

Revision in the Process-Oriented Translation Classroom: Student Perspectives

Chun-Chun Yeh

Revision (and self-revision) has consistently been regarded as indispensable in ensuring the quality of the translation product. From a pedagogical perspective, a self-revision task can provide translation trainees with an opportunity to reevaluate their output and become more reflective about their linguistic knowledge and translation strategies. Despite its potential benefits, however, revision has received little attention in the research of translation pedagogy. This study explored how a class of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) undergraduate students perceived the revision task in an English-Chinese translation classroom. In this one-semester study, the students were asked to revise their draft translations after receiving input from various sources. Through a questionnaire, interviews, and students' learning journals, this study examined students' perceived focus of revision as well as their perceptions of revision and related pedagogical activities. Results suggested that students placed greater importance on accuracy, tailoring, smoothness, and mechanics when revising. These preferred focuses of revision corresponded broadly to those revealed in studies of professional translators. As to the activities designed and implemented to scaffold the revision process, students appeared to favor group work and peer review. Findings also indicated that students generally agreed to the positive role of revision in the improvement of translation quality. Pedagogical implications are discussed.

Keywords: translation revision, student attitudes, scaffolding activities, translation pedagogy

Received: January 29, 2021

Revised: April 3, 2021, April 23, 2021

Accepted: June 24, 2021

過程導向翻譯課堂中的修訂活動：學生觀點

葉純純

要確保翻譯品質，修訂（和自我修訂）是不可避免的。在翻譯教學中，自我修訂任務可以促使學習者再次審視其譯文，並反思其語言能力及翻譯策略。雖然修訂任務有其益處，在翻譯教學領域，相關研究仍相當有限，因此，本研究要探討英語為外語的大學生對英中翻譯修訂任務的看法。此研究歷時一學期，學生完成翻譯初稿後，依據得到的多方回饋再修訂其譯文。研究蒐集資料包括問卷調查、訪談及學習日誌，以探討學生對修訂重點、修訂任務及修訂相關教學活動的看法。結果顯示，學生較關注的修訂重點為準確、考量特定需求、流暢和技術性細節，這些修訂重點與專業譯者的修訂重點有相當程度的吻合，而在多種支持修訂過程的教學活動中，學生偏好小組合作和同儕回饋活動。研究也發現，學生普遍認為修訂有助提升譯文品質。論文最後提出教學建議。

關鍵詞：翻譯修訂、學生態度、鷹架學習活動、翻譯教學

收件：2021年1月29日

修改：2021年4月3日、2021年4月23日

接受：2021年6月24日

Introduction

Researchers on translation pedagogy have noted problems in the traditional teacher-centered translation classroom (Gile, 1994), where the teacher explains translation principles and skills and then gives assignments, which students complete on their own and submit for teacher evaluation. In this pedagogical model, the teacher is charged with the responsibility of transmitting knowledge, while the student remains passive or unengaged. Addressing the inadequacy of such educational practice, Kiraly (1995) proposes a new pedagogy of translation with principles such as student-centered instruction, fostering responsibility, and encouraging cooperation (p. 33). In line with this idea, researchers and practitioners have begun to explore alternative ways of conducting teaching in the translation classroom. Among these attempts, process-oriented instruction, which aims to promote and facilitate learners' self-regulation, appears to have garnered both research and pedagogical attention. Arguing for the benefit of process-oriented teaching, many translator educators have thus implemented a variety of pedagogical interventions such as diary writing (Fox, 2000), integrated problem and decision reporting (Gile, 2004), and translation commentary (Shei, 2005). While these studies have reported a generally positive impact of these activities on students' translation competence, revision—a task with the potential of eliciting learner reflection on the decision-making process—has received relatively little attention in translation pedagogy.

In the field of translation, revision has consistently been regarded as indispensable in ensuring the quality of the translation product. The importance of revision, particularly self-revision (checking one's own work), should thus be emphasized “right from the very first practice course in translation” (Mossop, 2010, p. 8). From a pedagogical perspective, a self-revision task provides

translation trainees with an opportunity to review their drafts. With appropriate guidance and feedback, students can learn to identify and correct their own errors. Furthermore, when making revision decisions, trainees can potentially learn to monitor and evaluate their strategy use and become more reflective about their linguistic and translation knowledge. These metacognitive skills have been recognized as important factors contributing to success in the translation profession. It can therefore be argued that incorporating revision into translation pedagogy can benefit students both at the training stage and in their future careers (Chodkiewicz, 2018). Despite the potential benefits that a revision task may bring to student translators, relevant research remains sparse. Hence, this study set out to examine students' perceptions of revision in an undergraduate translation classroom. This inquiry will inform the field of translation pedagogy that has so far had little discussion about the use of revision in the teaching of translation.

Literature Review

Process-Oriented Approach in Translation Teaching

In the recent decades, the teaching of translation has seen a paradigm shift from teacher-centered to student-centered learning (Kiraly, 1995) and, accordingly, from product-oriented to process-oriented instruction. Drawing from constructivist theories of learning (Vygotsky, 1981), process-oriented translation teaching sees students as learners of translation methods rather than producers of finished products. Therefore, trainers adopting a process approach ask students questions about their translation choices to prompt trainees to reflect on their decision-making process (Gile, 1994).

Over the past decades, various efforts have been made to implement the process approach in translation teaching. In Gile (1994), when submitting translation assignments, students were required to attach written problem reports, where they described translation problems encountered such as understanding a particular sentence and searching for equivalents in the target language. A decade later, Gile (2004) revisited this pedagogical practice, which he now termed as *integrated problem and decision reporting*, and restated its advantages including more serious student work, heightened learner satisfaction as a translator, and increased teacher understanding of trainee problems.

Similar student written reports are widely adopted in the translation classroom, albeit in different names. For example, Fox (2000) used “translation diaries” to help learners develop the ability to analyze the source text and to produce texts tailored to the target readership. Shei (2005) asked students to write “translation commentary,” an English composition to accompany translation tasks. In the composition, students should detail their problem-solving procedures and other task-related thoughts. Similarly, Yeh (2009) implemented a “reflection writing” task to accompany translation assignments. Students were encouraged to reflect upon and write about their translation process such as the problems they encountered and the solutions they reached.

