She believes that theory helps students justify their choices. When students defend their
translation by saying “I don’t know, because it sounds better,” she tells them “This is not the answer your client wants to hear.” She also refers to the professional code of ethics frequently, and tells students “It’s a tool that can shift the responsibility from you to the ethics.” Kate’s students seemed to acknowledge the importance of theory, as one of them stated:

S1: Linking things to theory is helpful because rather than forming the ideas yourself and then having this vague thing floating over your head, you’d be like ‘this is something that I should do; this is established, it’s proven to work, here’s the idea, here’s the name of the idea, it’s concrete idea now.’ So it makes it easier to go from step one to two to three, going through the process rather than organically know how to do it, I mean through trial and error over and over again figuring out on our own. Because obviously the first time that we looked at that translation we didn’t do that, because we’re still getting a grasp of all these ideas and implementing all of them, so if we’re just trying to learn it organically it’ll take longer.

Kate also uses feedback to motivate students. “Students who aren’t self-motivated to work hard cannot be dealt with except by giving motivating feedback,” she affirmed. Kate tries to maintain a positive attitude in class and encourage students to keep learning even if they make mistakes. She uses English as the language of feedback, unless she provides examples, since it is simply more convenient for her and her students. Kate’s students also indicated that they prefer EN, not only because their Russian is not strong enough, but also because the reading assignments are all in English.

Changing students’ perception of ‘ideal translation’ is a main objective in Sarah’s feedback. She tries to instill in them that “there isn’t one single right way of translation, but there’re revisions that are more acceptable than others.” She found that students expect the instructor to tell them how to do it by directly giving them the ‘right’ answer; yet they need to understand that there can always be a ‘better’ answer. The client also decides what they want, but the client can be educated and quality can be negotiated. There is a fine line between the client/professional way and the ideal/academic way. Sarah tries to get this idea across by having students translate and revise their work, because this shows them that their first draft is not the best draft. Although she discusses some theoretical concepts in class, she does not necessarily use them in her feedback. She believed that students at this level do not have enough theory, and the class she teaches is not
grounded in theory. The theories she gives to students are mostly introductory and basic, involving practical aspects of theory (e.g., pragmatic strategies and techniques) more than the purely theoretical. Providing students with enough feedback without giving them ready-made solutions is the biggest challenge for Sarah, especially with students who struggle with comprehension and transfer issues. Giving students direct answers may end up giving them the instructor’s version of the translation, as opposed to guiding them indirectly to find their own answers. Sarah tries to overcome this by giving them leading clues that stimulate their thinking and urging them to keep trying. Since most students struggle with ES, Sarah uses English as the language of instruction and feedback so that she does not create additional confusion, as she put it. Her students also indicated that they prefer to use EN, but noted that Sarah allows them to use the language with which they feel more comfortable and that she is always ready to switch between L1 and L2 accordingly.

Emily always gives her students a translation brief to guide their translation process, and rarely asks them to come up with the brief themselves. She does involve students in devising a brief by asking them questions such as “Why might you want to translate this text? Who would be interested in this topic?” And so on. Students are required to fulfill the conditions of the brief grammatically, stylistically, and culturally. Through her feedback, Emily teaches students to be careful and rigorous, because careless grammatical errors could give poor impression to their readers. In addition to using dictionaries and glossaries, students need to learn how to research on the Internet to back up translation choices. This is why Emily instructs students to find parallel texts that have the same features as the ST (e.g., text register, genre, and style). She intentionally chooses STs that present challenging issues, such as use of slang words or foreign expressions, and asks students to target a specific kind of audience. Students are further required to write a reflection with each translation task and discuss how they dealt with the problematic areas. Emily uses English as the language of feedback because her students’ French is not advanced enough. She also strictly translates into English not only because of students’ low language proficiency,
but also because she herself does not feel she has the grasp of French syntax and culture to be able to judge French translations. She supposed that undergraduate students are just “getting their feet wet in translation,” while “real preparation” is in the graduate program. Her students admitted that they understand English better, but wished that Emily used French more in her instruction and feedback so that they would get extra practice with the L2.

‘Creativity’ is one of the issues that Thomas hopes to ‘constrain’ in his students’ translation. He found that creativity often tends to drag students away from the ST so far that they ‘distort’ the ST meaning. He argued that his job is to train professional translators on non-literary texts, which means that only a certain range of variation is acceptable in translation. Instructors who advocate ‘free’ translation and less adherence to the ST are often academics who have no professional experience, claimed Thomas. A creative solution is recommended, he emphasized, only if it conveys all the elements of meaning from the ST (see Excerpt 4, Appendix A-8). Thomas’ students noticed the difference between him and other instructors in terms of adherence to the ST, and quoted him saying, “Some people say there’s no right or wrong translations, well definitely there’re wrong translations!” In the workshop, Thomas does not review students’ translations beforehand so that he allows them to come up with their own solutions while he tries to react to them as a TT reader. Furthermore, reviewing students’ drafts would potentially lead him to focus on each student’s errors wherever they occur, then discuss all the ones that have errors. Students probably feel less comfortable knowing that the instructor goes through their translations beforehand and picks up their errors and focuses on them. Thomas found that the kind of ‘round robin’ workshop, where every student gets a turn in somewhat ‘anonymous’ way, is more comfortable and practical. Students typically know whose translation is up on screen even if their names are hidden because it is a small class and students are acquainted with each other. Every time he introduces a new assignment, Thomas gives a brief mini-lecture discussing the ST’s characteristics and translation brief, but devotes the majority of the class to discussing students’ drafts. The discussion revolves around students’ problems and rarely involves translation
theories. “Students don’t want theory, they want to translate,” he asserted. Thomas assigns translations into English only and uses English as the language of feedback, because students’ German is not strong enough. His students also expressed their preference for receiving the feedback in English so that they get the message as clearly as possible.

4.2.2.4 Systematicity of feedback

Kate uses two grading rubrics in her class: one for grading the translation assignments proper, and the other for grading essay assignments (see Figures 7-A/B). Kate feels upset about the ‘bitter’ fact that there is no widely accepted rubric for grading translation and that existing rubrics have their own weaknesses. How many points should be given or taken for a translation error is always a touchy and challenging task for Kate. The rubric she uses for translation is one that she originally developed for her own translation company, and it is inspired by the ATA framework. Since her company’s rubric is professional-oriented, she adjusted it slightly to suit her academic class. The adjusted rubric by itself may still look perplexing to students, so she thoroughly explains it to them from the beginning of the course and provides further written comments on their work to make it more formative. “Feedback doesn’t necessarily rely on rubrics, but you need them to give grades to students, and that’s how university works,” admitted Kate. She assumes that no matter how comprehensive the rubric is, there will always be the subjective ‘I’ of the evaluator. What she focuses on, especially being a professional practitioner who proofreads the work of professional translators, is thinking of students’ translations as another translation job and commenting the same way she comments on any other translator’s work. Kate’s students, on the other side, mentioned that they found the rubric useful particularly during the midterm project when they needed to translate a long ST for a real client. In that project, they were given a rubric to ensure they meet the expectations of the client. However, with the weekly assignments (consisting of short business correspondence), students were not given any rubrics to follow. One student wished that there was a rubric for those assignments as well, but he did not know how feasible it
would be. Both of her students noted that they definitely care about the comments more than the grade. “Well for this (practice) class, since I want to be a translator, I need the feedback more than the grade, I want to learn something, because this is what I’m going do in my whole life, I wouldn’t care if it’s for another class,” one student emphasized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The midterm will be assessed on the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ability to write business correspondence in Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Effective project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TEP (translation, editing, proofreading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adherence to all the “helpful” material covered in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Completeness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Please note that regardless of this rubric, it is crucial to submit a completed project. For example, if the translation is not “certified” by the translator and notarized by the Notary Public, it’s useless and the client will not be able to use it. Failure to submit a completed project might result in you losing the client and this law firm is a potential client of yours.) | 10% |
| 6. Timely submission |
(Please note that regardless of this rubric, submission by the deadline is crucial. Failure to do so might result in you losing the client and this law firm is a potential client of yours.) | 10% |

**Figure 7-A: Kate’s grading rubric for midterm translation project**

| 1. Cohesive narrative | 18% out of 20% |
| 2. Grammar: |
| Tenses | 8% out of 10% |
| Punctuation | 2% out of 5% |
| Style | 4% out of 5% |
| 3. Argumentativeness | 14% out of 15% |
| 4. Use of reading materials or any other applicable literature | 15% out of 15% |
| 5. Completeness | 10% out of 10% |
| 6. Creativity | 10% out of 10% |
| 7. Timely submission | 10% out of 10% |

**Figure 7-B: Kate’s grading rubric for essay assignments**
Sarah, too, uses a grading rubric that she adopted from the pedagogy course she took in her doctoral studies. She presumed that the rubric is clear to her students; they are given the rubric ahead of time, along with an explanation of what each grade means as well as an answer key to the rubric (see Figure 8). Sarah noted that the rubric by itself does not provide detailed
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Figure 8: Sarah's grading rubric and correction key
feedback, thus she often includes additional comments to leave no chance for confusion. For example, if the error is strictly terminological, she would write ‘TY’ and students would know that the term does not fit; but if it is a term that does not collocate, she would add an additional comment saying ‘collocational issue’ so that they would know what she means. Sarah tries to be as clear and forward with her comments as she can on top of providing the marking. She still feels that students care about the grade more than the comments. Students somehow associate success with grades, so if they get a decent grade, it means they have learned well and accomplished something. “It is a grade-driven culture,” Sarah reasoned. Sarah’s students, however, had a somewhat different perspective. In the interview, they expressed their interest in the comments more than the grade, but conceded that the grade is important because it reflects how well they did, and, overall, affects their GPA. Moreover, one student noted that, generally, the rubric can be frustrating if the instructor uses it to impose a subjective viewpoint:

S1: Generally, I don’t like rubrics because translation is not an exact science; sometimes you might say something and I might say something else and both are all okay. Of course if I did something wrong I want you to tell me, especially if it’s the opposite of what’s in the textbook, but sometimes it’s more like a subjective thing. And I think what’s more important than the grade is the feedback because it’s what makes us learn, but still we have to have a way to grade us, so until someone invents a better way for grading, I guess we’ll have to use rubrics.

Emily does not use any specific rubric for grading students’ translations. She explained that back when she was being trained to teach, the use of rubrics was not a common practice. When she started teaching, she mainly did what her professors did, and tried to avoid what she thought did not work. Thus, she developed her teaching approach mainly from experience. The scattered workshops she attended and articles she read on trainer training made her realize how important rubrics are, but she does not think she is an expert at making one herself. Now that she saw problematic issues in teaching translation classes, she felt a need for a grading rubric, and the more advanced the students, the more the rubric she felt was needed. With a clear and specific rubric, students can quickly see what the instructor’s reaction to their translation is. They can see
in a concrete way some of the negative and positive patterns in their work. Emily still explains to students what constitutes major and minor errors and briefly clarifies these categories in the course syllabus and in class (see Figure 9). So, in addition to using basic correction terms (e.g., WW for wrong word, PL for plural, etc.), she underlines the error and indicates if it is minor using one asterisk (*) or major using two asterisks (**). She deducts points accordingly and gives the total grade based on the number of major and minor errors. Emily assumed that her grading criteria are not specific enough to be a rubric and that she will work on developing it further for future classes. She also found that students care about grades more than the substance of feedback. Her students, however, noted that they care more about the comments and that Emily’s major-minor error grading is reasonable and straightforward.

![HOW I GRADE YOUR PAPERS](image)

As a certified member of the ATA, Thomas uses a color-coded system that is based on the ATA framework for standardized error marking (see Figure 10). Thomas’ assessment method is twofold. First, he marks up the translation using colored codes that indicate the severity of error. He also includes numbers for footnotes: the more severe the error, the longer the footnote.
Thomas’ least feedback, which he believed rarely happens, contains lighter colors indicating minor errors such as capitalization and punctuation, and no footnotes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Framework for Standardized Error Marking</strong></th>
<th><strong>Explanation of Error Categories</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addition:</strong> (A): An addition error occurs when the translator introduces superfluous information or stylistic effects. Candidates should generally resist the tendency to insert “clarifying” material. Explicitation is permissible. Explicitation is defined as “A translation procedure where the translator introduces precise semantic details into the target text for clarification or due to constraints imposed by the target language that were not expressed in the source text, but which are available from contextual knowledge or the situation described in the source text.” (Translation Terminology, p. 139)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambiguity:</strong> (AMB): An ambiguity error occurs when either the source or target text segment allows for more than one semantic interpretation, where its counterpart in the other language does not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capitalization:</strong> (C): A capitalization error occurs when the conventions of the target language concerning upper and lower case usage are not followed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohesion:</strong> (COH): A cohesion error occurs when a text is hard to follow because of inconsistent use of terminology, misuse of pronouns, inappropriate conjunctions, or other structural errors. Cohesion is the network of lexical, grammatical, and other relations which provide formal links between various parts of a text. These links assist the reader in navigating within the text. Although cohesion is a feature of the text as a whole, graders will mark an error for the individual element that disrupts the cohesion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diacritical marks / Accents:</strong> (D): A diacritical marks error occurs when the target-language conventions of accents and diacritical marks are not followed. If incorrect or missing diacritical marks obscure meaning (sense), the error is more serious.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faithfulness:</strong> (F): A faithfulness error occurs when the target text does not respect the meaning of the source text as much as possible. Candidates are asked to translate the meaning and intent of the source text, not to rewrite it or improve upon it. The grader will carefully compare the translation to the source text. If a “creative” rendition changes the meaning, an error will be marked. If recasting a sentence or paragraph—i.e., altering the order of its major elements—destroys the flow, changes the emphasis, or obscures the author’s intent, an error may be marked.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faux ami:</strong> (FA): A faux ami error occurs when words of similar form but dissimilar meaning across the language pair are confused. Faux amis, also known as false friends, are words in two or more languages that probably are derived from similar roots and that have very similar or identical forms, but that have different meanings, at least in some contexts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar:</strong> (G): A grammar error occurs when a sentence in the translation violates the grammatical rules of the target language. Grammar errors include lack of agreement between subject and verb, incorrect verb tenses or verb forms, and incorrect declension of nouns, pronouns, or adjectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illegibility:</strong> (ILL): An illegibility error occurs when graders cannot read what the candidate has written. It is the candidate’s responsibility to ensure that the graders can clearly discern what is written. Candidates are instructed to use pen or dark pencil and to write firmly enough to produce legible photocopies. Deletions, insertions, and revisions are acceptable if they do not make the intent unclear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecision: (IND)</td>
<td>An <strong>indecision</strong> error occurs when the candidate gives more than one option for a given translation unit. Graders will not choose the right word for the candidate. Even if both options are correct, an error will be marked. More points will be deducted if one or both options are incorrect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literalness: (L)</td>
<td>A <strong>literalness</strong> error occurs when a translation that follows the source text word for word results in awkward, unidiomatic, or incorrect renditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistranslation: (MT)</td>
<td>A <strong>mistranslation</strong> error occurs when the meaning of a segment of the original text is not conveyed properly in the target language. “Mistranslation” includes the more specific error categories described in separate entries. Mistranslations can also involve choice of prepositions, use of definite and indefinite articles, and choice of verb tense and mood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstanding: (MU)</td>
<td>A <strong>misunderstanding</strong> error occurs when the grader can see that the error arises from misreading a word, for example, or misinterpreting the syntax of a sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission: (O)</td>
<td>An <strong>omission</strong> error occurs when an element of information in the source text is left out of the target text. This covers not only textual information but also the author’s intention (irony, outrage). Missing titles, headings, or sentences within a passage may be marked as one or more errors of omission, depending on how much is omitted. <strong>Implicitation</strong> is permissible. Implicitation is defined as “A translation procedure intended to increase the economy of the target text and achieved by not explicitly rendering elements of information from the source text in the target text when they are evident from the context or the described situation and can be readily inferred by the speakers of the target language.” (Translation Terminology, p. 145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation: (P)</td>
<td>A <strong>punctuation</strong> error occurs when the conventions of the target language regarding punctuation are not followed, including those governing the use of quotation marks, commas, semicolons, and colons. Incorrect or unclear paragraphing is also counted as a punctuation error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register: (R)</td>
<td>A <strong>register</strong> error occurs when the language level or degree of formality produced in the target text is not appropriate for the target audience or medium specified in the Translation Instructions. Examples of register errors include using everyday words instead of medical terms in a text intended for a medical journal, translating a text intended to run as a newspaper editorial in legalese, using the familiar rather than the polite form of address, and using anachronistic or culturally inappropriate expressions. <strong>Register</strong> is defined as “A property of discourse that takes into account the nature of relationships among speakers, their socio-cultural level, the subjects treated and the degree of formality and familiarity selected for a given utterance or text.” (Translation Terminology, p. 172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling: (SP)</td>
<td>A <strong>spelling/character</strong> error occurs when a word or character in the translation is spelled/used incorrectly according to target-language conventions. A spelling/character error that causes confusion about the intended meaning is more serious and may be classified as a different type of error using the Flowchart and Framework. If a word has alternate acceptable spellings, the candidate should be consistent throughout the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style: (ST)</td>
<td>A <strong>style</strong> error occurs when the style of the translation is inappropriate for publication or professional use as specified by the Translation Instructions. For example, the style of an instructional text should correspond to the style typical of instructions in the target culture and language, or the temper of a persuasive essay may need to be toned down or amplified in order to achieve the desired effect in the target language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Syntax: (SYN) | A **syntax** error occurs when the arrangement of words or other elements of a sentence does not conform to the syntactic rules of the target language. Errors in this category include improper modification, lack of parallelism, and unnatural word order. If incorrect syntax changes or obscures the
meaning, the error is more serious and may be classified as a different type of error using the Flowchart and Framework.

**Terminology:** (T): A **terminology** error occurs when a term specific to a special subject field is not used when the corresponding term is used in the source text. This type of error often involves terms used in various technical contexts. This also applies to legal and financial contexts where words often have very specific meanings. In more general texts, a terminology error can occur when the candidate has not selected the most appropriate word among several that have similar (but not identical) meanings.

**Unfinished:** (UNF): A substantially **unfinished** passage is not graded. Missing titles, headings, or sentences within a passage may be marked as one or more errors of omission, depending on how much is omitted.

**Usage:** (U): A **usage** error occurs when conventions of wording in the target language are not followed. Correct and idiomatic usage of the target language is expected.

*Figure 10: Thomas’ rubric (ATA framework for standardized error marking)*

Thomas noted that, as a rule, he never compares a student’s translation to a model translation. Occasionally, however, he might read a student’s translation and compares it with his or her first draft to see what changes the student has actually made. Most often, he simply compares the translation to the ST and edits instantly. Next, Thomas uses a spreadsheet rubric that does the calculation of the errors and creates a score for each translation. The spreadsheet automatically creates a distribution chart of students’ errors cumulatively over the semester so that students can see graphically in what areas they have the most weakness (see Figure 11). In the final project, students only get ungraded color-coded marking without additional footnotes; it is students’ job to figure out the kind of error and revise their work. When they submit their final version of the project, they only get a final grade. Thomas believed that his feedback and grading method is not that complicated and that his students understand it well. Grade is part of the feedback, and American students are grade-focused. It is part of the American educational culture, he theorized. The great aspect about this rubric, he asserted, is that it was designed by professionals, not academics. He admitted, though, that this marking process is time consuming, but it helps him provide detailed feedback to students.
Figure 11: Selected samples of Thomas’ grading illustrative sheets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data points</th>
<th>E S C 2 R 4</th>
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<th>BI</th>
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<th>Total errors</th>
<th>Total points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thomas’ students, on the other hand, indicated that they care about both the grade and comments, especially if the latter arrives a little earlier. They concurred that the color-coded system is quite “interesting” and “useful,” even though they needed some time to get used to it:

S1: I like the color codes! The first time you see them they look pretty confusing and alarming, you’d see all those colors and you’re like ‘Oh God I did everything wrong, what am I gonna do!’ But actually we had it both this semester and last semester, so I’m already used to it, and I think it’s useful and it helps me realize what I need to go over when I review my translation, especially when it’s combined with further footnotes, you immediately realize what the problem is and go and fix it. I also look at the feedback to see if I made any progress at all, although the diagram that shows my weakness areas is kinda frightening, but I kinda like it, it feels kinda objective. I like it also because I feel that the professor wants to prepare us for the ATA exam so he wants us to get used to its evaluation system, that’s how I think of it. If I’m gonna take the exam, I wanna know how they’re evaluating my work.

4.2.2.5 Instructor-student roles

Kate maintained that instructors would always be a higher authority over their students and ‘democracy’ in the classroom is more of a ‘utopia.’ However, she believed that a teacher-centered classroom, where students just sit and listen, is not recommended, either. She personally is more inclined to a student-as-a-partner atmosphere, but would even take it to a ‘professional’ level, where students are treated as professional translators and the teacher as their client. Students are always welcome to negotiate instructor’s feedback and disagree with the teacher as long as they defend their translation choices. Kate randomly assigns materials from her own translation projects, and tries to prepare them before the course starts. These texts have to represent professional business texts and to address the thematic component she gives to students (e.g., business correspondence, request letters, recommendation letters, etc.). She has never allowed students to select the STs themselves, but she thought it would be interesting to do so once or twice as a way of involving students in the tasks. In Kate’s perspective, the ‘professional world’ provides the most effective source of feedback, the instructor and student peers come second as equally important, and self-feedback comes last. Her students noticed that Kate is a “super
organized person” who “takes feedback seriously,” which, in turn, makes them care about her feedback and take it seriously.

Most of the translation activities that Sarah implements in her class are collaborative. She usually tells students that the work they do is reflective of how they would operate if they were working with other practitioners in a professional environment. “This teaches them responsibility, accountability, and teamwork,” according to Sarah. The texts to be translated are usually of her choosing. She usually chooses texts that have been proven as authentic texts; either from the course textbook or ones that she herself has translated for a real client (both have a written permission from the client). Students are given the opportunity to choose their final texts, which reflects what their interests are after they have been exposed to different text types and subject areas. Sarah also wants students to realize that selecting a text they like does not mean translating it will be easy, which is why she has to approve it beforehand and make sure that it is challenging enough. Students should be enabled to express their views also concerning the instructor’s teaching method, argued Sarah, because this can improve the course as a whole. Some parts of the curriculum that are critical to students’ knowledge of the field still have to be covered, whether students like it or not. Students indicated that Sarah asks them to deal with her as a ‘client’ and to convince her of their translation choices. Students assume the role of professional translators so often that they give themselves brand names:

S1: My friend, who I’m always partner with in the translation projects, and I jokingly made our translation company because we work together so often, and we gave it a name (our last names combined). Now every time we turn in a translation assignment we sign it with our name as if it was a real company!

Although Emily stated that she “does not put much stock in concepts like democratic classroom,” she still believed that having a dialogue in class is helpful to her as an instructor before it is to students. She admitted that she frequently learns new ideas from her undergraduate students, especially when it comes to the Internet and social media. She is aware of the kind of
collaborative translation workshop where students work together and take different roles (e.g., translator, editor, proofreader, reporter, etc.), and thought it can be effective in enhancing translation skills. She expressed the opinion that young instructors were lucky to have graduated from classes where plenty of collaboration and interaction took place. In her case, she was trained to teach English language, not translation, and the kind of classroom she attended was ‘traditional’ where students “merely sat and listened to a professor.” Now as an instructor, she does not perform any collaborative projects and does most of the talking in class. In class, she usually sits at her desk and hardly ever stands during the class, let alone roams among students. She also assigns the texts for translation tasks and does not involve students in the selection process. She feels that her students do not see themselves as professional translators because their language skills are not high. Nevertheless, she does her best to activate students in class by asking them read their translations leading them to answers instead of giving them a model translation.

Thomas’ attitude in class is to treat students as ‘beginning colleagues.’ They work together in the same field, trying to make the translation as excellent as it can be. He believed in Krashen’s ‘affective filter’ in language learning where if the learner is tense, uptight, nervous, or unhappy in class, he or she will hardly learn anything. Thomas, therefore, tries to maintain a positive rapport by making the classroom atmosphere relaxed and friendly (see Note 1, Appendix A-8). He particularly does so because he will have to correct their errors and to tell them that they are ‘wrong.’ He assumed that his main job is to make them proficient translators, which means they might not always feel comfortable. He has to give them grades because otherwise they would not take the assignments seriously. He decides what and how they should learn because he believes “undergraduate students don’t know what they don’t know.” Their language proficiency and experience in translation are severely limited. They are too young in the field to know what an appropriate text is or how they should be evaluated. Therefore, he often selects the texts for the translation tasks, and only occasionally does he allow students to suggest the topic or length of the ST. The texts he selects are usually from his own translation projects; they have to be relevant...
to the topic of the class, and at a level where students can translate. The texts may get harder gradually. His students admitted that they found Thomas somewhat ‘intimidating’ at first with his wide experience and ‘overconfident’ remarks, but they felt more comfortable as they became acquainted with his personality. They noticed that even though he does most of the talking in class, there are always opportunities to intervene and ask questions or comments whenever they need.

4.2.3 Shaping feedback: Delivery and focus dimension

4.2.3.1 Mode of feedback

In every workshop, Kate secures students’ permission to project their translations and discuss their problematic issues. Students get a chance to comment on each other’s work, if it is an individual project. Kate found this verbal process to be relatively easy, since she only had two students (see Appendix A-5). She admitted that she does not know what will happen if she has 20 students or more in the class. After the class, Kate adds specific written comments on each student’s work and sends it back to students. When students receive their written and verbal feedback, they may resubmit as many drafts as they want. Resubmission is optional for students, not mandatory. Although Kate usually responds quickly to resubmission and may go back and forth with a student multiple times on one translation, she notifies students that her response to resubmission depends on how busy her schedule is.

Sarah, with her relatively large class, has a slightly different approach to feedback than Kate. Sarah first assigns a translation to students as groups, pairs, or individuals. Students are supposed to turn in their weekly assignments before the workshop. Sarah reviews all students’ translations and sees if there is any kind of general ‘themes’ that are apparent. Then, in class, she starts the workshop by asking students as a whole to talk about the challenges with which they struggled the most. This kind of general feedback, according to Sarah, is done verbally while
students are workshopping the translation, and its duration depends on how active students’ participation is (see Appendix A-6). After class, since students differ in their writing style, skills level, and language abilities, Sarah provides each student with written comments on his or her work and an ‘initial’ grade. Students are expected to turn in a revised version based on the whole-class discussion and the written individualized comments. Sarah mandates that students turn in a revised version of their work before she gives her final grade on the assignment. In the past, resubmission was optional in Sarah’s class, but she noticed that some students, when they got a grade, would be content with it and would not resubmit. Hence, she made it mandatory, and still grades both first and revised versions, so that students get an idea of where they stand and take the feedback more seriously.

Emily’s students are assigned a text to translate at home and come prepared to talk over it in class. They are not required to turn in a first draft, but they are expected to have it ready for a whole-class discussion. In class, Emily would first display the ST and start a general discussion about the characteristics of the text as well as the intended brief of the TT (see Excerpts 1-3, Appendix A-7). The discussion would tackle the ST line by line, paragraph by paragraph, with students taking turns reading their suggested translations. When a student proposes a translation, Emily would turn to the rest of the class and ask them if they have something different or would like to add any comments. Emily makes sure every student gets to be the reader, so that no one person dominates the discussion or exclusively volunteers her work. Emily does not necessarily know whether students have done their homework at home or not, but occasionally someone would admit that she did not do this part of the text, so Emily would then move to another student. After they go through the whole text, which may take more than one workshop, students take their class feedback home, revise their translation, and turn in a final translation in a hard copy. When Emily receives their final copies, she prints them out, goes through each individual paper, and handwrites her comments. Emily described her written feedback as ‘too thorough.’
For every translation task, Thomas assigns his students a text to translate at home and turn in a first draft before or, maximum, at the start of the workshop. Thomas does not look at these copies before the workshop or write down any comments; he always says, “Life is too short to look at too many draft translations!” In class, he puts all translations up on the screen, then he comments on them live. “I guess this maybe my own talent that I can sight-translate quite well,” he asserted, “and sight editing is even easier!” He estimated that the verbal feedback he gives in class constitutes a third of the total amount of feedback he provides to students. Thomas’ workshop is a sort of round robin; he cycles through students’ translations, each student gets a turn (i.e., with four students, each student often gets every fourth sentence, and so on). Meanwhile, students have their drafts right in their computers, and they can fix or write down notes while the discussion goes on. When the instructor examines a specific student’s text, other students compare their own drafts with the ST and with the TT on the screen (which is someone else’s), see where it matches and where it does not, and make decisions of what is ‘correct’ or not. At any time during the discussion, students may interrupt and comment about their classmate’s translation or ask specific questions about their own drafts. Thomas types on screen the suggested translation of each sentence based on the whole-class discussion, and may delete and re-type several times until everyone feels content with the outcome. Eventually, students have to keep track while workshopping throughout the whole text to where there might be problems, and uses that (verbal) feedback later in their revision process. Thomas speculated that if it were a bigger class, things might have been managed differently. After they workshop the whole text, students go home, revise their drafts, and turn in a final version. Afterward, Thomas sends students individual written feedback in which he corrects their respective errors using his color-coded marking and illustration, and assigns a final grade (see Figure 12). In the final project, he only highlights students’ errors in their first draft and gives a final grade on their final draft.
4.2.3.2 Error treatment

Although Kate’s two students have different language abilities (one is more advanced than the other), they both need feedback on punctuation, grammar, word choice, style, and other language skills in both the SL and TL. Kate indicated that she does not have a particular way of treating recurring errors, other than keep providing verbal and written feedback to students. She had to devote a whole class that was not in the syllabus to explain basic English grammar to the weaker student. In her written comments, she does not give out the answers readily. Using the track-
changes feature in MS Word, she poses Socratic questions frequently to encourage students to defend their translations. If it is an obvious error, such as capitalization, she would directly correct it adding a further comment in the margin. Some of her comments require students to carry our further research, such as “Elevate register, look for parallel texts, and check the source.” (See Figure 13)

Figure 13: Selected samples of Kate’s written feedback (1-2)
Figure 13: Selected samples of Kate’s written feedback (2-2)
Kate believed that students learn more effectively if they make effort in correcting their mistakes. She also had her students translate for a real law firm in the midterm project, and outsourced their translation to two professional proofreaders who provided feedback without knowing that the translators were students. She wanted students to get a taste of what professional feedback looks like. Kate’s students noted that they struggle most with register and terminology (of legal documents). “We don’t have fancy English words that much,” one student put it simply. The other student concurred and emphasized, “Even though I came to the US when I was four, and I speak English fluently, I have a hard time just picking the right register and the legal terminology; they’re completely different from common everyday English.”

