



AWEJ Vol.3 No.1 March 2012

pp.103-127

## Impediments to Translator Training at Arab Universities: Proposal for Change

Omar F. Atari  
Sultan Qaboos University  
Department of English

### Abstract

This paper seeks to engage scholars involved in translator training/translator education in a debate on the current state of affairs in most Arab university translator training programs. The author offers a possible framework for such a proposed debate by highlighting the impediments to translator training. Several aspects of translator training are overshadowed by certain impediments reflected in such elements as a lack of complementarity in classroom teaching, the mismatch between workplace expectations and translation teaching norms in academic settings, and opposed ideologies among translator trainers. Finally, the author presents some translation descriptors for teaching and assessment and two modules for training trainers and trainees.

*Keywords:* translator training, impediments, mismatches, workplace, translation competence.

### **Diagnosis of the Current State of Affairs**

Despite remarkable advancements made in translation studies, translator training in Arab university English departments continues to be overshadowed by various impediments such as misconceptions about the true nature of translation, the absence of a common ideology for translator training among translation teachers, presumptuous assumptions about trainees' bilingual competence, and mismatches between workplace expectations and translator training in academia.

#### **I. Misconceptions about the true nature of translation**

This is reflected in the age-long debates of product vs. process, literal vs. free, content vs. form; thus, translation is not perceived as a communicative transaction that takes place within a social network (Hatim & Mason, 1990).

The plight of age-long debates about translation issues is deeply rooted in the way the issues are presented and discussed. To conduct the debate on the basis of dichotomies inevitably discards the multiple constituents of interlingual/intercultural communicative dynamism reflected in each and every act of translating. The dichotomous discussions of free versus literal, content versus form or product versus process can never grasp the complexity and variability of the social networks within which translation usually takes place. The fundamental aspect of translation which is the translator's decision-making process is discarded. The constituents of the translator's decision-making process that are characteristically bound up with the stylistic preferences of the language pair involved, and the extralingual contextual variables comprising the purpose and function of the translation are completely overlooked. Unfortunately, such dichotomies are still looming large in our classrooms. One cannot help noticing the absence of concepts like, "client", "commission", purpose and function of source text (ST) and target text (TT) from classroom discussion. The aforementioned dichotomies can only perpetuate the misconceptions about the true nature of translation.

## **II. The Sheer Absence of a Common Ideology (i.e. Frame of Reference) for Translator Training among Translation Teachers**

Essentially there are two ideologies for translator training: translator training through "training" or translator training through "education". According to Bernardini (2004) "Education" is to favour the growth of the individual, developing her cognitive capacities, and those attitudes and predispositions that will put her in a position to cope with the most varying (professional) situations. The aim of "training", according to Bernardini, is to prepare learners to solve problems that can be identified in advance through the application of pre-set, or acquired procedures. Learning through training is a cumulative process while learning through education is a generative rather than a cumulative one". (p. 14)

As things stand now, translation teaching in most Arab university English departments is not done as "training" or as "education". This is reflected in the following two concomitants: (a) lack of complementarity in classroom teaching and (b) misinformed interpretation. .

### **a) Lack Complementarity of Classroom Teaching**

At best, translation teachers gear their teaching practices/activities to serve either one of two purposes: teaching translation as a tool for second language acquisition or the acquisition of translation competence. These two opposed ideologies leave our trainees at a loss. In fact, in many cases there is no awareness of these two paradigms of translation teaching. Bahumaid's (1995: 99) survey of the philosophy and objectives of Arab university translator training programs indicates a lack of clearly stated objectives coupled with a lack of rationale for the existence of such programs. Emery (2000) points out that "it will be a long time before Arab university English departments start to gear their translation teaching to career-, vocational-oriented programs".

What one quite noticeably finds in many translation teaching classrooms is a contrastive analysis of the lexical and/or grammar elements of the source text and target text by the majority translation teachers. What this practice boils down to is a perpetuation of the

misconception of translation as a product, as an exercise in traditional error analysis. In a few cases of classroom discussions, however, one may come across some cursory reference by teachers to the stylistic preferences of the languages involved, discoursal organizational patterns and pragmatic values of certain textual elements in the trainees' translational versions. Yet, this teaching practice which seems to be on the right track, does not place this multilayered analysis within established translator training models, namely Kiraly's (2000) socioconstructive approach or González Davies' (2005) task-based approach or Giles' (2005) process-centered approaches or Nord's (2005), profession-based learner-centered approach (cf. Kelly, 2005, 12-17).

