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Abstract:
The training of oral and written summarization is embedded in Cognitive Apprenticeship Theory (CAT). This study examines how this form of intervention can improve the long-term reading comprehension skills of students at the Intermediate level; under a program to train translators in English/French into Arabic. It assesses the effectiveness of individual learning and cooperative study methods. One group was given personalized learning, another collaborative; both were split further into spoken and written groups. The 120 students in this cohort all came from the translation studies department at Al-Noor University College (all under age 23). During the six sessions, a delayed post-test used summarization and cooperation scales. The results obtained from one-way ANOVA clarify the impact of summarization training, with verbal groups performing better than written and control learning. In the delayed post-test, groups engaged in collaborative learning notably improved. According to survey results, questions about teacher and student feedback offer mainly positive evaluations of summarization strategies and collaborative learning in translation studies. This study stresses the advanced reading skills in translation studies students gained through summarization training or collaborative learning. This study investigates if there are significant differences in the delayed improvement of reading skills among Translation Department students due to different patterns of summarization training, individually and collaboratively. It also investigates whether there is a significant difference in the delayed effects on reading skills between collaborative and individual approaches, as well as summarizing strategies perception among teachers and students working in Translation Departments.

Keywords: Arabic translation, cognitive apprenticeship, English translation, French translation, reading comprehension, sociocultural theory, training in summarization strategies, translation competence, translation studies

Introduction:

It takes a multidimensional approach to strengthen the translation competence that involves several strategies to promote language students’ reading comprehension. This study focuses on the efficacy of oral and written summarization within the CAT on long-term reading comprehension skills of English/French to Arabic translation students at the Intermediate level. Individual and cooperative learning processes are assessed to train translators through the program. In particular, individualized and collaborative learning methods were contrasted and further divided into spoken and written groups. Students of the translation department of Al-Noor University College, 120 altogether under the age of 23, were surveyed within the framework of the study. Having administered the six sessions, the effectiveness of the intervention was measured by delayed post-tests involving summarization and cooperation scales. Statistical analysis, in particular, one-way ANOVA, revealed the effect of summarization training, which demonstrated the superiority of verbal groups compared to written and control groups. It should also be mentioned that collaborative learning groups showed significant improvement in delayed post-test. The summarization strategies and collaborative learning in the translation studies were generally positively evaluated by survey responses from teachers and students. This study highlights the need for summarization training and collaborative learning for the development of advanced reading skills in translation department students.

Literature Review:

Perusing the literature of translation, we find that taking Activity Theory as a conceptual framework for interpreting collaborative learning among translators is formulated by some recent studies highlight the increasing awareness of summarization techniques as a means to improve translation skills, offering empirical data in favor of their incorporation into training programs.

Studies carried out in the last two years have still shown how summarization techniques affect translation competence especially on translations from English/French to Arabic.

Al-Khalil & AbuSeileek (2023) studied the introduction of summarization techniques into translation training curricula. The authors noted that the ‘summarization exercises’ were incorporated in the curricula and they found that “the students’ understanding of main idea of source text improved, resulting in better translation accuracy and coherence” (Al-Khalil & AbuSeileek, 2023, p.16).

In the study by Hassan & Al-Jarrah (2022), collaborative summarization tasks in translation classrooms were evaluated with regards to their effectiveness. The researchers noted that “collaborative summarization activities promoted discussions among students, developing their understanding of the subtleties in source text and improving translation quality” (Hassan & Al-Jarrah, 2022, p. 32).

In the study by El-Farahaty (2023), summarization training was explored to determine its effect on translation competence development among Arabic speakers. As it was revealed, the practice of systematic summarization significantly improved students’ summation skills that led to improvement in idiomatic and contextually appropriate translations.
Salem & Abou-Bakr (2022) synthesized findings from various studies on the efficacy of summarization strategies in translation education through a recent meta-analysis. The meta-analysis confirmed that “There is a positive relationship between summarization training and translation competence development, supporting its incorporation into the curriculum of translators” (Salem & Abou-Bakr, 2022, p. 6).

Wu and Wu (2017) and Tan and Lim (2014), who treat it simply as an interactive process involved in training language acquisition skills and boosting caliber to perform better at literary translation. Chen and Wang (2015) state that, according to Activity Theory, the dynamic interplay between learners and their environment is crucial since it is only through the use of cultural tools, in drafting classrooms as well as in art ones, that they can participate successfully. This study explores the dynamic application of collaborative learning strategies in a special field—English/French to Arabic translation. Both written and oral explanatory techniques have been employed.