Sarah noticed that many of her students struggle with comprehension. There is a great deal of intra-language issues; students are stuck between the SL and TL because they do not understand the ST quite well. This is mostly due to their lack of a fully developed language, since most of the students have not lived in a Spanish-speaking country. Their language competencies are weak overall, and this leads to literal rendition as well as major grammatical errors. A harder problem that her students face is terminology, which requires specific research skills. Depending on the type of error, Sarah may give direct instructions and possible solutions, such as “Try this term, literal translation, intra-language, etc.,” or simply put a smiley face meaning ‘okay.’ Most frequently, she gives leading remarks that help students contextualize the sentence, such as “Look at the context, read the ST out loud, read your translation out loud, think about what it is that you’re trying to say, read the previous sentence, how does this fit in, etc.,” all using the track-changes mode. Occasionally, she makes inquiry to which students may need to justify their choices, for example, “What do you mean by this.” Error codes, such as Sty (style) V:Ty (vocabulary: terminology), seem to be the most common type of correction in Sarah’s written feedback. These codes specify the type of error but still require students to find out the appropriate form by themselves (see Figure 14).
General Information about the Living Will

What will this guide tell you?

This guide is to help Andalusian citizens complete their Living Will, a document that is also known as a Health Care Directive.

These documents let you express beforehand in writing your wishes and preferences to everyone concerning health care providers, so that they will know what treatment you wish to receive when you become ill and you cannot communicate your wishes.

This guide offers simple and quick information about how to fill out these documents and best express your will.

Additionally, it contains additional information so that you will know more about Living Wills and know services that are offered by the Registro de Voluntades Vitales Anticipadas de Andalucía (Office of Living Wills of Andalucía).

What is a Living Will?

Who can write a Living Will?

- The elderly.
- Younger people who are emancipated.
- People who are legally incapacitated, provided that this sentence of incapacitation does not impede, and they are in a state of ability at the moment of formalizing their Declaration.

- that are not clinically indicated
Example: “I would like you to take all possible measures to keep me alive, including things that have not been proven useful or have been experimental”

The health personal should respect your health preferences about the withdrawn or not indicated treatment. However, keep in mind that the professionals only start certain treatments, even if you asked for them in the Declaration, when they consider if they are clinically indicated.

How can I register my Living Will?

1. Talk with a health professional that you trust and with your representative or substitute person (if you chose one) about your health preferences. The Andalusian health professional has an obligation to provide you with information about Living Wills.

2. If you want, ask a health professional to help you in the process. Although in this guide you will find explanations about medical terms that are frequently used, a professional can give you more detailed explanations. That way you will be more sure of what you want to put in your Declaration.


overall very well done. Please see comments for specifics.

Grade: 9.5/10

Figure 14: Selected samples of Sarah’s written feedback
In her class, Emily has three students with varying language levels. The weakest student struggles with basic grammatical and syntactic issues in her native language (EN). She does not spell well and had rudimentary notions of punctuations as well as run-on sentences. The second student has a good command of the native language, but not so much in the source language (FR). She does not understand French enough to be an accurate translator, and still makes awkward mistakes, such as false cognates, even in the final draft. The third one may make many translation errors during the workshop, but uses the verbal discussion quite impressively to turn in almost a near-expert translation. They all have a major problem of misunderstanding the ST, and, therefore, mistranslating it. As a way of treating such errors, Emily tries to review the errors quickly in class when she hands the graded papers back to students, and specifically focuses on the problems that most students have. She also does not forget to talk about things that students do particularly well. In her written comments, she uses metalinguistic comments such as (*) for minor error, (**) for major error, and (WC) for word choice, along with rhetorical comments such as “What does this mean?” (See Figure 15)

Figure 15: Selected samples of Emily’s written feedback (1-2)
Another strategy Emily uses is to ask students to find parallel texts and make use of them when they translate. She mandates that they post to her the links of the parallel texts they used for every translation task (see Excerpt 4, Appendix A-7). Emily’s students indicated that they struggle most with L2 sentence structure and collocation and that they need more feedback on use of dictionaries and online search.

Thomas considered additions, omissions, and terminology as the most typical errors that his students make. He maintained that students need more SL (German) competence, and they need to study abroad. Students simply lack experience in the SL and its culture. With recurring error types, he provides feedback in the footnotes of students’ written assignments reminding
them of specific strategies that he always brings up in the workshops. These footnotes often contain direct corrections (see Figure 16).

We continue developing ourselves for you
Caring, competent and always friendly – this is our team. At the Apollo Apotheke pharmacy, you will find employees from five countries and they will help you get better as fast as possible.

Advice is our most important product
Just like you, we also have to continually adjust to new laws and costs in the health care system. However, our goal to advise customers to the best of our knowledge and belief will not change.

Place your trust in us and ask us whatever you want to know about us, so we can do the best for you and accurately tailor our advice to your needs. Our team has specialized in diseases like diabetes, asthma, AIDS and allergies for years.

You can count on us
Successful treatment is the result of good cooperation between the patient, doctor and pharmacy. The more uncomplicated and openly all parties communicate among each other, the faster decisions can be made or corrected if necessary.

We are your doctor’s favorite trusted partner and advisor for questions regarding dosage or side effects of a drug, or in case you are interested in advice on patient oriented treatment. If high-quality individual medication preparation is required as part of your treatment, we can manufacture it in our modern laboratory.

We can get imported pharmaceuticals within a short period of time.

In addition to the medications prescribed by your doctor, here in our pharmacy we can recommend several options to support your healing process and enhance your well-being. If you are interested in the possibility of homeopathic treatment, we will gladly discuss it with you.

---

1 There’s one big mistranslation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total error points:</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>Text:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality points:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Apollo-Apotheke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined score:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Number of words:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length factor (Number of words / 250):</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted error points (Combined score / length factor):</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score (100 - Adjusted error points):</td>
<td>164.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>91.15%</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 MT 2 – Shift in focus. The ST says the employees are there for you, which is much more of a personal message than you will find.
3 SP 1 – continually
4 I see the implication of auch in Zukunft.
5 T 2 – from us. The ST could be ambiguous, but in this context, it’s not about the Apotheke, it’s about healthcare and diseases.
6 SP 1 – allergies.
7 Or more straightforwardly
8 MU 8 – This is a serious shift from the ST, which focuses on the patient. Keep the information flow and orientation similar to the ST. If you have questions about dosage or side effects of a medication, or if you are interested in patient-oriented treatment, we are always happy to be your doctor’s trusted partner and consultant.
9 WF/SP 2 – This is, I think, advisor.
10 Or customized.

Figure 16: Selected samples of Thomas’ written feedback (1-3)
We continue to advance ourselves for you

Caring, competent, and always friendly – that is our team. At the Apollo-Apotheke, our employees from five nations are there for you to help you get healthy as fast as possible.

Advise is our most important product

Not only you, but we as well have to continually adjust to new laws and costs in healthcare. However, our goal to advise our clients to the best of our knowledge and beliefs will never change.

Place your trust in us and ask us whatever you would like to know, so that we can do our best to fine-tune our advice exactly to your needs. Our team has specialized in diseases such as diabetes, asthma, AIDS, and allergies for many years.

You can count on us

Successful treatment is the result of good cooperation between the patient, the doctor, and the pharmacy. The less complicated and more openly all those involved communicate, the faster decisions can be made or corrected when necessary.

If there are questions about the dosage or side effects of a medication or if you are interested in patient-oriented treatment advice, we are a competent partner and consultant to your doctor. If high-quality individual drug preparations are required in the course of your treatment and we produce them in our modern laboratory.

We can get imported medications within a very short span of time.

In addition to the medications prescribed by your doctor, at our pharmacy, we can recommend several options to you that support your healing and enhance your well-being. Should you be interested in the possibility of homeopathic treatment, we would be happy to discuss that with you.

---

1 A lot of little things pull you down.

2 O 2 – I think you need to explicate pharmacy here.

3 WF 2 – advice.

4 SP 1 - advise

5 U 1 – This set phrase is always singular.

6 SP 1 – either with a hyphen (fine-tune) or a space (fine tune).

7 You need to know the difference between advice (noun) and to advise (verb).

8 G 1 – It's an adverb, needs an -ly ending.

9 Or focused

10 O 4 – Missing immer gern = always happy to be

11 Or customized

12 SY 2 – No and here. ..treatment, we... 

13 R 1 – quickly.

14 Or healing process

Figure 16: Selected samples of Thomas' written feedback (2-3)
CONDENSING BOILER TECHNOLOGY – GENERAL INFORMATION

WHAT IS CONDENSING BOILER TECHNOLOGY?

The combustion of natural gas produces the physical combustion reaction of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and water (H₂O). The water produced in case of regular combustion exists in exhaust gas in 3/4 vapor state. This water vapor is cooled to below the dew point in condensing boiler technology. It produces a liquid condensate. The heat is released in this conversation. This additional amount of heat supplies the heating system.

WHY IS CONDENSING BOILER TECHNOLOGY SO INEXPENSIVE?

The combustion of natural gas combines the hydrogen contained in fuel with the oxygen from the combustion air into water vapor. This water vapor contains caloric energy that is lost with conventional heating systems through the hot exhaust gas via the fireplace.

On the other hand, condensing boilers use this energy as the water vapor is cooled to the point that the steam turns into water again. This process is also known as condensation. The heating system’s return temperature is normally used to cool the water vapor. In order for this effect to function, the return water temperature must be under 57°C, because water vapor will become water again only below this temperature point. This is how condensing boilers reach efficiency rates of up to 110.2%.

GAS CONDENSING BOILER TECHNOLOGY

The gas condensing boiler technology works with an operating technology adjusted from the ambient temperature. Here as a result, water condensation is not prevented, but rather in principle, a gas boiler can be adapted to every property. Renewable energies (solar heat, heat pumps, etc.) especially benefit from the lower temperature levels at which this gas boiler works. Basically, the heating value can be divided into open flue operation and balanced flue operation. Open flue operation of a gas boiler is suitable for an environment that is not constantly used as a lounge. These environments include, in most cases, boiler rooms, equipment rooms or underutilized basements. Balanced flue operation of a gas heater is especially useful if there is not a suitable location available, like a boiler room with safe air supply.

FACTS AND FIGURES ABOUT CONDENSING BOILER TECHNOLOGY

The energy contained in a fuel is supplied to heating system without loss in the form of caloric energy. A small sample calculation illustrates efficiency rates of over 100% in condensing boilers: Natural gas losses up to 11% of energy if the energy from the water vapor is not used. Otherwise, a maximum of 11% additional energy can be used if the heat bound to the water vapor is used. In other words, the caloric energy from the water vapor is also used in addition to the 100% maximum convertible energy. Efficiency rate = 100% + 11% caloric energy from water vapor.

CONDENSING BOILER TECHNOLOGY IN NEW AND OLD BUILDINGS

Condensing boiler technology can be used efficiently in both new and old buildings.

---

1 Nice.
2 Needs an article.
3 For flow of information, this needs to come first.
4 Es is a dummy subject here. Get rid of it and the Kondensate is the subject.
5 No article in ST.
6 ST is passive.
7 Yes, but the sentence flows better with the preposition from the ST here.
8 Missing rest of sentence.
9 Bet Gas-Brennwert is a prepositional phrase and refers to the technology.
10 Into.
11 Different meaning of sicher.
12 Needs an article.
13 This is contrastive in a different way.
In his verbal feedback, Thomas rarely gives direct answers; instead, he gives leading questions such as “Did you consider this, why did you pick this, what was your strategy,” and the like (see Excerpts 1-3, Appendix A-8). He does this too in his written feedback on students’ drafts of the final projects. Thomas’ students noticed and appreciated his indirect manner in giving feedback:

S1: Yeah, he’ll say, for example, ‘this is a dative case you should keep this in mind’ and that’s almost like a cue, he’ll give you a little cue so that you know that something is wrong here you need to change it, so he’s not direct at all; he’s very indirect, almost like he doesn’t wanna give us the answer! Which is fine, I really like that, I think it’s good that I kind of critically think that way.

Thomas affirmed that he does not compare students to each other publically, as this is unacceptable in the American context. Comparison occurs naturally when discussing individual problems and everyone participates with random solutions.

4.2.3.3 Use of technology

Kate indicated that technology is strongly relevant in her translation class and that she cannot get by without it. Students send her their translations by email and she uses Word track-changes feature for commenting. She sends students links to useful websites from time to time, and always encourages students to do inter-lingual research with any term or word they do not fully understand. In class, she checks the Internet for anything that she has no answer for, which in itself a way to show students how a professional translator acts when faced with a translation problem. For final evaluation, she uses Excel sheets to fill up cumulative grades and send as PDFs to students. She has introduced the idea of corpus tools to her students and showed them how to use them, but she had not implemented them in translation workshops. She averred that online discussion forums are important teaching tools, but she had not experimented in them yet. She had not used Blackboard or Dropbox either, but she was considering ways to implement them in her class. Kate supposed that having only two students in class does not allow much room to diversify class activities. Had she had a larger class, she suggested that she would probably have
used a tool that collects all students’ translations in some way and combines major errors to show students in class, instead of looking at each translation individually.

“Technology encompasses a large part of our daily lives, and students are quite perceptive of it,” said Sarah. Bringing technology into the feedback process makes it more ‘realistic,’ according to Sarah, who always asks students to send her their translations in a Word document. She then uses both the comment and track-changes feature to enable students to trace her correction and respond, if need be, to additional remarks. She encourages students to use these features themselves, by, for instance, asking them to send her their final drafts leaving the track-changes enabled. She also asks students during workshops to email each other their work then proofread one another’s work. Each group or pair must use the track-changes mode when they edit translations so she can see the changes they have made in the original document. Sarah found that the use of technology in the feedback process allows instructors to avoid having a student not being able to read or follow the given comments. More importantly, a large part of the translation industry nowadays happens in cyber space, which means that students will be working with e-files when they deal with actual clients or with a team of translators. Students, therefore, should come to class as if they were going to work; they should bring their laptops and be ready to work on translations, research terminology, and communicate well with each other. Sarah had introduced some corpus tools to students but had not implemented any in her class activities. She did introduce the idea of online forums to students, but found most of them uncomfortable with it. Sarah complained about students using smartphones during class. She realized that they can use it to access dictionaries and online resources during group or pair work, so she allowed it in certain activities. Sarah’s students, too, assumed that it is vital to use technology, and liked the fact that Sarah allows them to bring to class the device they prefer, as long as they can use it to exchange documents and participate actively during workshops.

Emily is an instructor who “knows nothing about technology,” as she described herself. By technology, she was referring to CAT tools and electronic corpora. In her class, however, she does
use the OHP to display the ST and browse the Internet during the weekly workshops. She checks online resources when a term seems vague to students. She revealed that Wikipedia used to be a ‘bad word’ when it first came out, and that instructors thought they were supposed to tell students not to even use it. Nevertheless, she found that many academic and scientific entries are dependable and accurate, and that the reliability of such websites depends greatly on subject matter. She found many uses for these websites in her translation workshops; for example, when she teaches register, she would show students how to check the usage of a certain term in the parallel texts of these websites. As for automatic translation tools, such as Google Translate, they are strictly ‘taboo’ in her language classes, but in translation classes, these tools can be used to demonstrate various problematic issues in translation. Emily indicated though that she never exchanges documents through emails, but asks students to turn in their assignments in hard copies. Part of this is ergonomic, she explained, as she finds it terribly annoying to be tied to a computer screen for several hours, thus she prefers to grade translations with handwriting. Her students described her writing as “pretty easy to read in general, but occasionally there’s a couple of words that can hardly be read.” Students realized that further use of technology can be advantageous, yet they supposed it is not necessary. They believed that focusing on analyzing their translations, which is what Emily does, is more important.

Thomas supposed that computer tools are ‘indispensable’ in his translation workshops. Email is used not only for communication, but also for sending and receiving assignments. Written feedback includes Excel sheets of ATA point scale specifying the kind and seriousness of error, along with the students’ translations marked up in a Word document. In class, Thomas always has a browser open to make it clear to students that a) he makes mistakes, b) he does not necessarily always have the same “right” solution, and c) when stuck with a seeming problem, he can show students research strategies. Students at this stage are often not skilled in narrowing their queries to get relevant results from electronic search engines; thus, the workshop can be an excellent chance to enhance strategic and information search competence. Thomas does not use
Blackboard for this class, but he thinks seriously of using it for creating weekly pages with useful resources and links. This, he conceded, will be much more efficient for students to get to the materials they need in a fast, mechanical way. Conversely, however, he was not excited about implementing electronic discussion forums in the activities of this class. Based on his past experience, he found it extremely time consuming and annoying for the instructor and students to add such a task to their already-overloaded schedule. As a professional translator himself, Thomas preferred to concentrate on individual translation assignments, since translation, in his opinion, is fundamentally ‘solitary’ after all. Team translation almost never occurs in the real world, and no client would pay two translators to do a single text, he reasoned. Although Thomas’ students admired and liked his ‘thorough’ verbal and written feedback, they assumed that the use of Blackboard may help in making the feedback process faster and more organized. As a small group, students find it easy and helpful to communicate with each other outside the class through text messages and social networks.

4.2.3.4 Timing of feedback

Being a (graduate) student herself, Kate understands how it feels to get a late response from the instructor when one is in need of it. She feels lucky to have only two students in her class, which allowed her to respond to questions and concerns ‘extremely fast,’ as her students indicated. In her class, students are expected to submit their assignments before or at the start of the workshop session; she does not accept anything passes that time. Students get verbal feedback in the session and get a chance to ask for further details. Kate sends written feedback to students immediately after the session if the text is short and ‘easy,’ which is usually the case, she noted. If the text is a difficult one, the verbal portion of the feedback would be delayed and provided with the written portion in the next session, a week later. Thus, students’ translations must be discussed verbally first, and when the discussion is delayed, the written portion is delayed as well. Kate’s students expressed their admiration for the ‘very fast’ feedback she provides, and noted that they ‘hate it’
when it takes the instructor long to give feedback, making it difficult for them to remember what they have studied.

In Sarah’s class, students must deliver translation assignments on a Sunday, a day before the workshop, then, in the workshop on Monday, there is an immediate verbal discussion on the general overarching problems with which most students struggle. The individual written part of the feedback is also provided immediately after the workshop; it usually takes Sarah 5-6 hours during the day to respond. She tries to deliver the written feedback by Wednesday at the least so that students, who are already provided with verbal remarks, have until Friday to revise and resubmit their final drafts. On the final version, there is no feedback, only a grade. In a few instances, if she is still undecided about a student’s choice, she might tell the student to see additional comments and to revise and resubmit for the final grade.

For every translation assignment, Emily makes sure to first discuss the ST and translation brief in class then workshop the translation sentence by sentence. Even if they have two sentences left, she takes an extra day to workshop the rest of the text, because she does not like to ask students to go home and finish it themselves. Ideally, she would give back written comments to each student within a week of the class discussion. In practice, though, it may take two weeks or more, according to Emily. There are several reasons for delayed feedback. Students generally do not always turn in their deliverable translations together. One of Emily’s principles is to grade all the papers at the same time so that she maintains the same state of mind while working on papers as much as she can. She had to learn to be hard on students and not accept any late work, but she admitted that she “doesn’t have the heart to do so.” Students get sick and face unforeseen circumstances. Some of them have part-time jobs and live with other family members; they have adult responsibilities, and schoolwork is not always their highest priority. Furthermore, she herself feels so overwhelmed sometimes by the heavy teaching load that she cannot grade the assignments earlier. Emily’s students agreed that were written feedback provided more expeditiously it would be more helpful:
S1: For me I wish to get the feedback sooner because in a week or two I’m not gonna remember why I chose this sentence.
S2: Yeah I agree!
S1: …or like the reasons about the assessment on some phrases.
S2: We don’t get feedback on the translation until it is done basically, except for the final where we’re doing a rough draft which will be corrected or graded and then we get to revise it. On the workshops we talk about them together but we don’t get any written feedback (on the drafts) at all. She just gives us advice and we give each other advice then sometimes you think that your translation is perfect now, and then you turn it in and it’s not! And sometimes she doesn’t remember what she told you she liked one day, and if you put it in your translation she might not like it and then she grades it! So I’d like to have a rough draft and get feedback that’s not necessarily graded before turning in the final draft that’s graded.
Researcher: Don’t you think this is an extra burden?
S1: I think you learn better that way though.
S2: Yeah I like to do it that way, too. I think it’s extra work for the teacher actually! It’s more extra work for the professor than it is for the student.

In Thomas’ class, students often are assigned the translation task 3-4 days before the workshop. In class, it often takes 1-2 sessions (weeks) to finish workshopping the whole text. Students then have 5 days to turn in a final copy. Thomas then has two weeks to grade the final translations and give them back to students. In the course syllabus, he specifies that: “If you turn the first draft in, you get it back two weeks later.” This is the general rule that Thomas tries to adhere to, as long as he is on schedule and he has not been sick. Generally, he tries not to spend so much time on workshopping a text. If he notices a persistent problem for one student, he chops it off and asks the student to see him after class. Sometimes he has a weaker student’s translation that is full of basic grammatical errors. In such a case, he changes the direction of the discussion cycle and picks a different student’s translation, so that he saves other students’ time. Thomas’ timing of feedback was the issue that stood out as a major concern for his students. First, students complained about having fewer than 4 days to do the assignment:

S1: It says in the syllabus we have a whole week to do the assignment; we should be able to use that whole week and reevaluate umm… it’s like when I translate something, I translate it the first time and I take a couple of hours or a day or something, and I’ll go back and re-compare the two texts and make sure it’s the right translation, and I’ll do that over a few days, or sometimes it’s a long text that takes me few days just to get the one translation. And so we only have 2 days to do a translation, it’s very hard to put my best work in, so I’m not getting the appropriate feedback not because I didn’t know the right answer but because I didn’t put enough time to find a better answer.
Students also assumed that taking up to 4 weeks to receive the instructor’s written feedback could be frustrating, especially when the verbal feedback itself may take a couple of classes to be completely delivered:

S1: Like I said it’ll be a lot easier if everything, the verbal and written feedback, was done about the same time, because it’ll all sink at the same time, but because I’m going back to the written feedback almost a month later, it’s hard to remember why I was in that mindset, why I chose those words, why those things happen, etc. So just having everything happen at the same time is a lot better and more organized, and I’ll be able to refer back to those things those specific times and use it effectively.

S2: Yeah, personally, sometimes I forgot what translation I was given feedback on if the feedback was really late, but I guess that’s normal because you’re doing a translation after a translation and it’s expected that you forget the translation on which you get feedback. But it’d be better if we could get the feedback closer to when we did the workshop, but I understand it’s hard sometimes.

4.2.3.5 Regularity of feedback

Kate claimed that her feedback provision is regular and consistent. She provides written and verbal feedback on every single translation task that is assigned. Her two students are given written and verbal comments as long as they turn in their assignments, regardless of whether they ask for feedback or not. If her students submit revised versions, she would often respond promptly. This is the only class Kate teaches this semester, but she assumed she would follow the same approach to feedback in any practice class she teaches. She talks to other colleague instructors, but they do not necessarily discuss feedback. She expected, however, that their approach to feedback is different, and that it does not have to be the same. “It’d have been nice if we agreed on the same measurements of assessment,” she reported, “but it’s difficult to happen.” Her students indicated that having a small class felt ‘weird’ at first, but turned out to be quite helpful in that they had plenty of ‘one-on-one’ time with the instructor.

Sarah also provides feedback to all students who turn in their homework regardless of their interest in the feedback. She believed that it is up to students to consider her feedback or not, yet they still should be given the opportunity to receive feedback that could help them improve their work. Sarah assumed that she provides the same quality and quantity of feedback
in all the classes that she teaches, because she takes the same approach to feedback provision. The rubric she uses, though, may differ depending on the nature of the class (theoretical or practical), but she always insists on giving guided feedback to all students, because this is how they would learn their areas of weakness and how to improve them. Sarah indicated that she does not know about other instructors’ approach to feedback, as they rarely get together to talk about classes or exchange ideas in this regard. Her students noted, however, that resubmission of assignments is the unique aspect in Sarah’s approach to feedback:

S1: So, any of the classes I’ve ever taken has never required me to turn in a second copy with revision, they just give you feedback and they’re like “okay done, you don’t have to correct the mistakes that you’ve made,” so we’ve never learned from it, they just give us feedback and I’d skim over it and I’d be like “Okay this is the grade I got, there’s no chance I can get a better grade so I’m not gonna even look at it again.”

Emily thought that she provides regular and consistent amount of feedback to her students in all the classes that she teaches. She was aware of how other instructors approach feedback. Her fellow instructors are more comfortable with technology (e.g., using Blackboard), she noticed, and they correct on a computer screen, which means they keep a record of what they do. Since she provides handwritten feedback, she has no record of what she gives students once the papers return back to students. She also realized that some of the younger instructors are quite proficient at using rubrics, which she assumed has much to do with how they were educated in today’s schools. Her students felt that Emily’s feedback is ‘very’ consistent, but thought that other instructors give longer STs and, consequently, longer feedback.

Thomas was particularly assertive that his feedback is ‘identical’ across all practice classes he teaches, both at graduate and undergraduate levels. His students too acknowledged that his feedback is quite consistent. “He never rushes through the feedback, and you can tell that he enjoys correcting our translations,” one student noted. As for his theoretical classes, it is quite different. Thomas sees translation as a skill that can be learned by practicing, while theory is a body of knowledge that can be learned by reading and memorizing. Thus, for theoretical knowledge, he gives quizzes and essays, and provides feedback in terms of points-off and
occasional comments. He was certain that his feedback is different from other instructors’ feedback, mainly because most of them use a rubric other than the ATA’s. In his students’ view, Thomas discusses ‘everything’ in the text and asks direct questions to individual students, while other instructors often ask general questions and comment only on issues brought up by students. His feedback, therefore, is more ‘thorough’ but less immediate, they assessed.

4.2.4 Negotiating feedback: Interactional dimension

4.2.4.1 Feedback seeking

Kate indicated that her students do not need to ask for feedback because she provides it to them whenever they turn in an assignment. In her written feedback, she provides direct and indirect comments, along with a grade that can be improved if the student revises and resubmits. At the beginning of the semester, the weaker student in her class used to revise and resubmit with vague answers, so Kate instructed her to explain her translation choices and provide further examples. In this way, the student was involved not only in seeking further feedback, but also in responding actively to the feedback. Kate encourages students to take the feedback seriously by reminding them that she is willing to improve their grade as long as they argue their decisions convincingly.

It is Sarah’s routine to send out her feedback to students to say, “Review it and let me know if you have any questions.” Some students do occasionally ask questions, but the majority does not. Sarah assumed that this may be indicative of who cares about feedback and who does not. She supposed that her feedback is quite straightforward and students are comfortable with it. By the time they get her written feedback, they often have had an idea of where they erred since they have already received general (verbal) feedback in class and made some revision during the discussion. The whole-class feedback makes it considerably easier for students to complete the revision process with the individual written feedback. She also supposed that the questions she raises and/or responds to during the workshop, which in itself is a sort of in-process feedback, alleviates students of the need to ask additional questions. Sarah, nonetheless, affirmed that it is
the responsibility of the instructor to engage students in the feedback. It is the only way, she believed, the instructor can assess students’ knowledge and understanding, and guarantee that they are actually reading the feedback and thinking about their translation.

Although Emily encourages her students always to come and see her if they have any questions, they almost never do so. She speculated that this is because they usually make use of the class period and ask questions in class. The problem in this regard is that the questions are often about an individual student’s translation, and thus might not necessarily apply to others. What Emily does to compensate is to invite students to ask questions immediately when she gives them their papers back. She then allocates time to discuss some of the positive and negative choices that students have made. In this case, she would address the whole class without specifying a particular student, but each student will know their errors and can see her comments on the paper. Emily was still worried about weaker students who do not do well in their final versions and do not seem to care about improving their work. She supposed she might need to require of poorly performing students individual meetings outside of class to review corrections. Emily’s students suggested that they never felt timid or reluctant to ask or even disagree with her, but they found the class period sufficient for their further questions and thoughts.

Thomas indicated that his students rarely come to his office to ask for or negotiate feedback. Some students, particularly in the draft of the final project, might email him or come to his office to ask questions if they need assistance. The elaborate verbal and written feedback Thomas provides to all students who submit an assignment should satisfy their need for further assistance, he hoped. He also hoped, jokingly, that students do not have questions because they understand the feedback completely, not because they are ‘scared’ of him. While Thomas’ students expressed their total satisfaction with the quantity and quality of the feedback, one student did not find the instructor quite responsive outside the class. The student claimed that it often takes the instructor long time to respond to her emails. This, along with the instructor’s ‘opinionated’ personality, often discouraged the student from seeking further assistance.
4.2.4.2 Peer feedback

Kate has only two students, yet she considered peer review applicable and effective in her class. She often asks students to edit each other’s translation, and she found this activity to be ‘fascinating.’ Kate assumed that young people, particularly in Western cultures, do not always take advice from older people, especially instructors. In the minds of most students, instructors are there to give a grade, and everything else is irrelevant. Students, therefore, would rather take criticism from a classmate than from an instructor. In class, students are willing and responsive to work together, but sometimes they need encouragement. Her students found it ‘interesting’ to see their own translations side-by-side and compare the translation choices in each one. Sometimes each student is asked to come up with a translation brief and exchange it with the other classmate (see Excerpt 2, Appendix A-5). In individual projects, students are occasionally asked to send their translation to each other to edit and give feedback. In the midterm project, they worked together as a team outside the class. One student stated that peer feedback is useful because “it’s more casual and students can be very blunt to each other.” Kate noted that she does not expect from students a professional or advanced-level kind of peer evaluation, but simply an informal conversational discussion of the issues they face with translation. She surmised that students’ personality type may play a role on how active they are when they work with others.

Sarah is a strong advocate of peer feedback. She believed that it is particularly applicable to translation practice classes. She believed that it is common that a translator overlooks several intra-language issues in his or her own translation. Even if this translator revises the translation and reads it aloud, he or she might still fail to notice the parts that sound awkward or unnatural. Yet when another person reads that translation, this person is more likely to notice those problematic issues. Peer feedback is extremely important, Sarah assumed, because it allows students to work together and provide instant in-process feedback to one another. Hearing criticism from a colleague or friend is not as threatening as when it is from a professor. Sarah found peer feedback to be especially applicable in her class because she had three native speakers
of the L2 (ES), who would often give valuable insights to their peers when translating that direction, and receive the same when translating into the L1 (EN). In class, students often work together in teams and send their portion to one another (using Google Docs) for editing and revision (see Excerpt 3, Appendix A-6). When they work in pairs or groups, Sarah takes an active role by circulating around the class, closely observing, and assisting students. She often responds to a question by speaking loud enough so that other teams can hear and make note of the information if it applies to them. In other words, she tries to be “un-intrusively intrusive,” as she put it. With passive students, she tries to engage them by asking them questions or pair them up with an active student and have the passive student takes notes. Sarah’s students pointed out that peer feedback is quite helpful and every student in their class is willing to collaborate. They emphasized, however, that peer feedback cannot replace an instructor’s feedback:

S1: I think the responsibility of correcting things is the teacher’s in the first place not the peers, I go to class because I wanna learn from the professor not from... umm I like to know from my peers but I don’t wanna learn from them, because they’re as good as me, I don’t wanna depend a lot on them.

S2: I wouldn’t wanna depend on my peers to grade my work, I don’t mind peer editing as a part of the translation process, but I don’t want that to be the only part, I’d still want the teacher to revise my work.

Emily assumed that the whole-class workshop is itself an opportunity for students to translate and give peer feedback to one another. In the workshop, students seem to be responsive commenting occasionally and paying attention to the discussion. Emily’s students indicated that during workshops they write each other’s ideas and solutions if they ‘sound better’ than theirs. Emily has never done a group or pair activity, except once and it felt ‘awkward,’ as her students described it:

S1: There’s one time when she asked us to work in a group, and we felt that that was awkward because she was listening to everything we said and then she was like ‘okay what did you come up with?’