#### **b) Error/Shift Interpretation**

Teachers' feedback of their students' translational versions falls within the old-fashioned contrastive analysis or error analysis traditions. Such approaches to error phenomenon have nothing to do with translation shifts. Most research findings on English/Arabic/English trainee translators' shifts indicate that a majority of translation teachers' feedback is purely product-oriented. It is mainly linguistically-oriented with scant reference to proper translation processes and trainees' strategies such as identifying a problem, finding a solution to the problem, rephrasing, coming up with alternative solutions, checking their translational versions according to use and users, etc. Hard core evidence to these misinformed teaching practices can be easily secured from translation conference presentations. It is not difficult to see many participants in a conference discussing the lexical and syntactic problems of their trainees' translations into Arabic. Such presentations do not even specify the unit of analysis. They are merely exercises in contrastive analysis at the phrase or sentence level without hints to text type, language functions, communicative appeal, function and purpose of translation, users and beneficences, the client's brief, etc. By the same token, translation teachers do not seem to make adequate use of Catford's model (1965), of Vinay and Darbelnet's model (1996), or Pym's binary vs. non-binary errors approach (1992).

In a nutshell, the teachers' interpretation of trainees' shifts is neither a translation "training" nor translation "education" (Bernardini, 2004: 14). Such teaching practices do not qualify as proper product-oriented nor process-oriented approaches; even worse, they are not based on theoretical concepts from the aforementioned translator training models.

### **III. Presumptuous Assumptions about Trainees' Bilingual Competence**

Kelly (2005) writes:

Much translator training, particularly at the undergraduate level, is based on the myth that learners already master their working languages. The vast majority of translator trainers are aware that the future translators they are working with simply do not have the language competence necessary to undertake many translation tasks, particularly at the beginning of their training. (p. 115)

Translator-Training Programs, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels in the Arab world context are no exception. Trainers find themselves in a double bind when confronted by their trainees' translational drafts which normally exhibit inadequacies of L2 reading comprehension strategies, L2 writing genre conventions, let alone the propensity to misconstrue thematic progression while reading an ST and rendering it into the target language (cf. Atari, 2009 & Abu Radwan, 2009).

The issue of translator trainees' inadequate bilingual competence has been attributed by Malmkjaer, (1998, P. 2) to emphasis on functional and practical issues involved in the process of translation which leads to possible neglect of valuable linguistic and applied linguistic advances by many translator trainers. In this respect, Neubert (1995, P. 412) asserts that translator trainers should pay adequate attention to bilingual competence in their teaching practices as a threshold to translation competence acquisition. With reference to the language pair Arabic and English, Farghal (2009) observes that many Arabic-speaking students do not have an adequate level of language proficiency as a requisite to translator competence.

### **IV. Mismatches between Workplace Expectations and Translator Training in Academia**

The mismatches between expectations and demands of the workplace, on the one hand, and traditional translation teaching in most academic settings on the other, have been manifestly expressed in the following areas of translator training:

1. Text materials
2. Norms and conventions on quality assessment
3. Subsidiary skills of editing and revising

#### Text materials

Ideally, in a program of translator training, students will acquire translation skills/competences which will presumably help them compete on the job market as professional translators. Most of the text materials used in such translator training programs are customarily drawn from local and international magazines, journals, daily newspapers and modern literature. Specifically, classroom teaching materials are mostly news articles, literary texts and a few technical or legal texts.

The hegemony of such text materials onto classroom activities deprives translator trainees of the proper exposure to different genres and registers that are typically used in real-life contexts. Translator trainees have to have extensive experience in reading, analyzing and writing texts which are more relevant to the job market. In this respect, one should ask the following questions: How much exposure to career-related registers and texts do our trainees have? How much do they read, analyze, write and summarize such texts (i.e. letters of complaint, petitions, application forms, circulars, commercial ads, logos, tenders, documentaries, opinion columns, obituaries, patents, abstracts, article reviews, religious sermons, etc.)? Some of the major contributions to text material design for translator training include those made by Hatim (1997) and Dickins et al (2002). Hatim's text-typologically-based *Practical Guide English/Arabic/English Translation* (Saqi Books, London) are without a doubt an excellent source as it informs trainers and trainees of the distinctive features of virtual texts, tokens of the three major text types: legal, expository and argumentative. In addition, it informs trainers of the specific, even peculiar, stylistic features of texts in relation to discourse and genre. The book also draws