In addition to using dairies to focus students’ attention on the translation process, feedback provision has also garnered interest from translation educators embracing a process approach. Among sources of feedback, the teacher is well acknowledged as playing a critical role in enhancing students’ translation competence particularly when the feedback is systematic (Dollerup, 1994). Nevertheless, in the recent decades *collaborative learning* has gained increasing attention in translation teaching.

Collaborative learning is an umbrella term for a number of teaching approaches involving learners interacting in groups of two or more to achieve collective learning goals. The concept of collaborative learning can be linked with cognitive and sociocultural theories of verbal interaction and language acquisition. Among the cognitive theories that explain human language learning, Long's (1983, 1985) influential interaction hypothesis posits that verbal interaction and meaning negotiation are necessary for learning to occur because they provide comprehensible input needed for language acquisition. From a sociocultural perspective, verbal interaction is also of utmost importance for language acquisition because cognitive development, particularly higher order cognitive abilities such as language learning, is socially situated (Vygotsky, 1981). Therefore, learning can be understood as arising from interaction between humans and between an expert and a novice. More specifically, a person's learning or problem-solving ability can be augmented by carefully calibrated support provided by an expert, which is usually referred to as scaffolding. Although scaffolding is generally conceived as assistance provided by an adult or a more knowledgeable peer, studies of learner discourse have indicated that peers of similar L2 proficiency were capable of scaffolding each other in the process of completing a task (Ohta, 1995; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996). Furthermore, such mutual scaffolding, or "collective scaffolding" (Donato, 1994), encourages learners to pool together all available linguistic resources to solve problems at hand and thus enables them to perform beyond their existing level of competence.

Two classroom activities facilitating students' mutual scaffolding are peer review and group work. Wang and Han (2013), for example, implemented peer feedback in two English-Chinese translation tasks in an Australian university. In addition to providing online peer feedback, students were also encouraged to review peer's feedback on their own translation as well as read other students' peer

reviewed translations for comparison. The survey administered after these activities suggested that students found all the three activities beneficial to their learning, with receiving peer feedback bringing the most positive impact.

Group work is also popular with learners because it provides a more comfortable space for students to discuss ideas freely with their peers. In such a pedagogical activity, students can not only learn from each other but also learn to vocalize their thoughts and defend their translation decisions (Hubscher-Davidson, 2007). Recognizing the advantages of group work, teachers have accordingly designed collaborative group learning tasks to engage learners and develop translation competence. Students in Lee's (2012) study translated a travel guide collaboratively. In both Yeh (2011) and Lai (2002), students were put in small groups to work on translation projects over an extended period of time. In Chien (2015), students worked collaboratively to locate and correct translation errors in their everyday environment. In Romney (1997) and Tsai (2020), students were required to translate the assigned text individually and then participate in in-class collaborative activities such as group discussion and group presentations.

Despite these different applications, collaborative learning has consistently been found to bring positive effects in various ways. Cognitively, students developed more in-depth understanding of the source text and improved the grammatical accuracy of the target text (Romney, 1997). The translations generated collaboratively were generally of a higher quality (Lee, 2012) and exhibited more creativity (Lai, 2002; Lee, 2012). Metacognitively, students learned to evaluate different translation versions of the same source text and justify their choice of the version using their knowledge of the text's communicative function. They also became highly-motivated and autonomous learners (Lai, 2002). Affectively, students reported enjoying discussing and correcting errors with their peers (Chien, 2015). Similarly, Romney (1997) reported students' appreciation as well as

enjoyment in participating in the collaborative class. Students in Yeh's (2011) study indicated that they liked learning activities involving group work and discussion, such as in-class group discussion, oral report of group research, and project presentation.

The above review shows that various interventions have been implemented to provide support to assist in students' learning process. At the drafting stage, written problem reports or translation diaries can heighten students' awareness of problems encountered and strategies adopted to solve problems. Teacher or peer feedback at the post-drafting stage can provide the reader's perspective and allow learners to evaluate the appropriacy and adequacy of their translations. Collaborative group learning tasks can easily be turned into a mechanism to support students throughout the planning, drafting, and post-drafting phases. However, it is noted that the revision task, which should follow from the drafting and feedback activities, has seldom been closely examined in translation pedagogy research. This review of the literature will thus turn to considering revision in the practice and teaching of translation.

Translation Revision

Revision is described by Mossop (2010) as a function performed by professional translators where "they identify features of the draft translation that fall short of what is acceptable and make appropriate corrections and improvements" (p. 109). In other words, revision is a way of ensuring quality in translation, with the purpose of arriving at "intelligible and optimal relevant translations" (Carl & Schaeffer, 2017, p. 103). Skipping revision, "an essential part of translation production procedure" (Mossop, 2010, p. 116), is therefore considered unprofessional.

Revision in translation is a recursive process, and it may be performed during and after the drafting phase. Research has shown that translators monitor their output and perform revision before they finish translating the last source word (Asadi & Séguinot, 2005; Schaeffer et al., 2019). This type of revision, termed as “online revision” (Jakobsen, 2003), can be compared with “end revision,” which takes place immediately after the completion of the draft translation. Nevertheless, it is generally deemed advisable that a translator stay away from a draft translation for some time before coming back to its revision (Newmark, 1988) because a certain amount of time between the completion and revision of the draft translation may enable the translator to review the task with a fresh look.

In translation, different types of revision may be adopted depending on the purpose as well as other considerations such as time constraints and use purposes. For example, revision may take the form of unilingual reading or comparative checking, the former referring to the act of checking the translation without comparing it to the source text, and the latter involving comparing each sentence in the translation to the original text. Both unilingual reading and comparative reading are important to producing a quality translation, although it is often advised to perform unilingual reading first because one can often spot many errors using this method while avoiding introducing mistranslations in the process of correction (Mossop, 2010, p. 146).