S2: Yeah, and then we said ‘you just heard it all!’
Students felt that they could do a group project, and were surprised that they did not. One student noted, however, that she likes to hear other students’ views in group work, but does not like to rely on their translation. Emily indicated that she is not quite certain how to implement pair or group work effectively in her tiny class. In her graduate class, one week she has students translate a text and turn it in for a grade, and the next week they discuss a text and translate it in class. On one occasion, her five graduate students suggested they work as one group, and the workshop turned to be highly productive. Hence, she considered implementing the same idea in the undergraduate class as well.

Thomas is a firm believer that peer feedback is not efficient. He hardly ever assigns any peer projects either in class or outside the class. He believed that at the undergraduate level in the US, where language proficiency is low, students are not competent to give peer feedback. Students are not capable linguistically to simply recognize translation errors, let alone explain them to others. They are slow translators and inexperienced. Thomas guessed that they operate at level one or two on a 0-5 level, they have not reached the professional level yet. There is often a disparity of levels in the class. In such a case, the weaker student will not be able to find the errors in the stronger student’s text, and the stronger student will not know what to do with the weaker student’s text because it is extremely poor. Thomas does not prefer peer work also because the professional practice is ‘solo’ by its nature, and students should be prepared for that reality. His students indicated that class discussions allow them to see how their classmates translated and why they chose specific words, which in itself helps them figure out whether they did ‘wrong’ or ‘right.’ They found it remarkably useful to collaborate outside the class and exchange “natural peer feedback,” as one student called it. Students wished, however, that there was some kind of orientation at the beginning of the semester that prepared students for the new environment and encouraged them to be actively involved in the feedback process.
4.2.4.3  **Self-feedback**

Kate has no doubt that self-reflection is important, but she does not know how to check it in her students. She did not consider the translation log, which students provide with each text they translate, a form of reflective feedback. In the translation log, Kate asks students to list five to ten textual challenges they have encountered during the translation (see Figure 17). The form of reflective feedback that Kate meant was referring more to monitoring one’s own learning and progress, which, she believed, is the learner’s own responsibility. She surmised that her students are independent enough to improve their own learning, especially with today’s technology that has made knowledge easily accessible. Kate’s students, on the other hand, indicated that they are not in favor of reflective exercises such as the translation log, because they found it hard to realize their own mistakes. “It’s easier for me to see someone else’s work and compare it to mine than to criticize my own work, because I don’t know what I did wrong,” one student explained.

1. I wasn't sure if, or how, I should include the stamp in the middle. I decided to include it in a place that flowed with the rest of the text.
2. Decided to expand the 3АГС abbreviation
3. Couldn’t clearly make out the mother's name. Decided Liliya was the closest.
4. Have no idea what the handwritten text on the bottom or top of the right page is for. Decided to include it as best I could.

*Figure 17: Selected sample of Kate's student’s translation log*

In her class, Sarah had students grade themselves on a few occasions. Once, students were asked to translate a text individually and add the grade they thought they deserved. They were given a template of a list of areas (e.g., comprehension of ST) on which students evaluated themselves. On another occasion, students worked in teams, and each student was asked to grade him or herself (in terms of contribution to the project, time spent, etc.). Sarah noted that such exercise cannot be done at the beginning of the semester because students would find it difficult
and frightening to grade themselves. Throughout the semester, students develop some abilities through interaction with instructor and peers, and gradually gain the confidence they need to evaluate themselves. In addition to self-evaluation, Sarah asks students to write a translation log with every translation they submit. In the log, they need to address: (1) the issues with which they struggled, (2) how they went about resolving those issues, (3) what resources and references they used, and (4) the issues with which they are still struggling (see Figure 18). Some students may ask questions for themselves as they go along the translation and reply to those questions; others may include questions for the instructor as they consciously think about the process or the text. Sarah does not grade those kinds of exercises, but uses them to get an idea of students’ specific problems and to provide comments that help students solve those problems. She found that some students are more self-reflective and self-dependent than others, and this could be attributed to their personality and major of study.

**Translation Log:**

We struggled with a few terminology problems through this translation. The first was the translation of Motor No. Eventually, through the use of parallel texts, it seemed the most appropriate translation of this was to use VIN, vehicle identification number.

Another struggle we had was the abbreviation S.A. found in the title of the company. We looked and found that it stands for Sociedad Anonima. Because it was in the title of the company we decided to just leave the abbreviation as is.

For both the terms vuelco and suma asegurada, we used linguee to find the most appropriate ways to translate them. Suma asegurada was a bit tricky because of the wording used and how it would be translated to make the most sense. We ended up using the term “insured sum” to get the point across.

In general, the text was more flowery and overdone than it would be in English. Any sort of official document in English is very cut and dry and straight to the point. This text had some parts that were overdone a bit, which required us to omit some phrases.

**Fuentes:**
linguee.com
thesaurus.com
http://www.bing.com/images/search?q=Car+Insurance+Policy&FORM=RESTAB#view=detail&id=AA92A5DCC000008A839FED867C533651170AA4F&selectedIndex=6 (parallel text)

*Figure 18: Selected sample of Sarah’s student’s translation log*
To foster students’ self-feedback, Emily asks students to write a reflection paper for every translation task they do. In the reflection paper, students must describe the ST (i.e., text type, genre, audience, etc.), the translation brief (i.e., purpose of translation, target audience, how purpose was achieved, etc.), and the kind of problems that arose during translation (see Figure 19).

Figure 19: Selected sample of Emily’s student’s reflection (graded)
One of Emily’s students acknowledged that she liked this assignment:

S1: Yeah I love doing this assignment because it explains to the teacher what I was thinking when I was translating, and I can explain whatever issues I had and how I attempted to resolve them, and they can tell whether or not they worked basically.

The student was amused by the concept of self-feedback and indicated that she has never thought or even heard of it before the interview. Emily found that students had to be trained on how to write those reflections, which might explain why another student felt negative about them:

S2: I’m kinda sick of writing them! Like we have to talk about the ST and TT and the brief. To me, for all the translation we kinda say the same thing (neutral register, and stuff like that). Also you have to explain why you chose this word instead of picking that word. I don’t know it seems like a lot of work! I’d rather do a longer translation than keep writing the reflective papers.

Emily argued that students at this stage are not sufficiently independent and part of this assignment is to prepare them for the graduate program. She realized that unless students are made responsible for applying some of the theoretical ideas they discuss in the course, the ideas “go in one ear and out the other!”

Thomas has never assigned any specific tasks that emphasize reflective feedback. His approach is intensively focused on having students translate individually and discuss their translations collectively. He was aware that other instructors have done some reflection assignments, and assumed that “it’s a matter of teaching style.” He thought that a portfolio exercise is a great idea to foster reflective practice, but he has not implemented it yet. He asks his graduate students (but not undergraduates) to do a translation log for their final project. His students surmised that it would be interesting to do some reflective assignments during the semester. One student indicated that she makes personal annotations on her own translation draft during class discussions by commenting on errors rather than merely crossing them out (see Figure 20):

S1: As for myself, I make my own notes on the sides of every translation (using my laptop during workshops). I’d make notes for why I chose that word or why I didn’t choose this word, notes to keep in mind, notes about Germany itself, notes on why they use this specific way, and stuff that I found helpful and that I never would have known if it weren’t brought up in class. And I’ve actually kinda learned to do that on my own because I thought it’d be more helpful when I go back to look at a text. I wish I was doing that throughout all of the translations that I’ve done.
4.2.4.4 Feedback on feedback

Kate has never received any feedback from her students on her approach to feedback or teaching in general. She assumed that they are pleased with the way she handles everything since no student has ever complained. Kate also noted that she has not received any feedback from external sources such as peer instructors and coordinators. She supposed that it is somehow too early to get any kind of feedback from colleagues since this is her first time teaching translation courses. Her students indicated that they have never been asked to provide feedback for an instructor,
apart from course evaluations, and assumed that they have not reached that level yet. Giving instructors feedback (or general guidelines) on feedback provision from their colleagues or coordinators can be helpful, students thought, since instructors’ approach to feedback varies from one who gives great feedback to one who gives no feedback at all.

Sarah believed that it is important to listen to the student’s voices. “Students will always give feedback to the instructor if they are given a chance,” she asserted. In addition to the formal, course evaluation students fill out at the end of the semester, she ensures that her students give her specific feedback at every mid-point in the semester. In a brief survey, students are asked describe to her:

• What they like about the course so far
• What they find most beneficial
• What they like to see more of before the semester is over (e.g., certain text types)
• What they have learned so far about translation and their ability to translate, and
• How they would rate their skill in translation so far

Sarah noted that this feedback gives her some ideas of how she can improve the quality and quantity of the course content. She indicated that she has never been observed in her translation classes by an expert. She supposed that it is important to have someone who has taught these kinds of translation classes to observe the instructor and give useful feedback. Having an observer who is not familiar with translation practice would be challenging for both the observer and observed. She has been fortunate to work with a professor who has taught these classes before and done research in translator pedagogy. She met him before the start of the course and he gave her helpful suggestions on how to handle different situations, and provided her with resources that she can use for the class.

Emily has never asked students to give her feedback on her own teaching. One of her students, however, noted that she (the student) writes in the translation log whether she enjoyed the task or not even though Emily does not require so. Emily explained that she is not used to
asking for students’ opinions since it was not commonly practiced when she was a student herself. During her years of teaching translation, she had never received any feedback from colleague instructors, either. However, she indicated that the school department held a meeting once to discuss the translation program’s objectives and make them more concrete, as requested by the university administration. In that meeting, Emily found that other instructors were implementing interesting ideas, such as the self-reflection assignment, which she later put in her syllabus. In universities, instructors are supposed to focus on research and self-correct their own teaching, an aspect that Emily found upsetting. She wished that knowledge and experience were shared among the teaching faculty members in periodic seminars or trainings of some kind.

One of the first questions that Thomas often asks students at the start of the workshop is what they think of the text they have translated (in terms of text type, length, and complexity). He usually gets a positive response from students. For example, they might find the ST somewhat hard but have learned greatly from it. On rare occasions, the majority of the class may reveal that they were unable to comprehend the text or get anything from it. In such a case, Thomas would replace the text with one that is more appropriate. Besides this verbal, in-class feedback, Thomas also gets a standardized course evaluation at the end of every semester. He also asks for and receives a formal ‘peer evaluation’ from a colleague faculty member every year, as part of his application for post-tenure promotion. Still, he supposed that he probably needs to survey students to know specifically how they use feedback and what they find useful. Thomas’ students did not recall other than the quick verbal chat that he occasionally had with them about the topic of a ST or a task deadline. They believed that they are definitely capable of giving useful feedback to the instructor. They also wished to be allowed to pick an ST of their interest at least once or twice a semester. One student summarized her challenges with feedback by saying:

S1: First, being open to the feedback and to accepting the feedback, because it’s always hard to accept criticism from others. Second, organizing the feedback that you receive in a way that would be useful to you, and this is twofold: either you yourself compile the comments (verbal/written) that the instructor gives you and organize them, or the instructor himself organizes the comments (especially the verbal ones) that he gives in a way that makes it easier for the student to utilize it.
4.2.4.5  Feedback loop

“Students should always feel free to disagree with the instructor.” This is what Kate keeps telling her students. She keeps reminding them that “there’s no perfect translation, and if you can back up whatever you’re saying, I’ll be fine with it and I’ll accept it.” Kate indicated that it happens quite often that they disagree with her and insist on their opinion, especially her stronger student who has taken the course for the second time and is well spoken and outgoing. The other student is a bit timid by nature and has weaker language abilities. Kate keeps all the feedback she gives to students and arranges them in folders in her personal computer, but she has never reused them. She supposed that if she teaches this class several times and has a larger number of students, she might reuse the feedback in some way. What students do with her written feedback is unknown to her. She still keeps inviting them to submit as many drafts as they want even after the deadline (if it is not an essay assignment), and occasionally the weaker student returns with revisions. Kate’s students agreed that it is beneficial to save their translations along with the feedback for future assignments and, possibly, future jobs. One student, however, explained that he looks at the comments and makes a ‘mental note’ of them, but he rarely revises or returns to them again. He argued that he is not in the habit of revising his work, and that what he does with the feedback should be, in his view, entirely up to him:

S1: I’m not a believer in revision, I don’t know why, because when I do the revision I’m not looking at the whole text whatsoever, it’s like tedious to me. I’m just gonna change the small part that is indicated by the teacher and that’s it, let’s move on to another thing. So I don’t look at the whole translation, I only look at the part that was brought to my attention, and even then I do the revision just to get it out of the way so that I don’t have to think of it again. I’m not gonna sit there and analyze one little sentence and figure out all the ways I could do it and stuff like that. Again it’s an undergraduate level course, if we’re graduate or above like a master’s level or above, the situation will be different, but right now it’s umm, I don’t know. I think I like the teacher’s way of leaving the revision up to us.

Students, nevertheless, felt that the class period is more than sufficient to ask for clarification or elaboration on feedback. They do not hesitate to discuss or even disagree with
Kate, whom they felt to be intimidating at first but then realized that she is helpful and professional in her approach.

Sarah also archives her feedback. Since she provides it online on a computer, she has it saved as feedback copies. Sometimes, she looks at her general comments and sees whether they apply to certain individuals, but this is not necessarily the case because every year she has a different group of students’ level and ability. She occasionally looks back at previous feedback to see how similar that feedback is, but she never copies the same comments and uses them again. To close the feedback loop, she uses plenty of inquiry and discussion comments and mandates revision and resubmission. Further, she asks students to use track changes when they revise their documents, so that she makes sure they read her feedback and made the changes she has asked them to do. Sarah’s students noted that she always expects them to state ‘why’ they make certain choices, otherwise she ‘automatically’ considers their answer inadequate:

S1: In her class, if you can prove why you think the way you did, she’s gonna say that’s okay, unless it’s blatantly like an antonym for something umm... she’s never gonna tell you that it’s wrong, she might disagree and be like ‘Well I believe this is the best way to translate it, but I honor that you don’t think so because of the reason you have stated. She does this a lot.”

Sarah’s students also believed that revision is an effective way to improve one’s own learning. They take notes during class discussion, which makes it easier for them to revise and resubmit. One student, however, admitted that he resubmits without revising. He noted that printing out the translation and reading it aloud could be helpful, but he never had time to do so. Students agreed that Sarah’s written comments are quite comprehensible because her writing style is clear and because she types her comments.

Although there is some conversational interaction in Emily’s weekly discussions, she complained that one of her challenges is the feedback loop, which she felt was ‘incomplete.’ In every workshop, she can see that students take in what she and their classmates discuss and make use of it in their revision. The written comments she gives them on their finished work are what worries her, as she does not know if students know how to implement her written comments and
learn from them. Students are not instructed to take any action after submitting their assignments. When Emily was a graduate student, she got her paper back and that was it, her professors never followed up with students. Now as an instructor, she felt she is doing the same to her students. She gives students handwritten corrections and never occurs to her to save this feedback and reuse it one way or another. Emily’s students indicated that they read their instructor’s corrections and keep all graded translations in a file folder. One student noted that she returns to these corrected translations occasionally when she comes across similar problem areas.

In Thomas’ class, one-on-one conferencing happens less in the classroom and more in the revision process of the final project at the end of the semester. Students then would come to his office or send emails and discuss individual problem areas that they have identified. They rarely need to come back with further questions. This is because it is a small class and students get plenty of collective verbal feedback in the classroom. Thomas indicated that he always saves his written feedback and reuses it, not only to save time, but also for consistency. When he is grading, he has students’ documents open all at once, and grade them a paragraph at a time. In this way, he would remember what he marks as feedback on one student and reuse it when the error recurs, giving students identical feedback. What students do with his feedback is not apparent to Thomas as he never asked them or instructed them to use it in a certain way. He thought it is an interesting idea, but assumed, jokingly, that “life is too short for him to tell students what they should do with feedback.” Thomas’ students mentioned that they read the written comments once they receive them and try to make use of them. One student explained:

S1: I keep all the feedback that I get. I always look over it and make sure that I understand a lot of it. My computer is just filled with all kinds of written feedback, emails and questions that I’ve had about texts and stuff. So I’d make a separate document just saying ‘important stuff,’ sometimes I’ll write an email for myself. I do that because I like to reference back to it when I need it and use it, and I actually do that sometimes. I think the feedback is useful.
Students indicated that they rarely disagree with Thomas because he is way more knowledgeable than they are, but they assumed that they would not hesitate to express their viewpoint even if it opposed his.

**Summary**

In this chapter, the researcher reported the results of eight classroom observations, eight instructor interviews, and eight student group interviews, along with instructors’ samples of written feedback and grading rubrics. The collected data were analyzed through a socio-cultural dimension that situates feedback, a delivery-and-focus dimension that shapes feedback, and an interpersonal, interactional dimension that negotiates feedback. In the next chapter, persistent themes of the reported results will be discussed in detail, and specific implications and recommendations will be provided thereafter.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Overview

Providing an in-depth description of the feedback culture in translator education is the main objective of this doctoral dissertation. To achieve this objective, a diverse sample of instructor and student participants were selected from two different university translation institutions, one in Saudi Arabia and one in the United States. This chapter begins with a summary of the study’s major findings detailed in Chapter 4 (a summary of instructors’ profile is provided in Appendix C-3 for further clarity). The following findings describe how feedback is situated, shaped, and negotiated in the SA-CASE and US-CASE respectively, hence addressing questions one and two of the study. Emerging themes and issues that surfaced in the study are discussed afterward, addressing the third question of the study. The researcher then discusses implications of the findings and provides recommendations thereof. The Conclusions section comes next, comprising a brief discussion of the study’s limitations and directions for further research. The researcher’s final thoughts on this piece of research are provided subsequently.

5.1 Summary of Major Findings

5.1.1 How feedback is situated in the SA-CASE and US-CASE

5.1.1.1 Concept of feedback

This study revealed that feedback potentially means different things to different people. When asked to describe what feedback was, participants gave different viewpoints varying from restricting the meaning of feedback to the mere correction of the student’s errors, to a source of evaluation of the instructor’s teaching, to a broader view that saw feedback as communication between the parties involved in the educational process. In the US-CASE, two instructors looked at feedback from a ‘professional’ perspective, giving it a specific function and objective.
Noticeably, as a term, feedback was not immediately clear to student participants in the SA-CASE, who all fumbled a little when they first heard its closest Arabic translation *attaghthiah arraji’ah* (التغذية الراجعة)—literally ‘returned feeding’) or even the Arabic calque *fidbāk* (فيدباك) (see Table 6).

**Concept of feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bader</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is the act of commenting on students’ errors in the weekly workshops and exams. His students (unsurely) defined feedback as studying at home, instructor’s repeated information, and whole-class revision with instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Omar</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is a form of communication that starts from students and returns to them. For his students, feedback first seemed ambiguous as a concept, but then they expected it to be a collaborative, two-way interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zaid</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is a means (for both instructor and students) to assess students’ achievement of the course objectives. His students (unsurely) assumed that it denotes instructor’s correction of errors in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ali</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is a source of evaluation to the instructor’s teaching. After some hesitation, his students agreed that feedback is instructor’s explanation, criticism, analysis, and correction of students’ work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kate</strong></td>
<td>‘Review’ and ‘proofreading’ are more preferable words than ‘feedback,’ since they resemble the professional world. For her students, feedback is ‘communication’ that guides learners to find their own answers rather than telling them what is right or wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sarah</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is a way to help learners understand their current situation, motivates them to improve on existing skill set, and guides them to achieve aspired objectives. For her students, feedback is a tool that enables students to see their mistakes and know how to correct them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emily</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is how the instructor ‘reacts’ to students’ translation problems and whether the translation brief is accurately fulfilled. For her students, feedback is showing the learner other examples and ways of doing the task in order to help learners improve their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is highlighting the negative aspects in the learner’s work, rather than the positive, because this is how it is done in the marketplace. For his students, feedback is ‘guidelines’ that put students on the right track and make them understand why their answer is wrong/right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Concept of feedback

### 5.1.1.2 Importance of feedback

The study showed that feedback was seen as highly significant by all participants. Yet again, participants’ reasons varied, and were a continuation of how they viewed the concept in the first place (see Table 7).
Importance of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bader</th>
<th>Feedback is a major component of any teaching process. It is most helpful when it comes from different sources such as the student’s peers. For his students, feedback is a vital means to ‘convey’ the instructor’s experience to (the inexperienced) students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>“There is no teaching without feedback.” It is most useful when the instructor has communication skills. For his students, feedback is useful only if the instructor has the subject matter expertise and students are interested in learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>Feedback is the ‘backbone’ of the teaching process. Students expose their weakness in class discussions allowing the instructor to give appropriate advice. For his students, feedback helps them find their errors and, more importantly, avoid making them in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>“No teaching process can hold its ground without feedback.” Feedback makes instructors realize the flaws in their teaching and in students’ learning. For his students, feedback helps them know their own errors, avoid making them again, and listen to different viewpoints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Feedback is crucial for any educational process. Students should be given professional feedback by professional translators at least once in the course. For her students, feedback is important because translation mistakes in the professional world can be fatal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>It is only in the academia that students have a chance to get feedback, revise, and resubmit an improved work. Continuous feedback helps students reach expert level, but it requires students to revise and resubmit their work. For her students, feedback is important and highly effective if students take the feedback seriously and use it in their revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>The importance of feedback revolves around the translation brief. Feedback allows students to understand theoretical concepts and pay attention to them during translation. Her students found that feedback enables them to see the flaws in their own work and figure out various ways to improve it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Feedback is extremely critical for translation practice, that workshopping a text may take 2–3 classes until the text is fully discussed and students’ issues are all addressed. For his students, feedback is vital because it is so hard for students to judge any translation, not to mention their own.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Importance of feedback

5.1.1.3 Objectives of feedback

The feedback objectives discussed by instructors showed what aspects they emphasized most. Even though in both cases, language and cultural proficiencies were at the center of their concerns, there was an obvious focus in the US-CASE on bringing theoretical and professional concepts to translation practice. Professional code of ethics, translation brief, client/initiator, and target audience were examples of such concepts (see Table 8).
Objectives of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Feedback Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bader</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is used to educate students’ and improve their translation skills, train them on how to use specialized dictionaries, open their eyes to the differences between SL and TL, and provide cultural elaboration when the text requires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Omar</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is used to correct students’ lexical, syntactic, pragmatic, and cultural issues, and improve their translation skills such as reading comprehension, text analysis, and use of e-resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zaid</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is used to enhance students’ understanding of the ST’s lexical and cultural aspects. It revolves around students’ errors (more than their right solutions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ali</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is used to diagnose students’ challenges, modify the teaching, and diversify the ST types and lexicon accordingly. It is also used in class to motivate students while they workshop a translation in groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kate</strong></td>
<td>In addition to motivating students through positive comments, feedback is used to link translation theory and the professional code of ethics to practice. Her students also acknowledge the importance of theory in making practice more informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sarah</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is used to change students’ perception of what ‘ideal’ translation is, and that there is always a ‘better’ translation that one can achieve through revision. When it is provided indirectly, feedback can stimulate students’ thinking and encourage them to keep trying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emily</strong></td>
<td>Feedback is used to train students on how to analyze the ST and TT, make use of online resources and parallel texts, and look rigorously to language and grammar. Feedback is also used to guide students in fulfilling the changing requirements of translation brief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas</strong></td>
<td>Feedback revolves around students’ errors and translation problems, and it is used to urge students to adhere to the ST as much as possible. Reviewing students’ drafts and giving on-site verbal comments is a way that allows reacting to students’ work as a TT reader.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Objectives of feedback

5.1.1.4 Systematicity of feedback

While three instructors (Bader, Zaid, and Ali) in the SA-CASE used broad criteria and described them to students verbally through practice, only one instructor (Omar) used specific correction codes and described them to students in both written and verbal forms. In the US-CASE, all instructors used points-based written grading criteria: while two instructors (Kate and Sarah) used detailed numeric rubrics, one instructor (Emily) used a simple major-minor error rubric, and one instructor (Thomas) used the professional ATA error marking scale and color coding (see Table 9).
### Systematicity of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Grading Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bader</td>
<td>Grading has five levels: morphologic, syntactic, semantic, stylistic, and cultural. These levels, which were taught in a previous theoretical class, are discussed verbally every now and then, but not in a specific written form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>Grading is guided by a brief correction key of 7 major error types. This key is explained to students in the course syllabus and is used consistently in the instructor’s verbal and (midterm) written comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>Grading has 5 measures: clarity of handwriting, correctness of grammar, correctness of sentence structure, appropriateness for the target readership, and faithfulness to the ST’s form and ideas. These measures are explained to students verbally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Students are reminded (verbally) to pay attention to punctuation, spelling, word order, conjunctions, cohesion, coherence, and target culture. These broad measures had been taught to students in previous theoretical courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Two grading rubrics are used: one for the translation midterm projects and one for the essay assignments. Both rubrics are inspired by the ATA framework, but tailored to fit her practice class. Both are explained to students in written and verbal forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>A holistic grading rubric along with a correction key of 20 error types. Both are explained to students in written and verbal forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Brief holistic grading criteria of major and minor errors are used. The criteria are explained to students in the syllabus and used consistently in the instructor’s written and verbal comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Grading is based on the ATA framework for standard error marking (which classifies 22 error types), along with a color-coded system that indicate severity of error. Students also receive a spreadsheet with a bar graph of their cumulating errors over the semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Systematicity of feedback

5.1.1.5 **Teacher-student roles**

Generally, the instructor was seen as a higher authority in the eyes of all participants. The specific description participants gave to the instructor-student roles in the feedback process, again, was a reflection of how they viewed feedback in the first place. In the SA-CASE, instructors described their roles as a friend, partner, traffic police, and knowledgeable facilitator, while in the US-CASE two instructors (Kate and Sarah) preferred to take the professional role of a translation client, and two instructors (Emily and Thomas) considered students as (beginning) colleagues with whom they work to make a better translation (see Table 10).
### Teacher-student roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bader</th>
<th>Treating students as friends and building rapport with them is necessary to facilitate their acceptance of the feedback. His students differ over whether or not providing written feedback is a responsibility of the instructor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>Students should be treated as partners in a democratic classroom, where mutual respect is maintained and the teaching and learning are taken seriously. His students saw him as an older brother who is supportive, caring, and always available when they need him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>The instructor is the traffic police of the classroom: he observes and directs students' participation. He plans the course, assigns the STs, facilitates class discussion, and eventually gives grades. Students take care of the learning part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>The instructor is the knowledgeable facilitator: he selects the STs, treats students as partners, and makes students the center of the class. For his students, the instructor is more experienced and knowledgeable but should not impose his/her views on students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>A student-as-a-partner atmosphere is always preferable, but more preferable is a ‘professional’ level where students are treated as professional translators who have the right to defend their translation to the teacher as their client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>A collaborative classroom where students work together and assume the role of practitioners, and the teacher as their client, is the ideal scenario. Students should express their views on the teacher’s method because this benefits the course as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Even though the instructor sees dialogue essential to learning, her class centers mostly on her. She does most of the talking and hardly ever leaves her seat. She involves students by asking them to read their translations while she leads the discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Students are beginning colleagues; they work with the instructor to make translation as excellent as it can be. The class has to be relaxed and friendly to prepare students for their errors correction. Giving grades makes students take the assignments seriously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Teacher-student roles

### 5.1.2 How feedback is shaped in the SA-CASE and US-CASE

#### 5.1.2.1 Mode of feedback

In this dimension, the differences between participants within and across the two cases began to increase further. All instructors provided verbal whole-class comments on students’ translations. In the SA-CASE, however, all instructors often assigned a translation task before or in the class period, but did not require submitting any written draft. It was during class that students may read their own suggested translation (or part of it) and listen to what the instructor and classmates
say about it. There existed in the SA-CASE what may be called student-initiated feedback (in Zaid’s class), where a randomly selected student went to the IWB and typed his suggested translation, then responded to comments and questions from instructor and classmates, leading him to improve his translation. Providing written correction to students did not seem to be a common practice in the SA-CASE. After the midterm exams, students could see their papers and discuss their errors either in a one-on-one meeting with the instructor outside of class (as in Bader’s and Zaid’s classes), or via whole-class conferencing in class.

In the US-CASE, all four instructors required students to turn in a first and/or final draft of the translation before and/or after the workshop, and all four instructors provided individualized, written comments on students’ work. While one instructor (Emily) provided handwritten comments, three instructors gave typed comments. Submitting a revised version was mandatory in one class (Sarah’s) and optional in another (Kate’s). The study showed that among all participants, only one instructor (Kate) made use of professional feedback, where students’ translations were edited by a professional proofreader (see Table 11).

### Mode of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bader</strong></td>
<td>Verbal whole-class discussion is led by instructor in the weekly translation workshops. One-on-one conferencing is held only after the midterm exam to discuss student’s errors. Brief, whole-class conferencing is held to discuss the students’ common errors in the exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Omar</strong></td>
<td>Verbal whole-class discussion is led by instructor in the weekly workshops using the IWB to display the ST and type students’ suggested translations. For the midterm exam, students’ graded translations are displayed, and a collective discussion takes place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zaid</strong></td>
<td>Verbal whole-class discussion is led by a randomly selected student in the weekly workshops, using the IWB for displaying the ST and typing suggested translations. For the midterm exam, students’ errors are underlined and discussed collectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ali</strong></td>
<td>Verbal, short, and direct responses to students’ questions during the translation group workshop. The instructor may occasionally provide brief verbal whole-class comments on students’ previous translation task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kate</strong></td>
<td>In the weekly workshop, students’ translations are displayed and discussed collectively. The instructor provides individualized written comments after class. The instructor facilitates a professional feedback, where students receive comments from a professional proofreader.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sarah: In the class, brief verbal whole-class discussion on the weekly task challenges. After class, each student receives individualized written comments and an ‘initial’ grade. Students are required to turn in a revised version, and receive a final grade from the instructor.

Emily: The instructor leads a verbal whole-class discussion, which involves students reading and giving suggested translations. After translating the whole ST, students submit their first (and final) draft and receive handwritten comments and a grade the instructor.

Thomas: Students’ drafts are displayed and discussed collectively in a round-robin manner. Students use the verbal comments to revise their first drafts and resubmit a final draft. Later, the instructor provides written comments and a final grade to each student.

Table 11: Mode of feedback

5.1.2.2 Error treatment

In the SA-CASE, all instructors treated errors mainly through collective verbal discussions. Analyzing these discussions revealed variation among them. While two instructors (Bader and Ali) seemed to emphasize quantity of assignments over quality and often gave direct responses to students’ errors or questions, two instructors (Omar and Zaid) took their time in workshopping students’ translations by providing thorough, indirect comments. In the US-CASE, in addition to the verbal conversational discussions facilitated in class, all instructors provided individualized, written corrections. While two instructors (Kate and Sarah) provided plenty of error-codes, leading cues, and external resources and encouraged revision, the other two instructors (Emily and Thomas) gave direct comments and final grades in the written component of their feedback (see Table 12).