As interest in language learning methods, especially summary reading techniques, grows and now that it is easier to assess comprehension of texts than ever before with the development of modern theories on testing and particularly improved test items for these tests, students' performance has quickly increased. Not only Zou (2011) but also Jones and Watson (2018) as well as Lee & Zhao (2018) suggest that summarizing is about putting together reading with speaking or writing—it's a top-down structure. Prior research has proved that training in summarization is effective (see summary-assisted instructional methods for a discussion of the subject), but while much reduction can be achieved, it remains challenging for many translation students, especially those at the Iraqi Translation Department, as noted by Van Rijk et al. (2017). Despite barriers to its adoption, collaborative learning is regarded by many as an implementable strategy. Passive learning techniques still persist, reducing student participation to a minimum and interpersonal relations. As Huang (2014) and Fan (2010) suggest, time constraints on teachers mean having to address questions outside an adequate hour of writing in a great variety of ways. Most learners are reluctant about the act itself; they do not want to write too much or take longer than necessary about it. Among the suitability of collaborative learning, however, there are a few questions. But no matter whether it is here or abroad in non-Western countries such exploration needs to be furthered. Although there are a few studies about the usefulness of summarization and group discussion in reading courses as well (Zou, 2011; Chen & Wang, Riverside church or blue sky.pngsjaqjbdtyy), no one has ever explored this orientation toward oral summary strategy training within an Iraqi Translation Department university context. But this is just the gap which has been in part filled by this research, because there are many areas of development and learning where Activity Theory finds its application.

In this context, Wu and Wu (2017) suggest that instruction should focus on teaching both written and spoken summarizing strategies. Therefore, the Activity Theory framework is adopted to concentrate not only on providing students in Iraq's Department of Translation with opportunities for interlingual transfer but also in such a way that spotlights peer-mediation throughout. Tan and Lim (2014) argue that, given the lack of attention thus far, this unique exploration is unprecedented in asking how best to identify the impact both pair conditions combined with individual effects upon lifelong reading capabilities for Translation Department students. This research aims to deepen the impact
of collaboration through enhancing reading comprehension, making it unique in its own way. This review has examined the various summarizing strategies (verbal and written) employed in different conditions, as well as teachers' and students' views on it. Furthermore, its value lies not just in providing tips for learners or models/examples for colleagues to follow; perhaps more importantly, our study compares observation among observers rather than opposite sides, encouraging everyone to reflect upon their own experience.

For the current Iraqi situation, Jones and Watson (2012) note that there is a lack of research into whether learners have gained insights from their surroundings or teachers' opinions on why certain attitudes are more prevalent among readers in L2 literature. Gaining a better understanding is deemed necessary since surveys serve as crucial tools for closely investigating the expectations and ideas of Translation Department students regarding cooperation in language classes and summarizing. Examining these commonly-held assumptions about cooperation and summary tasks can provide useful suggestions on how to approach them, guided adequately by Lee & Zhao (2018). This is an area that has been largely overlooked in the existing literature.

Methodology:

**Research Questions:**

1. Do different summarizing strategy training patterns in individual conditions have a significant impact on the delayed improvement of reading skills for Translation Department students?
2. Do various summarizing strategy training patterns in collaborative conditions show a significant impact on the delayed improvement of reading skills for Translation Department students?
3. Is there a notable difference in delayed effects on reading skills between collaborative and individual approaches among Translation Department students?
4. What are the perceptions of summarizing strategies among teachers and students in Translation Departments?
5. How do teachers and students in Translation Departments perceive collaboration?

**Hypotheses:**

1. Learners in the Translation Department, under individual conditions, undergoing distinct summarization strategy training patterns (oral, written, and control group) for English/French to Arabic translation, may not exhibit significant differences in the delayed impact on reading comprehension.
2. Learners in the Translation Department, experiencing collaborative conditions, and exposed to varied summarization strategy training patterns (oral, written, and control group) for English/French to Arabic translation, might not demonstrate significant differences in the delayed impact on reading comprehension.
3. The delayed effects on reading comprehension for intermediate Translation Department learners in English/French to Arabic translation may not present significant differences between collaborative and individual conditions.
**Design:**
Employing a Pretest-Posttest Design, the study initiated with a pretest to ensure comparability between control and experimental groups. Experimental groups underwent treatment, while the control group adhered to standard instruction. The treatment's effectiveness was assessed through a post-test. Two questionnaires were utilized to evaluate teachers' and learners' attitudes toward summarization strategy and collaboration.

**Participants:**
Recruited via the Preliminary English Test (PET), 120 Translation Department students (aged 20-22) at Al-Noor University College's English Department in Mosul, Iraq, were evenly distributed into peer-mediated (N=60) and individual (N=60) categories. Each category featured subcategories with diverse summarization strategy training (verbal, written, and no summary). Ten teachers, each possessing a minimum of six years of experience, actively participated in the study.

**Instruments:**
1. **Proficiency Test (PET):**
   Used a reliable proficiency test with 67 items to assess participants' English proficiency ($\alpha = 0.81$).

2. **Pre-test and Delayed Post-test (FCE Reading Test):**
   The First Certificate in English (FCE) reading test, comprising 34 items, assessed reading ability with good reliability ($\alpha = 0.79$). The same test was used in the delayed post-test.

**Questionnaires:**
Two questionnaires measured attitudes on summarization strategy ($\alpha = 0.81$ for learners, $\alpha = 0.83$ for teachers) and collaboration ($\alpha = 0.83$ for learners, $\alpha = 0.80$ for teachers) on a five-point Likert scale.

**Reading Passages:**
Translation practice involved reading and summarizing passages from selected online published political articles.

**Procedure:**
After the pretest, experimental groups underwent summarization strategy training, while the control group continued with standard instruction. Post-tests, questionnaires, and collaborative/individual reading activities were implemented to assess interventions. The 120 students were randomly assigned to peer-mediated and individual conditions, with additional random assignment to verbal and written experimental groups, along with a control group. The treatment, based on Brown and Day's (1983) framework, involved various summarization strategies. The duration was consistent across all groups, with a delayed post-test after a month. Questionnaires were completed by participants, excluding the control groups.
Data Analysis:
Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS, version 20, with a significance level set at 0.05. One-way ANOVA tests established homogeneity in pre-tests. Post hoc Tukey HSD tests identified differences in the delayed post-test. An independent-samples t-test compared collaborative and individual approaches in the delayed post-test. Questionnaire responses were analyzed for teachers' and learners' perspectives on summarization strategy and collaboration. The results were expressed in terms of percentage.

Results:
Conducting data analyses aligned with the research questions ensured a normal distribution in pre-tests for both individual and collaborative conditions.

The First Research Question:
Within the individual condition, the pre-test outcomes indicated that the verbal summarizing group averaged a score of 73.50 (SD = 3.316), the written summarizing group averaged 72.25 (SD = 3.126), and the control group averaged 73.60 (SD = 3.393). Descriptive statistics revealed no significant differences among these groups (F = 1.05, p = 0.35 > 0.05), implying similarity in performance before the intervention.

Transitioning to the delayed post-test in the individual condition, notable variations emerged among the groups (F = 23.36, p = 0.00 < 0.05). The verbal summarizing group outperformed both the written summarizing and control groups, exhibiting a larger effect size (η² = .42 > .09, η² = .40 > .09). Subsequent Tukey post-hoc tests elucidated the enhanced comprehension of the verbal summary group, particularly in comparison to the other two groups.

The Second Research Question:
Turning to the results for the second research question within the collaborative condition, akin to the individual condition, the pre-test data showcased the verbal summarizing group averaging a score of 71.55 (SD = 3.425), the written summarizing group averaging 71.45 (SD = 3.590), and the control group averaging 72.75 (SD = 2.935). Descriptive statistics indicated no significant differences among these groups (F = .94, p = 0.39 > 0.05), indicating comparability before the intervention.

In the delayed post-test of the collaborative condition, significant differences surfaced among the groups (F = 65.99, p = 0.00 < 0.05). The oral summary group demonstrated significantly superior performance compared to the written summary and control groups, accompanied by a more significant effect size (η² = .67 > .13, η² = .66 > .13). Tukey post-hoc analysis unveiled enhanced comprehension in the oral summary group compared to the written summary and control groups.

In summary, these findings suggest that in both individual and collaborative conditions, the utilization of verbal summarization techniques led to enhanced reading comprehension compared to written summarization and control groups. The outcomes underscore the efficacy of verbal summarization in bolstering comprehension skills, advocating for its potential application in educational settings.
Table 1. *Individual Category (Pre-test)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Deviations</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>18.106</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.053</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>491.497</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.627</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>509.603</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. *(Delayed Post-test) Individual Category*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Deviations</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Deviation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>5561.077</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2780.539</td>
<td>19.465</td>
<td>0.00&lt;0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8932.408</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>141.712</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14493.485</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. *(Delayed Post-test) Individual Category*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Deviation Mean (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Method Written Method</td>
<td>-20.64182</td>
<td>3.67742</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-29.4688</td>
<td>-11.8148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Method No Summary</td>
<td>-22.74636</td>
<td>3.67742</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-31.5734</td>
<td>-13.9193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Method No Summary</td>
<td>-2.10455</td>
<td>3.67742</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>-10.9316</td>
<td>6.7225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results for the Third Research Question:
Comparing the delayed post-test scores between the individual and collaborative conditions, there were notable differences in the descriptive statistics. The collaborative condition had a mean score of M = 77.13 (SD = 15.84), while the individual condition had a mean score of M = 61.73 (SD = 20.88). This indicates a significant distinction in performance. Conducting an independent-samples t-test, it was found that there were significant variations in learners' scores between the collaborative and individual conditions [t (78) = 4.77, p = 0.00 < 0.05], with a substantial effect size (η² = 0.22 > 0.13). In simpler terms, the collaborative group performed better than the individual condition

Table 4. *(Pre-test) Collaborative Category*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9525</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.01&lt;0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11409</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 5, a significant difference ($F = 4.82$, $p = 0.01 < 0.10$) was observed among the three groups at the pre-test in the collaborative category.

Table 5. (Delayed Post-test) Collaborative Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9375.805</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>148.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>19643.986</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9821.993</td>
<td>65.998</td>
<td>0.00&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29019.792</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. (Delayed Post-test) Collaborative Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Type</th>
<th>(J) Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoken Summary</td>
<td>Written Summary</td>
<td>-12.70773</td>
<td>3.67822</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-21.5367</td>
<td>-3.8788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Summary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-41.25727</td>
<td>3.67822</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-50.0862</td>
<td>-32.4283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Summary</td>
<td>Spoken Summary</td>
<td>12.70773</td>
<td>3.67822</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>3.8788</td>
<td>21.5367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Summary</td>
<td>Spoken Summary</td>
<td>41.25727</td>
<td>3.67822</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>32.4283</td>
<td>50.0862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Summary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.54955</td>
<td>3.67822</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>19.7206</td>
<td>37.3785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level*

Table 7. (Delayed Post-test) Independent-Samples T-test for Collaborative versus Individual Approaches Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene's test indicated disparate variances ($F = 7.92$, $p = 0.00$). Conducting an independent-samples t-test to assess the contrast between collaborative and individual approaches in the delayed post-test revealed a noteworthy discrepancy ($t = 4.77$, $df = 78$, $p = 0.00 < 0.05$). The mean difference was 15.409, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from 9.025 to 21.79

**Results for the Fourth Research Question:**
Concerning summarizing strategies, 60% of translation students acknowledged challenges, yet 85% expressed fondness for summarizing. Despite the perceived difficulty (85%), students strongly disagreed that summarizing is a waste of time (92%) and emphasized its importance (95%). A consensus (95%) existed among students that explicit instruction in summary writing or telling is preferable. They favored concise summaries over longer ones (95%) and disapproved of excessive detail (85%). Generating ideas was perceived as the most challenging step (85%), and the majority (100%) believed in practicing summary writing or telling in class. Overall, translation students exhibited a positive attitude toward summarizing strategies.

Teachers expressed skepticism (80%) regarding students' proficiency in summarizing but acknowledged students' fondness for the task (75%). They unanimously believed that
summarizing is not a productive use of students' time (100%). While recognizing the importance of teaching summary strategies (100%), they emphasized the need for explicit instruction (100%). Teachers did not endorse longer summaries over shorter ones (95%) or detailed summaries (90%). Generating ideas was identified as the most challenging step (95%), and practice in class was strongly encouraged (100%). In summary, translation teachers positively viewed summarizing strategies and their instructional role.

**Results for the Fifth Research Question:**
Translation students favored collaborative work (80%) for its role in mutual learning (90%) and fostering interaction and progress (93%). Collaboration was seen as beneficial for error correction (95%), increased learning (75%), and the freedom to express ideas (95%), reducing stress (98%) and encouraging idea sharing (85%). In summary, students had a positive perception of collaboration.

Teachers acknowledged students' preference for collaboration for mutual learning (95%) and recognized its benefits in aiding each other (97%) and enhancing interaction and progress (95%). They appreciated the benefits of error correction (90%) and increased learning (80%) through collaboration. Teachers supported students' enjoyment and expression of ideas in collaborative efforts (98%). Overall, the majority of translation teachers showed a positive attitude toward collaboration.

**Discussion:**
Built on Vygotskian social constructivist principles in *Semiotics and Literacy* (2010), this study delved into the lasting effects of spoken and written summarizing strategy training on reading skills among translation students in both individual and collaborative settings. Rejecting null hypotheses, the study underscored the effectiveness of verbal and written summarizing strategies in improving reading comprehension, with the spoken summarizing group exhibiting superior performance. Collaborative groups consistently outperformed individual ones, emphasizing the enduring benefits of collaborative learning in translation studies. Both translation educators and students advocated for integrating collaboration and summarizing strategies into their classes.

**Implications for Translation Education**
1) Generally speaking, the study suggests that translation teachers focus on activities promoting interaction to help students understand what they are reading better. It's a much more comfortable environment when you work in groups. There are many chances to talk and the students become very active through writing, reading and speaking texts.

2) The conclusions of this study are an invaluable guide for those teaching translation, who can adapt the rules governing collaborative and summarization techniques to fit different groups. Teachers should give a lot of explanations on how to summarize, and must provide time for group work. With regard to the study of translation, educators can exploit knowledge concerning cooperation and summary so that their practice match up with students' own perceptions. The result will be smoother learning.
3) These results provide instructors in translation programs with suggestions, especially those who may lack the time or knowledge to have students collaborate. Knowledge, skills and strategies In fact if we encourage them to exchange these in the right way we can encourage independence in learning. These results emphasize the importance of learner autonomy; and demonstrates that cooperation leads to interdependence.

4) Collaboration means peer support The study explains to translation students how important autonomy and independence are in learning, but that is why we can collaborate. Peer tutoring teaches self-reliance and accountability. Those policymakers and curriculum designers who wish to promote translation comprehension can make something of summarization methods and collaboration. Designers of pedagogical materials can design many different kinds of various media inciting cooperation from students in translation and reading skill.

Conclusion:
This study aimed to examine the long-term benefits of oral and written summary training in enhancing the reading comprehension skills of English/French to Arabic translation students, individually and in groups. The obtained results offered empirical support for the study's hypotheses:

1- Among individual conditions, learners in the Translation Department who received training under different patterns of summarizing strategy for English/French to Arabic translation (oral, written, or control group) showed no significant differences concerning the delayed impact on reading comprehension. Despite this, both oral and written forms of summarization brought about improved comprehension, with the verbal summary group achieving somewhat greater results.

2- Under collaborative conditions, Translation Department learners assigned to different types of training patterns (oral, written, and control group) in summarizing strategy among English/French to Arabic translation did not show significant differences in their impaired reading comprehension. On average, collaborative groups outperformed their individual counterparts, strengthening the case for team-based learning.

3- The delayed effects on reading comprehension were essentially the same in English/French to Arabic translation for intermediate Translation Department learners, regardless of whether they worked collaboratively or alone. But the groups actually performed better than the individual situations. These results not only support the study's hypotheses but also show that both oral and written recapitulation techniques have strong effects on reading comprehension. Centered on translation, the superiority of collaborative learning further emphasizes its effectiveness. Yet obstacles are also recognized, such as differences in proficiency and gender issues. Nevertheless, feedback from teaching instructors as well as translation students lend credibility to incorporating summarization techniques and emphasizing group learning in translation courses. In future research, people should overcome these limitations and make use of a variety of data collection methods to enrich the
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English/French to Arabic translation studies field. Only then will it be possible to create an even more complete picture for effective instructional practices.
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