attention to translators' mediation, and the principles which underpin that mediation. All the same, the book requires some reflection on the part of the trainers to make the best use of its own materials. Furthermore, the texts included in that practical guide are in essence instances of cohesive, coherent, well-organized, even exemplary tokens in their overall organization structures. They are optimal for raising trainees' awareness of the salient stylistic features of rhetorical moves and their proper linguistic realizations in both Arabic and English. However, these texts do not necessarily represent the virtual texts at the workplace. Dickins's et al (2002, Routledge, London) Thinking Arabic Translation similarly highlights rhetorical devices and their linguistic realizations of texts and proposes excellent techniques and procedures for working from one language into the other. Yet, most of the texts and excerpts in the book fall within the category of either news articles or literary genres, which again fall short of representing materials from the workplace. Another workplace-related contribution is the legal translation guide by Shunnaq et al. (1995).

The text materials in those major contributions to translation teaching, helpful as they are, may not lend themselves well to optimal use as some trainers may not situate those materials within functionalist translator training approaches involving, the client's brief, the function and purpose of the ST& TT situation, the user of the translation and the players in the translation process (cf. Vermeer 1989, Nord 1997, Mantaari 1984).

This drawback in classroom teaching has to do with the fact that many trainers have never been professional translators; that is, they are either linguists or literature specialists. Farghal (2009: 12) bemoans this inadequacy in translator training programs stating that most Arab universities' translation programs were caught off guard in terms of the availability of competent translation trainers. The task of teaching translation has been assigned to bilingual academics who specialize in literature and/or linguistics. He adds: "...one can find translation trainers who neither have a sufficient theoretical background in Translation Studies, nor interest or motivation to familiarize themselves

with Translation Studies as an adequately established sub-discipline of Applied Linguistics".

### **Assessment**

At another level, there is still a lot of confusion, indeed, a lot of discrepancies among colleagues in the same unit/department or inter-regional departments about assessment. The assessment of translation is still a matter of personal impressionistic judgment. The overwhelming majority of trainers judge the translation as a product, an end-result text while also being heedless of the social network in which such translation takes place. As Beeby points out (2005):

This product-oriented "grammar translation" use of activity is untenable both pedagogically and from the point of view of translation theory: translation as a teaching activity should be concerned with the process and skill of translation and not only with the end product in so far as it arises from sound skills development. The final product is less important than the work which went into producing it. (p. 54)

According to Kelly (2005), the assessment of translator performance is an activity which, despite being widespread, is under-researched and under-discussed.

Furthermore, she points out that the assessment of any learning should be linked directly to the objectives or intended outcomes. This ingenious and very sensible premise by Kelly may not lend itself well to implementation in many Arab university translator training programs due to an apparent lack of available well-defined well-formulated learning outcomes if existent in the first place (cf. Bahumaid's survey, 1995: and Emery, 2000).

The sheer neglect of well-defined learning outcomes is highly indicative of a blurred vision of the ultimate goal of translator training – the acquisition of translation competence. In fact, translator training in the Arab university context has not yet resolved the conflicting ideologies held by two groups of trainers. There are those who firmly believe that their job is to teach translation in its own right while the others employ

consciously or subconsciously a language-oriented translation approach. Pym, (1992a: 279-288) being cognizant of the distinction between language-oriented translation teaching and translation proper teaching, still sees the two together not separately dealing with the subject of translation errors. Pym's approach to translation errors is based on his definition of translation competence which is the ability to produce a series of target texts from a source text and the ability to select only one from this array of texts and to propose it as a target text for a specified purpose and reader (Pym, 1992a: 281). On the basis of this definition of translation competence, Pym came up with a scheme for the analysis of errors. He introduced the concept, non-binary error vs. binary error whereby non-binarism implies that a wrong answer is not opposed to a right answer but that the choice made should be seen alongside at least one further choice which could also have been taken up but was not, and alongside an endless number of possible wrong answers. For non-binarism, in other words, there are at least two right answers and then the wrong ones (cf. Hatim 2001: 168-169). This insightful approach to error analysis is product-and process-oriented. Assessment in most translator training programs in the Arab university context is taken to mark the end of the learning process. The teacher sets a task, usually in examination conditions, which s/he then marks in order to be able to decide whether or not the students have reached the level required to pass the module and proceed to the following level, or receive the diploma. This summative type of assessment is product-oriented and thus, the non-binary vs. binary errors approach may not be applied effectively by most translator trainers in the Arab university context. In a nutshell, an obvious lack of a commonly accepted understanding of translation competence, coupled with an imbalance between language-oriented translation teaching and translation-proper teaching inevitably lead translator trainers to miss out on the utility of Pym's well-informed and informing error analysis model.