Error treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bader</td>
<td>For every translation task, the instructor leads the read-and-translate workshop and intervenes only if all students fail to give an acceptable translation. His written comments (on exams) involve direct correction, locating the error, and rhetorical questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>The instructor never gives direct answers; instead, he gives cues and inquiries. He allows students to improve and defend their (collective) translation, then give them his own suggested version. Students eventually get to choose one of the two acceptable versions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>In the weekly workshop, the instructor does not interfere in correcting students’ (collective) translation except by posing questions and directing attention to problematic issues. He may suggest a wrong translation to stimulate students’ thinking and heighten the discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students work in groups the entire workshop. Students’ few questions receive short and direct responses from the instructor. Quick verbal comments on student groups’ common errors may be provided at the start of the following workshop.

The instructor uses the track-change feature to pose questions and encourage further research. She does not give out the answers readily unless it is an obvious error, such as capitalization. Students once received feedback from two professional proofreaders.

Using the track-change mode in MS Word, the instructor gives direct instructions, possible solutions, leading cues, or inquiry annotations to which students may need to respond. Using error codes, such as Sty (style), seems to be her most common strategy.

In both his written and verbal comments, the instructor rarely gives direct answers; instead, he gives leading cues and inquiries. Only in students’ final draft that he gives direct reminders of specific strategies he always brings up in the workshops.

Table 12: Error treatment

5.1.2.3 Use of technology

Two instructors in the SA-CASE (Bader and Ali) did not use any form of technology in their translation classes, while the other two (Omar and Zaid) found it difficult to teach their classes without technology. The use of IWB to display and edit students’ translations and to consult online resources was observed noticeably in these two classes (of Omar’s and Zaid’s). While all instructors in the US-CASE utilized technology in class in several ways (such as consulting parallel texts), three instructors (Kate, Sarah, and Thomas) used technology also to provide typed comments and communicate with students outside the class (see Table 13).

Use of technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bader</th>
<th>The instructor does not use any form of technology even though he is a tech-savvy himself. He finds the use of IWB to be impractical and time-consuming because of their constant technical issues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>The instructor uses the IWB to display the ST and discuss students’ translations. He provides plenty of e-resources and frequently uses the Internet to check parallel texts and give research tips. He responds to students’ questions also through email and social media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zaid: The instructor uses the IWB to display and analyze the ST, to discuss students’ translations, and to display grades. The Internet is used during workshops to check lexical and cultural issues of the texts and to teach students how to use online resources effectively.

Ali: The instructor does not use any form of technology. IWB could have been more helpful had they involved less technical issues, he expects, and had students been more cooperative when assignments involved any use of technology.

Kate: The instructor uses Word, PowerPoint, and the IWB for the weekly verbal and written feedback. In class, she frequently checks the Internet for parallel texts and sends students links to useful resources. For final evaluation, she uses Excel sheets and sends PDF reports to students.

Sarah: Students turn in their translations in a Word format and receive instructor’s correction in a track-changes mode. Students are also encouraged to use this mode when submitting their final drafts. Students are often asked during workshops to email their work to each other for peer proofreading using the track-changes feature.

Emily: The instructor provides handwritten correction, but still uses the IWB to display the ST, check online resources, and consult parallel texts.

Thomas: Email is used not only for communication, but also for sending and receiving assignments. Written feedback includes Excel sheet of ATA point scale of error, along with student’s translation marked up in a Word document. In class, the IWB is used to display the ST and students’ drafts, and to consult the Internet for various purposes.

*Table 13: Use of technology*

### 5.1.2.4 Timing of feedback

The timing of feedback did not seem to be of concern to participants in the SA-CASE, as feedback was mostly provided verbally during or immediately after the process of translation or translation workshop. Post-process feedback occurred a week or two after the midterm exam, again in the form of whole-class verbal conferencing. In the US-CASE, since there was a written component of feedback in all classes, timing issues appeared with students having to submit a draft before or at the start of the workshop (with the exception of Emily, who did not require submission of a first draft). Students received an immediate collective conferencing in class on their first drafts, as well as delayed individualized written comments and grade on their final drafts. Interestingly, the two instructors (Kate and Sarah) who encouraged resubmission and provided further comments to students were reported to be the fastest and timeliest in delivering written feedback. The other two instructors (Emily and Thomas) were not so timely in their written comments (see Table 14).
Timing of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bader</th>
<th>The instructor provides immediate in-process verbal comments to students during their weekly workshops. A post-process feedback happens once during the semester, particularly a week or two after the midterm exam.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>The instructor’s verbal comments are provided to students during the weekly whole-class discussion. Workshopping a single ST may takes up to 3 weeks. Feedback on the midterm exam takes 1-2 weeks to arrive, depending on the instructor’s academic and administrative schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>The weekly verbal discussion occurs while students translate collectively in class. This verbal discussion continues for 2-3 weeks but does not necessarily cover the whole ST. A post-process verbal discussion of students’ common errors is held a week after the midterm exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Instructor’s brief responses to students’ questions are provided immediately while students are in the process of group translation. Before starting a new workshop, the instructor may give quick comments about the previous workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Verbal feedback is provided to students in the translation session, while written feedback is provided immediately after the session. If the text is a difficult one, the verbal portion of the feedback is delayed and provided with the written portion in the next session, a week later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>In the weekly workshop, there is an immediate verbal discussion on students’ overarching problems. The individual written feedback is provided immediately after the workshop, often within hours, which allows students to revise and submit their final draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Workshopping a single task may take up to 3 sessions. Students are supposed to turn in their draft after the task is fully workshopped, and then they receive written comments and a final grade within a week, ideally. This written feedback, however, may also take up to 3 weeks because of various reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Students often are assigned the translation task 3-4 days before the workshop. It often takes 1-2 sessions to finish workshopping a whole task. Students then have 5 days to turn in a final copy. The instructor then has two weeks to grade the final translation, but due to unforeseen circumstances, this written portion may often take longer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Timing of feedback

5.1.2.5 Regularity of feedback

Even though all instructors claimed to be consistent and regular in their feedback provision, triangulation of data revealed a slightly different truth. In the SA-CASE, while consistency and regularity of two instructors (Omar and Zaid) were highly appreciated by their students, two instructors (Bader and Ali) were reported to be inconsistent in delivering the same quality and quantity of feedback. In the US-CASE, all instructors provided regular feedback, though one instructor (Thomas) indicated using a different approach for theoretical classes (see Table 15).
**Regularity of feedback**

| **Bader** | Even though the instructor claims to provide the same quality and quantity of feedback in all classes, his use of the whiteboard in delivering the feedback was more in theoretical classes. His teaching style also changed as they advanced in the program in the sense that he does not provide all the answers and pushes students to be self-dependent. |
| **Omar** | The instructor provides the same quality and quantity of feedback to all students on every assignment, in all practice classes he teaches. He assigns short translation assignments over the semester but allows students to discuss them thoroughly. |
| **Zaid** | The instructor follows the same approach to feedback regardless of class size. He admits that smaller classes give students more opportunity to present their translation and lead the discussion. His consistent use of IWB in delivering the feedback is highly admired by his students. |
| **Ali** | The instructor’s quality and quantity of feedback depends greatly on the ST, he stated, but the manner of feedback delivery always remains the same. His verbal comments on students’ errors are occasional. He uses the same approach, which stresses group work, in both practice and theoretical classes. |
| **Kate** | The instructor provides written and verbal feedback on every single translation task that is assigned. If her students submit revised versions (which is optional), she often responds promptly. This is the only class she teaches this semester, but she assumes she would follow the same approach to feedback in any practice class she teaches. |
| **Sarah** | The instructor provides the same quality and quantity of feedback in all the classes that she teaches, because she takes the same approach to feedback provision in all classes. The rubric she uses, though, may differ depending on the nature of the class (theoretical or practical). |
| **Emily** | The instructor provides regular and consistent amount of feedback to her students in all the classes that she teaches. Since she provides handwritten feedback, she has no record of what she gives to students once the papers return to students. |
| **Thomas** | The instructor’s feedback is regular and consistent across all practice classes he teaches. In theoretical classes, however, he gives quizzes and essays, and provides feedback in terms of points-off and occasional comments. |

*Table 15: Regularity of feedback*

### 5.1.3 How feedback is negotiated in the SA-CASE and US-CASE

#### 5.1.3.1 Feedback seeking

All instructors believed they provided sufficient feedback to their students without the latter having to ask for it. Instructors also indicated that there would always be students who were less interested in the feedback no matter how the instructor tried to involve them. Students, on the other hand, defended their position by arguing that when instructor’s responses were too short
and hasty (as in Ali's case) or too belated (as in Thomas' case), students would get discouraged from seeking further feedback or clarification (see Table 16).

**Feedback seeking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bader</td>
<td>The instructor allows sufficient time for students to receive verbal comments and answers to their questions during the class period. Students find the class time sufficient for getting the clarification they need since there are only four students in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>The instructor succeeds in creating a friendly environment that encourages students to be active in class. Students are motivated due to the dynamic atmosphere of the weekly workshops. The instructor's friendly attitude invites students to negotiate their grades and ask for further elaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>Students in this class lead the process of feedback by going to the IWB, typing their own translation, and responding to the class questions and suggestions. Feedback in this case is initiated by students, allowing them to spontaneously ask for and discuss the feedback easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Even though the instructor asserts that students are always welcome to ask for feedback and discuss their grades, his students feel that the sort of hasty and brief responses he often gives makes them hesitate to seek further feedback from the instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>The instructor makes sure to provide regular feedback to students before they ask for it, and encourages students to return with questions and revision if they want to improve their grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>The instructor believes that it is her responsibility to engage students in the feedback. In addition to her verbal feedback, the instructor gives written feedback regularly and mandates students to revise and resubmit improved version of their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>The class time is seen by both the instructor and students to be sufficient for seeking feedback and asking for clarification. The instructor, however, feels that she might need to mandate seeing her when students get lower grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>The instructor finds that the elaborate verbal and written feedback he provides to each student in class leaves no room for students to ask for further help. Some students, however, find his belated responses to their email questions rather discouraging.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 16: Feedback seeking*

### 5.1.3.2 Peer feedback

In the SA-CASE, while one instructor (Ali) implemented group work in all translation workshops, a second instructor (Bader) found the class too small for group/pair projects. The other two instructors (Omar and Zaid) seemed to use group work cautiously, allowing students to work together briefly for specific pretranslation activities. In the US-CASE, two instructors (Kate and
Sarah) assigned pair/group projects and instructed students to peer review and proofread one another. In the other two classes, only individual translation projects were assigned, and peer feedback seemed to occur accidentally during whole-class discussions (see Table 17).

**Peer feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bader</td>
<td>During translation workshops, the instructor asks students in a direct manner to comment on their classmate’s translation during workshops. Aside from this regular routine in class, there are no activities or projects that require peer feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>For some translation tasks, students translate individually in class for 30-45 minutes, then (occasionally) get in pairs/groups to discuss their translations briefly before the instructor starts the whole-class discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>Each translation task starts in class with a 30-minute terminology search activity in which students work in teams of 2-3 using their own printed dictionaries. The whole-class discussion begins with a student leading a discussion where direct and indirect peer comments take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Students are assigned to work in groups in all translation workshops. While the instructor values group work greatly, his students felt that his group activities are less effective because of the instructor’s weak involvement in them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Even though this class has only two students, the instructor assigns translation projects that involve peer editing and feedback. Sometimes each student is asked to come up with a translation brief but translates according to the other classmate’s brief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Peer feedback is especially applicable in this class because some students are native speakers of L2. In class, students often work in teams and send their draft electronically to one another during the workshop for editing and revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Aside from the whole-class discussion in which peer feedback occurs indirectly, there are no deliberate group/pair translation projects. Students were surprised that there are no group projects in this class, and the instructor indicates that she will consider implementing some in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>The instructor does not believe in peer feedback due to students’ low level of language proficiency, and because the translation profession is ‘solo’ by its nature. Students find it useful to collaborate outside the class and exchange <em>natural peer feedback</em>, as they call it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 17: Peer feedback*

### 5.1.3.3 Self-feedback

In the SA-CASE, instructors did not seem to implement any activities that deliberately employ self-feedback. Students’ low level of language proficiency was apparently to blame, according to most instructors. In the US-CASE, one instructor (Thomas) avoided such activities for the same
reason, but regularly provided students with a graph of their culminating errors to help students monitor their own progress. In the other three classes, instructors required students to submit a reflective log in every translation task. One instructor (Sarah) asked students in few occasions to grade themselves and evaluate their own performance using a guided checklist (see Table 18).

**Self-feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bader</th>
<th>The instructor tried once to allow students to evaluate themselves, but they did not show positive reaction. The instructor never involves students in the ST selection or in the assessment process. His students do a sort of self-reflection when they study at home.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>Other than reminding students to revise their translation critically, the instructor assigns no specific activities that deliberately involve self-reflection. Designing the course components, including ST selection, is strictly the instructor’s responsibility, according to the instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>In class discussions, the instructor often asks students to comment on their own translations before turning the question to the rest of the class. Still, he considers self-feedback to be the least effective source of feedback because of students’ low language proficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>The instructor encourages students to practice translation outside the classroom as much as they can. Other than this, there are no specific activities designed for self-reflection in this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Even though she believes in the importance of self-feedback, the instructor admits that she does not know how to implement it. She does not see the translation log students have to submit in every translation task as a form of reflective feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>On some occasions, students are asked to grade their own translation according to a self-evaluation template. They are also asked to write a translation log with every translation task, and select the ST for their final project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Students are asked to write a reflection paper for every translation task. In the reflection, students describe the ST, the translation brief, and the problems they face. While some students enjoy this exercise, one student finds it repetitive and burdensome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Students regularly see their cumulating errors in a bar graph, which is a form of self-reflection. Students wish to be allowed to select the ST and do some reflective assignments occasionally, but the instructor finds students’ linguistic level too low for this kind of tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 18: Self-feedback*

### 5.1.3.4 Feedback on feedback

Asking students to give feedback about the feedback or about teaching in general did not seem to be a common practice in either the SA-CASE or the US-CASE. For most instructors, students at this stage were incapable of providing useful feedback to the instructor. While some instructors
(e.g., Thomas and Zaid) may have verbally asked students how they felt about a certain task, two instructors (Omar and Sarah) stood out as the only instructors who surveyed students’ opinions in written form and took their opinions seriously (see Table 19).

### Feedback on feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bader</td>
<td>The instructor and his students do not believe strongly in students’ evaluation of the instructor because of the huge gap between the two in terms of knowledge and expertise. The instructor does not receive feedback from any other resources, either.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar</td>
<td>The instructor and his students believe strongly in the value of students’ feedback to instructor. Occasionally, the instructor asks students about the topics they wish to translate and take their views seriously. Once a semester, he asks students to list the positive and negative aspects of his teaching approach and suggest ways to improve the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid</td>
<td>The instructor believes that students are capable of expressing views that improve the course, but he seeks their feedback only if he notices discomfort among them. The instructor does not receive feedback from other resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>The instructor does not take students’ feedback on his teaching because he believes that not all of them are capable of evaluating the instructor biasedly. On the contrary, his students believe they are always capable of providing useful insights to the instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Aside from the systematic course evaluation she receives at the end of semester, the instructor has never received any feedback from any other sources. She assumes that everything goes well because no student has complained yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>The instructor asks students to give her specific feedback at every mid-point in the semester. In a brief survey, students describe what they like about the course, what they do not like, what they have learned so far, and how they rate their skill in translation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>The instructor never asks students (or any other source) to give her feedback on her teaching. One student notes, however, that she (the student) writes in the translation log whether she enjoys the task or not even though the instructor does not require so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>In addition to students’ standardized evaluation at the end of semester, the instructor gets a formal peer evaluation from a colleague faculty member every year as part of a post-tenure promotion. Still, he feels that he might need to survey students to know specifically how they use the feedback and what aspects they find useful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Feedback on feedback

### 5.1.3.5 Feedback loop

All participants acknowledged the importance of dialogue and indicated that they facilitate it in their class. In most workshops, students were involved in a thorough whole-class discussion where they were asked (directly and indirectly) to present their translation (or part of it) and
defend it. Bader’s focus on quantity seemed to reduce the depth of discussion in his class. In the large classes of Ali and Sarah, students’ involvement in the whole-class discussion was, naturally, weaker. In these two classes, students were involved more in pair and group work and had less interaction with the instructor. Sarah’s provision of individualized written comments and collaborative use of technology optimized her communication with students. Mandating revision and resubmission increased the chances of feedback loop in Sarah’s class. Since the other instructors in the US-CASE evaluated a final draft only, they all felt unsure concerning what students do with or feel about their feedback (see Table 20).

**Feedback loop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Feedback Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bader</strong></td>
<td>The instructor’s emphasis on quantity of assignments over depth and quality of discussion reduces the effectiveness of feedback in this class. The use of one-on-one conferencing helps in completing the feedback loop, even though it is conducted only after the midterm exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Omar</strong></td>
<td>The dynamic atmosphere of the class allows student to engage actively in the workshops. The instructor’s dialogic method encourages students to present and fully discuss their own translations before listening and discussing the instructor’s suggested version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zaid</strong></td>
<td>This class necessitates that students lead of the discussion while the instructor directs and makes sure they are on the right track. The instructor avoids giving direct answers and interferes only by giving questions and cues that increase mutual understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ali</strong></td>
<td>The instructor’s brief and direct responses to students’ answers reduce the chances of real engagement inside or outside the class. The lack of individualized, written comments makes the loop clearly incomplete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kate</strong></td>
<td>The fact that the instructor invites students to justify their translation and submit as many drafts as they want, and that some students do return with questions and revisions, certainly creates a feedback loop between the instructor and learners in this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sarah</strong></td>
<td>In her written feedback, the instructor uses plenty of discussion comments and inquiries and mandates that students revise and resubmit their work. Students are further asked to use the track-change feature so that their responses become clear to the instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emily</strong></td>
<td>Although she tries to involve students in verbal conversations about the feedback and asks students to write a reflective log, the instructor still feels that the loop is incomplete because she does not know what students do with the feedback, especially those with low grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas</strong></td>
<td>One-on-one dialogue happens less in the classroom and more in the revision process of the final project at the end of the semester. Students rarely return with questions or comments because of the abundant verbal and written feedback they receive, the instructor believes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 20: Feedback loop*
5.2 Emerging Themes and Issues

5.2.1 Different perception leads to different practice

One of the first themes that stood out clearly in the data was participants’ different perspectives of feedback. Their understandings of what feedback entails as a concept was as various as their attitudes toward feedback, which may suggest a causal relationship between the two.

In the SA-CASE, the researcher’s choice of an appropriate Arabic word for feedback was a bit challenging. Even though words such as correction, comments, remarks, information, and grading were commonly used in the SA-CASE, the word feedback, which encompasses all of the above, turned out to be less so. While designing the data collection instruments, the researcher conducted some research and found *attaghtthiah arrajii’ah* (التغذية الراجعة) to be the most common translation of the word in the Arabic academic literature. In the interviews, he used *attaghtthiah arrajii’ah* alternatively with the calque *fidbāk* (فيدباك) which comes second in terms of popularity. To remove ambiguity, the researcher gave further explanation to the participants who did not seem to understand the concept immediately.

Most of the SA-CASE student participants were not sure what feedback meant. After brief clarification from the researcher, students knew what kind of feedback they prefer and what qualities they would like to see in it. In the US-CASE, both instructors and students were more apprised of what feedback entails, although certain types and functions of feedback seemed new to some participants. For instance, some students (e.g., Emily’s students) found the concepts self-feedback and feedback loop to be interestingly new. All participants, in both cases, acknowledged the value of feedback but each participant looked at it from a slightly different angle. While some participants highlighted the error detection aspect of feedback (e.g., Thomas), others focused on the communicative role it played between the instructor and learner (e.g., Omar). Some instructors emphasized what feedback offers to the instructor and how it can improve the teaching (e.g., Ali), others put emphasis on its benefits to the learner (e.g., Sarah). Instructors who were
attached more to the industry drew attention to the professional standards and the importance of bringing them to the classroom (e.g., Kate).

Students’ perception of feedback appeared to be influenced in some way by their respective instructor’s perception and practice of feedback. In the SA-CASE, the definition of feedback given by most students highlighted verbal and collective modes. When specifically asked if they preferred written correction, some students did see a real need for it, and some thought it would be helpful but burdensome to the instructor. In the US-CASE, students brought up the translation marketplace frequently. The only group of students who emphasized the importance of revision was the group that was mandated by their instructor to turn in a revised version of their corrected translation.

5.2.2 Verbal collective versus written individualized feedback

“While the spoken word can travel faster, you can’t take it home in your hand. Only the written word can be absorbed wholly at the convenience of the reader.” These words, said by Kingman Brewster (1964, p. 5), former president of Yale University, seemed to be apply in the US-CASE more than the SA-CASE.

An obvious theme that revealed itself throughout the study was the absence of written feedback in the SA-CASE. When asked to provide samples of written feedback, two instructors returned with none (Ali and Zaid). The other two provided samples of graded midterm exams and indicated that students were not allowed to take them home. In all translation assignments, students were not supposed to turn in a written draft before the class. Students were required to come to class prepared to (verbally) workshop a translation with the instructor and take as many notes as they could. In the largest class (Ali’s), students worked in groups and each group turned in a translation, yet they received no written comments on it, only occasional verbal remarks.

The SA-CASE instructors had various reasons for not providing written feedback to their students. Giving tailored comments to an individual student may have benefited this specific
student but not the whole group to which he or she belonged. In other words, “it would not serve the collective interest of students,” as one instructor (Zaid) literally said. Another reason for not providing written comments was the instructor’s large classes and heavy teaching load. The SA-CASE instructors had 19, 8, 6, and 4 students in their classes respectively, while the US-CASE instructors had 12, 4, 3, 2 students in their classes. The numbers of students in the two cases were relatively close. In the US-CASE, instructors complained about their teaching load, yet they provided frequent written feedback to each student. Three instructors in the US-CASE required students to submit a translation draft before or at the start of the translation workshop, and these instructors provided written comments on each individual’s work. The fourth instructor (Emily) expected students to come to class ready with their drafts but required individual submission after workshopping the whole text. She then provided individualized written comments to each student.

While all instructors in the SA-CASE relied solely on verbal collective discussions, instructors in the US-CASE seemed to use the verbal collective discussions as supportive to the written individualized component. In the US-CASE, two instructors (Emily and Thomas) assigned individual projects, but never group or pair work. The former thought her class to be too small for such activities, while the latter believed that translation is fundamentally solitary in nature, thus students should be trained that way. Group and pair work existed in both the SA-CASE and US-CASE, yet in the latter each group or pair member was expected to turn in an individual contribution and was often graded on it. Students were assigned a specific individual task to carry out (e.g., looking-up terms, editing, proofreading, etc.) within the assigned general collective task. In the SA-CASE, when students worked in groups, they worked as a group and graded as a group. One instructor in the SA-CASE (Ali) indicated that he avoided giving praise to an individual student in front of the class as this had negative consequences overall. Instead, the instructor directed his positive remarks to the group as a whole without singling out the student. Another instructor in the SA-CASE (Zaid) asserted that his job was to plan the course and facilitate the
learning, while the students’ job was to follow the plan and do the learning. “Students should do the writing, not instructors,” according to Zaid.

5.2.3 From broad verbal to specific written criteria

The use of clearly specified assessment criteria reflected how systematic the feedback was. Based on the analyzed data, it could be argued that the systematicity of feedback may be linked in some way to the verbal-written orientation of a given culture.

In the SA-CASE, only one instructor (Omar) used a written correction key that his students clearly understood and applied in the workshops. The other three instructors relied mostly on verbal instruction to describe their standards. When asked about the grading criteria used in their classes, students hesitated and could not provide a definite answer. The fact that the SA-CASE instructors did not provide written correction may explain their lower dependence on written points-based grading criteria. Total dependence on verbal collective feedback made instructors also depend on broad verbal criteria. Furthermore, instructors seemed to separate sharply between theory and practice, thus laying aside any theoretical element from the course including the grading criteria. They justified their lack of written grading criteria by arguing that students had already studied error typologies and translation strategies in theoretical courses such as Introduction to Translation, hence there was no need to repeat this part. Practice classes were devoted to practice and practice only. “Practice doesn’t happen by theorizing about translation, but by doing translation,” said Ali. Instructors also did not see a need for spending time on the rubrics because students’ low language proficiency would not help them grasp the idea. Grading criteria were seen as too complicated and advanced for students.

In the US-CASE, all instructors used points-based, written criteria for grading. The grading measures they used varied from a sophisticated, professional rubric (Thomas’) to simple, major-minor error evaluation (Emily’s). Emily, who used simple major-minor error correction, believed that her literary background, rather than translation, made her less proficient in
developing translation rubrics. She also blamed this on the fact that use of rubrics was not so common when she was a student. Eventually, Emily still saw great use and benefit in grading rubrics. She realized the need for rubrics after teaching translation practice for a couple of semesters, and she planned to develop a rubric for her class with the help of a professional colleague. It seemed that the prevailing culture surrounding Emily made her not only non-resistant to the idea of rubrics, but also determined to embrace it. The prevailing culture in the SA-CASE, on the contrary, did not encourage the use of grading rubrics, thus instructors did not feel pressured to use rubrics in the way Emily did. The prevailing culture in the SA-CASE also had an effect on the perspective of students’, who did not see a real need for rubrics either.

The US-CASE instructors brought up the issue of grades frequently when they talked about rubrics. It seemed that one of the reasons for using the rubrics in the US-CASE was to give grades as objectively and concretely as possible. According to the US-CASE instructors, American students are grade-focused; they associate success with grades and expect to see an explanation for their missing grades. The rubrics detail the marking process and help students understand where they are in the process. Interestingly, while some students found grades equally as important as instructor’s comments, the majority of students considered the instructor’s comments to be more important and valuable than grades. In the SA-CASE, instructors also thought that students generally care about grades more than the comments, but their students indicated otherwise. The SA-CASE instructors gave summative grades for translation assignments and exams with verbal discussion of errors in the classroom. Their students (e.g., Zaid’s and Ali’s) wished to get a clearer justification of their grades but felt reluctant to request it as it may have been interpreted as a gesture of distrust.

5.2.4 Error ‘detection’ and rater variability

A major theme that arose in the data is instructors’ emphasis on students’ errors. Most instructors in both the SA-CASE and US-CASE repeatedly stressed this idea. Instructors in both contexts
seemed to have the routine of devoting time to discussing students’ common errors and overarching problems. The instructor’s main role was seen as that of a knowledgeable expert who was there to tell students where they erred and how to fix their errors.

One instructor in the SA-CASE (Zaid) described himself as a ‘traffic police,’ regulating students’ participation in a way that that exposed students’ weaknesses and flaws and allowed the instructor to provide help. ‘Hunting for errors’ was the literal phrase that that instructor used to describe what he did in the weekly translation workshop. Another instructor (Bader) often directed questions to weaker students first so that more errors would come to the surface. It appeared that each translation error made by a student was, in and of itself, an opportunity to raise a translation issue in class, diagnose a student need, and provide appropriate assistance. “Students do not learn much from a correct answer,” one instructor affirmed (Zaid). A correct answer says that the student knows, therefore no need to waste time on what the student already knows.

Likewise, in the US-CASE, this tone of focusing on errors was frequently present. One instructor (Thomas) indicated that he displayed students’ translation on the class screen and edited on site. The instructor here saw himself as a professional editor more than a facilitating mentor. Again, this instructor emphasized his role of error spotting and specifically called it “negative feedback amplification.” He was openly not in support of highlighting the positive aspects in students’ work. Yet, his rationale was a bit different from the one used by the SA-CASE instructors mentioned earlier. He believed that the translation marketplace does not give much praise and stops only at translation errors. This ‘tough’ reality should be brought to the classroom, according to Thomas, so that students get prepared for what is ahead of them.

Instructors in both contexts admitted that dealing with errors is not an easy task. A doctor sometimes has to perform a painful surgery to treat a patient. In the SA-CASE, one instructor (Bader) saw effective feedback as one that takes into consideration the psychology of the student. The same idea was expressed by a US-CASE instructor (Thomas) who indicated that he tried to
maintain a positive rapport by making the class relaxed and friendly. This helped students to accept criticism and get used to someone telling them that they are ‘wrong,’ as the two instructors put it. Making students become proficient translators may necessitate that they sometimes feel uncomfortable.

5.2.5 Technology-facilitated feedback

Another theme that could easily be identified in the data was the strong connection between feedback and technology. While two instructors (Bader and Ali) did not implement computer technology in their translation classes mainly because of the technical problems it constantly involved, all six other instructors found it hard to teach without the help of technology.

Those who integrated technology in their translation classes found several uses for it. In addition to using email for communication with students outside the class, instructors used email to send and receive translation tasks. In class, they displayed the ST and allowed students to follow the discussion in an easier manner. Instead of the instructor asking students to check a given sentence in a given line, the instructor simply pointed to it on the wide screen. Students’ translations were also projected and analyzed alongside, and online resources were always a right-click away. Four instructors (Omar, Zaid, Kate, and Thomas) used IWB-facilitated feedback, workshopping students’ translations using the class wide screen. Their use of the wide screen to type each translation, discuss it, and edit it on site made a huge difference compared to the traditional read-and-translate method utilized by other instructors (e.g., Bader and Emily). Omar and Zaid did not provide written correction on students’ work, yet their use of IWB added a demonstrative component to the verbal component and made the students’ task of following the discussion and taking notes much easier. The use of IWB in providing the feedback helped students visualize what the instructors said, as opposed to only hearing it. In Zaid’s class, students seemed to be the most active and engaged in the discussion since they themselves went to the IWB and typed their translation then led the discussion. In Omar and Thomas’ classes, on the other
side, the instructor led the discussion and typed students’ suggestions, which made him clearly do most of the talking and writing.

The use of IWB made the translation workshops more dynamic and effective, as many student participants indicated. Omar and Zaid’s students were extremely satisfied with their instructors’ method of feedback and they wished other instructors would follow their approach in using the IWB. They did not find the scarcity of written correction a big issue. Ali’s students, on the other hand, seemed to be frustrated about their instructor’s ‘hasty’ manner in giving the feedback. They found concentration while the instructor read the ST from a paper to be wearying sometimes, and wished that he implemented technology in some way. While Thomas displayed students’ translations along with the ST and typed the suggested ‘better’ translation that resulted from the discussion, Omar and Zaid engaged students more by asking them to suggest their translation or (in Zaid’s case) go to the IWB and type it themselves. A common aspect of those three instructors was that they took their time in discussing students’ translations. This was particularly admired by their students and was brought up as a teaching quality that made a huge impact on their learning of translation.

The use of machine translation, such as Google Translate, also appeared frequently in the data. Instructors seemed to face the challenge of students resorting to these free automated services for an instant translation of the ST. Some instructors (e.g., Bader and Omar) indicated that they strictly prohibited students from using such tools. The use of these tools was frowned upon to the extent that instructors made the comment “Don’t google translate” when a student suggested an apparently literal rendering. Other instructors (e.g., Emily) seemed to adapt more with these tools that they sometimes used in class to illustrate problematic issues in translation. The Internet overall was a valuable resource to most instructors in this study. During all observed classes (except Bader’s and Ali’s), instructors checked parallel texts and showed their students how to find a solution to a translation problem.
5.2.6 Market-oriented feedback

A consistent theme in the data was the idea of bringing the ‘professional world’ to the classroom. The application of theoretical concepts in translation practice classes seemed to be a distinct feature in the US-CASE classes, but not so much in the SA-CASE classes.