To facilitate quality control, various checklists of translation errors or problems needing attention have been developed. Among them, Mossop’s (2010) list of 12 parameters is perhaps the most frequently cited in the revision literature. Mossop’s revision parameters are phrased in the question form and classified into four groups: meaning transfer, content, language, and presentation, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1*Mossop's Model of Revision Parameters*

Parameters	Specific parameters	Error types
Meaning transfer	Accuracy	Does the translation reflect the message of the source text?
	Completeness	Have any elements of the message been left out?
Content	Logic	Does the sequence of ideas make sense? Is there any nonsense or contradiction?
	Facts	Are there any factual, conceptual, or mathematical errors?
Language	Smoothness	Does the wording flow? Are the connections between sentences clear? Are the relationships among the parts of each sentence clear? Are there any awkward, hard-to-read sentences?
	Tailoring	Is the language suited to the users of the translation and the use they will make of it?
	Sub-language	Is the style suited to the genre? Has correct terminology been used?
	Idiom	Are all the word combinations idiomatic?
	Mechanics	Have the rules of grammar, spelling, punctuation, and correct usage been observed?
Presentation	Layout	Are there any problems in the way the text is arranged on the page: spacing, indentation, margins, etc.?
	Typography	Are there any problems related to bolding, underlining, font type, font size, etc.?
	Organization	Are there any problems in the way the document as a whole is organized: page numbering, headers, footnotes, table of contents, etc.?

Note. Adapted from *Revising and Editing for Translators* (2nd ed., p. 125), by B. Mossop, 2010, St. Jerome. Copyright 2010 by St. Jerome.

Mossop's (2010) revision parameters have been used as a yardstick to compare with the parameters employed by practicing translators and revisers when

revising either other people's or their own translations. For example, Shih (2006) observed that the specific revision parameters obtained in her study of Taiwanese translators corresponded to Mossop's in general. Rasmussen and Schjoldager's (2011) study similarly reported that the problems attended to by the revisers in their survey study were largely comparable with those identified in Mossop's list of parameters. Therefore, to facilitate comparison across studies, the current research adopted Mossop's revision parameters to elicit information about students' perceptions of their revision practice.

Researchers have examined various aspects of translation revision including the role of revision in the translation process (Asadi & Séguinot, 2005; Dimitrova, 2005), evaluation of revision quality (Arthern, 1987), quality of unilingual revision versus comparative revision (Brunette et al., 2005), and relationship between the amount of time spent and the quality of revision (Künzli, 2007). Relatively little research has been undertaken on translators' perception of revision, except for Shih (2006). Shih's interview study recruited 26 Taiwanese non-literary professional translators with varying working experience and investigated a range of revision routines and procedures including the number of times revision was performed, length of drawer-time (the amount of time between the completion and revision of the draft translation), and individual translators' revision checklists. Results suggested that a majority of her participants performed self-revision either once or twice, depending on the length and the urgency of the task. They did not often have extended drawer-time because of the imposed time constraints. As to revision checklists, the top three problems these professional translators checked for were fluency, accuracy, and terminology control (i.e., consistent use of terminology throughout the whole translation). Furthermore, Shih observed that her participants were capable of adjusting and customizing their revision priorities in order to attain the utmost performance.

Revision in Translation Training

Studies on revision in translation training can be broadly divided into two groups. The first addresses revision-specific education, aiming at developing trainees' ability to execute revision as a professional activity. These studies have identified revision competence (Künzli, 2006; Robert et al., 2017) and examined the effect of revision training (Scocchera, 2020). The second group of studies looks at revision as a stage of the assignment cycle in translation training, particularly in undergraduate education. In these studies, revision is incorporated into translation learning and teaching mainly to engage students by encouraging them to invest more time and effort into the assignment, with the ultimate goal of developing students' translation competence. This review shall now focus on the second group of research to better contextualize the present study.

Chodkiewicz (2018) investigated the decisions and success of students' revision in response to teacher feedback on their draft translations. A class of 36 undergraduate translation students were given an assignment to complete at home. Errors in the draft translations were identified by the instructor and then classified into six categories: functionality, meaning transfer, terminology, style and register, grammar, and formal aspects. The students were then asked to either revise or justify their translation decisions in response to teacher feedback. Results suggested that students revised a great majority of teacher markings in all the six categories, but at the same time they took no action regarding 16.2% of the markings in grammar and 12.2% in form. The most justifications were made in functionality and meaning, and most of these justifications were deemed successful. On the other hand, where students decided to revise their decisions for functionality and meaning, the revisions were less successful, with some of them actually leading to a negative effect on the translation. It has to be noted that despite providing

valuable insights into students' revision decisions and success, Chodkiewicz's (2018) largely quantitative study did not offer detailed information regarding the specific reasons for revising or not revising errors marked by the instructor. Furthermore, research has shown that students tend to make revisions in reaction to teacher feedback because the teacher is perceived as knowledgeable and capable of giving useful feedback (Nelson & Carson, 1998; Zhang, 1995). It is not known how students will approach and perceive the revision task if provided with input mainly from collaborative activities such as group work and peer review. The last issue was recently taken up by Tsai's (2020) research.

Also conducted in an undergraduate translation course, Tsai (2020) examined how students perceived three activities—group presentations, written peer review, and peer assessment using a checklist—designed to assist students in the revision of their draft translations. Findings suggested that a majority of the respondents found group presentations to be the most interesting because they could learn from their peers and from their own errors. The participants also found group presentations to be the most useful and consulted presentation slides when revising. Their trust in the slides mainly resulted from a belief that the group had carefully examined every word and did thorough research, thereby assuring the credibility of the presentation content. In addition, the students acknowledged that all three activities helped enhance language skills and boost confidence in translation competence. While this study has shed light on students' perceptions of collaborative activities in the translation classroom, it neither addressed how they viewed revision as a stage of the assignment cycle in translation learning and how they prioritized translation problems needing attention in revision.