Most current assessment paradigms tend to centre on the concept of translation error, but there is no real overall consensus on what constitutes an acceptable translation and what constitutes a 'translation error'. Traditionally, assessment is taken to mark the end of the

learning process. Those are neither summative nor formative modules for translation assessment. Furthermore, emphasis is placed on what students do wrong, not what they have learned.

As it is obvious that there is no collaboration between academic training institutions and the workplace at large, the trainers do not know much about the workplace norms on the quality of translation. This has to do with the fact that translating agencies in the local communities of each Arab country are not quite active nor quite visibly existing entities. We need a lot of research to allocate those translating agencies and their norms for translation quality assessment.

Kelly (2005, p. 143) states that: "It is positive for trainers to come into contact with professional criteria for quality assessment, and to be able to contrast them with those applied in the academic context, and indeed to question both".

To counteract this dilemma, I present my own model of translation descriptors (Table 1) and I match them with translation competence components based on my years of teaching translation and reviews of the available literature.

Here is *Table 1: The model of translation descriptors*:

Parameters	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+ / C
1. Accuracy: Completeness Appeal	The translation accurately reflects the ST message. All elements of ST message are kept intact. Translation has its appeal on TT readers .	Translation accurately reflects ST message. All elements are kept intact. Appeal is not adequate	Translation accurately reflects ST message. All elements are intact. TT reader appeal is not quite the same as ST	Translation accurately reflects ST message; one element of ST message has been lost appeal on TT readers is not quite clear	Although translation somehow reflects ST message, yet several elements have been lost. No appeal	ST message has been perverted; most ST elements have been lost

<p>2. Text Type:  Genre conventions  Suitability to users and use</p>	<p>Language of the translation is suited to the users and the use of it. It uses the correct terminology and phraseology of the target genre. All word combinations are idiomatic. Translation observes the rhetorical organization preferences of the TT language</p>	<p>Translation uses the correct terminology of the target genre; it observes rhetorical preferences of the TT language. All word combinations are idiomatic except one or two</p>	<p>Translation uses the terminology, phraseology of the TT language; it observes most of the rhetorical preferences of the TT genre. Few word combinations are unidiomatic</p>	<p>The translation uses the terminology &amp; phraseology of the TT language; it observes some of the rhetorical preferences of the TT genre with word combinations closer to the ST language than the TT language</p>	<p>The translation is a mere reproduction of the ST language features; it exhibits rhetorical preferences of the SL and it has few idiomatic word combinations</p>	<p>The translation is in direct violation of all TL rhetorical preferences; it has many odd phrases &amp; inappropriate terminology. Most of its sentences are hard to read</p>
<p>3. Textuality: Coherence &amp; Cohesion</p>	<p>The sequence of ideas makes sense. The translation has no factual or conceptual errors. Sentences are well-connected just like TL sentences</p>	<p>The sequence of ideas is logical; they make sense. Connectivity is typical of TL sentences. Only one instance of a factual error</p>	<p>Sequence of ideas is logical; it makes sense. Sentences and all parts of sentences are connected. However, there are two instances of conceptual errors</p>	<p>All sentences are well-connected, yet there is one instance of illogical sequence of ideas</p>	<p>Sentences are connected, but the sequence of ideas is illogical sometimes and there are traces of ST interference.</p>	<p>The translation is neither cohesive nor coherent. Flow of ideas makes it difficult to read the text</p>
<p>4. Physical Presentation , Mechanics &amp; Layout</p>	<p>Spacing, indentation, margins, bolding, font type, headers, footnotes, all perfect</p>	<p>No problems with spacing, layout, font type, etc.</p>	<p>Spacing, indentation, margins, font type all perfect. Page numbering, headers, footnotes are not quite good</p>	<p>Few instances of lack of indentation, margins, font type, etc.</p>	<p>Spacing is not adequate nor is layout</p>	<p>No spacing, no layout, etc.</p>

### Matching the descriptors with translation competence components

1. Translation competence is the core of translator training, the core of translation assessment and the core of our descriptors rubric.
2. According to Beeby A.; M. Fernandez, H. Albir (2003), translation competence is qualitatively different from **bilingual competence**. The latter is only one of several components that make up translation competence.
3. The components of translation competence including **bilingual competence** are **interrelated** and there are **hierarchies** among them.
4. Translation competence is expert knowledge and it is primarily procedural knowledge. Thus, strategies play a very important role and most processes are automatic.