In the US-CASE, all instructors set aside a specific time for analyzing the ST and discussing the translation brief in any translation task. They may have assumed the role of a translation client or initiator and asked students to specify the purpose (or skopos) of the translation task. One instructor (Kate) asked students to translate for a ‘real’ law firm, and had their work edited by two professional proofreaders. Instructors devoted part of the course to teach theoretical concepts and, sometimes, names of leading scholars in the field. They insisted that they used theory that was relevant to practice, theory that helped students justify their translation choices. The one instructor who seemed to concentrate more on practice and less on theory (i.e., Thomas), still analyzed the ST and discussed the translation brief briefly prior to the translation workshop. He used professional translation assessment and educated students about professional translation ethics. Students in the US-CASE seemed to be influenced by this ‘professional’ culture of feedback. They brought up the marketplace quite often in the interview. They talked about professional ethics and preparation for the ATA certifying exam. They realized the importance of getting as much feedback as they could while they were in school because once they work in the ‘real world,’ errors can be fatal.

In the SA-CASE, the observed practice classes seemed to be devoid of theoretical concepts. Instructors’ analysis of the ST often focused on textual and lexical features. They may have compared the SL and TL cultures and readership and discuss the purpose of translation. But theoretical concepts and professional ethics were rarely brought up in class. Again, instructors seemed to avoid discussing translation theory in practice courses because it was the subject of theoretical courses. Furthermore, while some instructors (e.g., Bader and Zaid) claimed that students did not reach the level at which they could grasp translation theory, other instructors
(e.g., Omar) avoided discussing translation theory also because of his unfamiliarity with this area of knowledge. Omar admitted that he did not feel competent enough to discuss translation theory with his students. He focused on linguistic and instrumental skills such as reading comprehension, textual analysis, and use of bilingual dictionaries. The separation between theory and practice in these classes was confirmed by one instructor (Ali) who argued that “practice doesn’t happen by theorizing about translation, but by doing translation.” The strong emphasis on practice in Ali’s class appeared in the large quantity of STs he covered throughout the semester. He assigned a new ST each week and did not spend much time on analyzing the ST or discussing students’ translations.

The influence of professional background on translation practices could be seen in all of the US-CASE classes. One instructor (Thomas) took a firm stand toward what some may consider creativity. He found that translator instructors who lacked professional experience tended to give their students too much liberty in deviating from the ST meanings. His students noticed the difference between him and other instructors, and made sure to adhere to the ST as much as they could to please him. This professional influence made another instructor (Kate) seek the help of ‘real’ clients and proofreaders to prepare students for the marketplace. It made a third instructor (Sarah) ask students to deal with her as a client while they played the role of professional translators, to the extent that some students gave themselves a brand name as if they were a real translation company. The professional influence could also be seen in the fourth instructor’s (Emily) class, who assigned a translation brief with a purpose and audience different from that of the ST to challenge her students and put them in authentic situations. All of these influences of professional practice appeared in the US-CASE, but not in the SA-CASE.

5.2.7 Peer feedback: Conflicting views and attitudes

Across the two contexts of the SA-CASE and US-CASE, peer feedback seemed to be the most controversial. The study revealed that there were three types of instructors: those who believed
firmly in peer feedback, those who did not believe in peer feedback, and those who took a cautious approach to it. Students also had varying views about the effectiveness of peer feedback.

Bader from the SA-CASE believed in the importance of diversifying the source of feedback and engaging students in giving the feedback. Yet, he found the class of four students too small for group work. Bader’s view and attitude was similar to that of Emily from the US-CASE who had three students and found peer activities difficult to implement. Like Bader, she believed that the whole-class workshop was itself a chance for students to provide peer feedback to one another. Interestingly, these two instructors also followed a read-and-translate approach in their translation workshops. Their students wished to see some pair or group projects in the class, but could not imagine how this would be applicable in their small class.

The two instructors who used group activities cautiously were Omar and Zaid. They used group work, when they used it, in pretranslation tasks. Omar sometimes asked students to work in groups and discuss their individual translations briefly before the whole-class workshop. He mandated that each student translate and have his own translation draft ready before getting into a group. Omar sat closer to students while they worked in groups and took notes of their discussion in order to use them in the workshop. Zaid asked students to form into teams of three and do a terminology search using the dictionary. He roamed around students and offered assistance to whomever needed it. Omar believed that diagnosing the chemistry among students early in the semester was necessary before deciding whether group activities were appropriate to the class. Students of Omar and Zaid found peer feedback useful and indicated that they appreciated giving and receiving feedback from their classmates.

Group work seemed to be the most common method in the largest two classes of this study (Ali’s and Sarah’s, 19 students and 12 students respectively). In almost all translation workshops in these two classes, students worked in groups. The effectiveness of group activities in these two classes differed drastically, however. In Ali’s class, no theoretical component was integrated in any way into the practice component. Students worked in groups in almost all of the class period,
and listened to occasional brief comments from the instructor who got involved minimally in the activity. Students spent more time translating and less time discussing their work. They became demotivated and found group work ineffective. In Sarah’s class, students were exposed to a variety of pre- and post-translation tasks: they extracted terminology, exchanged drafts, peer edited and proofread, and listened to the instructor’s theoretical mini-lectures prior to each translation workshop. They worked in groups, in pairs, and individually. When students worked in groups, Sarah took an active role by circulating among students and interacting positively with students. After the workshop, students received written feedback from the instructor and incorporated it in their (mandatory) revised version. Having three native speakers of Spanish in the class added a special value to Sarah’s peer activities. Students found the collaborative atmosphere of the class quite useful.

Kate and Thomas might have been the strongest advocates of bringing professional standards to the translation classroom. Nevertheless, the former was a strong believer in peer feedback, while the latter was a strong skeptic toward peer feedback. Even though she had two students in her class, Kate found peer feedback applicable and ‘fascinating.’ In her class, students were asked to do a translation pair project and edit each other’s individual work. In an individual project once, each student was asked to come up with a translation brief for the task but then to use the classmate’s translation brief instead. The variety of activities in Kate’s class made the class dynamic and lively. Her students found peer feedback useful and enjoyable. On the contrary, Thomas did not assign any pair or group projects. He believed that students at this stage were not competent of giving useful feedback. Student’s low level of language proficiency made them incapable of realizing translation errors. Thomas also believed that the professional practice of translation is solitary in nature, thus students should be trained for that reality. His students admired the thorough collective discussion in class, but indicated that they exchanged ‘natural peer feedback’ outside the class.
5.2.8 Self-feedback: ‘Vaguely interesting!’

Self-feedback is a broad concept within the practice of self-regulated learning. It places the learner at the center of the educational process and can occur through goal-setting, self-motivation, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and self-reflection. It can be fostered by activities such as portfolios, journals, and diaries (Di Giulio, 2004). The concept, and hence value, of self-feedback did not seem to be immediately clear to most participants of this study, including instructors.

In the SA-CASE, the ambiguity of the self-feedback concept made Bader reduce it to students’ grading of their own work. He argued that students were incapable of doing such a task because they were not trained to do so. Students often think highly of themselves, which made them unable to see their own flaws. He, thus, did not allow students to select an ST or give an opinion on the assessment process. Likewise, Omar assumed that students at this stage were incapable of assessing others’ work, let alone their own. Asking students to revise their translation during exams was seen by Omar as a form of self-reflection. Zaid assumed the same when he indicated that he asked students to comment on their own translation during class workshops. He still argued that self-feedback was the least effective source of feedback because of students’ low language proficiency. Not far from this perspective, Ali considered encouraging students to look critically at others’ translations outside the class a form of self-evaluation. He also believed that tracking students’ progress throughout the semester revealed how much they had reflected on their own errors.

In the US-CASE, Thomas appeared to be of the same opinion that students “don’t know what they don’t know,” thus they could hardly benefit from any self-assessment task. He did not look excited about reflective assignments such as portfolio and saw them as “a matter of teaching style.” The other three instructors (Kate, Sarah, and Emily) showed enthusiasm about the idea of self-feedback and this reflected in their practice, though in varying degrees. Kate asked students to turn in a translation log with each translation task and list 5-10 challenges they had encountered during the translation process. Although this is a form of self-feedback, Kate did not
see it as such. Kate understood self-feedback as an ongoing process of monitoring one’s own learning progress, which, she admitted, “she did not know how to check.” She still believed such process to be the students’ responsibility, not the instructor’s. In Sarah’s class, even though it was the largest in the US-CASE, deliberate self-feedback occurred in several tasks. In addition to the mandatory translation log, students occasionally were asked to grade their individual translation or contribution to a group/pair project. Students were guided further with a template to guide their self-assessment task. Emily also required students to write a reflective essay with each translation they submitted, but found that students needed more training on these tasks since students, according to her, were not sufficiently independent at this stage.

Students’ reactions to these self-feedback exercises varied as well. While some students ‘loved’ those reflective assignments and found in them an opportunity to express their views about the task, others felt a bit ‘fed up’ because of the repetitive nature of the assignment. Some students found those sub-tasks to be harder than the main translation task; students knew how to translate but they did not know how to judge their own translation. Overall, students were amused by the concept of self-feedback and admitted that they had never heard of it. It was “vaguely interesting,” as one student (of Emily’s) put it. These conflicting reactions to self-feedback from both instructors and students raised significant implications.

5.2.9 Feedback on feedback: A tough question!

Most instructors in this study knew little of what their students do with or feel about the feedback. Feedback on feedback is a further step that increases the common understanding between the instructor and students. As students may receive feedback from various sources, instructors likewise can receive feedback on their feedback from various sources. What emerged in this study was that almost no instructors received feedback from other sources such as a colleague instructor or peer evaluator.
The formal, standardized course evaluation, which all students complete at the end of the semester, is a procedure adopted in both the SA-CASE and US-CASE. It is a multiple-choice survey that asks students to evaluate their instructor on a set of items that include the teaching and assessment method. Surprisingly, no instructor in both cases of this study, nor any student, seemed to have a positive opinion about it. Most instructors believed that students do not take that survey seriously, and when they do, they rarely give honest opinions. Students, in like manner, claimed that instructors do not take the survey seriously, which in turn makes students care less about it. Some instructors (e.g., Bader and Ali) specified that students are incapable of evaluating their instructor because of the huge gap in knowledge and experience between the two. Those instructors claimed that low achievement and less serious students often give biased evaluations for emotional and personal reasons rather than rational and academic ones.

During the semester, instructors were of three kinds. The first kind (e.g., Omar and Sarah) believed strongly in the value of students’ feedback, which prompted them to ask students to express their views about all aspects of the course in written and verbal format. The second kind (e.g., Zaid and Thomas) did not believe strongly in students’ feedback, but they did not mind listening to students’ overall impression about a few aspects of the course such as the difficulty of the ST. The third kind never asked for students’ feedback, either because the instructor believed that students were incapable of benefiting the instructor (as in Bader’s case), or because the instructor was not used to getting feedback from students because it was not a common practice when she was a student (as in Emily’s case).

Noticeably, students of instructors who believed strongly in student feedback were more confident in stating that they were capable of giving useful input to the instructor. By contrast, students of instructors who did not ask for student feedback assumed that students were generally incapable of giving valuable input to the instructor. Reflective exercises in themselves could be a form of student feedback, even though some instructors (e.g., Kate and Emily) did not bring them up when asked about ‘closing the gap.’ One student (of Emily’s) indicated that she used these
translation logs to state whether or not she enjoyed the translation task and how much she learned from it. She found in the log a great opportunity to express her views about the assignments and make her voice heard in a frequent manner.

5.2.10 Dialogue(s) and the feedback loop

‘Dialogic’ was a word that almost all instructors used to describe their class atmosphere. All instructors, in both SA-CASE and US-CASE, considered their classes to be dialogic in nature, and that dialogue was an essential feature in the feedback they facilitated in each translation task. Yet, the collected data revealed that while dialogue did exist in most observed classes, it existed in varying forms and degrees.

In the SA-CASE, one instructor (Bader) made sure he created a friendly atmosphere and maintained a positive rapport with students. In every translation workshop, students were encouraged to participate by reading part of their translation and defending it even if they had to disagree with the instructor. Students admitted that Bader pushed them to do so, and in such a small class, they had no choice but to engage in the discussion. His technique of consulting all the students when an error was made and listening to each student before intervening increased student engagement further. However, because of his obvious focus on the quantity of assignments, Bader’s responses were often characterized as directive, authoritative evaluation. It mostly consisted of direct correction with explanation. The read-and-translate method applied in his class revolved around the instructor, as every student directed their answers to the instructor and waited for the instructor’s comment. Even when they were asked to comment on their classmates’ translations, students still addressed the instructor and wrote down his direct response as the ideal answer. Bader attempted to complete the loop through one-on-one meetings with students outside the classroom. According to his students, this technique, which was applied once a semester after the midterm exam, would have been more useful had it been more immediate and frequent.
In Omar and Zaid’s classes, dialogue occurred in a dynamic form. Their use of IWB added a visual, demonstrative mode to their dominating verbal method. In addition to giving students a greater chance to present and defend their work on the wide screen, these two instructors always avoided giving direct corrections. They gave cues and raised questions that challenged students’ thinking. They requested a response that may have included documentation, for example, by referring students to the dictionary. They hinted at the error and may have located it only when students seemed to stray away from it. They may have even played the devil’s advocate by suggesting a ‘wrong’ translation only to provoke the discussion further. In Zaid’s class, students initiated the feedback by going to the IWB and typing their own translation themselves. Students’ sense of ownership of their work could clearly be noticed through their great satisfaction with the feedback they received in these two classes. It also appeared in their understanding of the feedback concept, which, for Omar’s students, was a “collaborative two-way interaction.” Students declared that these two instructors (Omar and Zaid) had made a difference in the way students translated and criticized others’ translations.

Dialogue that occurred in Ali’s class also differed in nature. His total dependence on ‘autonomous’ group activities made his involvement in their work quite limited. In his observed class, stronger students took care of the translation task, while weaker students were carelessly inactive. Collaborative feedback was reported by his students to be ineffective. Ali’s adherence to exposing students to as many different STs as possible made him concentrate on quantity of tasks at the cost of quality. His verbal feedback consisted mainly of direct comments with limited explanation. The loop was hardly complete in Ali’s communication with students, as students hardly got any post-task feedback either in verbal or in written form, not to mention the lack of any individualized follow-up conferencing. The frustrated experience with and attitude toward feedback shown by Ali’s students raised questions and doubts about the effectiveness of his approach to feedback.
In the US-CASE, dialogue was encouraged in all classes, and it took various forms. Generally, all instructors facilitated collective verbal discussion, followed by individualized written comments to each student. Kate and Sarah took a further step by inviting students to submit a revised version of their work, which puts the onus of feedback solicitation on the student—a very student-centered move. Their use of the track-change feature of MS Word facilitated this procedure further. Requiring students to write a reflection on every translation task engaged students in the feedback loop and helped them monitor and improve their own performance. Sarah’s survey of students’ views on the course in the middle of the semester allowed her to get feedback on feedback and adjust her method accordingly. Emily and Thomas seemed to provide the most detailed verbal comments in their classes, and students found it an advantageous feature of these two classes. Emily used a read-and-translate method, yet she spent longer discussing students’ translations, giving the quality of assignments priority over quantity. Thomas’ use of IWB and his display of students’ translations on the class screen made it easier for his students to follow and engage in the discussion.

When asked about what their students do with the feedback, all instructors in the SA-CASE and US-CASE had no clear idea. Some instructors tried to put the ball in students’ court by assuming that it was entirely the students’ responsibility what to do with the feedback. The majority, however, indicated that they should have known what students did with or felt about the feedback, as this could make the feedback loop run more efficiently.

5.3 Implications and Recommendations

With the objective of describing the feedback culture in translator education, this study attempted to address a simple, yet complex question: How do translator instructors and students situate, shape, and negotiate feedback in their translation practice classes? The nature of this broad question demanded a comprehensive conceptual framework that facilitates depicting a detailed
picture of the examined topic. It also required examining case studies where translation is being practiced by students and evaluated by instructors. The selected case studies of undergraduate translator education programs (the SA-CASE and US-CASE) were ideal because of their prominent reputation in their region, their well-structured program curricula, and the ease of access they provided to the researcher. The population of study was narrowed down to instructors and students of advanced translation practice courses. This reduction in project scope raised the chance of recruiting instructors who were more experienced and students who were more mature. The selected sample population was diverse in terms of age, gender, academic degree, professional experience, teaching experience, language combination, and number of students. This diverse sample helped give a qualitative account of the perceptions and practices in the two examined contexts each of which was anything but homogenous.

The study revealed that participants had varied understandings of what feedback is. Some participants had a clearer and more definite idea of feedback than others. What was obvious in the data was the strong influence of academic and professional experience on instructors’ perceptions of feedback. A participant such as Kate was not excited about the term ‘feedback’ and preferred ‘editing’ or ‘proofreading’ over it. She had her students translate for a real law firm in a midterm project and outsourced their translations to professional proofreaders. Her professional experience as an owner of a translation company situated the way she looked at feedback and affected her classroom dynamics. Kate’s perception and practice of feedback, in turn, seemed to influence the way her students looked at feedback and its importance. They considered feedback vital because of the sensitivity of documents with which translators work professionally, especially in fields like medicine and law where errors could bring about tragic consequences. An instructor like Omar recalled his previous experience as a college translation student and confessed that his instructor’s read-and-translate method was ineffective. He saw feedback as a form of communication that starts and ends with students. His students, in the same
manner, asserted that feedback should be a two-way collaborative interaction between student and instructor.

This finding has a significant implication for the theorization and practice of translator education. Learners often see things through the eyes of their teachers and may gradually be influenced by the latter’s own beliefs about and practices of teaching and learning (Kern, 1995; Allen, 1996). Students can grasp the idea of effective feedback and realize how crucial it is to their progress in learning. Realizing the value of something is the first step to appreciating it and using it to one’s own benefit. It is difficult to imagine an enthusiastic, dynamic instructor believing firmly in the value of effective feedback and acting on this belief, having students who are demotivated or frustrated about the feedback. And vice versa. One of the striking statements that Ali’s students made was that “we could easily tell whether or not the instructor enjoys having a conversation with us on our work.” They indicated that they lost interest in the feedback because they felt the instructor lacked interest in teaching. They also lost interest in peer feedback because of their instructor’s passive involvement in the activity. By contrast, Sarah’s emphasis on the importance of revision reflected on her students who confidently argued that feedback cannot be useful if students do not read feedback carefully and use it in their revision. Revision was a burden but it was what made students learn from their errors, Sarah’s students asserted. The active role Sarah played in group and pair work was one of the main reasons her students found peer feedback useful. Again, this finding implied that clear understanding of what makes feedback effective leads to appreciation of its value. And this consequently leads to practice in which feedback is emphasized and enhanced through various modes and tools. Students appreciate and respond to the feedback accordingly.

This study showed that instructors valued verbal feedback and facilitated it in their classes. Most classes have translation workshops where students are asked to share their translation drafts and discuss them in a verbal, collective way. Yet, while individualized written feedback was rarely delivered in the SA-CASE, it was delivered regularly in all classes of the
**US-CASE.** In the SA-CASE, the collective interest overshadowed the individual interest. Verbal in-process feedback is provided to students in a collaborative manner between the instructor and students. In the US-CASE, verbal collective discussion was seen as supportive to the written feedback tailored to each individual student. In this respect, this finding lends support to Alsahli’s broad claim (2012) that there is a “lack of feedback” in a number of university translation programs in Saudi Arabia. It, however, elucidates Alsahli’s claim further by confirming the written component was indeed mostly absent in the SA-CASE, but still the verbal component was strongly present. This has a significant sociocultural implication. The SA-CASE instructors believed in the importance of feedback and had their classes centered on students. Yet, verbal discussion was the most preferable and dominant kind of communication they implemented. While most of their students thought that frequent written feedback would be useful, some students argued that the thorough class discussions left no need for any additional written comments. Students did not seem to see the real necessity for written feedback because most of their translation work was done verbally. They may have brought their written drafts or notes to class, but they were not required to submit any work beside their verbal participation.

**The scarcity of written feedback in the SA-CASE raises some concerns.** Since the subject of the course is translation, not interpretation, shouldn’t students be producing written work? Shouldn’t written outcomes be corrected in written format (Brookhart, 2008)? Doesn’t written and computer delivery of feedback enhance intervention effects and construct it as less biased, as some studies indicate (e.g., Kluger & DeNisi, 1996; Shute, 2008)? Wouldn’t written correction help students organize the instructor’s feedback and permanently retain the most important parts of it (Brookhart, 2008)? Wouldn’t written feedback have a greater chance of meeting individual needs, which vary from one student to the next, particularly when students (in this study and previous studies) specifically complained about the lack of ‘written’ feedback? Isn’t translation a form of “creative writing” (Perteghella & Loffredo, 2007) that requires various writing skills, such as grammar and sentence structure, that cannot always be detected when
produced verbally? Can students advance in producing acceptable written translation outcomes without ongoing written correction from an expert (Shreve, 2006)? Shouldn’t translation be ‘edited,’ ‘revised,’ and ‘proofread’ as it is commonly practiced in the translation marketplace (Gouadec, 2007)? Don’t professional translators often work within a network of practitioners that may require them to give and/or receive editing and proofreading as part of the translation service provided to the client? Shouldn’t these translation skills be emphasized in translation practice classes to prepare students for the realities of the labor market ahead of them (Olvera-Lobo et al., 2007)? Such questions will require answers from translator instructors who saw no need for providing written feedback on students’ work.

**The obvious emphasis on collective, verbal feedback in the SA-CASE, as opposed to individualized, written feedback in the US-CASE, could be an attribute of the social context to which each case belongs.** “Feedback is rooted in social practice,” as Washbourne (2014) has rightly remarked, “and unavoidably involves the positioning of social subjects in discourse and the constitution of their relations” (p. 3). According to Hall (1979), “context carries varying proportions of the meaning” (p. 86). Hall perceives context as “the information that surrounds an event; it is inextricably bound up with the meaning of the event.” For Hall, “the cultures of the world can be compared on a scale from high to low context” (Hall & Hall, 1990, p. 6). The communication style of a high context culture tends to depend on the physical context (e.g., body language, facial expressions, voice tone, and eye contact) and the shared information internalized in the individual person. Part of the meaning is implicit in the transmitted massage. In a low context culture, in contrast, meanings are explicitly stated in the transmitted message and explanation is expected when something is missing. High context cultures tend to value the collective and group harmony over the individual’s needs and goals, while low context cultures tend to do the opposite (Hall, 1979, p. 79). In a collectivist culture, according to Hofstede (1980), individuals are expected to be integrated into groups and the good of the group comes ahead of the personal interest and success. Interdependence among group
members and conformity are encouraged. In an individualist culture, self-actualization and personal accomplishments are emphasized. Individual interests prevail over the collective interests and every person has the right to have his or her own private opinion (p. 45). Zaid in the SA-CASE declared literally that “(individualized) written feedback would not serve the collective interest of students,” while Thomas in the US-CASE emphasizes individual tasks on the basis that “professional translation is solitary in nature.”

**The contextual effect seems to extend to the systematicity of feedback in the examined cases.** The SA-CASE instructors had broad (unwritten) assessment criteria that were explained to students verbally. This is in a sense consistent with Atari’s claim (2012) that “[t]he assessment of translation (in the Arab universities) is still a matter of personal impressionistic judgment” (p. 110). This unsystematic approach resulted in student participants not being able to recall (in the interview) what these criteria exactly were. Students found it difficult to link to practice broad concepts such as cohesion and coherence, as indicated by Ali’s students. The only exception was Omar, who used simple, straightforward correction codes. He explained his error typology to students in both written and verbal forms, and this resulted in a better understanding and application on the part of students. In the US-CASE, instructors’ grading criteria were explained to student in both written and verbal forms. Their criteria varied from broad, holistic measures (i.e., Kate and Emily), to more detailed, analytic rubrics (i.e., Sarah and Thomas). Their students showed clear understanding of the grading criteria and found them useful. While it proves true that students may not always comprehend the assessment criteria or rubrics, as some SA-CASE instructors complained, with training and practice they can. A good example is Thomas’ students who found their instructors’ sophisticated rubric intimidating and confusing at first, but over time found it interesting and worthwhile. Thus, it can be recommended that the next step after clarifying the concept and value of effective feedback to students is to teach and train students on the assessment criteria. Having written, well-defined grading rubrics makes this process easier and more efficient (CCSSO, 2008). Learning what and how to use the grading
criteria does not only help students comprehend the instructor’s feedback, but also enables them to use the criteria in their self- and peer feedback. Sadler (1989) emphasizes:

For students to be able to improve, they must develop the capacity to monitor the quality of their own work during actual production. This in turn requires that students possess an appreciation of what high quality work is, that they have the evaluative skill necessary for them to compare with some objectivity the quality of what they are producing in relation to the higher standard, and that they develop a store of tactics or moves which can be drawn upon to modify their own work (p. 119).

The absence of written correction in the SA-CASE seemed to leave a gap that was filled with different modes of feedback such as one-on-one conferencing and IWB-facilitated discussion. In the former mode, Bader and Zaid reported that they sit with every student in class after the midterm exam and discuss the exam results. In the latter mode, Omar and Zaid used the IWB to display the ST along with students’ translations, which were typed and corrected on site collectively. Students expressed great satisfaction with this method of feedback compared to the classical read-and-translate method. Workshopping students’ translations using the IWB or OHP made students more active and engaged in the discussion. The most salient evidence of active engagement appeared in Zaid’s class where students went to the IWB themselves and typed their own translations then led the class discussion. Giving students the opportunity to present their own work and defend it enhanced their confidence and sense of authorship. Clearly, technology played an integral role in most observed classes of this study. Today’s digital natives are more than ever familiar and at ease with technology, and through basic training can quickly adapt with it. The fact that six instructors and their students in this study used technology with feedback and reported great success with it suggests that technology makes feedback more effective. Students with instructors who did not use any form of technology (i.e., Bader and Ali) reported the least satisfaction. Choosing not to use technology because of its technical issues (as Bader did) or because students do not react positively to it (as Ali did), is countered by the successful experiences of those who integrated it in their classes.
The timing of feedback did not appear to be an issue for the SA-CASE students, since they mostly received immediate, in-process, verbal feedback in each translation workshop. Students were expected to prepare their translation drafts and notes before the workshop but did the translation collectively with their instructor in the workshop. In the US-CASE, students in most cases had to translate at home and turn in their drafts before the workshop. They appreciated the detailed discussion some instructors facilitated in class. So, the verbal feedback they received in class was slightly delayed (post-process). Students’ remarks concerning the timing of feedback were specifically about the written component. The beginning instructors (Kate and Sarah) devoted shorter time for discussion in class, yet they provided “super-fast” written comments to every student. The mid-career instructors (Emily and Thomas) took more time in discussing students’ translation (sometimes up to three weeks), but this was at the expense of the written component, which had to be delayed consequently. While there was a consensus among students on the great value of the ‘thorough’ verbal discussion these two instructors provided, students found the delayed written part a bit upsetting. There was up to four-week separation between students’ translation process and the instructor’s written feedback. Students admitted that it was often hard for them to remember why they made certain choices or what mindset they were in when they were translating (four weeks ago). Emily and Thomas resembled Omar and Zaid in devoting much time and attention to class verbal discussion. **Striking a balance between verbal and written feedback and maintaining their timeliness is obviously a challenge that instructors have to address.** It may require assigning shorter translation tasks so that each translation receives the proper attention it deserves in a timely manner.

Instructors varied in their perception of feedback and in their use of rubrics and technology. They also varied in their ‘detection of errors’ and emphasis on praise. Commenting on a correct translation did not add to student’s knowledge for Zaid, and it was not the norm in the professional world for Thomas. Instructor variation occurred in their evaluation of translation errors. Students complained over the bittersweet fact that each instructor assessed their
translations differently. What one instructor considered a creative solution, another instructor may have seen as deviation from the ST meaning. Students admitted that they found these differences confusing sometimes. Eventually, they did not expect instructors to be carbon copies of one another and attested that this variability enriched their learning experience as students. They wished, however, that instructors met regularly and agreed on general guidelines concerning feedback and translation assessment. Instructor variation may have been attributed to instructors’ different academic backgrounds, professional experience, and personal character. Alternatively, it could merely be an inherent human variation in the ability to detect and interpret translation errors. Students need to be educated and frequently reminded that instructors have different approaches to feedback and assessment, in the same way that practitioners and clients in the marketplace have different beliefs and attitudes. **Students need to be trained to adapt to each translator instructor and learn from him or her, but in the end develop their own way of translating.** This cannot be achieved unless instructors show flexibility in their approach by encouraging dialogue and participation. Students should be engaged in the feedback through tasks that allow them to present their work and defend it in verbal and written forms. Instructors need to present their correction as a suggested, rather than ideal, answer. While students may present an incorrect translation, there can always be more than one correct translation.

Dialogic feedback can be achieved by enabling students to take more responsibility for their own learning and fully progress as competent translators. **Part of students’ responsibility is to engage in class discussions and share feedback with their classmates.** “Translation is for discussion,” as Newmark states (1988, p. 21), and “the ability to discuss translations in an objective way is central to a translator's competence,” as Kussmaul asserts (1995). “It is only through interaction with peers and members of the professional community that students develop a sense of belonging and legitimacy within that community,” according to Johnson (2003, p. 100). Peer feedback occurs directly through collaborative
activities, or indirectly through whole-class discussions. A central factor in the success of peer feedback is the active role and involvement of the instructor in the activity (Kiraly, 2003, p. 21). Students should be given clear instructions on what to discuss and based on what criteria, and should be given sufficient time to prepare before the class (Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick, 2006, p. 205). This study showed that students valued peer feedback as a secondary source with which they can compare their work and gain a different perspective on the task. The instructor is always seen as the first and most reliable source of feedback to students. Peer activities, hence, should not occupy a large part of the class period, and should be used as supportive to the main activity not vice versa. Some instructors in this study (e.g., Thomas) opposed peer activities on the basis that professional translators mostly work alone. Peer work is still a great opportunity to diversify in-class activities and cater for different student abilities and interests (González Davies, 2005, p. 73). Giving and receiving feedback is a key skill that students will take with them into their careers and throughout their lifetime. “If our students graduate not only with translation skills but also with critical, creative thinking skills and communication skills as responsible professionals, they will make invaluable contributions to our society in numerous ways” (Kim, 2005, p. 12). In a translation practice class, peer work does not necessarily have to involve students translating together. Students can take the role of terminologist, proofreader, reviser, and editor (as recommended by Kiraly [2003], Gouadec [2007], and Olvera-Lobo et al. [2007], among others); roles that professional translators typically take in the labor market. Practicing these roles serves both professional and pedagogical purposes and contributes to promoting an effective feedback culture.