While revision has long been recognized and recommended as a means of bolstering students' composing ability (Ferris, 1997; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994), it has received scant attention in the translation classroom despite the repeated call

for the incorporation of a process approach in translation training. Little is known regarding translation students' practice and perceptions of revision. To mediate the gap, this study set out to explore how English as a Foreign Language (EFL) undergraduate students perceived the revision task in an English-Chinese/Chinese-English translation classroom. In this one-semester study, the students were asked to revise their draft translations after receiving input from various sources. Through a questionnaire, interviews, and students' learning journals, this study examined students' perceived focus of revision as well as their perceptions of revision and related pedagogical activities.

Method

Research Context and Participants

This study was conducted in an introductory translation course at a public university in southern Taiwan. This semester-long elective course focused on a combination of theory and practice, working primarily with short non-literary texts. Two textbooks of translation were adopted, one dealing with English-Chinese translation and the other addressing Chinese-English translation. The class met once a week for three hours. Course activities consisted of lectures, in-class translation exercises, and interactive discussion based on either the textbook contents or translation exercises.

All 19 students of the translation course were invited to participate in the research. All except two were English majors in their third and fourth years. Among the 18 students who returned the questionnaire, two-thirds were female. None of them had formally studied translation before. A great majority of them rated their English reading (78%) and writing (72%) ability as *fairly good*.

Translation Assignments, Revisions, and Scaffolding Activities

Students were given five translation assignments in the semester, the first three being English into Chinese translation and the final two Chinese into English translation. Each source text was around 200 words long. Students were given a week to complete the draft translations and another week to revise. It should be noted that this introductory translation course did not aim to cultivate professional revisers. Rather, revision was incorporated into the assignment mainly to encourage students to invest more time and effort in the translation process, with the ultimate goal of developing their translation competence and positive attitudes (Chodkiewicz, 2018).

To support students' revision, input was provided from different sources including peers, self, and teacher. Input from peers took the forms of group presentations and peer review. First, students were randomly assigned into five groups, each taking charge of one assignment presentation. The presentation was given in the class meeting following the submission of the draft translations and covered an analysis of the source text, explanation of translation strategies, and justification of translation decisions. It also included a question-and-answer session to allow an opportunity for the student audience to seek clarification or further explanation from the presenting group. Then, after the presentation, students were required to conduct peer review in pairs, offering suggestions and ideas to help each other correct and improve draft translations. These two activities together lasted around 40 minutes.

After the two student-centered activities, the teacher provided feedback. To promote collaborative learning and problem-solving abilities, teacher feedback was kept brief to prevent students from becoming dependent on the teacher. Instead of giving direct correction, the teacher pointed out where the presenting group might

have misinterpreted or have failed to understand. She then urged the students to reconsider the translation problems in their revisions. It should be noted that, after students submitted their revisions in the following week, the teacher would conduct whole class discussions to address translation issues identified in the assignment so as to ensure adequate guidance for student translators.

Students were also instructed to keep a learning journal either in English or in Chinese, writing an entry to accompany each translation or revision task in addition to a final reflective entry at the end of the semester. They were encouraged to keep a record of the translation or revision process, note the strategies to tackle translation problems and the reasons to justify their revision decisions (Fox, 2000; Gile, 1994, 2004; Yeh, 2009). Because of its potential to facilitate self-reflection and self-directed learning, the learning journal was deemed as a form of self-feedback.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data sources for this study included a questionnaire, individual interviews, and learning journals. The use of these multiple sources of data allowed triangulation of the findings, thus adding rigor to the research.

A questionnaire consisting of three parts was administered towards the end of the course to gauge students' perceptions of revising translation. The first part of the questionnaire (Appendix) comprised participants' demographic information, including gender, translation experience, and self-rated English reading and writing ability. Part B asked students to report the amount of attention given to various error types when revising. These error types were adapted from Mossop's (2010) list of revision parameters. However, the parameters concerning physical presentation—layout, typography, and organization—were excluded because these problems were deemed irrelevant to the revision task investigated in the study. The

final part contained seven Likert-scale questions and one open question. Four of the Likert-scale questions gauged students' perceptions of the four activities designed to support students' revision process—journal keeping, group presentations, peer review, and teacher feedback. The remaining three Likert-scale items and the open question examined students' general perceptions of revision in translation.

After the questionnaire was completed, three students (S1, S2, S3) volunteered to participate in follow-up interviews. These students represented a diversity of learner characteristics such as gender, motivation, and English proficiency level and were expected to provide multiple views on the research issue. The interviewees were informed of the purpose of the study and assured of the confidentiality of their participation and responses. The interviews were held individually in the researcher's office one week after questionnaire administration. They were conducted in students' first language, Mandarin Chinese, to ensure free expression of experience and opinions. During the interview, students were asked to comment or elaborate on their responses to the questionnaire, using examples from their own translations and revisions, when applicable. The interviews, lasting on average 54 minutes, were audio-recorded, transcribed, and translated.

Students' learning journals served as the third data source. A total of 209 entries were collected. Journal entries written in Chinese were selectively translated into English to prepare for analysis.

For data analysis, the scaled items in the questionnaire were analyzed with descriptive analysis. Then, qualitative data elicited from interviews, learning journals, and student responses to the open questions in the questionnaire were subject to thematic analysis. They were read and reread to identify initial themes or codes. Themes were then grouped and emerging patterns were classified into categories.

Results and Discussion

Focuses of Revision

Table 2 presents students' reported focuses in revising their translation. Overall, the students placed the most importance on accuracy ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.70$) and tailoring ($M = 3.28$, $SD = 0.57$), followed by smoothness ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 0.86$) and mechanics ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 0.86$). In contrast, they paid less attention to facts ($M = 2.39$, $SD = 0.85$) and sub-language ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 0.84$) when revising draft translations. These findings, particularly the revision focuses that the participants gave more weight on, can be substantiated by the qualitative data obtained from interviews and learning journals, as described below.