Based on the above-stated premises, we establish that translation competence is made up of a system of sub-components which are inter-related and hierarchical. These sub-components are:

- a. bilingual competence,
  - b. an extra-linguistic competence;
  - c. an instrumental/professional competence;
  - d. a transfer competence and a
  - e. strategic competence,
- The **bilingual competence** is the underlying system of knowledge and abilities necessary for linguistic communication in both languages.
  - The **extra-linguistic competence** is the implicit or explicit knowledge about the world in general and specific areas of knowledge: knowledge about translation (its premises: types of translation unit, the processes required, etc.); bicultural knowledge and subject knowledge.
  - The **instrumental/professional competence** is the knowledge and abilities associated with the practice of professional translation: knowledge and use of all kinds of

documentation sources; knowledge and use of new technologies; knowledge of the work market and the profession (prices, types of brief, etc.)

- The **transfer competence** is the **central competence** that integrates all the others. It is the ability to complete the transfer process from the source text to the target text, that is, to **understand the source text and re-express** it in the **target language**, taking into account the **purpose of the translation** and the **characteristics of the receiver**.

- The **strategic competence** includes all the individual procedures, conscious and unconscious, verbal and non-verbal, used to solve the problems encountered during the translation process. This competence **plays an essential role in relation to all the others**, because it is used to detect problems, take decisions, and makes-up for errors or weaknesses in the other competencies.

All these competencies interact to make up translation competence and they are integrated in every translation act, **establishing inter-relations and hierarchies**.

The inter-relations are controlled by the **strategic sub-competence**, because its role is to monitor and compensate for the other sub-competencies, as it makes up for weaknesses and solves problems.

### **Suggested Rubric**

Based on the aforementioned premises and some scholars' characterization of translation competence and its sub-competencies, categories of the proposed rubric of translation descriptors can be matched with translation sub-competencies. It is important to note that the proposed rubric is **hierarchical and the categories arranged in the first vertical column** cuts across all those translation sub-competencies where **the transfer and extra-linguistic sub-competencies are properly placed on top of that hierarchy** followed by the **strategic, extra linguistic and finally strategic, linguistic, and instrumental/professional sub-competencies** down the hierarchy. To illustrate the following chart lists the categories of the rubric in the left-hand column and the translation sub-competencies in the right-hand column:

*Chart1: Matching descriptors with translation sub-competencies*

1. Accuracy, Completeness, Communicative impact	Transfer sub-competence, extra-linguistic sub-competence
2. Text type, Genre conventions: suitability to users and use	Strategic sub-competence, bi-lingual sub-competence, transfer sub-competence
3. Textuality: macro-level: (coherence & cohesion)	Bilingual sub-competence, strategic sub-competence
4. Textuality: Micro-level (Grammaticality)	Bilingual sub-competence, strategic sub-competence
5. Physical Presentation, Mechanics, layout...etc.	Instrumental/professional sub-competence

The five categories vertically arranged in our rubric are in line with our understanding that students should approach their translating tasks from a top-down to bottom-up hierarchy. Unfortunately, the most typical approach adopted by our trainee translators is bottom-up. This has its drawbacks.

- A. According to Nord (1996), Kussmaul (1995), Seguinot (1998) and others, students are tempted to **keep as close to the ST structures as possible**, which leads to **linguistic interferences** and **mistakes** even when translating into the native language.
- B. Translating is seen as a **code-switching operation**, where lexical or syntactic equivalences play the most important part.
- C. The focus of attention is directed to **the smaller units of language**, and the **whole of the text in its communicative situation** is often lost.
- D. Decisions are often based on personal intuition which makes it difficult to justify them by intersubjective reasons, e.g. from translator to customer or reviser in

translation practice and from **student to teacher in translator training, or vice versa**.

### **Editing and Revising**

At the workplace, students of translation may find themselves in a position where they are required to be a jack of all trades. They may be required to write summaries, CVs, even prepare material for a company, or check somebody's texts, etc. Translator trainees are constantly advised by their teachers to check their translations, that is, to do self-revision. But they are not given substantive advice on how to do it (Mossop: 2001: iv).

In fact, when trainees are asked to check their own translations or swap their drafts and revise for each other, they tend to detect certain inappropriate lexical items or certain grammatical inaccuracies like in tenses, prepositions, adjective-noun combinations, etc. At best they may be able to detect certain faulty collocational patterns. The higher-level textual issues involving coherence of ideas, the thematic arrangement within the text, the rhetorical organizational patterns of cause-effect, general versus specific, thesis versus anti-thesis, implicit versus explicit renditions of the author's ideas tend to be completely overlooked. Trainee translators need intensive and systematic training in editing and revising as a prerequisite for their future careers.