Students can be more effective at giving and receiving feedback when they are trained on self-feedback and reflection. “The priority in translation instruction,” according to Zhu (2011), “should be given to the optimization of thinking habits and the development of the ability of monitoring thinking” (p. 20). This study revealed that few instructors ‘deliberately’ assign self-feedback exercises in their classes. The most obvious form of self-feedback appeared in the
translation log assignment which three instructors (Kate, Sarah, and Emily) required from their students in each translation task. Even though one instructor (Kate) did not realize it, this reflective exercise involved a form of self-evaluation that helped students think over their own strengths and weaknesses and monitor their own learning. Sarah asked students occasionally to evaluate their work or contribution to group work. Providing students with clear instructions on the task and an assessment template to follow, as Sarah did, increased the efficiency of the task. Students should not be expected to perform flawlessly in these reflective exercises even with the instructor’s guidance. Training students on self-feedback exercises should be integrated into the course; it should start with tasks of appropriate difficulty to the student’s level and advance gradually. Students should be educated about the value of these exercises to the learning progress. When students get involved in selecting the ST and in presenting their own translation to others, they see more value in the task. It seems contradictory to claim that students are incapable of doing peer or self-feedback, and at the same time expect them to be self-dependent and responsible for their own learning. The transition from a transmissionist instructor-centered teaching to a socially negotiated student-centered teaching requires a shift of focus from the instructor to the student. It also requires a shift from the conventional, monologic paradigm of feedback to the sustainable, dialogic paradigm of feedback, as proposed by Carless (2015) (see Figure 21). Sustainable feedback practices are defined as “dialogic activities in which students generate and use feedback from peers, themselves or others as part of an ongoing process of developing capacities as autonomous, self-regulating learners” (p. 202). Trusting students and giving them the confidence to assess their own performance helps them and the instructor know whether the lesson is deeply understood or merely memorized and regurgitated. Providing students with a regular report that illustrates their errors and areas of weakness, as Thomas did, is another technique that helps students reflect on and monitor their own progress. It, however, requires that extra dialogic step of checking out with students and ensuring that they understood the feedback, learnt from it, and acted upon it.
Feedback reaches its optimal value when students report to the instructor, or, in other words, give feedback on instructor's feedback. Feedback on feedback is capable of closing the loop of feedback and helping instructors help students make sense of the feedback they receive. “The fastest way to change the feedback culture in any organization is for the leader to become a better receiver,” as Sheila Heen (2015) puts it. By following up with students and discussing what they have learned from the formative feedback they receive, instructors can evaluate their own approach to feedback and make it more effective. Self-reflection assignments and translation logs can certainly serve in this direction. Few instructors (Sarah and Omar) survey their students’ views on the course during the semester. Fewer instructors and students believed in the formal course evaluation students complete at the end of the semester. This important procedure can generate greater results if conducted more properly. Conducting this evaluation before the end of the semester and allowing students to discuss their views with instructors can make a real difference. Students give useful insights if they see tangible evidence that their voice is heard and appreciated by instructors. Instructors, on the other hand,
should be provided with sufficient time and training to implement an effective feedback, and reward them for their dedication accordingly. Instructors can get peer review from colleague instructors and share successful methods of feedback with them. Surprisingly, the study revealed that no instructor reported receiving or giving feedback to a peer instructor, except for one instructor (Thomas) who received a formal peer evaluation as part of a post-tenure promotion. Instructors acknowledged the great significance of feedback and believed that not all instructors and students realized such significance. Some instructors (e.g., Emily) admitted that they learned certain techniques, such as a translation log, accidently through a formal department meeting or a doctoral course advisor. Instructors should, therefore, be given the opportunity to have a regular seminar or roundtable of some sort to share success stories on teaching methods, including assessment and feedback. Through these meetings, instructors enhance their own strengths and find solutions to the challenges they face with their classes.

**Based on this dialogic vision of feedback, it is recommended that students take a more interactive role in the feedback loop of each translation practice task.** After assigning the translation task, the instructor analyzes the ST (or part of it) and discusses with students the translation brief and grading criteria. Having a well-defined written rubric makes the mission of instructor and students clearer and more systematic. The ST is sent to students via an OSLMS program. Every student works on the translation at home and submits a first draft to the instructor. Once this step is completed, the OSLMS program will allow each student to share his or her draft with a (random, anonymous) peer. Each student reads the peer’s draft and responds to it with a brief comment. Thus, all students receive the instructor’s critique along with their peer’s critique, and review them before the workshop. In class, students discuss with the instructor their positive and negative translation choices and suggest ways to improve their work. The loop of feedback is completed by students submitting a final (revised) draft of their work along and a short self-critique. In the self-critique, students briefly reflect on their own performance on the task and touch on the muddiest points with which they still struggle.
Repeating this interactive process frequently throughout the semester helps students understand the grading criteria better and get in the habit of giving and receiving feedback using the rubric. This interactive role of students in the feedback process can be illustrated in Figure 22.

Figure 22: Student’s interactive role in the feedback loop of the translation task

5.4 Conclusions

5.4.1 Limitations of the study

The purpose of this study was to describe and understand the feedback culture in two cases of translator education programs. The analytical framework designed to achieve this exploratory purpose, therefore, was characterized by breadth rather than depth. Peer feedback, for example, was described in this study as it was perceived and practiced by the participants of these two cases.
without scrutinizing the quality of its content or empirically investigating its effect on students’ learning process.

In addition to the limitation of design, the study was also limited in its method. The researcher took a qualitative, case-study approach using interview, observation, and document review as the main tools of data collection. Initially, the researcher used a mixed-method design using a survey questionnaire to gain supporting quantitative evidence. The relatively small number of questionnaire respondents in both the SA-CASE and US-CASE, however, resulted in unreliable data that, upon analysis, had to be discarded.

The two case studies examined in this piece of research were chosen because of their reputable, well-structured translator education programs that offer multiple translation practice courses. The choice of two cases that belong to two different geographical and sociocultural contexts was made to widen the scope of study and increase sample diversity. The two cases did provide a variety of beliefs and attitudes concerning feedback that certainly enriched the understanding of the feedback culture in translator education as broad and diverse as it may be. The two cases, however, are not necessarily typical of other translation education programs in SA and in the US, let alone worldwide. So, generalization of results cannot be made.

The sample of participants was selected randomly from a population that was narrowed down to instructors and students of advanced translation practice courses. The population of the study did not include instructors and students at novice levels or of theoretical translation courses within the programs’ curricula. As anticipated, the narrow population allowed selection of advanced and experienced participants who provided rich information on the studied phenomenon. However, since it is a narrow category of individuals, findings of their perceptions and practices cannot be used to predict the perceptions and practices of other instructors and students within the two cases or elsewhere.

The study also had a limitation that was associated with gender, particularly in the SA-CASE. The selected SA-CASE was a predominantly male establishment (single-gender education
is the norm in SA), whereas the US-CASE was a co-educational establishment. Even though this aspect contributed to the sampling diversity and served the qualitative exploratory nature of the study, it may have affected the resulting findings and emerging themes. Involving Saudi female instructors and students in the study may have revealed different patterns of perception and attitude in the SA-CASE. Implications and recommendations of the study, therefore, may not have the capacity to extend to a SA female context.

Finally, the researcher’s affiliation to the two establishments of the SA-CASE and US-CASE might have influenced his objectivity and, hence, affected the study results. Affiliation to the two case studies, however, could be seen as an advantage to this project. It provided an ease of access to the researcher and facilitated the quick development of rapport and trust with participants. Instructor participants knew the researcher as a lecturer colleague (in the SA-CASE) and as a doctoral student/classmate (in the US-CASE), and student participants knew him formally through their instructors. Participants may have responded differently depending on how acquainted they were with the researcher. Overall, however, they all showed interest in the topic and shared invaluable perceptions and experiences with the researcher.

5.4.2 Suggestions for further research

Findings of this study raised critical issues that can be addressed in future studies. A larger-scale quantitative investigation may analyze instructor and student preference with respect to feedback modes and sources. A larger number of participants from multiple translator education programs (including predominantly female programs) in SA and/or the US may be surveyed to determine their preference for verbal, written, collective, individualized, instructor, peer, and self-feedback. Investigation may also include instructors’ treatment of errors and use of technology. Respondents may specify what they find most effective and why.

The analytical framework used in this study proved to be useful in providing a panoramic view of the feedback culture in the examined cases. It allowed looking at the feedback culture from
a three-dimensional perspective: sociocultural, focus and delivery, and interactional. The framework can certainly be duplicated and applied to different contexts. Future researchers can also focus on one of the three dimensions and probe further in the analysis. The three dimensions may be modified or extended to include other subcategories. For example, the sociocultural dimension can be expanded to involve gender roles, group dynamics, personality type, and motivation in the effectiveness of feedback process in translator education.

An empirical process-oriented study may specifically examine the effectiveness of participants’ feedback practices. Researchers may compare the results of verbal whole-class discussions against verbal IWB-facilitated discussions. The latter can be instructor-initiated or student-initiated, and each may produce varying effects on students’ learning. Comparison may focus on written feedback: typed versus handwritten, rubric-supported versus no rubric, revision versus no revision, and immediate versus delayed. Professional orientation of feedback is also worth examining: use of rubrics, use of translation briefs, dealing with real clients, and outsourcing to professional proofreaders can be tested by further experimentation.

Instructors’ variation in their error treatment, which appeared clearly in this study, can certainly be backed empirically. A group of translator instructors may participate in correcting a student’s translation and have their corrections analyzed in terms of detection of errors, directness of comments, use of codes and footnotes, use of praise and dialogue, and so forth. Instructors’ sensitivity to students’ creativity in rendering the ST’s linguistic, stylistic, and cultural particularities is also worth investigating (Byrne, 2006; Kussmaul, 2000; Perteghella & Loffredo, 2007; Pommer, 2008 are examples of works that dealt with creativity in translation). Using techniques such as think-aloud and eye-tracking protocols could yield interesting results. A follow-on experiment could examine the effectiveness of each correction on the student’s revision and subsequent translation task.

Timely and organized delivery of verbal and written feedback was a concern expressed repeatedly by participants in this study. The use of an LMS, such as Blackboard, may prove helpful
in providing timely and more organized feedback. Further research is needed to examine the efficiency of this web-based platform in exchanging feedback. An OSLMS such as Moodle (Fictumova, 2004) may prove effective in energizing the cycle of feedback and making the feedback loop more dynamic. Yet again, additional experimental studies are needed to test the integration of these systems in the feedback culture and to examine their practicality and productivity for both translator instructors and students.

5.4.3 Final thoughts

The Arab thinker, Abdel Wahhab El-Messiri (1938-2008), once said:

“Human knowledge is knowledge of comparison; we do not gain knowledge of something in relation to itself but in relation to another entity that shares similarities or differences” (Herfi, 2009, p. 164; my translation).

The comparative exploration of this study aspired to enrich our grasp of the diverse feedback culture in translator education by investigating two cases of undergraduate translation programs in two different countries. To do so, a random group of instructors \((n=8)\) and students \((n=58)\) were selected from two different undergraduate translator education programs, one in Saudi Arabia and one in the United States. Review of the literature facilitated the design of a three-dimensional analytical framework that was used to investigate the participants’ perception and practice of feedback. The qualitative tools employed in this study (observation, interview, and document review) enabled the researcher to obtain in-depth information about the investigated topic. The findings revealed that translator instructors vary in their approach to feedback at the sociocultural level that situates feedback, at the delivery and focus level that shapes feedback, and at the interpersonal and interactional level that negotiates feedback.

In their description of feedback, some instructors saw feedback as verbal and collective, while others could not perceive it in isolation from the marketplace standards. There were those
instructors who used broad holistic grading criteria and described them to students in a verbal manner, and there were those who used a detailed analytical grading rubric in an attempt to articulate precisely what goes wrong in a translation. Integrating technology in the feedback process appeared in the use of IWB for collective verbal discussions and in the use of email and MS Office programs for written (typed) individualized comments. Still, there were those who preferred traditional read-and-translate workshops and gave handwritten comments on students’ translations. Mandating students to read the feedback and resubmit a revised translation was necessary for one instructor but not so for another. Revealingly, most students seemed to be influenced by their instructors’ perspectives and attitudes towards teaching translation.

This should not imply that we recommend, or even expect, a one-size-fits-all approach to feedback. In fact, the opposite is true. The variety of perspectives and practices of feedback contribute immensely to shaping the learner’s unique capabilities and prepares him or her for the marketplace, which is anything but homogenous. Student preparation is still difficult to attain unless learners are, in Kiralyan terms (2000), ‘empowered’ to take their learning into their own hands. Students learn more effectively when they ‘manage’ their feedback and ‘talk’ about their work to instructor, peers, and the class as a whole. Feedback management—giving, receiving, anticipating, acting strategically upon—is seen by Washbourne (2014, p. 3) as an inextricable component of the translation learner’s interpersonal, or socio-affective, competence. Student-initiated feedback gives students a sense of authorship and control over their own translation. Translation log exercises move the responsibility to students and urge them to reflect on their own strengths and weaknesses. Giving students an opportunity to take part in selecting the ST once in a while and to express their views about the feedback method emphasize the student-centeredness of the class and help students become independent and responsible learners.

Students should be taught that instructors vary in their personality, enthusiasm, knowledge, experience, and hence teaching method and style. In translator education, this study showed that instructors also vary in their perception and practice of feedback. Without doubt,
students should learn to match their instructor’s approach to feedback with their own learning needs. It is, however, the instructor’s responsibility to educate students about feedback. Students should know what effective feedback is, what it constitutes, what value it brings to their learning, and on what basis (or standards) it rests. It is important that students know the various modes and sources of feedback and what advantages and disadvantages each has. Students should understand that, as students, they have rights and duties concerning feedback. They have the right to receive written and verbal feedback in a timely manner from both instructor and classmates, and their duties include providing feedback to self, peer, and instructor.

Dialogue is the force that keeps the feedback loop going, and it is the “struggle,” as Bakhtin puts it, through which “all meaning is achieved” (Holquist, 1990, p. 39). Dialogue is not likely to bear fruit unless the instructor and student use it to reach a common understanding, and this cannot be achieved unless students know what they ‘dialogue’ about and how they go about it. Optimally, the task starts with a specific content, specific task, and specific instructions on what students are expected to produce. Clear understanding of the assessment criteria helps students meet their instructor’s expectations and become better evaluators of their own work and that of their peer. Students should be given sufficient time to prepare for the dialogue, especially in the beginning weeks of the course. A sense of social and individual responsibility is fostered when students are encouraged to give feedback to their peers and their own selves (in reflective practice). The feedback loop closes when students report back to instructor and provide feedback on feedback, which helps the instructor to provide tailored assistance and adjust the teaching accordingly. Repetition of this process throughout the semester deepens students’ understanding of the concept and value of effective feedback and makes them better givers and receivers of feedback.

In conclusion, we reiterate that an effective feedback culture needs to be built on clear understanding of the concept and value of effective feedback. Assigning a well-defined task and clear instructions on which will be expected of students and how they will be assessed enhance
the feedback process. “Feedback does not solve problems by itself,” as Millar (2006) rightly argues; rather, “it opens the door for problem-solving discussions and follow-up actions” (p. 79). Students should then take an interactive role in the process by preparing for and engaging in a dialogic feedback with the instructor and peers. Self-reflection and reporting to instructor keep the loop running and maximize the value of feedback. In this manner, feedback becomes a continuous, productive process rather than a finished, inactive product, and a formative routine as opposed to a summative archive. And it acknowledges, as the UK-based Osney Grange Group (OGG) proposes (2009), that “high level and complex learning is best developed when feedback is seen as a relational process that takes place over time, is dialogic, and is integral to learning and teaching” (p. 1).
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Appendix A-1: Selected Excerpts and Notes from Bader’s Class Observation

Overview: *Class duration: 80 minutes. *Place: colleague classroom, equipped with a whiteboard, an OHP, an IWB, and a multimedia podium. *Seating: straight rows facing the front of the classroom. *Number of students: 4. *Instructor Bader (B) came on time and started by distributing a legal document in RU about individual and state properties.

Excerpt 1:
B: (Speaking in AR, he asked the first student on his left to read the first sentence and identify the ‘unfamiliar’ words).
S1: (Reading Право частной собственности охраняется законом, then translating into AR) “[حق التملك / The right to private property is guaranteed by the law].”
B: “Ok, you could say [is guaranteed by the law] and preserve the syntactic structure of ST. But it’s always recommended that you simplify the sentence structure. For example, if we have the sentence “My documents were accepted by the university,” we could simplify it by saying “The university accepted my documents,” right? So, in the same way we could reverse the sentence order and start with the verb, making it a verbal sentence, as it’s often the case in AR, and say [يضمن أو يحفظ القانون حق التملك الخاص / The law guarantees or protects the right to private property]. You could also translate it as [The right to private property is guaranteed or protected by the law] but this way you’re gonna complicate it a little bit, when you’re required to simplify the syntactic level. Ok? Excellent.”

Excerpt 2:
B: “Next, S2, read the next sentence and tell us what the ‘vague’ words are.”
S2: (Reading the RU sentence with difficulty: Каждый вправе иметь имущество в собственности, владеть, пользоваться и распоряжаться им как единолично, так и совместно с другими лицами, then translating into AR) “[كل فرد له حق تملك الأراضي / Every individual has the right to own estates...].”
B: “Wait, in this context, the word имущество has a different meaning.”
S2: “I think it means [estates]. That’s how we translated it in a previous text.”
B: “Right, but it’s a little different in this context; the previous context was about real estate properties. Here it refers to ‘properties’ or ‘things’ in general, this is a specific term, it doesn’t work if you translate it literally. We’ve explained this term before and wrote it on the board, you have to memorize it! Ok, S2, keep going.”
S2: “[Every individual has the right to own things, possess, use or get rid of...]
B: “Распорядиться is not [get rid of], it’s [dispose of]. Your classmate made the same mistake before and I corrected him. Don’t google translate! Don’t make the same mistake!”
S2: “[Every individual has the right to own things, possess, use or dispose of, umm...]
B: “Ok, we need an object here, and we need to pay attention to all referential pronouns in the sentence. So let’s say [Every individual has the right to own, possess, use or dispose of things both individually and jointly with others].”

Excerpt 3:
B: “Ok, let’s move on, S3, go ahead and read the next sentence.”
S3: (Reading the RU sentence with difficulty, with instructor correcting his pronunciation).
B: “Now, are there any unfamiliar words?”
S3: “Yes, иначе как по решению суда?”
B: “It means [لا يأمر من المحكمة / except with a decree from the court].”
S2: “Can we say [قرار / decision]. It may also refer to [ترخيص/license]. Sometimes if you want to start a business, you need a kind of решение or license from the municipal office.”
S1: “Sir, what about На основании решения?”
B: “This phrase means [On the basis of the decision]. Clear?”
S3: “And предотвращать, does it mean ‘prevention’?”
B: “No. This is a verb, it means ‘to prevent,’ e.g., to prevent someone from something. Don’t confuse it with the word лишение which means ‘deprivation,’ e.g., ‘deprivation of maternal right.’”

Excerpt 4:
B: “Ok, is there any other question? Everything is clear? Ok, S3, read the next sentence to the period.”
S3: (Reading: Никто не может быть лишен своего имущества иначе как по решению суда, then translating into AR) “[لا يجوز لأحد أن يحرم أحداً من ممتلكاته] / No one shall deprive the person from his/her properties...].”
B: “No, come on, man! Don’t be deceived by the position of the word. It’s past participle here, it’s in the passive voice.”
S3: “[لا يجوز لأحد أن يَحرم / No one shall deprive umm...]”
B: “[لا يجوز لأحد أن يُحرم / No one shall be deprived...]”
S3: “[لا يجوز لأحد أن يَحرم من ممتلكاته إلا بقرار من المحكمة / No one shall be deprived from his/her properties without a decree from the court].”
B: “Exactly! Can’t be better!”
B: “You deprived me from joy! (Singing!), how would you translate this?”
Ss: (Laughing!)
B: “Ok, shall we start our quiz now?” (Students had a quiz in the remaining half an hour of the class).

Notes:
1. The instructor seemed to have a good relationship with students; he called them by their first names, used simple (colloquial) language, and joked with students occasionally.
2. Most of the instructor’s comments on students’ translations were more of direct answers than indirect or dialogic. He encouraged students to participate also by giving direct instructions, such as “Don’t remain silent, I’ll come back to you, you’re gonna be next, etc.”
3. The instructor’s friendly relationship with students seemed to make him somewhat ‘blunt’ in his criticism, giving comments like “Come on man, don’t google translate, don’t make the same mistake as your classmate, etc.” On the other hand, he used a lot of positive remarks, such as “Excellent, bravo, can’t be better, etc.”
Appendix A-2: Selected Excerpts and Notes from Omar’s Class Observation

Overview: *Class duration: 90 minutes. *Place: colleague classroom, equipped with a whiteboard, an OHP, an IWB, and a multimedia podium. *Seating: straight rows facing the front of the classroom. *Number of students: 6. *Instructor Omar (O) came on time and started by connecting his flash drive to the IWB computer. He first began with a brief PowerPoint presentation on students’ common errors of last week midterm. A whole class workshop of the midterm ST followed and took most of the class period. The class ended by displaying students’ graded exam papers with their names hidden (see Figure 5 for a sample) along with the ST, and discussing each error in students’ translations.

Excerpt 1:
O: (Asking students to read and translate the first sentence) “Go ahead, S1.”
S1: (Translating into AR) “[تأمين السيارة هو الحد الأدنى قانونياً للتأمين / Car insurance is the least legal form of insurance].”
O: (Typing the student’s translation and commenting as he typed) “Is it [of insurance] or [of car insurance]? What does it say in the ST? You have L’assurance automobile, can we say [Auto insurance is the least legally permitted form of auto insurance]. What do you think?”
S2: “I think [of insurance]. Do we have to say [of auto insurance]?”
O: “…because it’s in the ST.”
S3: “Do we have to stick to the ST, professor?”
O: “Yes, we should stick to the ST, unless we can manipulate words to avoid repetition, perhaps. Do you have a synonym that would replace it? Repetition becomes a problem if it’s awkward and can be avoided without affecting the ST meaning. Do you have any suggestions to make the sentence sound better?”
S1: “[Third party auto insurance is the least legally permitted form or least legal form...]
O: “Yes, [the least legal form] is better than [least legally permitted form]...”
S1: “[in the matter of automobile].”
O: “[in the matter of]? This phrase could be replaced with [concerning, regarding, with regard to]...”
S4: “Professor, what is the literal translation of en matière de?”
O: “Well, here we have the prepositions en and de; their translation differs depending on the context. Like I told you before, prepositions play different roles in different contexts, that’s why they’re called ‘sense words.’ So we can use ‘regarding’ or, if you want a longer form, ‘with regard to.’ Any other suggestion. Ok, let’s move on.”

Excerpt 2:
O: (Reading the next sentence in FR) “Responsibility civique est obligatoire...”
S1: “[Obligatory...]
O: “Who obligates whom? Let’s look at the literal meaning for a second; who’s the obligator? In France, they have what they call Responsibility civique (المسؤولية المدنية أو العامة / civil or public responsibility); when you buy a car, you must have an insurance, no question about it. So, in that sense, everyone should be responsible to be insured while driving. This is why car insurance is obligatory. Now, how do you make it sound natural in AR?”
S2: “[It is obligatory to have a civil or public responsibility insurance...]
O: (Commenting as he typed on the IWB) “Right, and we put [public] in brackets to indicate that it’s also possible. But be careful here, don’t insert multiple options in brackets, as some of you did in the exam! (Class laughing!) It’s a real problem; my job is to grade your translation choice not to choose for you!”
O: “Ok, do you think the translation now is appropriate: [that is why it is permitted to obtain an insurance]?”
S3: “How about [...] it is mandatory/obligatory to obtain an insurance]?”
O: “Nice, but [obligatory] on whom?”
S3: “[...obligatory on the person]...”
O: “So [that is why it is obligatory on the person to obtain a civil or public responsibility insurance]?”
S4: “Maybe it’s better to say [...]on the owner]?”
O: “No, no, no. Let’s not add a lot things; we’ve manipulated the AR a little bit to make it sound more natural.”
S3: “Sir, can we say [the State or law obligates the person]?”
O: “No need to add a subject, because it’s understood from the context. Plus it’s not mentioned in the ST; so stick to the ST not to your background information. Your background information helps you understand the text not add extra information to it.”
S5: “Can we use [necessary] instead of [obligatory]?”
O: “Nope, that’s a different word: nécessaire. The ST word is obligatoire.”
O: “Ok, good. Now this is how I translated it: [That is why civil responsibility insurance is considered obligatory in the driver (to be more precise)]. Which one do you think is more appropriate: my translation or yours?”
Ss: (Some students preferred students’ suggestion, others preferred the instructor’s).
O: “Personally I prefer mine, but both are correct. You can pick either one.”

Excerpt 3:
O: “Ok, next.”
S1: (Translating, using an incorrect AR subject-verb order) “هذا التأمين يغطي الأضرار” / This insurance covers the damages.
O: (Correcting as he typed) “Ok, we say [This kind of insurance covers] covers what? [the damages] what kind of damages? [body injuries...]”
S2: “Why don’t we just say [damages]? It’s dommages in the ST!”
O: “Right, but it’s specified in the ST [corporœls dommages], we can’t go around it. Ok, [covers body injuries...]”
S3: “[...body injuries for others].”
O: “[...for others!] It doesn’t sound right. Look, guys, if it sounds awkward in AR, it means you’re still thinking in FR! Your mind is still in France, bring it home!”
O: “Ok, we have causé par, how do we translate it?”
S2: “[...that cause injuries to others]?”
O: “Is there any other suggestion?”
S4: “[...injuries caused by others]?”
O: “No, it’s not caused by others; it’s caused by you, the driver!”
O: “[This type of insurance covers others’ body injuries], there’s something wrong here!”
S3: “[This kind of insurance covers body injuries...]”
O: “Ok, keep going. Try to change [caused by].”
S3: “[...body injuries which others injured from...]”
O: “[...injuries which others injured!] Try to use a different verb; let’s avoid repetition. I’d say [...]which others suffered from], it’s more appropriate in AR. Now which AR verb goes with [body injuries]?”
S4: “Shouldn’t we add [because of the accident] to make it clear?”
O: “Nope, it’s understood from the context. And it’s not my business as a translator to make it clear!”
S4: “[...which the other party suffered from].”
O: “[...body injuries from which others suffered], should we put it in the past or present tense, which one is more appropriate?”
O: “I’d use the present [from which others suffer].”

Excerpt 4:
O: (Typing a suggested translation) “ولا يغطي هذا النوع من التأمين تصليح المركبة” / This kind of insurance covers vehicle repair expenses...”
S1: “Why don’t you say [car repair] instead of [vehicle repair]?”
O: (Turning the question to students) “What’s the difference between car and vehicle?”
S1: “Same thing!”
O: “Not really. ‘Car’ is a small vehicle. ‘Vehicle’ can be a car, a truck, a tractor, it can even be a motorbike or bicycle. You can use ‘car’ if it was clearly intended in the ST. Otherwise, we stick to the ST. It’s a logical
question that translator may ask, but the ST writer sometimes uses certain words purposefully, so we should maintain that choice. Keep going.”

S2: (Translating) “إذا كنت أنت المسؤول عن الحادث / If you were responsible for the accident...”

O: “Shouldn’t we say [if it is your fault] instead of [if you are responsible]?”

Ss: (Debating... some students voted for the former, others with the latter).

O: “Well, literally it’s [responsible/responsible] but it’ll sound more familiar in AR if we say [إذا كنت أنت المخطئ أو المتسبب في الحادث / if the accident is your fault or is caused by you]. Ok, continue.”

S2: “لديك الخيار من نوعين / You have the option with two kinds]”

O: “Ok, where’s the verb? You’re now writing FR in AR! When you start an AR sentence, always look for the main verb in the ST and start with it.”

O: (Typing while students gave further suggestions) “[To insure your car... or vehicle, you have an option of two levels...]

O: “In France they use ‘levels’ or ‘classes’ with insurance, but in Saudi we usually use ‘options’ or ‘types,’ so it’s better to pick a word that’s commonly used in the target culture, to avoid confusion.”

Notes:

1. The instructor started the discussion by jokingly saying, “Have you googled the translation!” to which students laughed and began describing how they felt about last week’s exam. He then gave a brief mini-lecture using a PowerPoint presentation, the instructor demonstrated that students’ common errors in the exam were: incomprehension of the ST, literal rendering of the ST terminology and register, wrong word choice, and lack of revision of the TT.

2. The instructor was commenting on students’ suggestions consecutively as he typed them, as if he were thinking out loud, which clearly made students think and re-suggest better translations. Almost all students were active in the class, even though the instructor wasn’t asking anyone directly to participate.

3. At the end of the class, the instructor told students that he’d send them an email with a list of the topics and terminology that students would choose from in the final exam.
Appendix A-3: Selected Excerpts and Notes from Zaid’s Class Observation

Overview: *Class duration: 100 minutes. *Place: colleague classroom, equipped with a whiteboard, an OHP, an IWB, and a multimedia podium. *Seating: straight rows facing the front of the classroom. *Number of students: 8. *Instructor Zaid (Z) came to class on time and started connecting the IWB and preparing the required files. He then displayed an ST in ES about the importance of education (which was given to students last week), asked a student to read the whole text aloud, and started a discussion on the text’s lexical and cultural features.

Excerpt 1:

Z: (Speaking in ES) “Ok, class, what vocabulary do you find difficult to understand in this text?”
Ss: “Sí Bien, pedagógico, etc.” (Students suggested a few words and instructor corrected some pronunciation while taking notes in a small sheet of paper).
Z: “Sí Bien is a conjunction. What does it mean? What do you think?”
S1: “Does it mean ‘probable’ or ‘possible’?”
Z: “We have Sí and Bien, separately what does each one mean?”
S2: “Sí means ‘yes’ and Bien means ‘good’.”
Z: “Now together, Sí Bien, what do they mean as a conjunction? Did you consult the dictionary? (Now addressing a specific student) Look it up in the dictionary and tell us what it means.”
S3: “Looking in the dictionary It means ‘Even though.’”
Z: “Correct. So as you can see, these two words as a conjunction have a totally different meaning, ‘even though, even if,’ etc.”
Z: “Ok, what about the word pedagógico? What does the dictionary say, S4?”
S4: “I think it means ‘instructive.’” S5: “No, it is ‘educational’.” S6: “I couldn’t find it!”
Z: “What do you think, S2? S3? Do you agree? (Z. addressing other students by their names and)”
Z: “Right it means ‘pedagogical/instructive’. But what is educación?”
Ss: “It means التدريس ‘teaching’.”
Z: “No!”
Ss: “It must be التعليم ‘education’ then!”
Z: “Yes! We say, for example, ‘the man received no formal education’. The ST context talks about ‘education’ in general, so it seems that التعليم is the appropriate word for it.” (Z. continued for a few minutes discussing difficult words, such as fórmula, cálculo, intrépido, and marginación, in the same dialogical, roundabout way every time until students themselves gave an appropriate translation).