Table 2

Focuses of Revision

Item	Mean	SD	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	A lot
1. Accuracy	3.44	0.70	0	2 (11%)	6 (33%)	10 (56%)
2. Completeness	2.67	0.91	1 (6%)	8 (44%)	5 (28%)	4 (22%)
3. Logic	3.06	1.00	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	7 (39%)	7 (39%)
4. Facts	2.39	0.85	1 (6%)	12 (67%)	2 (11%)	3 (17%)
5. Smoothness	3.17	0.86	1 (6%)	2 (11%)	8 (44%)	7 (39%)
6. Tailoring	3.28	0.57	0	1 (6%)	11 (61%)	6 (33%)
7. Sub-language	2.33	0.84	3 (17%)	7 (39%)	7 (39%)	1 (6%)
8. Idiom	2.94	0.73	0	5 (28%)	9 (50%)	4 (22%)
9. Mechanics	3.17	0.86	0	5 (28%)	5 (28%)	8 (44%)

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

First, students' tendency to pay attention to the accuracy issue can be evidenced in the interviewees' accounts. For example, S3 reported that accuracy was a problem he felt he had to keep in mind constantly because he tended to overinterpret and stretch the meaning of some words and expressions of the source text. Similarly, S2 emphasized that to her, accuracy was the most important among all these different aspects of revision.

Their emphasis on tailoring, whether the language is suited to the users of the translation, was manifested in two students' reflections in the final journal entry: "The most important thing [I learned in this course] was when I was translating, I kept reminding myself of the target readers. Are they foreigners or are they Chinese? I would revise my language to suit the target readership [my translation from Chinese]" (Journal #11, S6). And "[T]o think of your target readers is the most central thing I have learned in the class. If the readers are not familiar with the context, to add the information in order to help the readers is essential" (Journal #11, S8).

Both interviews and learning journals suggested that these students were mindful of the smoothness issue when revising. In the interview, S3 argued that the criterion of smoothness was important because good translation should "read like works written by professional Chinese writers" and "give readers the impression that they were reading original works, instead of translated works." The analysis of the learning journals also revealed students' attempts to improve the flow between sentences and enhance the smoothness of the target text. This is reflected particularly well in the following description, where S10 reported her efforts to strengthen text cohesion through techniques such as insertion, division, and expansion:

In this Chinese-English translation assignment, I inserted quite a few connectors to strengthen the connection between sentences and the logic of

the text. Also, I divided sentences so that they would not become too lengthy. Moreover, I used the expansion procedure by adding nouns and enhancing sentence connections. But, after these procedures were applied, the number of words in my translation increased. This is the biggest concern I have about this assignment [my translation from Chinese]. (Journal #9, S10)

Finally, the interviewees argued that the mechanics aspect was “the most fundamental element of a text” (Interview, S2) and making mistakes in this aspect would “create a bad impression” (Interview, S3) and might be “unacceptable to the reader” (Interview, S2).

Scaffolding Activities

Table 3, which conflates points 1 and 2 (*strongly disagree* and *disagree*) and 4 and 5 (*agree* and *strongly agree*) on the scale, presents the findings on how students perceived the usefulness of various activities designed to provide input from three sources: peers, self, and teacher. Results suggested that input from peers was the most well-received. All the questionnaire respondents agreed that listening to group presentations contributed to the quality of their revision, while more than four-fifths of them (83%) found peer review useful.

Table 3

Student Perception of Scaffolding Activities

Item	Mean	SD	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Keeping a learning journal	3.56	1.04	2 (11%)	6 (33%)	10 (56%)
Listening to group presentations	4.78	0.43	0	0	18 (100%)
In-class peer review/discussion	4.39	0.78	0	3 (17%)	15 (83%)
Teacher feedback/input	4.17	0.86	1 (6%)	2 (11%)	15 (83%)

Teacher feedback was rated by 83% of the respondents as useful. As described earlier, the teacher deliberately kept short the feedback and refrained from giving direct correction until the students submitted revised translations. However, perhaps due to the expert status of the teacher (Nelson & Carson, 1998; Zhang, 1995), input from this source still earned favorable evaluation from a majority of the participants.

Finally, keeping a learning journal, deemed as a form of self-feedback, received the least appreciation from participants although there were still over half of them (56%) who indicated their positive attitudes towards the activity. Because this study is particularly interested in studying the effect of collaborative learning on students' perceptions of revision, students' attitudes towards group presentations and peer review are further explored using qualitative data from interviews and learning journals.

Analysis of the interviewees' accounts identified two possible reasons why listening to group presentations was favored the most among the four scaffolding activities. First, the students apparently had high trust in the works done by the presenting groups, believing that the presenters must have worked hard on the task (S1) and thoroughly "digested the text to be translated" (S3). In addition, these presentations were found to be beneficial in aiding the revision process because they "gave a comprehensive view of the translation task including how the ideas in the passage were sequenced, how a certain word was chosen, why expansion or omission strategies were used in the translation, etc." (Interview, S3).

Analysis of the learning journals also suggested that the students' revisions were often inspired by the presentations, whether they were previously aware of a problem in their drafts or not. Several instances in the journal entries showed that the students sometimes encountered translation problems when working on the draft. Bearing the difficulty in mind, when attending the presentation, they would

closely observe how their peers tackled the problem, as exemplified by the following extract:

Another difficulty I encountered [in my first draft] was the translation of the phrase “a questing literary figure.” I checked out the meaning of “questing” and got no further than equivalents like searching, exploring, or pursuing. I applied the meaning to translate the sentence, and it turned out to mean “searching for a literary figure.” It’s awkward and incomprehensible. However, the group did a wonderful job. They expanded the meaning of questing and interpreted it as “going on an adventure,” which apparently makes more sense [my translation from Chinese]. (Journal #6, S5)

As shown in the extract, S5 was acutely troubled by a translation problem when working on the draft and felt dissatisfied with her own solution even after expending much effort on it. Then at the presentation, she recognized that the presenting group had discovered a reasonable solution and gladly adopted the group’s translation in her revision.