What to consider when revising a translation

#### **1. Completeness and Accuracy**

- a) Does the translation reflect the message of the source text?
- b) Are all elements of the message kept intact in the translation?
- c) Does the translation preserve the same text type as that of the source text?

#### **2. Problems of language and use**

- a) At the macro-textual level:
  - a.1. Does the text exhibit logical sequence of ideas? (coherence)
- b) At the micro-level:
  - b.1. Are the connectives between sentences clear?  
Are the relationships among the parts of each sentence clear?

Are there any instances of miscolllocations?

Are there any instances of vague, incomprehensible phrases, clauses?

### **3. The function and purpose of the translation**

a) Does the translation have the same degree of communicative appeal on the target readers as the source text does on its intended readers?

b) Is the language suited to the users of the translation and the use they will make of it?

c) Are the content organization and rhetorical organizational patterns suited to the genre?

### **Remedies and Suggestions for Change**

The shortcomings of translator training that have been explicitly spelt-out call for remediation. Remediation has to cater for the two concerned parties involved in any translator training program: translation teachers (i.e. trainers) and translator trainees. The most pressing need and compelling requisite for trainers is a common and uniformly adopted frame of reference (i.e. ideology) for their teaching of translation. As for trainees, an advanced level of bilingual competence must be the targeted aim during the very early years of their training (i.e. first year and a half). Such an advanced level of bilingual competence becomes a must in their endeavor to acquire the targeted translation competence.

### **Rationale**

According to Kelly (2005), “most translator training programs in certain university systems do not have explicit definitions of their intentions which can be referred to by both staff and students as a basic reference point”. (p. 151)

The different areas of competence or expertise required in order to be a competent translator trainer are:

- Professional translation practice
- Translation studies as an academic discipline

- Teaching skills

Considering the first two essential requirements for overall translator trainer competence, one finds two problems: First, most trainers are specialists in either linguistics or literature. Rarely do we find trainers who are translation-proper specialists. Lately, however, one can find one or two translation-proper specialists in each translator training program. Furthermore, most of those three categories of trainers do not have professional translation practice. To make up for those shortcomings, one would want to see a commonly shared frame of reference by all trainers irrespective of their field of specialization. They have to have a general consensus on the ideology for teaching translation – a shared set of principles, guidelines for all.

### **Training the Trainers**

The most important concept in drawing a plan for a workshop or a seminar for trainers is taking into account their social or market needs and their specific institutional training programs. In other words, **the closer to the trainer's actual context is to his/her work environment, the more suitable the training modules will be.**

Based on the findings of this critique of the current state of affairs in most Arab university English departments, and taking into account the local context and specific shortcomings stated earlier, two modules can be designed to cater for both trainers' and trainees' immediate needs. Here are two proposed modules:

#### **Module one**

- Target Participants: Teachers of translation courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

#### **Ultimate Objective**

At the end of this workshop, translation teachers will be able to:

- Possess and employ a unanimously approved and agreed frame of reference (i.e. ideology) for their training of trainee translators.

#### **Specific Objective**

Translator trainers (i.e. the participants) will be able to:

- use techniques of teaching which achieve an adequate level of complementarity in their classroom teaching
- introduce the concepts that form the core of the translating act
- coordinate the teaching of those concepts with their colleagues

#### Implementation of program

Participants will conduct a weekly workshop on one specific reading assignment from the following available and relevant literature. Each weekly session will be led by one faculty member from the participants. This will be done by rotation.

#### **Reading assignments**

Hatim, B. & J. Munday, (2004). *Translation: An advanced Resource Book*. London and New York, Routledge.

<b>Week</b>	<b>Components to be covered</b>
1	Unit 1. What is Translation? Sections A, B & C.
2	Unit 2: Translation Strategies. Sections A, B & C.
3	Unit of Translation. Sections A, B & C.
4	Translation shifts in J. Mundy. <u>Introducing Translation Studies, Theories and Applications</u> , London & New York, 2008.
5	Same source as above, Chapter 5: Functional Theories of Translation.
6	Same source as above. Chapter 6.
7	Same source as above. Chapter 9.
8	Article: Colina, Sonia (2002). "Second Language Acquisition, Language Teaching and Translation Studies". <u>The Translator</u> , Vol. 8, No. 1, pp: 1-23. St. Jerome.

9	Article: Chesterman, Andrew. "Communication Strategies, Learning Strategies and Translation Strategies ". in Malmkjaer, K. 1998. <u>Translation and Language Teaching</u> , pp: 135-145, St. Jerome.
10	Nida's work 37-40 Newmark's 40-44 Catford's 50-60 Vinay & Darbelmet 55-57 Monday's (2001) <u>Introducing Translation Studies: Theories &amp; Applications</u>
11	Functionalist approaches/models Reiss's Text Type 72-73 Mantaari's Translation Action 73 Vermeer's Skopos 78 Nord's Translation-oriented text analysis 78-81 Same source as above
12	Hatim & Mason 89 House's Model 89-92 Baker's 92-95 Hatim & Mason 144-150

Applications for teaching the respective courses of the program:

- 1) All course descriptions and course outlines shall be prepared in light of insights, concepts from the list of readings.
- 2) The summaries of the reading materials shall be documented and saved in a special file as a reference point for all teachers.

Note: I know that most teachers must have reviewed the literature and read all the above-mentioned references, but what is required is a fresh review of these issues to come up with an agreement on these as their points of reference for their classroom teaching practices.

### **Module Two**

**Target Participants:** Trainee Translators in both graduate and undergraduate programs.

### **Method of implementation**

Translator Training during the first couple of years in a 4-year B. A. Translator Training Program and a two-year graduate program.

**General Aims:** Students will be able to:

Read and write English and Arabic texts of all types and registers as competent bilinguals.

**Specific Objectives**

Students will be able to:

- employ a bidirectional text processing of L2 reading texts (i.e. employ top-down and bottom-up text reading strategies)
- extract the main thesis, anti-thesis, elaboration of thesis, and their linguistic realizations
- integrate lower-level textual issues with the overall top-level textual issues
- distinguish discourse organizational signals which are dysfunctional from those that are rhetorically functional
- recognize explicit and implicit information in SL text
- rephrase certain syntactically complex structures with embedded reduced non-finite clauses in both Arabic and English
- extract the theme and rheme in a clause pattern in English and convert them into Arabic
- recognize evaluativeness in source texts
- restructure certain source texts according to genre conventions
- recognize certain organizational moves of certain genres in both languages
- analyze a range of registers in both languages
- summarize certain chunks from the source text in both languages

### Teachers' Role

Teachers are required to review the available relevant literature as a stepping stone to lead trainees to realize the established objectives above:

1. Smith, F. 2004. Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read (6<sup>th</sup> edition). N. J. Lawrence Elbraum Association, Inc.
2. Goodman, K. S. 1967. "Reading: a Psycholinguistic Guessing Game". Journal of Reading Specialist, 6 (1): 126-135.
3. Grabe, W. 1998. "Reassessing the Term "Interaction". In D. Currell, J. Devine & D. Eskey (Eds.) Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading, pp: 56-71. CUP.
4. Colina, Sonia. 2002. "Second Language Acquisition, Language Teaching and Translation Studies". The Translator, 202, (8), 1, pp: 1-23, St. Jerome.
5. Grabe, W. 1991. "Current Developments in Second Language Reading Research". In TESOL Quarterly, 25: 375-406.
6. Silva, Tony. 1993 "Understanding the Nature of Second Language Writing". TESOL Quarterly, 27, No. 4, pp: 657-677.
7. Connor, U. 199 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Contrastive Rhetoric. Chapter4, Contrastive Rhetoric and the Field of Rhetoric & Composition, pp: 57-79.  
Chapter 8: Genre-Specific Studies in Contrastive Rhetoric, pp: 126-149.  
Chapter 7: Contrastive Rhetoric and Translation Studies, pp: 117-123.
8. Atari, O. & Adel Abu-Radwan. 2009. "A Cross Sectional Study of Translator Trainees' L2 Reading Comprehension Strategies". Interpreter/Translator Journal, Vol. , No. pp: 225-256. Manchester, St. Jerome.

**Conclusion**

Based on my translator training experience in several Arab universities coupled with empirical research findings, I hereby offer a characterization of the obstacles to translator training at Arab universities. The translation descriptors and the proposed modules call for further investigation of the status quo of translator training in the Arab world context.

**Acknowledgment**

I would like to express my deep appreciation for Dr. Sandhya Mehta of the English Department at SQU for her comments and editorial notes on an early version of this paper.

**About the author:**

Omar F. Atari is Professor of Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies. His research interests centers on the interaction between Translator Training and EFL Pedagogy. His publications appeared in *BABEL*, *META*, *Interpreter/Translator Trainer*, *J. of Literary Semantics*, *IRAL*, *TURJUMAN*, *IJAES*.

## References

- Anderman, G. (1998). Finding the Right Words: Translation Teaching and Language Teaching. In Malmkjoer, K. (Eds.). *Translation and Language Teaching*, 39-52. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Atari, O. & A. Abu Radwan. (2009). A Cross-Sectional Study of Translator Trainees' L2 Reading Comprehension Skill and Strategies. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 3, No. 2, Sept., pp: 225-256. Manchester, UK and Kinderhook (NY), USA, St. Jerome Publishing.
- Atari, O. (2005). Saudi Students' Translation Strategies in an Undergraduate Translator Program. *Meta* 50 (1): 180-194. Montreal, Canada.
- Bahumaid, S. A. (1995). On the Teaching of Translation at the University Level. *Turjuman*, 4(2), 95-104. Tangiers, Morocco.
- Beeby, A. (2004). Language Learning for Translators: Designing a Syllabus. In Malmkjoer, K. (Ed.) *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmers*, pp: 39-65. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Bernardini, S. (2004). The Theory Behind the Practice: Translator Training or Translator Education?. In Malmkjoer (Ed.). *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmers*, pp: 17-29. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Catford, J. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London, Oxford University Press.
- Chesterman, A. (1998). Communicative Strategies, Learning Strategies and Translation Strategies. Malmkjoer, K. (Eds.) *Translation and Language Teaching*, 135-145. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Colina, S. (2002). Second Language Acquisition: Language Teaching and Translation Studies. *The Translator*, 8 (1) 1-23. Manchester, UK. St. Jerome Publishing.
- Dickins, J. et al. (2002). *Thinking Arabic Translation: A Course in Translation Method: Arabic and English*. London, Routledge.
- Emery, P. (2000). Introduction to Translation Theory and Contrastive Textology in Arab

- University Translation Classes. In *IJAES*, 1, 105-113. Beirut, Librarie du Liban.
- Farghal, M. (2009). Basic Issues in Translator Training with Special Reference to Arab Universities. *IJAES*, Vol. 10, pp: 5-24. Beirut, Libraire du Liban Publishers.
- Giles, D. (2005). Process-centered Approaches. In Kelly, *A Handbook for Translator Trainers*, 13, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Hatim, B. & J. Munday (2004). *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hatim, B. (1997). *Practical Guide English/Arabic/English Translation*. London: Saqi Books.
- Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*, pp: 2-5 , London, Longman.
- Hatim, Shunnaq & Buckley. (1995). *The Legal Translator at Work: Arabic-English Legal Translation: A Practical Guide*. Irbid, Jordan. Dar Al-Hilal for Translation and Publishing.
- Hurtado and Gonzaler Davies (2005). Task-based Approaches. In Kelly, D. *A Handbook for Translator Trainers*. 16-17. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kelly, D. (2004). *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmers*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishers.
- Kelly, D. (2005). *A Handbook for Translator Trainers*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kiraly, D. (2000). *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Manchester :St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kusmul, P. (1995). *Training the Translator*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Malmkjoer, K. (1998). *Translation and Language Teaching. Language Teaching and Translation*. St. Jerome Publishing.
- Mossop, B. (2001). *Editing and Revising, Revising and Editing for Translators*. 98-105. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Neubert, A. (2000). Competence in Languages and in Translation. In Ch. Schäffner and B. Adab (Eds.) *Developing Translation Competence*. 123-129. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Nord, Ch. (2005). Towards Profession-based Learner-centered Approaches. Kelly, D. A. *Handbook for Translator Trainers*, 12-13. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Pym, A. (1992). Translation Error Analysis and the Interface with Language Teaching. In C. Dollerup and A. Loddegaard (eds.) *Teaching Translation and Interpreting: Training, Talent and Experience. Papers from the First International Conference*, Elsinore, 31 May – 2 June. Amsterdam and Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Sequinot, C. (1991). A Study of Student Translation Strategies. In S. Tirkkonen Condit (ed). *Empirical Research in Translation and Intercultural Studies*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Vermeer, J. J. (1996). *A Scopus Theory of Translation (Some arguments for and against)*. Heidelberg. Paris: Didier.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean Darbelnet. (1996). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English. A Methodology for Translation*, translated and edited by Juan C. Sager and M.-J. Hamel. Amsterdam & Philadelphia. John Benjamins.