Excerpt 2:

Z: “Alright, S1, shall we start?” (Now Z. sat in the second row among students, and asked a student to go to the multimedia podium in front of the class and start typing his suggested translation of the first paragraph).
S1: (Reading the ST sentence and typing his suggested translation on the IWB) “La educación exige emociones ¿Estamos educando a las nuevas generaciones para vivir en un mundo que ya no existe? El sistema pedagógico parece haberse estancado en la era industrial en la que fue diseñado. I’d translate it as إنا ندرّس أجيالًا لعالم آخر. نظام التدريس اضطر إيقاف ما صممه له. لقد كانت تعليمات المدارس دائماً صارمة حول تكثيف الدراسة والحصول على / We teach generations in another world. The teaching system was forced to stop what was designed for it. School instructions have always been strict regarding intensive studying and getting high grades, then obtaining the university degree].”
Z: “Ok, S1, what do you think of your own translation?”
S1: “I think it’s bad!”
Z: “I don’t see it bad; I see that we can make it better. Which part do you feel uncomfortable with?”
S1: “The very first part [We educate generations in another world] sounds awkward to me!”
Z: “Ok, guys, what do you think?”
S2: “I think we should phrase it in the form of a question, [Are we educating generations...]”
Z: “Right, we notice that the ST sentence is in the exclamatory or rhetorical question kind of form. Guys, what do you think of your classmate’s suggestion? Any other comments?
S3: “I think we should change [teach generations] to [educate generations], professor.”
S4: “I think we should also add [young] before [generations]?”
Z: “Let’s handle S3’s suggestion first. Which one do you think is more appropriate: [educate] or [teach]?”
S5: “I vote for [teach] because the rest of the text speaks a lot about ‘studying’ and stuff…”
Z: “What do you think S6, S7, S8?”
S6: “I think we should say [ندرس / teach] because the rest of the text speaks a lot about ‘studying’ and stuff…”
S7: “I say [ندرس / educate] because the context is about ‘education’.”
S8: “I say [ندرس / edify].”
Z: “[Edify]! You’re looking for trouble, are you!” (Class laughing!)

Excerpt 3:
S1: “For the phrase a las nuevas generaciones, I suggest [الأجيال الجديدة / new generations].”
S2: “I prefer [الأجيال الحديثة / modern generations].”
S3: “I’d say [الأجيال القادمة / next generations].”
Z: “Well, I’d put aside [next generations] because there’s another word for ‘next’ in ES.”
S3: “I think ‘next’ is the intended word, professor.”
S2: “I think it’s ‘new’ because the ST talks about current generations, not ‘next’ generations that haven’t come yet.”
Z: “Exactly, this is the point; the text focuses on the present day, on today’s issues. But, at the same time, the text calls for preparing for the future, so I think you’ve got a point there, too, S3.”
S4: “What about en un mundo que ya no existe, I’ve translated it as [في عالم لا يوجد له / In a world that has no existence] because it has the word existir.”
Z: “I see. What do you think, guys? We have que ya no in the ST, what does it mean?”
S1: “It means ‘That hasn’t been’?”
Z: “Yes! This is the meaning. But how do you say it in a better AR? How do we say que ya no existe in good AR?”
S2: “في عالم لم يوجد / that hasn’t existed?” S3: “في عالم انتهى / that which is over?”
S4: “في عالم قد انقضى أو خلا / that which has been over?”
Z: “Hmm, good! Those could work. The literal translation of the phrase que ya no existe is [لم يعد له وجود / that no longer exists], while your suggestion, S2, [that hasn’t existed] is a translation of a slightly different phrase [eso no ha existido]. So we could probably say [in a world that no longer exists, in an era that has gone by]. Excellent!”

Excerpt 4:
Z: “Ok, class, what do you think of your translation of ‘El sistema pedagógico parece haberse estancado en la era industrial en la que fue diseñado’? Can you explain it to me in colloquial AR? If you can’t explain the sentence to yourself and make sure that you fully understand it, you won’t be able to translate it.” (Students now were discussing the suggested translation among themselves, with Z. listening and interfering only with questions or comments to explain the meaning of certain words in ES (and AR interchangeably), but rarely to give a direct translation of words).
S1: “The educational system in the industrial age seems advanced…”
S2: “I’d say that education in the industrial era stopped…”
Z: “What is the thing that stopped?”
S3: “The educational system.”
S4: “The educational system seems to settle for the educational plan that was put before…”
Z: “Yes! This is the meaning. Explain it further to me.”
S4: “I mean the educational system stopped and hasn’t improved anymore.”
Z: “Excellent. This is the point. Is it clear now? So, when we read: the educational system had to stop what was designed for it, does it give the same idea?”
Ss: “No, not quite well.”
Z: “Ok, let’s rephrase it then. Try to start with ‘It seems that…”’
S3: “[It seems that the educational system stopped.]”
S5: “[It seems that the educational system settled for the industrial era that was designed.]”
Z: “What is the thing that was designed?”
S5: “The educational system.”
Z: “So, it means that is that the industrial era is the one that has designed the educational system which has become restrained in that era for which the system has been designed. This is the meaning!” (Students kept suggesting and rephrasing while Z. gave them directions. Z. also spent few minutes discussing the difference between simple present tense and present perfect tense).
Z: “So the appropriate translation would be [يبدو أن نظام التعليم قد توقف/استقر في الحقبة الصناعية التي صُمم لأجلها] / It seems that the educational system has stopped/settled in the industrial era for which it was designed].”

Notes:
1. The instructor spoke in fluent ES most of the class. Students responded to instructor’s questions in AR and occasionally in ES, but the instructor responded back only in ES.
2. The workshop in general was dynamic, with students and instructor exchanging discussion in a relatively equal amount.
3. The instructor seemed to avoid giving a definite decision or statement about students’ wrong translations; he used ‘maybe’, ‘probably’, and ‘possible’, which seemed to encourage students to try again and rephrase their suggestions. He seemed to say ‘this is the literal translation’ in his comments whenever he noticed that students had gone far away in their translations.
Appendix A-4: Selected Excerpts and Notes from Ali’s Class Observation

Overview: *Class duration: 90 minutes. *Place: colleague classroom, equipped with a whiteboard, an OHP, an IWB, and a multimedia podium. *Seating: four groups sitting in circles. *Number of students: 19. *Instructor Ali (A) came on time and started by distributing a legal document in EN entitled ‘How to become a legal translator.’

Excerpt 1:
A: (Introducing a new ST) “This is an easy text. It briefly talks about what one needs to become a certified legal translator. It’s written in EN, so our discussion will be mostly in EN. Please get in groups of four or three, and start translating the text into AR. Again, try to use EN as much as you can…”

Excerpt 2:
A: “Notice here that the word ‘legal’ in the title doesn’t mean نظمي/شرعي ‘lawful’ or permitted by law, etc. It rather refers to something or someone associated with the profession of law. So in this context، المترجم القانوني ‘legal translator’ is someone whose career involves translating legal texts and dealing with legal terminology…”
S1: “Excuse me, sir. In the ST sentence: Court translators work in a variety of legal settings, such as attorney-client meetings, preliminary hearings, etc. What does settings mean?”
A: “Setting hear means المجال/area.”

Excerpt 3:
A: “Everybody should participate! Don’t depend on one person! And remember, when you translate, pay attention to the cohesion and coherence of your writing; every sentence should be linked to other sentences in a meaningful way. Try to understand the message of the author. Try to differentiate between a general word and a term. A term is a word or expression that has a particular meaning in a particular field of study. (Moving around the groups, and now addressing a specific student) “Come on, my friend, contribute with your group members, share your ideas with them.”

Excerpt 4:
A: (Now 70 minutes had passed to the workshop, a group handed in their translation to A. who spotted an error and immediately commented using the whiteboard. He addressed the group in a voice that was loud enough for the rest of the class to hear) “Guys, in the phrase ‘The institute of Linguists,’ I see that you used the word [لغويات/linguistics] when you should’ve used the word [لغوي/linguist]. You should know the difference between the two. They’re both nouns, but ‘linguistics’ is the scientific study of language, a field of knowledge, whereas ‘linguist’ is the person who specializes in this field of knowledge, the field of ‘linguistics’. You may think that this is a trivial, harmless mistake, but it’s not. It made a huge difference to the meaning of the ST word. Imagine if you interpret in the court and you made an error that changes the meaning of the message; a person’s life might be in danger because of you!”

Notes:
1. The instructor used both EN and AR in commenting and responding to students’ questions.
2. The instructor took a tour around the groups twice throughout the whole activity, then returned to his desk standing there and writing something on his notebook. His monitoring of students’ groups is silent and quiet, most of the time. There were a couple of instances where the instructor responded to a student’s question. In both instances, students asked direct questions about the meaning of specific words, to which the instructor gave direct answers.
3. Some students were more active and involved in the group work than others. In each group, there was a student using his smart phone, seemingly to look up difficult words in online dictionaries.
The general atmosphere of the activity began to get a bit wearisome as the time passes. The researcher could hear some students complaining; one student leaned his head backward, closed his eyes, and said to his classmates “Let me know when you’re done translating!” The researcher could also hear other students chat about things that clearly had nothing to do with the task. The researcher supposed that having students spend over an hour doing the same activity and not diversifying the workshop may cause some of the boredom that appeared on students.
Appendix A-5: Selected Excerpts and Notes from Kate’s Class Observation

Overview: *Class duration: 90 minutes. *Place: colleague classroom, equipped with a whiteboard, OHP, and a classroom monitor. *Seating: hollow square. *Number of students: 2. *Instructor Kate (K) came on time, but took 5 minutes to connect her laptop and prepare the ST document (which was a marriage dissolution) as well as students’ drafts and had them ready for discussion.

Excerpt 1:
K: (Speaking in EN, she started to discuss last week’s assignment, translation of a hospital recommendation letter, and focus particularly on students’ translation problems, which include false friends, noun-adjective agreement (feminine, masculine, neutral), and dates/address formatting).
S1: “When I’m writing I hesitate a lot and I’m not sure of my structure, unlike when I speak I feel more confident.”
K: “When you’re writing, try to articulate, say out loud, what you’re writing, fix it, and then put it down.”
K: “If you need help with that, email me I’ll give you more explanation... but overall your work is very good!”
K: “Ok, anything that stands out in last week’s assignment?”
K: (Asking S1 about his translation of a specific term) “How does it sound?”
S1: “Horrible! It’s awkward, it doesn’t really make sense!”
K: “Awkward, exactly. Let’s go back to Jacobson. You don’t go immediately to translation; for a native speaker of EN, this doesn’t make sense. See, if you don’t understand what it means in RU, how are you gonna translate it? So, let’s read the RU sentence first, what does it mean in RU?”
K: (Trying to make sure that students fully comprehend the ST, by discussing the purpose of translating this kind of certificate) “Why would such a document be important? Think of the translation brief, think of when and where you could use a medical certificate?”
S1: “You could use it to get a passport, since you’ll have to show that you had all your vaccination and stuff.”
K: “Oh yeah, vaccination, that’s a good point! Also, a doctor needs to look at the certificate with a translation to follow up on a patient’s health and give a full diagnosis. Anything else? What if it’s a legal matter, what if that person was persecuted in his/her country and they’re here in the States applying for asylum, for example, and they have to prove that they were persecuted and that their trauma was caused by someone beat them up, would that affect their case?”
Ss: “Yes.”
K: “Ok, let’s move on, anything else?”

Excerpt 2:
K: “Now work in group, real quick, you have maybe 2 minutes. Think of a translation brief for that; what, where, and how, under what circumstances we can use this translation. Go back to our text analysis of Nord’s and Functionalists’; Functionalists ignore that ST but Nord says no we need to analyze the ST first and then apply a deep analysis to the TT and see how it differs and then we’ll have our translation brief.”
K: “So work in group real quick... work in group means you need to talk together!”
Ss: (Laughing!)
K: “Remember there is no right or wrong answer, as long as you justify your answer; there could be a hundred scenarios, so whatever you come up with is fine with me as long as it’s a decent answer... don’t tell me that the function is that they are going to use that translation on the moon! I don’t want that!” (smiling!)
S1: “Unless they have a good reason for that!” (laughing!)
K: “I want something useful! (laughing!)
K: (After a short pause...) “OK, go!” (She asked them several questions: What’s the function of the ST... audience... time of reception... medium of transmission... purpose... and students provided suggestions and K. commented right away).
S1: “Time of reception is umm forever?”
K: “Yeah forever, it could be, but usually recommendation letters you want them fresh, right?”
S1: “Yeah.”
K: “I mean if it’s 30 years from the time it was given it might not be that useful, but it could be.”

**Excerpt 3:**
K: “So that was your translation assignment, let’s talk a little bit about it.” (Now K. started a discussion about the layout and headings which were typed in small font, and whether they need to be translated or not).
K: “So, would you or would you not translate it, and why?”
K: (Jokingly) “I already know S1’s answer, because his rationale is always ‘more words more money!’”
S1: “Not just the money factor, but if you submitted the translation and someone looking at the original and found this little text underneath, they might ask about it, also they might not know whether these names beneath these titles are name or sir name.”
K: “What would you do to pinpoint to the last name?”
S1: “All capitals?”
K: “Yes, all capitals, but still.”
S1: “But still a lot of people in America think that *Patronymic* is a last name, like always, just because of how Russians are referred to in the movies or video games, when they play the role of bad guys...” (smiling!)
K: “Ok, any other rationale behind that? Would you or wouldn’t, S2?
S2: “I think I would because of the same reason because people might be confused about which name is the first and which is not, other than that I wouldn’t because it looks as extra stuff and it’ll make the translation complicated.”
K: “But if you want it to look fancy.”
S1: “But if it’s for information purposes not just to look fancy, because why would anyone want their birth certificate look fancy!”
K: “I attended a class at this university before, and the same point was raised and someone said that the tendency is to omit these titles because they are meaningless, since it’s obvious that the names will be read in order, same thing applies to the DOB, but still I think this is obvious for you, the translator, since you know both texts, but for your readers they won’t necessarily be as obvious as you think. But yeah there is no right or wrong here; the main thing is your client, he or she is the one who decides; whatever the client wants, skopos, you do it...”
K: (Cautioning) “…as long as it doesn’t contradict the code of ethics of translators/interpreters, or your own professional code of ethics, if it doesn’t, your good to go, if it does you don’t say to the client ‘hey I’m not gonna do that!’ You nicely and politely—because you don’t wanna lose that client, right—you think of the reason why you don’t wanna do it, remember we talked about it, you try to push it on something else, you don’t wanna say ‘I’ don’t wanna do it because ‘I’ know better than you, or something! Rather you say ‘according to, for example, the ATA professional code of ethics or any other professional code of ethics you wanna cite, and to justify the information here, read to them the part directly: the code of ethics specifies that ‘so and so.’ You don’t wanna go too deep into the philosophical discussion of what is considered an omission and what is considered an addition, etc. because the client doesn’t know any better, just cite to them directly from the codes and that you’re abiding by these codes.”

**Excerpt 4:**
S1: “I couldn’t figure out what that sort of code next to the husband’s name means, should we just ignore it?”
K: “That’s a good point, and I don’t have an answer for that! What do you do in this case? You just take this thing and google it, see what’s going on, what comes up, and I’m going to do this in a second. If nothing comes up, if you cannot find the answer, the other best solution would be to contact your colleagues, ask around, you never know, someone might have an answer.” (K. now checking Wikipedia to find out about the unfamiliar code) “So it was just the name of a city!”
S1: “Like a village?”
K: “Yeah, like a village! What would you do in the certificate now?”
S1: “Well if he was born in it when it was with that name, I’ll keep it as it is.”
K: “Ok, what else you can do?”
S2: “Put the new name in parenthesis after it or in brackets, and say ‘currently so and so’ or write the current name and put the old name in brackets ‘so and so formally?’”

K: “Yes, you can do either or. A lot of this you’ll be doing with the names of the institutions when you’re translating diplomas. If you have a diploma of 1950 and that was from so and so institute, chances are that in 2015 it doesn’t have that name, so a better strategy is to look up the name, you have to look up the name, and in parenthesis you put a brief note, e.g., formally so and so, to explain the peculiar information about the name. And what is the reason of that? Because if someone wants to check whether I attended that university of not, right, so you need to put a current name so that I (the client) can find it, I don’t want to do all the research that you (the translator) are supposed to do, and you definitely want to keep whatever is in the original.”

K: “Now, work individually, two minutes, write a translation brief for the marriage dissolution certificate, just ignore the registration thing and all that, think of medium, purpose, when, where, by who... but work individually, I want to see two separate briefs, two minutes, your time starts now!”

K: (After a brief pause) “The reason for this is because in your homework you, S1, will translate this certificate according to her translation brief and she (S2) will be translating according to yours. I hope they don’t match!”

K: “Now, what briefs did you come up with?” (K was accurate in sticking to the two minutes... she listened to students’ briefs, discussed them for few minutes, then asked students to email each other’s their briefs and use it for their translation homework).

Notes:

1. The instructor started by reminding students that in the ‘pure practice’ part of the class, they apply some theoretical concepts (e.g., Vermeer’s skopos) on business correspondents such as birth/death certificate, marriage certificate, marriage dissolution, recommendation letter, and diploma translations. She reminded them that they ‘cherry pick’ from the theories what fits the practical nature of the class.

2. The class started in a comfortable atmosphere; one student brought a chocolate candy and gave his classmate, and there was a friendly and humorous chat between the teacher and students about the weather for few moments.

3. In Excerpt 4, the instructor was clearly sending a message to her students that being an instructor doesn’t mean she knows everything. She then showed students practically how to find a quick answer by consulting an appropriate online resource.
Appendix A-6: Selected Excerpts and Notes from Sarah’s Class Observation

Overview: *Class duration: 90 minutes. *Place: regular classroom, equipped with a wide whiteboard, an OHP, and a classroom monitor. *Seating: connected rows. *Number of students: 12. *Instructor Sarah (S) came on time, connected her laptop to the classroom monitor, and displayed the ST document (which was a medical script written by the instructor herself) in preparation for the whole-class discussion on students’ common errors.

Excerpt 1:
S: (Speaking in EN) “The biggest challenge was that the side effects were written in Catalan. Also single words and abbreviations were tricky. Research skills again! So, how did you go about it? What did you do? You should ask help from a colleague. You should help each other. You should look it up in ES first to make the deciphering easier!” (Students seemed to be excited to tell the teacher about their experience with this homework).
S1: (A student, who was native speaker of ES, commented) “At first I was like ‘what language is this’ I didn’t realize it was ES! Was the script a doctor’s handwriting?”
S: “No, it was actually my own handwriting!” (S. told the class why she picked this ST in particular and what was the story behind it, then asked the class) “Other thoughts or comments? I noticed that the natives had an easier time reading it. Maybe because they could defer from the context, or just it was easier to read, or because it made a lot of sense! (Class laughing!)
S: “I had an advantage because I know what they were talking about because I was there. I was supposed to summarize this and submit it along with my complaint to my insurance company. Knowing the diagnosis of the disease helps you as a translator in ‘deciphering’ the handwritten name of the medicine that you were asked to translate. So anybody would like to give it a try and read the first sentence?”

Excerpt 2:
S: (After discussing the script and its suggested translations) “Congrats! You’ve passed! Now you can work as professional translators!” (Thanking students for completing the task and submitting it on time).
S: “Email each other your own ‘deciphers’ of the script and discuss your work in groups.” (Students were divided into 4 groups. One student went from her group to the next group just to ask an ES native student then returned to her group. It appeared that peer discussion was not only done within each group but across groups as well).
S: (After half an hour of class time, S. asked students) “How did you do with difficult words? “Did you have a translator’s note for illegible words? You could add a note saying: this could mean so and so but it’s not a complete word so I left out.”
S: “OK, you can do more revision and send back to my email.”

Excerpt 3:
S: (After discussing the translation homework, S. started her theoretical part of the class by raising the question) “What’s the difference between scientific and technical translation?” (This part of the class which lasted for about 6 minutes was in the form of mini-lecture where the teacher gave a PowerPoint presentation on ‘text typology’ and did most of the talking with a single instance of participation from one student. S. then asked the class to go to the textbook and to translate a short text from EN to ES. She asked students to work in pairs and to pick a classmate whom they had never worked with before. Which got some students moving around the class for a minute to find a partner. Students were then divided into 5 groups of 2/3, and the activity lasted for 10 minutes).
S: “You want to build a good business relationships in the future! If you have any question you can consult other teams, Ok?” (There were some instances where students actually consulted members of other groups. In this activity, S. at first kept her approach of roaming around the groups every 2 minutes or so, responding to questions, but then became more quiet as the activity went on and returned to her desk to read in her notebook).
S: “Almost done? No? Ok, take 5 more minutes. If you were working in-house and you receive this translation you’ll probably be asked to do this within an hour!”
S: “Ok, challenges?” (Then a whole-class discussion started on the problem areas that students had faced with ST. They agreed that terminologies and register were the toughest challenge they had encountered).

Excerpt 4:
S: “In the next workshop (next week), you’ll be working in teams of three. Please try to start thinking about your final project because you’re gonna be submitting your ideas to me for approval by week 13, so there’s a couple of weeks left. Some of you have already spoken to me, please do send me your brief in an email so that I have an idea of what you’re doing before I verbally approve it, ok? And also in week 16 (final class) we’ll have a special conversation with a guest speaker who will talk about what it’s like to be a translation project manager, so that you get a feel of what it’s like to be managing a team of translators or work with someone who does so.”

Notes:

1. In general, most students were active in group/pair work, but in whole-class discussion, only few students participated. Most students used their laptops to type their translation directly into their computers, some used their smartphones to look up a word on the Internet, only 1 or 2 students were writing in a notebook.

2. This class felt like a workshop; it was dynamic and fast-paced most of the time. It was divided into short segments that contained mini-lectures, group work, pair work, and whole-class discussion. There were instances of humorous and positive remarks from the instructor, which reduced the tension and added some motivation to the class.

3. The fact that there were native speakers of the TL in class added some value, since those students not only were consulted by their classmates about language and cultural aspects of the L2 but also by the instructor herself.
Appendix A-7: Selected Excerpts and Notes from Emily’s Class Observation

Overview: *Class duration: 90 minutes. *Place: computer lab classroom, equipped with a whiteboard, an OHP, and a classroom monitor. *Seating: connected rows facing the front of the classroom. *Number of students: 3. *Instructor Emily (E) came 5 minutes earlier, connected her flash drive to the lab computer and pulled up the documents she would use (an ST and some parallel texts), and displayed the ST (which was about Apidae – a collective term for Bees) on the lab monitor.

Excerpt 1:
E: (Speaking in EN) “Ok, we’re starting a new text today, so you guys are gonna tell me all about the text. Did you talk about the brief? One of the things that translators sometimes do is come up with a brief. But before we get to this, let’s talk about some aspects of the text: who is the one who wrote the ST? I did give you the URL, right? Where did this ST first appear? The link I gave you was in *Le Monde*, but I don’t think that it was published there first, because what we have here is a sort of a summary. So tell me about the ST?”
S1: “It’s informative.”
E: “It’s informative, everybody agrees? Is it operative or expressive? What do you think?”
S2: “I guess it’s kind of operative because it’s trying to get people to think about the subject.”
E: “To make people think about what?”
S2: “Umm make people think about the subject, reason...”
E: “well, informative texts can make people think of reason and subject! Well that’s possible! Informative texts often exist to make people think about the subject, they exist to change people’s ideas about what they already know, or to make them aware of something they don’t know, or see why something is significant that they know. So this is an aspect of an informative texts.”
E: “You didn’t comment about the type, so what kind of textual genre is it?”
S3: “It’s an article from a website?”
E: “So it’s an article from a website. Can you go a little bit more into what kind of article?”
S3: “Scientific article?”
E: “Scientific. Who do you think is the target audience? No ideas?”
S1: “I mean I’d say anyone, especially people who’re interested in reading articles in scientific magazines.”
E: “So anybody who’s interested in reading magazines, is that what you’re saying?”
S1: “I mean it can fit like anyone that just wants to read about Apidae bees and who’s interested in scientific magazines.”
E: Ok, other thoughts about the FR ST? Well, I have another question: Do you think this is for say 12 year olds who might be interested in bees and questions of ichnology? Would they be interested in reading this article?”
S3: “I don’t think so. I think those things will have a lot of more scientific terms like names of the chemicals and stuff.”
E: “Ok, other thoughts? Look at the length of the sentences; what do you think? Remember this type here is in heavier type face, but this is just a summary of what you’re gonna get overall, so from the part right here we might not be able to draw a lot of conclusions. But based on this you have a number of words that’re ‘multi-syllabic’, you have a lot of words that have more than one syllable. When people try to judge reading level in En, what they do is that they look at the proportion of words that are more than one syllable. Some words are perfectly common and have more than one syllable (e.g., beautiful, Elizabeth...) but in general, when a text has a lot of words that are multisyllabic, it raises the reading level a little bit.”

Excerpt 2:
E: “Ok, one of you mentioned the fact that you have some technical terms in here, and they’re not completely explained, they could have explained this word (i.e., insecticide) or at least say it’s an antibiotic, so for certain readers you might wanna explain in very simple terms what this word is, and I have to confess that I don’t know what this word is without some assistance! That tells us anything about who’s meant to read
this article; maybe somebody with probably sophisticated reading level, do you think this would be expert scientists would be the target audience of this text right here?”

S1: “Not necessarily, I mean the text is not that difficult to understand, so I think they want people like just high school and up or college and up to read it, because they’d still understand even if they didn’t know the meaning of some chemicals.”

E: “OK, other comments about that? So, S1 is saying that this article is for a general audience, maybe a little more advanced not like middle school children, but a little more advanced who have the curiosity to read about article like this, and who won’t be withdrawn by some of the unfamiliar terms because they’re interested, I think that’s a fair summary of what you said. Ok, your classmates agree? I think that’s such a pretty fair assumption. I’d characterize this as an article written for an educated general audience who has an interest in this topic. In the United States, general audience sometimes gives us the impression that they’re not sophisticated in terms of reading, and we’ve had a lot of things that have come up in the news recently for people who took the ball and ran with it in the wrong direction, they picked up on something and violently disagree and an old brouhaha arouse when they haven’t really understood it in the first place; I think America readers are not especially sophisticated, I tell you that this is true but you’re free to disagree with me. And I wonder if an article like this would appeal to people who have special interest in the topic or interested in science or concerned about the ichnology, probably also who have a higher reading level.”

E: “OK, let’s talk about the register and modality. What’s the register?”

S3: “It uses scientific terms and everything.”

E: “So, neutral register with some technical terminology. Is it objective or evaluative?”

S1: “I think it’s objective.”

E: “OK, objective, so you don’t see any first or second person pronoun? Ok sorry that was a different modality! (Laughing!) Ok, you don’t see any adjectives that express a personal point of view? Everybody agrees? Ok, is it personal or impersonal?

S1: “Impersonal?”

E: “Ok, impersonal, so the article doesn’t address the reader; the writer or those who came up with the research don’t refer to themselves as a first of second person pronoun. Ok, if you translated this for an audience of educated but not expert American readers, did any of those aspects of the text have to change? Change the register for example?

S2: “I’d change the register if this is going to be put in a newspaper because newspapers I think are written at 6th grade level.”

E: “8th grade level.”

S2: “But this will be appropriate if it’s for a scientific journal.”

Excerpt 3:

E: “OK, let’s talk about the brief, for those who sign in a brief they wanna know what characteristics this text has. So, why might you wanna translate this text? Who would be interested? What about people who are interested in ichnology? Would ordinary people like you and me be interested in issues that concern the ichnology? Will they be interested in conservation? Any people who are interested in buying natural was to combat problems that farmers in cultivated areas have to deal with, well here you have an article that tells us that an antibiotic use of bees seems to be causing some of the problems that bees die of. So let’s say somebody who’s iconological minded, or a group of college students who needed a translation of a summary of a longer article to put it in their website, so let’s say a group of students that they’re interested in iconological issues would like to be able to read this in En, if they go to the original article in Plus 1, it might be a little bit too difficult for them to read because in Plus 1 scientists write for specialists, so it might not be accessible to them. This article cites a lot from an article published in EN in Plus 1, research that’s done in the US, Plus 1 is a scientific journal, it might be that the language is too dense. So here you have a summary, so let’s say we’re translating this for a website, it’s informative, talks about some of the dangers of using this particular insect antibiotic, and yet it’s short and fairly accessible, so let’s say that’s the target audience of our translation, what do you think, do you think that’s a reasonable brief?”
E: (After a short pause) “So it’s not gonna be for the general public, it’s gonna be for people who’re interested but not experts, interested in iconological issues, they know some of the terminology and issues, they’re passionate about this kind of information, but they’re not necessarily trained as scientists. So, how would that affect what we choose to do with the translation? Would you change the register? Would you leave it impersonal? You know in this writing sometimes people go to the second person to make the text very user friendly. So, we said this text is objective as opposed to evaluative, would you change that?”
S2: “I’d leave it as it is.”
E: “I wouldn’t change it either.
E: “Ok, as you’re working on this text, have you seen any potential problems of any kind?
S3: “All the scientific terms!”
E: “OK, scientific terms, sometimes it’s hard for us to translate terms if we don’t understand what they are, for me there’re few reasons I didn’t understand. So scientific terms could be a challenge. Were you be able to find equivalents for the scientific terms? Are there any that you couldn’t find equivalents for?
S3: “There’re some that we could find in parallel texts (such as Toxine), loan words, but you find the names in parallel texts.

**Excerpt 4:**
K: “OK, other types of problems with this text, anybody?”
S2: “I think I wasn’t sure whether to say ‘colonies’ or ‘hives’ in different places, because in some places in the text it seems like the French specify that they’re calling it colony, but in other places, it wasn’t as clear so I was a bit confused.”
K: “OK, did you get any help from parallel texts?”
S2: “Yes, somewhere, but it seemed interchangeable.”
E: “So what can you do to figure out that these words are interchangeable or not? Is there a difference that carries a distinction? Are they really interchangeable? That’s a really good question. So what did you do to find out?”
S1: “I looked them up in parallel texts.”
E: “You know, if you find both terms in parallel texts, what happens is you got to infer a lot, so maybe another step in your research would be to look then up in field-specific dictionaries, and sometimes if you can find say the notes of a professor that have been written up for clients they’ll give the definition and may give a little more explanation, so field-specific dictionaries are very useful, but you roam around the Internet you find a lot of things, like some professors will put his PowerPoint somewhere or something like that, so that could be another approach you look both terms up in a dictionary that has to do with ichnology, insect, biology, something like that, you then get some explanation to the difference between colony and hive and it’ll help you decide the instances when they come up.”

**Notes:**

1. Repeating questions by way of rephrasing them can encourage students to participate. This strategy was used frequently by the instructor.

2. Mentioning students’ names during the discussion by the instructor, which reflects closer relationship with students. The small size of class certainly helps a lot with that.

3. After each question from the instructor, there seemed to be a long pause, which, along with the ‘lecturing’ style of the workshop, gave the class a monotonous rhythm.
Appendix A-8: Selected Excerpts and Notes from Thomas’s Class Observation

Overview: *Class duration: 90 minutes. *Place: computer lab classroom, equipped with a wall screen, an OHP, and a classroom monitor. *Seating: connected rows. *Number of students: 4. *Instructor Thomas (T) came 15 minutes earlier and began connecting his own laptop to the classroom monitor. He opened the ST document (which was a welcome page of a German pharmacy website) along with students’ drafts and had them ready for the workshop.

Excerpt 1:
T: (Speaking in EN) “Why might not [A focus on health] be the best choice?” (Referring to a student’s translation of a pharmacy’s slogan).
S2: “I think it might be a slogan of someone else in the target culture.”
T: “Who uses it?”
S1: “*Allstate* (a well-known US insurance company)?”
T: “Yes! You may actually have a law suit in your hands if you start using other people’s trademark slogans on your website!”
S2: “They said it’s their own trademark!”
T: “And that’s the question: is it general enough that everyone knows that? And it may be.”
T: (Now, reading the ST sentence and S1’s translation, and commenting) “Eine erfolgreiche Therapie ist das Ergebnis eines guten Zusammenwirkens zwischen Patient, Arzt und Apotheke [Successful therapy results of good interaction between patient, doctor, and pharmacy]. How does this sound? A little odd. It’s right on its fact but it’s a little bit odd, is anything striking you all as odd? A ‘good interaction,’ ok, the ST’s word is probably not ‘interaction,’ in a way it is, but that’s probably not the best of word choice, do you have something else?”
S1: “I’m not sure but what about ‘collaboration’ or ‘cooperation’?”
T: “Ok, think of the words ‘interaction, collaboration, cooperation.’ First of all think of collocation. What collocates with ‘interaction,’ any word that collocates with interaction, ‘successful interaction’? How about ‘drug interaction’? Right, that word almost comes across to me as particularly in the pharmaceutical field. We talk about interaction between drugs, right, so it’s probably not the best choice we’re talking about here, which is ‘human interaction.’ Now let’s take ‘collaboration,’ there’s no word worrying than ‘collaboration!’ It’s less common, any connotations? Differences between ‘collaboration’ and ‘cooperation’?”
S1: “‘Collaboration’ sounds like maybe you’re both working on a project or something.”
T: “Ok, collaborating with classmates, collaborating with the enemy, ‘collaboration’ in some contexts, e.g. look at world war two, ‘collaborators’ were the ones who collaborated with the enemy, they were not good people, and so for some people that’s not a good choice. And so when we’re talking about patient, doctor, and pharmacists, ‘collaborating’... sure you could, ‘cooperating’ is probably the most neutral choice, so [the result of good cooperation], ‘good cooperation’ collocate well, it’s not bad, does it work?”
S2: “I’m not sure.”
T: “Which is more common? Did you google to find it? Let’s do it... I mean we could go and look up...” (T. opened the Internet browser and googled ‘good cooperation/cooperation/interaction’).
T: “‘Good cooperation’ comes up a little bit more commonly, but they’re collocations at the end, there’s nothing wrong with either one. Ok, let’s move on.”

Excerpt 2:
T: (Reading ST sentence and S2’s translation, and commenting) “Je unkomplizierter und offener alle Beteiligten miteinander kommunizieren desto schneller lassen sich Entscheidungen herbeiführen oder gegebenenfalls auch korrigieren. [The less complicated and more open communication with all those involved]. Umm think about that, [The faster decisions can be made or corrections when necessary]. What strategy would you say you used here, S2?”
S2: “Umm, not quite sure.”
T: “You have the word ‘communication’ in EN, as a noun, what is the corresponding word in GR in this text?”
S2: “It’s the verb.”
T: “It’s the verb, what you have done here is you’ve modulated, you’ve taken a verb and turned it into a noun, usually we recommend going the other way, GR tends to be very noun heavy, and we recommend taking GR nouns and turning them into verbs, if we take GR verbs and turn them into nouns we’re making the EN even more heavy than the Gr, and I’ve questioned whether, it’s not that it’s wrong.”

Excerpt 3:
T: (Reading the ST sentence and S3’s translation, then commenting) “Interessieren Sie sich für die Möglichkeiten einer homöopathischen Behandlung... [If you’re interested in the possibility of a homeopathic treatment...]. In the ST it says it’s more than one, do we need to translate the plural in GR into plural in EN here and say ‘possibilities’?”
S1: “I think we should you use the plural?”
T: “I’m inclined to agree with you, but why?”
S3: “I didn’t do that, I knew that’s a plural but I didn’t think of it.”
S2: “It’ll be like [if you’re interested in the possibilities]. I mean it’s weird!”
T: “Right, you’re right, so even though you have a plural in the surface of the ST, usage in EN says we don’t use ‘possibilities’ in the plural in this kind of context...”
S1: “...and that kinda happens a lot, I mean not a lot but does come up like crippling where you get things in EN that you have a mass noun, or it’s just singular like ‘informations,’ you know.”
T: “Yeah, right we know that *informationen* in GR is a count noun and in EN it’s a mass noun; you cannot translate it in the plural, the difference here is that: [consider the possibilities], what you got here, and you recognized this accurately, it’s good work! There’re two different usages of ‘possibility’: there’s a count noun: there’s one ‘possibility’ of doing this or that, consider all the possibilities and choose one, right, so there’s count noun... but there’s also a mass noun usage and that’s what this is, this noun *informationen* is plural in Gr, where in EN the ‘possibility’ is this abstract idea of an option that you wouldn’t have in a plural, so that’s the difference, ok. So good work there!”

Excerpt 4:
S1: “Sir, about the sentence *Interessieren Sie sich für die Möglichkeiten einer homöopathischen Behandlung kommen wir gern mit Ihnen*. Would it sound better to say: [We will be glad to talk to you about the possibility of homeopathic treatment if you are interested]?”
T: “Well, there’re three ideas in the ST sentence fundamentally: (1) you’re interested (2) in homeopathic treatment (3) we’ll talk about. And they are in that order; your sentence violates the idea of what we call ‘theme-rheme.’”
S1: “Oh yeah.”
T: “We want to say what we’re talking about, and then say something about it, and the GR does this by saying: [If you are interested in this, then we’ll talk about it]. What you’re saying is backward: [We’ll talk about it if you are interested in this]. So, that information about homeopathic treatment has to come earlier in the sentence, ok? So I think you have to keep the GR order ideas. Any questions?”
S2: “The graph on the top has a line under the umm a little text under the title, I was like ‘oh should I translate that or not,’ so what do you think?”
T: “Ok, before we go on, does everybody write the source? If it says translate every word on the page you translate every word on the page, don’t forget the source reference (referring to the URL). Ok, then we have this logo, umm it kinda depends on your translation brief; if you’re translating the entire website, so you got the umm official legal notices every German website has to have, etc. and you talk to the actual client, the actual owner of this place, and they wanna say, the first question I’d have is: does this tagline occur anywhere else except in the logo? If it doesn’t, then it needs a solution, because of the way this is designed, it’ll be easy to take this and put it into a paint program and just dark over those letters and put the tagline in and say ‘this is the graphic you use on the EN version of your website,’ right, and then you can come up...”
with the translation slogan. On the other hand, you wouldn’t have to, you could say ‘that’s just a logo, the
tagline doesn’t appear anywhere else’; we can just use the logo, and for Americans who are reading it are
just gonna not know what that means.”
S2: “That’s what it thought, too, I actually didn’t translate it.”
T: “Right. You wouldn’t translate it unless you’re specifically asked to edit the images; that’s again the
translation brief.”

Notes:

1. The instructor started the first five minutes by opening the browser on YouTube and playing short
videos of humorous RU commercials while students were still coming to class, and exchanging informal
chats with those who arrived.

2. The instructor’s way of discussing students’ translations was not by comparing students’ translations
initially, but by taking one or two sentences of each student’s translation, discussing it against the
always displayed ST, then moving to a new sentence yet for a different student. Occasionally he would
have checked how the rest of the class did with a certain term or phrase, or respond to a student who
specifically asked him to look at and comment on what he/she had done.

3. The instructor gave few remarks while commenting on students’ errors to ease the tension, for example,
“Let’s go on to the next victim!” (referring to a student’s translation, with a smile)... “What a good
question!” “Good discussion!” “Don’t you love language, it’s fun!”
Appendix B-1: Instructor Interview Question Protocol

* Codes in red represent the alignment between interview items and the examined category in the analytical framework (discussed in Section 3.3.4.).

1. **Introductory question**: How many years have you been teaching translation? How many years have you been practicing professional translation? Have you had any professional/academic training in teaching and in translation? What does translation practice courses mean to you <in terms of concept and importance> [1-all]

2. **In your opinion, what is feedback?** What constitutes effective feedback? [1-a/c] How important is feedback in translation practice courses? [1-b]

3. **Which mode of feedback do you use most?** (i.e., written/verbal/individualized/whole-class)? [2-a] Can you describe the feedback process/mechanism that you implement in your class? [2-all]

4. **Do you use any grading criteria/rubric in your feedback?** If yes, how clearly specified is it to your students? Do you find it useful in providing detailed feedback to students? How often do you rely on personal impression in your feedback? [1/d] *Can you provide me with a copy of your grading criteria, if you have any?*

5. **Which language do you use for instruction and feedback: L1 or L2?** Do you think this has an influence on getting the message across clearly to the students? [1-c, 2-b]

6. **How relevant is technology and computer tools to the feedback process in your class?** Do you use these tools for the feedback in any way? If not, what are your reasons for not using them? [2-c]

7. **What is the timing of your feedback?** Do you provide immediate feedback or delayed? During the translation process (in class) or on the final draft of the product, and why? [2-d]

8. **What are students’ typical weaknesses/errors in translation?** [1-c] What are the areas/skills of translation on which you think your students need more feedback? [1-c] How do you deal with students’ recurring errors and mistakes? [2-b]

9. **How do you correct students’ work:** in a direct manner (e.g., by stating what needs improving), in an indirect way (e.g., by indicating/locating the error and asking for revision), in a metalinguistic way (e.g., by using error codes & abbreviations), or in a dialogical way (e.g., by asking them to revise or explain), and why? [2-b]

10. **What kind of comments do you typically write?** How often do you focus on cognitive processes (such as problem solving & decision-making)? [2-b] *Can you provide me with some samples of your feedback?*

11. **In your comments, how often do you provide theoretical elaboration?** Do you focus more on skills (training) or theories (education)? Can you give us some examples? [1-c, 2-b]

12. **Do you compare an individual student’s work to other students’ works, to his/her own past performance, and/or to explicit established criteria?** Which one do you think is more effective? How often do you use praise and how important this is? [2-b]

13. **How important is it to you to include marks (grades) in your written/verbal feedback, and why?** How clear your grading system is to your students? [1-d, 2-b]

14. **What do you do with your feedback after it is given to students:** for example, do you keep records of it to re-use it in subsequent tasks to save time and effort? What do students do with the feedback they receive in your class? How do you direct students to use the feedback they receive in your class? [2-b, 3-d]
15. **How consistent is your feedback provision?** Do you provide the same quantity and quality of feedback to all students in the class regardless of their performance or interest in the feedback? Do you provide the same quantity and quality of feedback in all translation practice courses that you teach regardless of the field of translation or class level? [2-e]

16. **Is this course’s feedback different from that of your other translation practice courses?** Is it different from the feedback in other instructors’ translation practice courses? What about other theoretical translation courses? If yes, how so? [2-e, 3-e]

17. **How engaged are students in the feedback process?** Do they ask for feedback? Do they negotiate your feedback with you and ask for elaboration? Do you encourage them to do so? Do you think it is the responsibility of instructors to encourage their students to do so in the first place? [3-a/d]

18. **How applicable is peer feedback in your class?** Do students exchange feedback with their peers? Do you encourage them to do so? How willing and responsive are students to work in pairs/groups? Do you think you need to train them to do so (e.g., by teaching them how to use the assessment criteria)? [3-b]

19. **How reflective is your class?** Do students provide self-feedback to themselves? Do you encourage them to do so? How independent do you think your students are in improving their own learning? Do you think you need to prepare them for that (e.g., by training them on writing reflective portfolio essays)? [3-c]

20. **Which form of feedback (teacher/peers/self) do you think is most helpful, and why?** [3-all]

21. **How collaborative is your translation practice class?** How do you think dialogue helps in fostering learning in translation practice? How dialogic do you think your feedback is? What do you think of the notions: students as partners/costumers, and democratic classroom? [1-e, 3-all]

22. **Describe the kind of translation activities/assignments/texts you typically give in your class.** What is your approach to text selection? Do you allow students to take part in selecting the materials/texts for translation activities? Do you use feedback (to and from students) to modify and improve these activities/assignments/texts? [3-c/d/e]

23. **Do students take part in setting the assessment criteria or choosing the appropriate method of feedback?** Are they capable of doing so? What do you think about this? [1-d, 3-c]

24. **How often do students give you feedback on your teaching/course?** Do you encourage them to do so? Are they capable of doing so? Do you get feedback from other sources (e.g., other instructors, coordinators, etc.)? How important do you think this is? [3-e]

25. **Are you encouraged by the program coordinators/supervisors to provide effective feedback to your students?** Do you think this is important for the program as a whole? Do you think instructors of translation practice should consult among themselves on feedback standards and criteria? Why or why not? [1-e, 3-e]

26. **What are the major challenges that you encounter with feedback** (e.g., class size and teaching load)? What solutions do you suggest to overcome these challenges (e.g., innovative feedback strategies, such as the use of podcast [audio recording] to enhance verbal feedback? [1/2/3]

27. **What is your overall satisfaction with the feedback in this translation practice course?** What (if anything) could be changed to improve the feedback practices in this course and make them more effective? [1/2/3]

28. **Are there any other points you would like to make** about the perceptions and practices of feedback in your translation practice courses? Were there any questions you expected me to ask you but I did not, or questions that you did not expect me to ask you but I did? [1/2/3]
Appendix B-2: Student Interview Question Protocol

* Codes in red represent the alignment between interview items and the examined category in the analytical framework (discussed in Section 3.3.4.).

1. **Introductory question**: Why did you choose to major in translation? What do you expect to learn in translation practice courses? How do you study for these courses? [1-all]

2. **In your opinion, what is feedback?** What constitutes effective feedback? [1-a/c] How important is feedback in translation practice courses? [1-b]

3. **Which mode of feedback does your instructor use most** (i.e., written/verbal/individualized/whole-class)? [2-a] Can you describe the feedback process/mechanism your instructor implements in this class? [2-all]

4. **Does your instructor use any grading criteria/rubric in his/her feedback?** If yes, how clearly specified is it to you? Do you find it useful in providing detailed feedback to you? How often does your instructor rely on personal impression in his/her feedback? [1/d] *Can you provide me with a copy of the grading criteria, if you have any?*

5. **Which language does your instructor use for instruction and feedback: L1 or L2?** Do you think this has an influence on getting the message across clearly to the students? [1-c, 2-b]

6. **How relevant is technology and computer tools to the feedback process in this class?** Does your instructor use these tools for the feedback in any way? If not, what are the reasons for not using them? [2-e]

7. **What is the timing of your instructor’s feedback?** Does he/she provide immediate feedback or delayed? During the translation process (in class) or on the final draft of the product? What do you think about that? [2-b]

8. **What are your typical weaknesses/errors in translation?** What are the areas/skills of translation on which you think you need more feedback? [1-c] How does your instructor deal with your recurring errors and mistakes? [2-d]

9. **How does your instructor correct your work?** in a direct manner (e.g., by stating what needs improving), in an indirect way (e.g., by indicating/locating the error and asking for revision), in a metalinguistic way (e.g., by using error codes & abbreviations), or in a dialogical way (e.g., by asking them to revise or explain)? What do you think about that? [2-b]

10. **What kind of comments does your instructor typically write?** How often does he/she focus on cognitive processes (such as problem solving & decision-making)? [2-b] *Can you provide me with some samples of his/her feedback?*

11. **In your instructor’s comments, how often does he/she provide theoretical elaboration?** Does he/she focus more on skills (training) or theories (education)? Can you give us some examples? [1-c, 2-b]

12. **Does your instructor compare your work to other students’ works, to your own past performance, and/or to explicit established criteria?** Which one do you think is more effective? How often does your instructor use praise and how important this is? [2-b]

13. **How important is it to you that instructors include marks (grades) in their written/verbal feedback, and why?** How clear your instructor’s grading system is to you? [1-d, 2-b]

14. **What do does your instructor do with feedback after it is given to students?** For example, does the instructor keep records of feedback to re-use it in subsequent tasks to save time and effort? What do you do with the feedback they receive in your class? How does your instructor direct you to use the feedback you receive in this class? [2-b, 3-d]
15. **How consistent is your instructor’s feedback provision?** Does the instructor provide the same quantity and quality of feedback to all students in the class regardless of their performance or interest in the feedback? Does the instructor provide the same quantity and quality of feedback in all translation practice courses that he/she teach regardless of the field of translation or class level? [2-e]

16. **Is this course’s feedback different from that of the instructor’s other translation practice courses?** Is it different from the feedback in other instructors’ translation practice courses? What about other theoretical translation practice courses? If yes, how so? [2-e, 3-e]

17. **How engaged are you in the feedback process?** Do you ask for feedback? [3-a] Do you negotiate your instructor’s feedback with him/her and ask for elaboration? Does your instructor encourage you to do so? Do you think it is the responsibility of instructors to encourage their students to do so in the first place? [3-a/d]

18. **How applicable is peer feedback in this class?** Do you exchange feedback with their peers? Does your instructor encourage you to do so? How willing and responsive are students to work in pairs/groups? Do you think your instructor needs to train you to do so (e.g., by teaching you how to use the assessment criteria)? [3-b]

19. **How reflective is this class?** Do you provide self-feedback to yourselves? Does your instructor encourage you to do so? How independent do you think students are in improving their own learning? Do you think your instructor need to prepare you for that (e.g., by training you on writing reflective portfolio essays)? [3-c]

20. **Which form of feedback (teacher/peers/self) do you think is most helpful, and why?** [3-all]

21. **How collaborative is this translation practice class?** How do you think dialogue helps in fostering learning in translation practice? How dialogic do you think your instructor’s feedback is? What do you think of the notions: students as partners/costumers, and democratic classroom? [1-e, 3-all]

22. **Describe the kind of translation activities/assignments/texts your instructor typically gives in this class.** What is your instructor’s approach to text selection? Does he/she allow students to take part in selecting the materials/texts for translation activities? Does he/she use feedback (to and from students) to modify and improve these activities/assignments/texts? [3-e/d/e]

23. **Do you take part in setting the assessment criteria or choosing the appropriate method of feedback?** Are you capable of doing so? What do you think about this? [1-d, 3-c]

24. **How often do you give your instructor feedback on his/her teaching/course?** Does your instructor encourage you to do so? Are you capable of doing so? Does your instructor get feedback from other sources (e.g., other instructors, coordinators, etc.)? How important do you think this is? [3-e]

25. **Do you think instructors should be encouraged by the program coordinators/supervisors to provide effective feedback to their students?** Do you think this is important for the program as a whole? Do you think instructors of translation practice should consult among themselves on feedback standards and criteria? Why or why not? [1-e, 3-e]

26. **What are the major challenges that you encounter with feedback** (e.g., feedback is rare, generic (not individualized), lacking clarity or focus)? What solutions do you suggest to overcome these challenges? [1/2/3]

27. **What is your overall satisfaction with the feedback in this translation practice course?** What (if anything) could be changed to improve the feedback practices in this course and make them more effective? [1/2/3]

28. **Are there any other points you would like to make** about the perceptions and practices of feedback in your translation practice courses? Were there any questions you expected me to ask you but I did not, or questions that you did not expect me to ask you but I did? [1/2/3]
Appendix C-1: The SA-CASE Program Curriculum (English Module)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>COURSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PREPERATORY YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reading1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reading2</td>
<td>Writing2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reading3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics</td>
<td>Introduction to Syntax and Morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>At-Sight Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Computer Applications to Translation</td>
<td>Consecutive and Bilateral Translation1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arabization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Literary Translation</td>
<td>Second Language4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C-2: The US-CASE Program Curriculum (Spanish Module)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMESTER</th>
<th>COURSE SUBJECT AND TITLE</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>US 10097 Destination Kent State: First Year Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPAN 3/4xxxx Spanish Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Core I. Composition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Core II. Mathematics and Critical Reasoning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Core III. Humanities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Core IV. Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>TRST 20009 The Multilingual Information Lifecycle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPAN 3/4xxxx Spanish Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Core V. Humanities or Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Core VI. Social Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Core VII. Basic Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>ENG 20002 Introduction to Technical Writing or ENG 30063 Business and Professional Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPAN 3/4xxxx Spanish Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor, certificate or second major/degree course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent Core VIII. Additional</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Diversity Course Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>SPAN 38240 Conversation for Business and Special Purposes: Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRST 30330 Cross-Language Mediation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor, certificate or second major/degree course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Diversity Course Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiential Learning Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>SPAN 38231 Translation Practice: Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRST 30230 Approaches to Translation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPAN 48240 Business and Special Texts: Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing-Intensive Course Requirement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor, certificate or second major/degree courses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>SPAN 48230 Advanced Translation Practice: Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPAN 4xxxx Spanish Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor, certificate or second major/degree course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Electives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>SPAN 3/4xxxx Spanish Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPAN 4xxxx Spanish Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor, certificate or second major/degree course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Electives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>MCLS 30420 Foreign Language and Culture Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Electives</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C-3: Summary of Instructors’ Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Item</th>
<th>Bader</th>
<th>Omar</th>
<th>Zaid</th>
<th>Ali</th>
<th>Kate</th>
<th>Sarah</th>
<th>Emily</th>
<th>Thomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role in Class</strong></td>
<td>Traditional friend</td>
<td>Dynamic partner</td>
<td>Dynamic facilitator</td>
<td>Passive facilitator</td>
<td>Professional client</td>
<td>Academic reviser</td>
<td>Traditional client</td>
<td>Professional editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision of Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Evaluation for both instructor &amp; student</td>
<td>Evaluation for instructor</td>
<td>Review, proofreading</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Pen-&amp;-paper correction</td>
<td>Critical editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Verbal broad criteria</td>
<td>Written correction key of 7 error types</td>
<td>Verbal broad criteria</td>
<td>Verbal broad criteria</td>
<td>Points-based rubric for essay assignments and the midterm translation project</td>
<td>Points-based rubric &amp; a correction key of 20 error types</td>
<td>Simple major-minor error rubric of 10 error types</td>
<td>Detailed (ATA) rubric, colored-code system, &amp; spreadsheet of students’ culminating errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whole-class Verbal Interaction</strong></td>
<td>Read-and-translate discussion led by instructor</td>
<td>Active discussion led by instructor using IWB</td>
<td>Dynamic discussion led by students using IWB</td>
<td>Occasional responses to groups’ questions</td>
<td>Active discussion of students’ drafts using OHP</td>
<td>Discussion of students’ common errors using OHP</td>
<td>Read-and-translate discussion led by instructor using OHP</td>
<td>Active discussion of students’ drafts using OHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualized Written Comments</strong></td>
<td>Only for the midterm exam (handwritten)</td>
<td>Only for the midterm exam (handwritten)</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Always (typed)</td>
<td>Always (typed)</td>
<td>Always (handwritten)</td>
<td>Always (typed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request First Draft Submission</td>
<td>Required (graded)</td>
<td>Required (graded)</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Required (not graded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Revised Draft Submission</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required (graded)</td>
<td>Required (graded)</td>
<td>Required (graded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Error Treatment</td>
<td>Direct, verbal corrections</td>
<td>Indirect verbal &amp; demonstrative conversations (led by student)</td>
<td>Direct, verbal, written, &amp; demonstrative conversations</td>
<td>Indirect verbal conversations + direct written comments</td>
<td>Indirect, verbal, written, &amp; demonstrative conversations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to Professional Practices</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of IWB/OHP/Class Monitor</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Always → to display the ST &amp; type their TT</td>
<td>Always → to display the ST &amp; students’ graded TTs</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Always → to display the ST &amp; parallel texts</td>
<td>Always → to display the ST &amp; parallel texts</td>
<td>Always → to display the ST &amp; students’ TTs, for workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Resources (in class)</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Always → for class workshops</td>
<td>Always → for class workshops</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Always → for written feedback</td>
<td>Always → for written feedback</td>
<td>Only for displaying the ST in class</td>
<td>Always → for written feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Email</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Occasionally –for administrative purposes</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Occasionally –for administrative purposes</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Blackboard</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Portfolio</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Pair Tasks</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-One Conferencing</td>
<td>Provided after midterm exam + when student requests it</td>
<td>When student requests it</td>
<td>Provided after midterm exam + when student requests it</td>
<td>When student requests it</td>
<td>It is the norm (since the class has two students only)</td>
<td>When student requests it</td>
<td>When student requests it</td>
<td>When student requests it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reflection Tasks</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Selection of ST</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Once for the final project</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Instructor Evaluation</td>
<td>Formal end-of-course evaluation</td>
<td>Formal end-of-course evaluation + informal mid-of-semester evaluation</td>
<td>Formal end-of-course evaluation</td>
<td>Formal end-of-course evaluation</td>
<td>Formal end-of-course evaluation + informal mid-of-semester evaluation</td>
<td>Formal end-of-course evaluation</td>
<td>Formal end-of-course evaluation</td>
<td>Formal end-of-course evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Feedback from Peer Instructor

| Students’ limited language proficiency + IWB technical issues | Students’ limited language proficiency + Teaching/administrative workload | Students’ limited language proficiency | Students’ careless & repetitive errors + Teaching workload – which prevents providing written feedback | Lack of universal rubric + Grading objectively (definition of errors) | Coming up with ways to provide feedback without giving answers directly + Having more time to do one-on-one conferencing | Hearing back from students concerning the feedback (completing the loop) + Using a more detailed grading rubric | Students’ limited language proficiency + Hearing back from students concerning the feedback (completing the loop) |

### Instructors’ Major Challenges

| Lack of written feedback + Lack of theoretical topics + Lack of clear course plan | No complaints about the feedback | Organizing the (rich) verbal feedback & making most use of it | Lack of written feedback + Lack of sufficient verbal discussion + Instructor’s passive involvement in class workshops | Wished there were more positive comments + Wished there was a rubric for the weekly translation tasks | No complaints about the feedback | Wished written feedback arrives earlier + Whished there was written feedback on first draft + Wished assessment criteria were more objective | Wished the written feedback arrives earlier + Organizing the (rich) verbal feedback + Wished the Blackboard was utilized |

### Students’ Major Challenges

| Satisfied | Very satisfied | Very satisfied | Very satisfied | Very satisfied | Satisfied | Very satisfied | Very satisfied |

### Instructors’ Level of Satisfaction

| Very satisfied | Satisfied | Very satisfied | Very satisfied | Very satisfied | Very satisfied | Satisfied | Very satisfied |

### Students’ Level of Satisfaction

| Satisfied | Very satisfied | Very satisfied | Dissatisfied | Very satisfied | Very satisfied | Satisfied | Satisfied |
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The Kent State University Institutional Review Board has reviewed and approved your Application for Approval to Use Human Research Participants as Level I/Exempt from Annual review research. Your research project involves minimal risk to human subjects and meets the criteria for the following category of exemption under federal regulations:

- Exemption 2: Educational Tests, Surveys, Interviews, and Public Behavior Observations

This application was approved on March 20, 2014.

***Submission of annual review reports is not required for Level I/Exempt projects.

If any modifications are made in research design, methodology, or procedures that increase the risks to subjects or includes activities that do not fall within the approved exemption category, those modifications must be submitted to and approved by the IRB before implementation.
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Appendix D-2: Informed Consent Forms

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Study Title
The Feedback Culture in Translator Education: A Comparative Exploration of Two Distinct University Translation Programs

Investigators
Dr. Richard Kelly Washbourne (PI)  
Hisham M. Alfaxayd (Co-Investigator)

You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form will provide you with information on the research project, what you will need to do, and the associated risks and benefits of the research. Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form carefully. It is important that you ask questions and fully understand the research in order to make an informed decision. You will receive a copy of this document to take with you.

Purpose
This study aims to throw some light on the culture of feedback in translator education by investigating the perceptions and practices of translator instructors and students at two distinct university translation programs, namely King Saud University in Saudi Arabia and Kent State University in the United States. The comparative analysis of feedback in these two samples of translator programs will help the researcher identify major characteristics and tendencies of feedback in translator education and assess the extent to which current theoretical principles of effective feedback are readily applicable and acceptable in these two educational environments.

Procedures
The researcher will implement the following methods:

1- A classroom observation of one session of the Advanced Translation Practice course that is offered to students in their senior year of study.

2- A semi-structured interview with both the instructor and students of the observed class; the instructor’s interview will be individual, whereas the students’ will be in the form of 3-4 focus-group interview. Both interviews will take approximately 90 minutes.

3- An online questionnaire that will take the participant approximately 15 minutes to complete, which is to be responded to by the instructor and students of the observed class.

4- Interviewed instructors will be optionally asked to provide samples of their written feedback, course syllabi, and assessment criteria/rubrics.

Audio Recording
The interviews and classroom observation of this study will involve audio recording which will be later transcribed for analysis. The audio tapes will be used exclusively for the academic purpose of this study and will be disposed of upon completion of study. Participants will have the option of hearing the tapes prior to their use.
Benefits
This research will not benefit you directly. However, your participation in this study will help us to better understand how feedback is perceived and practiced in your translation program today in comparison with another translation program that belongs to a different educational culture. Differences and commonalities between and across the two programs will be measured against current theoretical principles of effective feedback and will describe the dominating features and tendencies of each program. The comprehensive exploration of the feedback culture in this study will be a step to enhancing the teacher-student interaction and communication in translator education and improving the overall quality of educational instruction in the examined contexts. The implications and recommendations of this study will certainly be relevant to similar educational contexts around the world and can be used to evaluate and improve the feedback perceptions and practices in these contexts.

Risks and Discomforts
There are no anticipated risks beyond those encountered in everyday life. However, you may ask to see the questions before deciding whether or not to participate in the study. Also, if you do not wish to answer a question during your participation, you may skip it and go on to the next question.

Privacy and Confidentiality
Identifying information will not be included in the data that you provide. Your anonymity is further protected by not asking you to sign and return the informed consent form. Your study related information will be kept confidential within the limits of the law. Any identifying information (written and audio) will be kept in a secure location and only the researcher and his academic advising committee will have access to the data. Research participants will not be identified in any publication or presentation of research results; only aggregate data will be used. Confidentiality, anonymity, and privacy of your data (i.e. coding of data, storage, and disposition of data after study completion) will be strictly maintained in this study. All procedures will be consistent with those stated in the IRB protocol application.

Voluntary Participation
Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Contact Information
If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may contact Dr. Richard Kelly Washbourne at 330.672.2150, or Hisham M. Aljarrayd at 330.780.8034. This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330.672.2704.
Consent Statement and Signature
I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that a copy of this consent will be provided to me for future reference. My completion (and return) of this questionnaire/interview will be indicative of my consent to participate in this research study.

_________________________________________  __________________________
Participant Signature                      Date
AUDIOTAPE CONSENT FORM

Study Title
The Feedback Culture in Translator Education: A Comparative Exploration of Two Distinct University Translation Programs

Investigators
Dr. Richard Kelly Washbourne (PI)
Hisham M. Alfayyadh (Co-Investigator)

I agree to participate in an audio taped interview about “The Feedback Culture in Translator Education: A Comparative Exploration of Two Distinct University Translation Programs” as part of this project and for the purposes of data analysis. I agree that Hisham M. Alfayyadh may audio tape this interview. The date, time, and place of the interview will be mutually agreed upon.

_________________________  __________________________
Signature Date

I have been told that I have the right to listen to the recording of the interview before it is used. I have decided that I:

____ want to listen to the recording ______ do not want to listen to the recording

Sign now below if you do not want to listen to the recording. If you want to listen to the recording, you will be asked to sign after listening to them.

Hisham M. Alfayyadh may / may not (circle one) use the audio-tapes/video tapes made of me. The original tapes or copies may be used for:

____ this research project _____ publication _____ presentation at professional meetings

_________________________  __________________________
Signature Date