In some other instances, the students reported how they noticed a different solution in the presenting group’s translation and recognized it as a better alternative. They were thus prompted to incorporate input from the presentation into their own revisions, as suggested in the following extract:

I really think the group did a very good job. I learned a lot from them and adopted some of their translation in my revision. For example, I translated “hero” invariably to *yingxiong* 英雄, but they varied between *wuxia renwu* 武俠人物 and *daxia* 大俠, which were more befitting words to describe the character referred to. It never occurred to me to use those words. They also chose a wonderful word to translate “soldier” in the first sentence. So, in this revision, I adopted a number of their words to replace mine [my translation from Chinese]. (Journal #6, S14)

Furthermore, the students referred to input from group presentations not only when they explained the reasons for their revisions (as shown in the above two extracts), but also when they justified their decision of not revising. In the following extract, S8 justified a decision to retain her own translation after she was made aware of a difference between her own and the presenting group's translations:

In my A5, I added the extra explanation of *Humanities and Social Sciences Newsletter Quarterly*. In the beginning, I could not decide whether using [the expansion procedure] here was adequate. However, I still decided to remain it after the presentation of group 5 because I thought most of readers hadn't heard of this journal before. It is important to think of the target readers and provide them with the information which helps them realize better. (Journal #10, S8)

The other form of peer collaboration, peer review, also received favorable views from the students. In particular, S3 noted in the interview that peer review provided personalized feedback, and he particularly appreciated his review partner reading his draft and telling him directly, "hey, I don't understand what this means here" (Interview, S3). S1 made a similar observation and said, "peer review allows the opportunity for more detailed discussion. Also, I can ask my review partner questions not covered in the group presentation" (Interview, S1).

An additional source of input not captured in the questionnaire but brought up by the interviewees was the group presentation that they were directly involved in. The interviewees reported that although they were required to give presentations in groups only once during the semester, they found the experience hugely beneficial for their revision. In preparing for presentations, they spent an enormous amount of time comparing group members' translations and discussing problems and solutions, as recalled by one of the interviewees: "After putting together all our

translations, we realized that they were all different. Even the title was translated differently. So we discussed the translation sentence by sentence, each member explaining their reasons and justifying their translation” (Interview, S1). The same interviewee claimed further that such active and intense discussion engaged her even more than attending other groups’ presentations. At the same time, it presented a valuable learning opportunity where she developed abilities to evaluate different renditions of the same text and identify errors that needed to be fixed.

Attitudes Towards Translation Revision

Finally, the questionnaire sought to determine students’ attitudes towards revision in translation. As shown in Table 4, which also conflates points 1 and 2 (*strongly disagree* and *disagree*) and 4 and 5 (*agree* and *strongly agree*) on the scale, students strongly believed in the positive role of revision in the improvement of translation quality. They also tended to think that revision was a worthwhile effort and more revision would lead to better quality.

Table 4

Attitudes Towards Translation Revision

Item	Mean	SD	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Revision improved the quality of my translation.	4.72	0.46	0	0	18 (100%)
Revision in translation is a waste of time.	1.39	0.61	17 (95%)	1 (6%)	0
The more times I revise, the better translation I will produce.	3.94	0.80	1 (6%)	3 (17%)	14 (78%)

In contrast to the overall positive attitudes found in the questionnaire responses, however, one interviewee, S2, was rather reserved about the relationship

between revision and quality improvement. She gave an example from her final assignment. In the revised draft, she changed her translation of a passage from the passive to the active voice, believing that using the active voice and highlighting the agents of the actions would be better writing. However, she received feedback from the teacher suggesting that the actions, instead of the agents, appeared to be the focus of the passage and therefore the passive voice should be a more effective choice to translate the particular sentence. She commented ruefully, “This proves that revision does not necessarily result in improved translation” (Interview, S2).

Another interesting finding from the interview data analysis was that to some students preparing a revised translation may present a more demanding task than working on the first draft. This perception was exemplified by S3’s narrative in which he compared his attitudes towards draft translations and revisions. When working on the first draft, S3 commented, he felt free and unrestrained because he was able to experiment with various translation strategies without worrying much about making mistakes. In contrast:

working on a revised version could be a painful process. You need to spend lots of time to—. A revised version cannot look as if it were produced by uneducated people or novice translators. So, it takes time. Also, you have to consider the information given in group presentations, consider the input provided by your peer, consider your own ideas and your own interpretation. (Interview, S3)

The student’s account suggested that the self-revision task, together with the input provided in multiple ways, can help heighten learners’ expectations of quality in their translation and raise awareness of the important role of revision in enhancing translation quality.

Discussion

This study examined translation students' revision practice and attitudes and contributes to our understanding of how students approach revision and how they perceive its role in the quality check of a translation product. Regarding students' revision practice, it is interesting to note that their preferred focuses of revision corresponded broadly to those revealed in studies of professional translators. For example, the students in this study reported paying much attention to accuracy and smoothness; similarly, professional translators in Shih's (2006) study referred to accuracy and fluency (deemed comparable to smoothness in the model of revision parameters proposed in Mossop, 2010) when asked to name problems they checked for during revision. Furthermore, a majority of the students in this study gave a little or no attention to the facts parameter, which is a content-related problem type, while Rasmussen and Schjoldager (2011) specially noted that content-related problems were not included in the revision checklist used by a Danish translation agency in their study, suggesting that the content parameter may receive little attention in the agency's revision work. These findings indicate that both novice and professional translators are likely to place more emphasis on transfer and linguistic errors than on content-related problems when revising other people's or their own translations. However, it should be noted that in the case of translation students, the content parameter may be even more easily overlooked for two reasons. First, because of their relative lack of experience and proficiency, students may tend to focus on decoding the source text at the level of words, phrases, and sentences, thereby spending less time and energy for content editing, i.e., "checking and correcting a text for its ideas" (Mossop, 2010, p. 80). Second, students may be inclined to believe that the source text, usually provided by the instructor, should contain no errors and therefore need no checking for factual, logical, or mathematical errors.

As to the activities designed and implemented to scaffold students' revision process, the analysis suggested that students strongly favored activities that involved peer collaboration such as peer review and group work. This finding is consistent with that of previous research on the use of peer review and group work in the translation classroom (Chien, 2015; Romney, 1997; Tsai, 2020; Wang & Han, 2013; Yeh, 2011). In particular, the finding corroborates that of Tsai (2020), a recent study that also adopted activities such as group presentations and peer review to facilitate students' revision process. Participants in the current research and Tsai (2020) expressed similarly favorable opinions including learning from their peers and appreciating the presentations given by their peers. Furthermore, students' preference for giving group presentations may also be explained in light of collaborative learning theories discussed above. It is possible that the interaction and discussion in the process of preparing for the presentation provide not only comprehensible input but also ample opportunities for meaning negotiation and knowledge construction (Long, 1983, 1985). Furthermore, in order to produce a joint presentation where the group members have to explain and justify their translation decisions to peer audience, students are inclined to help and learn from each other in order to reach a mutual goal. Such collective scaffolding (Donato, 1994) may thus render the activity both meaningful and enjoyable.

In terms of general attitudes, although questionnaire results indicated a clear recognition of the role of revision in enhancing translation quality, interview accounts revealed that the students were not oblivious to its potential negative outcomes. As observed by Künzli (2007), "quality takes time" (p. 121), but the amount of time spent on revision does not always correlate positively with quality in revision. Chodkiewicz's (2018) study on translation students' revision found that roughly a third of changes made in response to teacher marking were unsuccessful. Professional revisers were also found to make unnecessary revision (i.e., revision

that does not affect the quality of revision) or even introduce new errors (Arthern, 1983, 1987; Künzli, 2007) and deteriorate the quality of the original translation.

Conclusion

Using data collected from a questionnaire, interviews, and learning journals, this study examined how students approach and perceive revision in translation. Certain limitations of the study should be acknowledged. They include a relatively small sample in a particular context and a reliance on participants' self-reports. Another limitation is that the study did not examine whether students encountered varying degrees of difficulty in addressing the investigated error types or whether students' translation competence affected the quality of the revision. It also did not consider the impact of directionality (i.e., from English into Chinese vs. from Chinese into English) on students' perception and prioritized revision focuses. These limitations should be addressed in future research in order to advance our understanding of translation pedagogy.

Despite the limitations, the study sheds light on how translation students perceive revision and the provision of scaffolding in the revision process. Several pedagogical implications can be drawn from this study. First, not only revision but also scaffolding activities providing input from multiple sources, should be integrated into the translation learning process. The combination of these pedagogical activities can push students to invest more time and effort in improving their translation output as well as cultivate a stronger sense of responsibility towards the quality of the translation.

Second, given students' preference for group work, collaborative learning activities should be incorporated into the learning process so as to engage students and provide opportunities for mutual scaffolding. In addition to collaborative

activities described in this study, collaborative revision and project-based group work can also be implemented to boost the effect of translation training (Lai, 2002; Scocchera, 2020; Yeh, 2011).

Third, dedicated workshops can be held at different stages of revision learning. For example, prior to the first revision assignment, a workshop can be given to familiarize students with various revision approaches such as unilingual reading and comparative checking. Students can also be introduced to Mossop's (2010) revision parameters, which they may use to monitor translation output. After students gain some experience in revision, a workshop enabling students to share and compare their revision strategies can be set up to facilitate their learning from peers. Such a systematic introduction of revision knowledge and skills can be expected to contribute to the improvement of translation competence and outcome.

References

- Arthern, P. J. (1983). Judging the quality of revision. *Lebende Sprachen*, 28(2), 53-57. <https://doi.org/10.1515/les.1983.28.2.53>
- Arthern, P. J. (1987). Four eyes are better than two. In C. Picken (Ed.), *Translating and the computer 8: A profession on the move: Proceedings of a conference jointly sponsored by Aslib, the Association for Information Management, the Aslib Technical Translation Group, the Institute of Translation and Interpreting* (pp. 14-26). Aslib.
- Asadi, P., & Séguinot, C. (2005). Shortcuts, strategies and general patterns in a process study of nine professionals. *Meta*, 50(2), 522-547. <https://doi.org/10.7202/010998ar>
- Brunette, L., Gagnon, C., & Hine, J. (2005). The Grevis project: Revise or court calamity. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 6(1), 29-45. <https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.6.2005.1.3>
- Carl, M., & Schaeffer, M. (2017). Sketch of a noisy channel model for the translation process. In S. Hansen-Schirra, O. Czulo, & S. Hofmann (Eds.), *Empirical modelling of translation and interpreting* (pp. 71-116). Language Science Press.
- Chien, C. W. (2015). EFL undergraduates' awareness of translation errors in their everyday environment. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(1), 91-98. <https://doi.org/10.17507/JLTR.0601.11>
- Chodkiewicz, M. (2018). How successful are undergraduate students in revising and justifying different types of translation decisions in response to instructor feedback? *Między Oryginałem a Przekładem*, 24(4 (42)), 53-73. <https://doi.org/10.12797/MOaP.24.2018.42.04>
- Dimitrova, B. E. (2005). *Expertise and explicitation in the translation process*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.64>

- Dollerup, C. (1994). Systematic feedback in teaching translation. In C. Dollerup & A. Lindegaard (Eds.), *Teaching translation and interpreting 2: Insights, aims, visions* (pp. 121-132). John Benjamins.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33-56). Ablex.
- Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588049>
- Fox, O. (2000). The use of translation diaries in a process-oriented translation teaching methodology. In C. Schäffner & B. Adab (Eds.), *Developing translation competence* (pp. 115-130). John Benjamins.
- Gile, D. (1994). The process-oriented approach in translation training. In C. Dollerup & A. Lindegaard (Eds.), *Teaching translation and interpreting 2: Insights, aims, visions* (pp. 107-112). John Benjamins.
- Gile, D. (2004). Integrated problem and decision reporting as a translator training tool. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 2, 2-20. https://www.jostrans.org/issue02/art_gile.pdf
- Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2007). Meeting students' expectations in undergraduate translation programs. *Translation Journal*, 11(1). <http://www.bokorlang.com/journal/39edu.htm>
- Jakobsen, A. L. (2003). Effects of think aloud on translation speed, revision, and segmentation. In F. Alves (Ed.), *Triangulating translation: Perspectives in process oriented research* (pp. 69-95). John Benjamins.
- Kiraly, D. C. (1995). *Pathways to translation: Pedagogy and process*. Kent State University Press.
- Künzli, A. (2006). Teaching and learning translation revision: Some suggestions based on evidence from a think-aloud protocol study. In M. Garant (Ed.),

- Current trends in translation teaching and learning* (pp. 9-24). University of Helsinki Department of Translation Studies.
- Künzli, A. (2007). Translation revision: A study of the performance of ten professional translators revising a legal text. In Y. Gambier, M. Shlesinger, & R. Stolze (Eds.), *Doubts and directions in translation studies: Selected contributions from the EST Congress, Lisbon 2004* (pp. 115-126). John Benjamins.
- Lai, S. (2002). Translation practicum at university level: A report. *Studies of Translation and Interpretation*, 7, 377-397.
- Lee, T. Y. E. (2012). Collaborative learning in translating a travel guide: A case study. *Translation Journal*, 16(3). <http://translationjournal.net/journal/61travel.htm>
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126-141. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.126>
- Long, M. H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Newbury House.
- Mendonça, C. O., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 745-769. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587558>
- Mossop, B. (2010). *Revising and editing for translators* (2nd ed.). St. Jerome.
- Nelson, G. L., & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(2), 113-131. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(98\)90010-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90010-8)
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice-Hall.
- Ohta, A. S. (1995). Applying sociocultural theory to an analysis of learner discourse: Learner-learner collaborative interaction in the zone of proximal development. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 93-121. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L462005219>

- Rasmussen, K. W., & Schjoldager, A. (2011). Revising translations: A survey of revision policies in Danish translation companies. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 15, 87-120. https://www.jostrans.org/issue15/art_rasmussen.pdf
- Robert, I. S., Remael, A., & Ureel, J. J. J. (2017). Towards a model of translation revision competence. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 11(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2016.1198183>
- Romney, J. (1997). Collaborative learning in a translation course. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54(1), 48-67. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.54.1.48>
- Schaeffer, M., Tardel, A., Hofmann, S., & Hansen-Schirra, S. (2019). Cognitive effort and efficiency in translation revision. In E. Huertas-Barros, S. Vandepitte, & E. Iglesias-Fernández (Eds.), *Quality assurance and assessment practices in translation and interpreting* (pp. 226-243). IGI Global.
- Scocchera, G. (2020). The competent reviser: A short-term empirical study on revision teaching and revision competence acquisition. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 14(1), 19-37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2019.1639245>
- Shei, C. C. C. (2005). Translation commentary: A happy medium between translation curriculum and EAP. *System*, 33(2), 309-325. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.01.004>
- Shih, Y. Y. C. (2006). Revision from translators' point of view: An interview study. *Target*, 18(2), 295-312. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.18.2.05shi>
- Tsai, Y. (2020). Collaborating in a flipped translation classroom: The student perception. *T&I Review*, 10(2), 49-73. <https://doi.org/10.22962/tnirvw.2020.10.2.003>
- Villamil, O. S., & de Guerrero, M. C. M. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Social-cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5(1), 51-75. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(96\)90015-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(96)90015-6)

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 144-188). M. E. Sharpe.
- Wang, K., & Han, C. (2013). Accomplishment in the multitude of counsellors: Peer feedback in translation training. *Translation & Interpreting*, 5(2), 62-75. <https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.105202.2013.a05>
- Yeh, C. C. (2009). Reflection in the translation classroom. *Studies in English Language and Literature*, 23, 107-118.
- Yeh, C. C. (2011). Implementing a book translation project in the translation classroom. *Studies of Translation and Interpretation*, 14, 135-167. <https://doi.org/10.29786/sti.201112.0007>
- Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 209-222. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743\(95\)90010-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(95)90010-1)

Appendix

Questionnaire on Revision Behavior and Perceptions

Part A. Basic Information

1. What is your gender? Male Female
2. Is this your first translation course?
 Yes
 No. Please give the what, when, and where of the prior translation courses:

3. Before taking this course, did you have experience in professional translation (paid translation work)?
 Yes. Please give information: _____
 No.
4. How do you rate your English reading ability, as compared with students in this class?
 Very good Fairly good Poor Very poor
5. How do you rate your English writing ability, as compared with students in this class?
 Very good Fairly good Poor Very poor

Part B. Focus of Revision

When revising your translation, how much attention did you give to the following problems/errors?

Item	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	A lot
1. Accuracy: Does the translation reflect the message of the source text?				
2. Completeness: Have any elements of the message been left out?				
3. Logic: Does the sequence of ideas make sense? Is there any nonsense or contradiction?				
4. Facts: Are there any factual, conceptual or mathematical errors?				
5. Smoothness: Does the wording flow? Are the connections between sentences clear? Are the relationships among the parts of each sentence clear? Are there any awkward, hard-to-read sentences?				
6. Tailoring: Is the language suited to the users of the translation and the use they will make of it?				
7. Sub-language: Is the style suited to the genre? Has correct terminology been used?				
8. Idiom: Are all the word combinations idiomatic?				
9. Mechanics: Have the rules of grammar, spelling, punctuation and correct usage been observed?				

Additional comments about problems/errors you checked for in revision:

Part C. Useful Activities and General Perceptions

Please indicate (✓) whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Item	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Keeping a learning journal contributes to my revision.					
2. Listening to group presentations on assignments contributes to my revision.					
3. In-class peer review/discussion contributes to my revision.					
4. Teacher feedback/input contributes to my revision.					
5. Revision improved the quality of my translation.					
6. Revision in translation is a waste of time.					
7. The more times I revise, the better translation I will produce.					

Additional comments about the revision assignments in the course:
