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Abstract

The gap between theory and practice has long been an issue of discussion in Translation Studies, particularly in the pedagogy of translation. While the teaching of theory has been an integral part of translator education in academic institutions, students and practitioners of translation tend to think that practice should be prioritised over theory. Although scholars have often argued the benefit of theoretical knowledge of translation to practice, the discussions have tended to lack empirical evidence, relying heavily on anecdotal evidence provided by teachers as well as the beliefs of scholars.

Against this background, the present study aims to generate a translators’ version of translation theory from working practitioners’ meta-discourse about their professional practice. The main source of data comes from semi-structured interviews with seventeen successful translators who work in the language combination of English and Japanese. Using a methodologically eclectic approach (drawing on grounded theory, narrative inquiry and Discursive Psychology), the translators’ theorisation patterns are explored, which is then compared with various theories of translation that are popular within academia or related to the study outcomes.

The study revealed that the major concepts presented in the interviewees’ theorisation are: role of participants and natural/literal translations. Their accounts demonstrated a particular narrative structure involving the concepts of text type, money, feedback and repeated commission. In addition, scarce use of metaphor was identified as their discursive characteristics. By comparing the outcomes with the theories found within academia, I argue that the similarities and differences identified can be fed into translation pedagogy, particularly in relation to the notions presented in the theory of translatorial action, norm theory, skopos theory and dichotomous notions of translation such as foreignising and domesticating translations. Some suggestions of how to use those outcomes in the classroom will be presented too.
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Introduction

The present study attempts to examine how English/Japanese successful professional translators theorise their professional practice when they are asked to give accounts about their experiences of dispute situations with their clients. The ultimate purpose of the study is to narrow the gap between theory and practice in translation, particularly in translator education where teachers of translation argue that theoretical knowledge of translation is of benefit to practice while students are often reported to tend to be averse to studying theories. This gap has often been discussed in Translation Studies. For example, Hanna (2009) reports that students tend to have negative views of the learning of theory as opposed to practical translation exercises, which manifests itself in the students’ low attendance at translation studies classes as opposed to practical translation sessions and their lower degree of involvement in theory-related activities. Similarly, Woodsworth (2002:135) reports

Although tempting, logically, to provide the historical background and theoretical foundations before moving on to practice, students really needed to begin translating texts early in the course. Otherwise, they would grow impatient.

Rogers (in Schäffner 2002:64) also explains that in her institution:

Theory and practice modules run in parallel, because students often feel that if they are not doing translation they are not really learning anything. ... Students ... often perceive the focus in theory classes on linguistic or cultural theories of transfer as being quite removed from the actual "real world" practice of translation.

This negative attitude of students to theory is also reported in Cronin (2005), Shuttleworth (2001) and Kujamäki (2004), and most prominently, Chesterman and Wagner (2002).

Hatim (2001:3) rightly disapproves of this tendency and calls for further research, stating:

The polarisation is historical and is evidence of the misleading demarcation lines that are often too readily drawn between theoretician and practitioner in many disciplines. Theory and practice are ultimately complementary and, particularly in a field such as translation, the distinction needs to be re-examined.

The aim of the present study is to tackle the gap between theory and practice in translation education. The study originates from my personal experiences, and it will be helpful to briefly describe my own career history to illustrate how this research project was conceived.

Upon completion of my undergraduate study in foreign languages in Japan, I
briefly worked as a language teacher and then a translation project manager. I then moved to the UK and worked as an in-house translator for a Japanese financial company in London. I received most of my translator training in this period, which lasted for three years. I then became a freelance translator and after 12 years I started to teach translation part-time at London Metropolitan University (and later at two additional institutions). My duty in the first teaching post was to supervise Japanese overseas students’ practical translation, and at that point I had no knowledge of translation theories. However, since my teaching duties included dissertation supervision and marking, in addition to the teaching of practical translation, I started to read Translation Studies literature. This was my first encounter with academic literature on translation, and I found it fascinating because the practice of translation, which I had been engaged in first-hand as a professional translator, was articulated logically and lucidly within the frameworks of various theories, sometimes in relation to empirical studies. I realised for the first time that ‘doing’ and ‘explaining’ translation are two different things – something that had never occurred to me before because I never had to ‘explain’ my translation in my professional life – and I found both activities interesting and exciting. Motivated by this experience I decided to enrol in an MA Translation Studies course, and then moved on to PhD study to pursue translation as an academic subject.

Though I personally found studying translation theories fascinating, I soon came to realise that I was in a minority and that many practitioners seemed to feel theory had not much to offer to practice. For example, when I told a fellow translator that I was studying translation theory as a postgraduate, she (a very experienced professional translator) said, defensively, “I don’t know any translation theory, but we translators can do a good job without knowing any theory, can’t we?”

This kind of perception of the relationship (or lack of it) between theory and practice is widespread among translators, as indicated by an informal survey of the translators’ Internet forum, Proz.com. In one of the forum discussions titled “Is translation theory useful for the practising translator: Your opinion please” (posted between 11-21/01/2011, accessed on 01/07/2013 at http://www.proz.com/forum/translation_theory_and_practice/189199-is_translation_theory_useful_to_the_practising_translator%3A_your_opinions please.html), instigated by an MA Translation Studies student who was about to write his dissertation, thirteen members of the forum (all professional translators) discussed the issue in nineteen postings. The discussion demonstrated opinions both for and against the usefulness of translation theory for practitioners, but my attention was particularly drawn to a post about the “arrogance” of theoreticians:
Recently I had a heated discussion on this topic with a friend who teaches translation theory at a university. I found myself frustrated by what strikes me as the arrogance of theoreticians. There was much talk of how this or that theory has now been "discredited," which is a ridiculous concept. (my emphasis)

This translator further claims that only theories in disciplines such as history or medicine can be discredited where empirical evidence can be put to a test, but “in translation theory and literary theory, we're not dealing with facts but fashions”. Another member agreed to this opinion strongly, saying “I completely agree with Steven above, especially what he says about the arrogance of theoreticians”.

Many academics in the discipline of Translation Studies may disagree (especially with the claim that many issues in Translation Studies cannot be tested empirically like in history or medicine), but we should not discount this opinion completely. If some practitioners feel that theoreticians are being “arrogant”, the reason for it must be worth investigating.

Why do translators feel that theoreticians of translation are arrogant?

The reason for this may be that the theories of translation currently preferred in academia do not sufficiently cover the reality of translation practice. This may be true in two ways. On the one hand, the areas covered by the theories may miss certain crucial aspects of the modern-day practice of translation. On the other hand, the way the theories explain translational phenomena, in other words, the discourse of the theories, may not be in tune with how practising translators think and talk. If either or both are the case, it is not surprising if practising translators do not find academic theories useful.

The gap between theory and practice is felt particularly keenly in translation classrooms because it is in educational settings that theory is overtly taught and discussed. Students of translation on university translation courses often complain that their courses are too theory-oriented, which they believe will not help them become professional translators. To confirm this attitude of students, I conducted a small-scale questionnaire survey between June and July in 2011 with MA and BA Translation Studies students at London Metropolitan University. A questionnaire was distributed to 117 students electronically via their university email addresses and 22 students returned it (response rate: 19%). For one of the questions, “Do you think learning theory has been useful to your translation training?”, 82% of the respondents answered “Yes”, which seems to be very positive. However, in the free answer section, 10 students gave their opinions and 9 of them expressed negative views. The followings are some examples (reproduced as in the original except that obvious spelling mistakes
To be honest, my opinion is that we need more practice rather than theory! ... one can read a thousand books on translation theory and still experience problems when trying to generate a translation or not be able to do it at all. The more we practise the better we become! (MA student)

• I think theory is necessary however some books are extremely scholarly hence difficult to read, some are a tad out-dated and also, a lot of scholars actually propose very similar not to say the same approaches ... (MA student)

• ... too much emphasis is placed on [theories], and more often than not, to a useless degree, since there are a lot of theories which are too abstract and they don't have to offer anything in practice. (MA student)

• ... Unfortunately, the practical aspects are not taught enough at university, so that the students are not well prepared for their future career, especially as a freelance translator. (BA student)

Some academics have addressed the issue of students' negative attitudes to translation theory. Hanna (2009) and Shih (2011) both use an action research method to find a way to encourage students to learn theories with a positive attitude. Shuttleworth's (2001) study, which examines the possibilities of viable generic theory classes, does not present itself as action research as such like Hanna's and Shih's, but he involves his students in the study by a means of questionnaires, so it has a flavour of action research too.

The present study, which was originally motivated by my experience as a translator, a student of translation and later as a teacher and scholar of translation, aims to contribute to this body of research by adopting a social-scientific methodology, which is still relatively new in Translation Studies. Specifically, it aims to facilitate the integration of consideration of translators' realities into current translation theories, in the hope that this may contribute to making translation teaching more attractive and appealing for future translators, because “[a] translation theory appropriate for a translation pedagogy – and it is not clear how many we have in our discipline by this definition – should say something about how translation works and how it is done” (Shreve in Foreword to Kiraly, 1995:xi). The present study intends to elicit this “something” (ibid.) from translators’ discourse.

When the professional translator mentioned above said “I don't know any translation theory”, this does not mean in reality that she does not theorise. Her utterance should be interpreted to mean that she had never attempted to systematise
her procedural knowledge (as opposed to declarative knowledge as termed by Anderson 2000) of translation and to express it verbally. She does have sufficient procedural knowledge to work as a successful translator, and why should she bother to put it into words? (Just like me when I was working as a professional translator: I never thought or felt a need to verbalise my procedural knowledge about translation then).

In the present study, I attempted to make professional translators do exactly that — to talk about their procedural knowledge — and to examine how they theorise their practice. In other words, I attempted to generate a translators’ version of translation theory from their accounts. Data was collected from professional translators’ discourse in interviews where they were asked “Have your clients ever had disagreements/issues with the quality of your translation? What did they say to you and what did you say to them?” All interviewees engaged in English/Japanese translation, my own language combination. This language combination was chosen so that detailed investigation of the participants’ accounts of linguistic matters would be possible. The collected data was analysed using a discourse analysis method. In the analysis, methods of social sciences, more specifically, grounded theory, narrative inquiry and Discursive Psychology, were used. In the Discussion section, the theory generated in the analysis will be compared with accepted translation theories to identify if there is any gap between them. If a gap is identified, it can then be used to implement existing translator training curricula.

The study is structured as follows. In Chapter 1, the notion of ‘theory’ in Translation Studies will be reviewed and discussed to provide a set of terms to be used in the study. In Chapter 2, exiting literature will be reviewed to investigate the status quo of theory teaching in translation classes, and the results of my preliminary survey regarding the topic will be reported. In Chapter 3, the issue of knowledge of translation and translation theory, particularly the issue of its measurement, will be discussed by reviewing existing literature. The epistemological aspects of the issue in Translation Studies in general as well as the epistemological stance of the present study (i.e. social constructionism) will be discussed. Chapter 4 will present the methodology and methods used in the present study, and the collection and analysis of data will be reported in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 will provide a discussion of the outcomes of the analysis by comparing them with accepted academic theories, exploring the differences and similarities between them. Finally, Chapter 7 will offer a summary of the study and of its limitations, and suggest further possible research.
Chapter 1 What is translation theory?

In embarking on a discussion about translation theory and its use in pedagogical environments, it is necessary to discuss what a theory of translation is. This chapter will first review literature and establish what kind of theories are being discussed in Translation Studies currently. It will then classify those theories into six (tentative) types.

1.1 Plethora of theories in Translation Studies

In a discussion of theories in the discipline of second language acquisition (SLA), VanPatten and Williams (2007:vii) present a parable about four blind men and an elephant as an analogy to explain why there are so many competing theories in that discipline.

These sightless men chance upon a pachyderm for the first time and one, holding its tail, says, “Ah! The elephant is very much like a rope.” The second one has wrapped his arms around a giant leg and says, “Ah! The elephant is like a tree.” The third has been feeling alongside the elephant’s massive body and says, “Ah! The elephant is very much like a wall.’ The fourth, having seized the trunk, cries out, “Ah! The elephant is very much like a snake.” For us, SLA is a big elephant that researchers can easily look at from different perspectives.

Researchers in the discipline of Translation Studies would say the same: there are a number of theories, each of which covers a specific area of translation using a particular model and approach, but there is no comprehensive theory which can explain all phenomena pertaining to translation because the discipline, like SLA, covers “an incredibly complex set of processes” (ibid.:viii).

In order to obtain an overview of what theories and theoretical notions of translation are being discussed in the discipline of Translation Studies currently, three influential monographs were consulted: Exploring Translation Theories (Pym, 2010), In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation (Baker, 1992), and Training the Translator (Kussmaul, 1995). Pym’s recent monograph was consulted first to compose a list of the most up-to-date theories or concepts commonly discussed in Translation Studies. This monograph was chosen because it covers a wide range of theories falling under seven different paradigms within Translation Studies (natural equivalence; directional equivalence; purposes; descriptions; uncertainty; localization; and cultural translation). Pym claims that a plurality of paradigms is an advantage for the discipline (2010:4) and that this monograph aims to keep a fair balance between those different paradigms (ibid.:5). This claim by Pym suggests that the selection of theories in this monograph should be fairly unbiased towards any particular paradigm or
approach, which will help us build a comprehensive list of translation theories. Yet, coverage of one field is thin in this monograph, i.e. theories from the field of text linguistics. The use of linguistic theories in Translation Studies research, especially of text linguistics, was prevalent in the 1990s (Klaudy, 2003), but in the new millennium this tendency has been declining. A realistic assumption is that a fashion in the academic circle will take time to infiltrate practitioners’ (in this case translation teachers’) workplaces, so, with a view to composing a comprehensive list of theories which are relevant not only to research but also to present-day pedagogy of translation, it would be rational to include linguistics-oriented theories and notions. For this reason, Mona Baker’s much-used textbook (1992) and Paul Kussmaul’s much-cited monograph on translation pedagogy (1995) were consulted to supplement the list.

Below is the list of theories and theoretical concepts compiled from the three monographs followed by their founders and/or major proponents in brackets (and due to the interdisciplinary nature of Translation Studies, a further literature review will expand the already long list even further).

- domesticating vs. foreignising translation (Schleiermacher, Venuti)
- adequate vs. acceptable translation (Toury)
- dynamic vs. formal equivalence (Nida)
- semantic vs. communicative translation (Newmark)
- overt vs. covert translation (House)
- documentary vs. instrumental translation (Nord)
- fluent vs. resistant translation (Venuti)
- illusory vs. anti-illusory translation (Levý)
- denotative/ connotative/ text normative/ pragmatic/ formal translation (Koller)
- One-to-one/ one-to-several/ one-to-part/ one-to-none equivalence (Kade)
- theory of sense/deverbalization (Seleskovitch)
- restrained translation (Berman)
- text type analysis (Reiss)
- translatorial action theory (Holz-Mänttäri)
- principle of the necessary degree of precision (the “good enough” theory) (Hönig and Kussmaul)
- skopos theory (Vermeer)
- skopos theory with the concept of loyalty (Nord)
- langue vs. parole (Saussure)
- linguistic relativity (Sapir & Whorf)
- componential analysis (Katz and Foder, Nida)
- translation shifts (Catford)
- translation procedures (Vinay and Darbelnet)
- transformational-generative grammar (Chomsky)
- discourse analysis (e.g. Hatim and Mason)
- kernel phrases (Chomsky)
- Grice’s maxims (Grice)
- relevance theory (Gutt; Sperber and Wilson)
- semiotics
• Russian Formalism
• functional sentence perspective (The Prague School)
• theme and rheme (Halliday)
• speech act theory (Searle)
• principles of analogy and local interpretation (Brown and Yule)
• register (“field, tenor, mode”, Halliday)
• scenes-and-frames
• patronage (Lefevere)
• translation culture (Prunč)
• norm theory (Toury, Chesterman)
• law of interference (Toury)
• law of growing standardization (Toury)
• translation universals (ex. lexical simplification, explicitation, unique-item etc.)
• radical translation (principle of indeterminacy) (Quine)
• family likeness (Croce, Wittgenstein)
• constructivism
• game theory (Levý)
• deconstruction (Derrida)
• abusive translation (Lewis)
• after-life (Walter Benjamin)
• actor-network theory [translation sociology]
• habitus (Bourdieu)
• systems theory
• gender studies (e.g. Chamberlain)
• postcolonialism (e.g. Bassnett)
• theories of consensus (e.g. Locke, Katz)
• hermeneutics (e.g. Husserl, Gadamer)

The list shows that the catalogue of theories and concepts discussed and taught in present Translation Studies presents a broad mixture of notions. This can be explained with reference to the variety of approaches to the discipline taken by Translation Studies scholars. Malmkjær (2005:20-21) explains that Translation Studies scholars have developed the discipline in three different ways:

a) Theories belonging to other disciplines have been extended to encompass translational phenomena, as when Gutt (1991) extended relevance theory to encompass translational phenomena.

b) Theories belonging to other disciplines have been used to describe translational phenomena, as when Catford (1965) used Halliday’s (1961) systemic functional grammar to develop a linguistic theory of translation.

c) Translational phenomena have been considered specific to the independent discipline of Translation Studies, but been illuminated through insights drawn from other disciplines, as in the work of most contemporary Translation Studies scholars.

In the following sections, I tentatively classify existing translation theories and
theoretical notions along six parameters in order to better understand that there are different types of theories (including what participants mistakenly consider to be theories) of translation.

1.2 Six (tentative) parameters for classification of translation theories

1.2.1 Parameter No1: Big theories and small theories

This classification uses my own rather simplistic terms (for clarity and convenience), i.e. ‘small’ theories for those that focus on individual parts of the discipline at one time and ‘big’ theories for those that can only be arrived at by consolidating small theories or by adopting an approach which can cover a wide range of translational phenomena.

In Popperian philosophy of science, a statement concerning natural phenomena is deemed to be a legitimate scientific theory only when the statement is falsifiable, and the more falsification tests the statement can endure, the wider range of phenomena and events the theory can explain, and thus the more robust the statement is as a scientific theory (Chalmers 1982). In other words, in simplistic terms, a theory becomes better when it becomes bigger – so long as the falsifiability criterion is kept prominently in mind as the theory grows.

If ‘big’ theories are what sciences strive for, that is what modern Translation Studies has been striving for too. In an influential paper presented to the Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics in Copenhagen in August 1972, James Holmes (1972/1988, reprinted in 2004, which will be used for citation) declared that Translation Studies should seek “to develop a full, inclusive theory accommodating so many elements that it can serve to explain and predict all phenomena falling within the terrain of translating and translation ...” (1972/2004:186). In the same paper, Holmes described the then state of translation theories as “little more than prolegomena”, and many as actually only “axioms, postulates, and hypotheses” (ibid.). So, according to Holmes, translation theories (at least until the 1970s) were small theories, many of which were not qualified to be recognised as a full-fledged theory.

Holmes (ibid.:186-188) also categorised translation theories into six sub-categories according to their scope: medium-, area-, rank-, text-type-, time- and problem-restricted translation theories. A theory which falls under one of these categories can be called a ‘small’ theory as opposed to a ‘big’ theory and it is in the field of these small theories that he considers “most significant advances have been made in recent years” (ibid.:186), by the early 1970s, that is.

Chesterman (2007:12-14), in his discussion of how researchers can contribute to
theory making in Translation Studies, also maintains that “[o]ne way of contributing to
theory is indeed to show the relations between different existing theories and theory-
types, and thus try to develop a still more general theory.”

Toury (1995:16) similarly holds that translation theories evolve from small ones
to big ones through the following process: a number of findings from descriptive studies
in the above mentioned sub-categories accumulate and form “laws” of translation. Laws
of translation are different from general theories in that they are not absolute but
merely state the likelihood that translators' behaviour or resulting textual features will
occur under certain conditions. When laws of translation in different sub-categories
demonstrate various overlapping features, they gradually form a more general theory
of translation, producing a ‘big’ theory.

If the ultimate purpose of theorising is to formulate ‘big’ theories, Ernst-August
Gutt (1991) is certainly one of the scholars who attempted to achieve this goal. For
Gutt, the world of translation theory is too disintegrated, lacking a comprehensive
approach. Consequently, he tries to address this situation by drawing on relevance
theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1995), claiming that all sorts of phenomena of translation
can be explained within the framework of this single theory. Further, Gutt rather
boldly declared that “translation theory and translation studies should have been made
redundant by relevance theory” (1991:307). Although his book, Translation and
Relevance: Cognition and Context (1991) was a success, producing a second edition a
decade later, Gutt also attracted various criticisms from translation scholars1. The
fundamental reason behind those criticisms may be that Gutt’s method of building up a
‘big’ theory was different from what Toury suggested: Gutt adopted a ready-made
theory which was well established in the field of linguistics to the discipline of
Translation Studies rather than, as Toury recommended, building up a translation-
specific theory by gathering ‘small’ theories which belonged to the sub-categories in
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1 Malmkjær (1992) is one of them. While admitting that Gutt’s application of relevance
theory to the field of translation has been successful in the sense that the value of relevance
theory as a scientific theory has been increased by Gutt’s work because a scientific theory’s
strength is judged by how many phenomena it can account for, Malmkjær argues that what
Gutt achieved in the end was merely “a reformulation … of some of the concerns of
translation theorists, in relevance theoretic terms” (ibid.:306). As a result, if translators
want “direct help with their everyday concerns, they should not expect to find it [in Gutt’s
work]” (ibid.) because not much about translation is explained there apart from the
processing effort of the target readers.
Tirkkonen-Condit (2002) voices a similar disapproval saying that although relevance theory
has powerful explanatory power, if a translator wants to account for the differences
between a translation and its source text, it does not explain the kind of questions directly
related to the everyday practice of translators such as “what causes the translator’s
linguistic choices to be systematically slightly different from comparable text production in
the original?” or “why are particular high-frequency elements …under-represented or over-
represented in translated language?” (ibid.:195)
In contrast to Gutt, Tymoczko (2007) is sceptical about the possibility of establishing a big theory in Translation Studies. Her claim, however, has not arisen with a view to promoting Translation Studies as a scientific discipline (as Chesterman and Toury did). Taking a non-essentialist viewpoint, Tymoczko criticises what is defined as ‘translation’ in modern western Translation Studies and maintains that translation should be understood as a more cross-cultural concept (or what she calls a ‘cluster concept’ (2007:180)). For Tymoczko, each cluster, which loosely corresponds to a community or a culture, encompasses characteristic notions about translation. Although those clusters are loosely related to each other under the umbrella concept of translation, “a theory that delineates communalities or conditions applicable to all translators and all translations is not the sort of theory that translation studies can aspire to” (ibid.). So, for Tymoczko, a ‘big’ translation theory is not what we should be striving for, not for the purpose of achieving scientifically acceptable standards, but for a rather ideological aspiration, i.e. to establish non-Eurocentric translation theories. At the same time Tymoczko admits that small theories which account for culture-specific phenomena have only “very limited theoretical utility” (ibid.) and she suggests that those small culture-specific theories be called “conceptualisations of translation” (ibid.: 181) rather than theories. Because Translation Studies is, according to Tymoczko, currently extremely Eurocentric (which is one of the main concerns of her study), Tymoczko claims that many current theories in reality remain at the level of “Eurocentric conceptualisations” (ibid.) and asserts that adequate translation theories must be “comprehensive and yet flexible enough to deal with ... varied parameters through time and space” (ibid.). In other words, what Tymoczko seeks for as an ideal translation theory is a 'small' theory, which is yet not too small to fall under the label of ‘area-restricted’ or ‘time-restricted’ theory so that it still retains a valid theoretical utility over different languages and times like a ‘big’ theory would do. However, the question of what is ‘adequate’ in terms of ‘comprehensiveness’ and ‘flexibility’ would entirely depend on the specific research project and it cannot be denied that Tymoczko's claim sounds rather idealistic.

In summary, as a new but independent discipline, production of ‘big’ theories is an aspiration of many Translation Studies scholars, but we should not forget that the utility and applicability of such theories to translators’ practice are a different matter.

1-2-2 Parameter No 2: Theories and models

According to Bortolotti (2008:173), a model in a scientific discipline is “a fiction,
an object, structure or description that represents some features of a theory.” In contrast, a theory is “a coherent and systematic explanation of why some facts occur in the way they do and a reasoned way of predicting the facts that will occur in the future” (ibid.: 154). Simply put, “theories explain and predict events” (ibid.:53), while models do the former (explain) but not the latter (predict).

VanPatten and Williams (2007) report that in the discipline of second language acquisition, participants often mix the two concepts and use the terms ‘theories’ and ‘models’ alternately. According to VanPatten and Williams (ibid.:5) a model “describes processes or sets of processes of a phenomenon” but a theory is different from a model in that it can be used to predict a phenomenon. In other words, a model shows how, but does not need to explain why.

While Bortilotti’s (2008), VanPatten and Williams’s (2007) definitions of a model are of a general sort, which can be interpreted in any discipline, Hermans (2009) gives a more translation-specific account of models, saying that the concept of a model is relevant to translation from four different angles.

First, there are theoretical models of translation which are “hypothetical constructs which operate at a higher level of abstraction than the concrete detail of individual phenomena and may be used as an explanatory framework to account for the world of phenomena” (ibid.:179). In this context, Hermans reports that a theoretical model can be borrowed from a neighbouring discipline and used as a “probing instrument, a prism or searchlight which allows new things to come into view or to perceive familiar things in a new light” (ibid.) and this is precisely what has happened frequently in Translation Studies recently.

Second, one can talk about an “analogue model” (ibid.:180) of a translation process. Here, a model means a visual explication of a process involved in translation. One example is:

‘sender1→message1→receiver1 = translator = sender2→message2→receiver2’

(ibid.:180)

This sequential model represents the process of translation: the translator first acts as a receiver of a message in one language and then as the sender of a new (translated) message, in another language, to a new receiver. This kind of model is, according to Hermans (ibid.), used extensively for intellectual or pedagogical purposes.

Third, one can say that the act of translation itself is an act of ‘modelling’. When a textual product is a kind of representation of a source text, in whatever form it may be, however similar or not similar to the source text, and the agents involved recognise the product as a translation of the source text, then the product is a ‘model’ of the source text.
Fourth, models are relevant to translation in relation to translation norms (and this is an understanding of model which is closely related to the definitions by Bortilotti’s (2008) and VanPatten and Williams’s (2007) as presented above). In translation, norms may be considered to be “social regulation mechanisms which make certain choices and decisions by the translator more likely than others” or “particular kinds of expectations which are shared among most member of a community and tell them how to behave in certain situations” (Hermans 2009:181). Norms are internalised in the translator’s mind and what is regarded as correct behaviours in the community comprises of intersubjective “notion of correctness”, i.e. “a notion of what is proper or correct in particular situations” (ibid.: 181). Because of this abstract property of norms, this is where models enter:

Because correctness notions are abstract values, more concrete models of correct behaviour are derived either directly from the values and attitudes which make up the correctness notions or from concrete instances and occurrences which have come to be regarded as exemplifying such notions. These models can, in turn, serve as prototypes to be imitated, as examples of good practice. (ibid.:181)

When translation students want to learn how a professional translator should behave in producing good-quality translations, they strive to learn these “models” which “serve as prototypes to be imitated, as examples of good practice” (Hermans 2009:181). Models in this sense are prescriptive and in translation classes, these models are often described in the form of a ‘translation strategy’. Translation teachers often use the term “strategy” for a concrete description of how to produce translations. The next section will discuss the notion of translation strategy, along with other related (and often confusing) notions.

1-2-3 Parameter No 3: Theories and strategies

The notion of translation strategy is extremely ambiguous in Translation Studies. The word ‘strategy’ means, in an ordinary sense, “a general plan or set of plans intended to achieve something, especially over a long period” (Collins COBUILD advanced learner’s English dictionary new digital edition, 2004), and in the context of translation, ‘something’ means achieving a successful translation. When the translator faces a translation problem, he/she decides on a strategy to use to solve the problem. By executing the strategy, he/she achieves a result, i.e. a translated text. However, ambiguity arises because the term “translation strategy” is in reality used for, broadly
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speaking, three different notions. First, it can denote the process of producing a translation while the focus is heavily on the resultant textual feature. Second, it can concern behavioural patterns of the translator which will eventually influence the textual features of translation. This is different from the first definition in that the focus is on the process leading to the text production. Finally, it can mean a global plan which governs the whole process of translating the particular text, or sections of the text.

The reason for the manifold definitions of the same term is, according to Gambier (2010), the variety of disciplinary backgrounds of researchers who use the term, the purpose of their studies and the scopes of their investigations. For example, researchers conducting comparative studies of ST and TT will focus on the relations between the textual features of two texts, inferring the process of text production from the static data. In this case, the first definition is most likely to apply. On the other hand, researchers who study translation processes will adopt a broader view of translation processes, including what happens before and after the actual text production in addition to the process of text production and the resultant textual features, focusing on what goes on in translators' minds and the process of planning and implementing the strategy. In this case, the second definition will apply. And the third definition works at a higher level than the actual text production, at which the main concern is the translator's policy on and attitude to text production rather than the actual behaviours or text features. Venuti (1998:240) subscribes to this definition, stating:

Strategies of translation involve the basic tasks of choosing the foreign text to be translated and developing a method to translate it. Both of these tasks are determined by various factors: cultural, economic, political.

And Venuti's main concern is his famous dichotomy of translation strategies: 'foreignization' and 'domestication' (1995).

In addition to the manifold definitions of the term, there are many other competing terms which sometimes do and other times do not mean the same. Such terms include procedure, method, technique, solution and tactics. For these reasons, the definition of “translation strategy” is extremely ambiguous in Translation Studies, creating a “terminological mess” (Pym 2011:92).

Since the 1980s, process-study researchers, who adopt the second definition of translation strategy, have attempted to use observational outcomes of strategies (of both students and professionals) for educational purposes, aiming to teach students the
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3 Though Pym (2011:101) is critical of this research method saying, “There seems to be no possible justification for using the term “strategy” to refer to a simple action, technique, step, method, or pattern of behavior that you just discern from looking at a set of bitexts.”
most efficient and competent process of translation by focusing the psychological and
behavioural processes of translation rather than focusing solely on the textual features
of translation (most recent examples include Massey & Ehrensberger-Dow 2011; Göpferich 2013). Amongst this kind of studies, González Davies et al. (2001) provide
some examples of students’ possible strategies such as “read [the TT] aloud to
somebody else” or “gapping the text for another reader to complete and discover/discuss
other translation options”. González Davies et al. call the textual results in the TT of
those strategies “solutions”. Similarly, Zabalbeascoa (2000:120) gives an extensive
array of examples of translation strategies ranging from text analysis and reading
strategies, (TT) writing strategies, research strategies to assessment strategies (of
price, difficulty of task, time given) etc. He, too, calls the textual results of executing a
strategy “solutions”.

Despite these recent developments, though, what tends to be taught in
translation classes as “translation strategies” are classifications of textual features of
translation, very often only vaguely implying the process leading to the decision of
producing the textual feature. The explanation is normally given according to
translation problems. For instance, the teacher may explain in a class that the problem
of translating cultural references in a novel (or puns in limerick, technical terms in a
computer manual, swear words in a film, to name a few examples) can be solved by
using a certain translation strategy (such as the strategy of “cultural substitution”
suggested in Baker (1992:31-34)). In this kind of explanation, it is often not clear
whether the term “strategy” focuses only on the textual features or the procedure
leading to the production of the text.

This confusion may be understandable though: even if we consider a translation
strategy to be a plan or a process (or an action) of producing certain portion of
translation, the end result always involves a textual feature and it is sometimes
inevitable that the observer’s attention is particularly drawn to the textual feature
because the process is not always visible but the textual feature is. This may be
particularly so in translation classes because without a tangible result (whether on a
piece of paper or on the computer screen), it is very difficult for the students to
acknowledge that they have used a certain strategy.

Existing literature offers a number of classification systems of translation
strategies in the sense of the first definition. These include, in addition to Vinay &
Darbelnet (1958) as mentioned above, Nida (1964), Catford (1965), Newmark (1988),
Baker (1992), Chesterman (1997), and in audiovisual translation, Díaz Cintas and
Remael (2007). These works are often used as translation textbooks in translation
courses and consequently the confusion regarding the definition of “strategies” and
other related terms seems to have been carried over to present-day classrooms.

To clarify the complexity and confusion about the definition of translation strategies and other related terms, Chesterman’s (2000) framework is useful. Chesterman divides strategies into three kinds: (a) search strategies, (b) creativity strategies, and (c) textual strategies. Search strategies include procedural methods of documentation such as the use of the Internet, parallel texts etc. Creativity strategies are more general behavioural actions to enhance the creativity of the translator such as having a break at a certain interval, going for a walk, revising the text the next day, etc. Those two kinds of strategies correspond more or less to the second definition of translation strategy I presented above. And the third kind of strategies (textual strategies), i.e. “explicit manipulation of units of translation” (ibid.: 82) are similar to the first definition above. In the present study, I will collectively call the first two types of strategies ‘operational strategies’ and the third ‘textual strategies’.

Lastly, one point I want to make clear in this section is the difference between the concept of strategy and that of theory because I sometimes witness that my students confuse these two concepts. Some students wrongly assume that by describing the translation strategies which they used in their translations (for example, in their annotated translation projects), they have “used translation theories”. They may confuse these two concepts because they seek in theories concrete guidelines for translation, which are often described as a translation strategy. The point which needs to be made clear here is that a strategy is a conscious or unconscious process the translator undertakes in the actual translating while theories may underlie the choice of a strategy.

To summarise the discussion above, the following table presents the definitions of the term ‘strategy’ and its related terms as used in the present study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher level of abstraction</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>An account which explains a phenomenon of translation and predicts its effects.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
<td>A global solution, much like the translator’s policy or attitude towards the particular translation assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>A procedure (conscious and unconscious, verbal or non-verbal) used by the translator to solve problems that emerge when carrying out the translation process with a particular objective in mind. There are two sub-categories of strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Textual strategy: a procedure which entails explicit manipulation of units of translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Operational strategy: non-textual procedures such as documentation (searches using the Internet or parallel texts) or more general behavioural procedures to enhance the productivity and creativity of the translator such as having a break at a certain interval or revising the text next day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Definition of terms (from theory to strategy)

1.2.4 Parameter No 4: Theories and Paradigms

In the previous sections I discussed the difference between theory and the subordinate concepts of model and strategy. It would be appropriate now to discuss the difference between theory and the superordinate concept of paradigm.

A paradigm is a concept which is larger than theory in the sense that several theories can fall within one paradigm. Pym (2010) identifies seven different paradigms in Translation Studies (i.e. natural equivalence; directional equivalence; purposes; descriptions; uncertainty; localization; and cultural translation) and discusses various theories of translation within each paradigm. Pym (ibid.: 3) defines paradigms as “sets of principles that underlie different groups of theories”. When participants in translation (including scholars and practitioners) talk about translation with shared ideas, principles and a point of departure, a paradigm is established.

The concept of paradigm is useful in a discussion of translation theories because these paradigms are about what the translators or anybody involved in translation think about the fundamental question of “what translation is, what it can be, and how a translator should act in the world” (Pym 2010: 4). If two parties discuss translation on the basis of two different paradigms, the outcome is very likely to be “continued tension (debate without resolution), revolution (one paradigm wins out over the other), or more commonly silence (people choose to travel along separate paths)” (ibid.:3).
Chalmers (1982) states, in his account of Kuhn’s notion of a paradigm, that “a mature science is governed by a single paradigm”. Kuhn calls science “a puzzle-solving activity governed by the rules of a paradigm” (cited in Chalmers 1982:110) and the puzzle includes both theories and experiments within the discipline. Following these criteria, Translation Studies cannot be, unfortunately, called a mature science just like “much of modern sociology” because it “lacks a paradigm and consequently fails to qualify as science” (Chalmers 1982:109).

However, it seems to be unfair to bluntly pronounce Translation Studies to be unscientific based on Chalmer’s criteria about mature natural sciences. It is indeed true that several different paradigms do exist within the discipline of Translation Studies, but because of this distinctive feature, the state of Translation Studies as it is can also be understood to be a strength of the discipline as Pym (2010:4) claims:

The practical advantage we want to defend here is that of a plurality of paradigms. Rather than set out to defend one paradigm against all others, we are interested in promoting awareness that there are many valuable ways of approaching translation, any of which may prove useful or stimulating in a given situation.

Similarly, Tennent (2005a-xviii) says:

... it is highly improbable that any one general theory of translation could be capacious enough, open enough to encompass all the variants and satisfy the different theoretical and methodological constituencies.

This plurality of paradigms is, however, not always problem-free. Between 2000 and 2002 the Translation Studies community debated the topic extensively in the journal Target in response to the call for discussions by Andrew Chesterman and Rosemary Arrojo (Chesterman & Arrojo 2000 and following articles). Chesterman and Arrojo started the discussion by saying that there is a divide in the discipline with regard to the principal approach to translation: the ‘empirical, descriptive approach’ and the ‘postmodern, cultural studies approach’. The focus of the discussion was whether Translation Studies could have one shared ground for discussion when the division seems to be evident. Several Translation Studies scholars expressed their opinions in the discussion, but the claim by Pym (2000) seems to be particularly relevant to the current (pedagogy-oriented) study. Pym claims that the empirical and descriptive approach tries to encompass most common phenomena of translation, often trying to find laws and norms which govern such phenomena. On the other hand, the postmodern approach is interested in less common but intriguing, innovative, sometimes even provocative and change-inducing aspects of translation, which is meant to be empowering for translators. Now, if we are to discuss translation theories
in a pedagogical context, as Pym claims, professional translators may feel more empowered by learning the outcomes of what the researchers of the former paradigm have been working on because they include discoveries about technological development and strategic actions about clients and texts.

On the other hand, Bartrina (2005) claims that learning different theories including those belonging to the postmodern paradigm is beneficial to translation students because those theories make them aware of the idea of meaning.

The question of whether the multiplicity of paradigms is an advantage or disadvantage for the discipline and subsequently for translators and translation students deserves more discussion.

1.2.5 Parameter No 5: Theories of a humanistic type and those of a scientific type

In the previous section I touched upon the issue of the status (or lack of status) of Translation Studies as a mature scientific discipline. In this section we will look into its quality as a scientific discipline in a chronological manner.

The historical development of Translation Studies can be divided into three main stages: first, it started as a humanistic venture about 2000 years ago; then efforts started to arise to change it into a more scientific discipline after World War II, and finally more rigorous scientific research methodologies started to be adopted after the 1970s.

First stage: Cicero (46 BC) to World War II

Traditionally, accounts of translation have been located in the fields of philology, literary criticism and theology (due to its use in Bible translations), so translation theories were historically enunciated within the humanities rather than the sciences. Scholars formulated general notions about translation and those statements are what we now read as traditional translation theories. It is commonly recognised that this period started with Cicero with his famous precept from 46 BC about how he translated speeches by Greek orators into Latin: “I did not hold it necessary to render word for word, but I preserved the general style and force of the language” (Venuti 2004:13). According to Malmkjær (2005:2), this is because Cicero’s work is among the oldest writings about translation that are still extant and because it has had a substantial influence on the development of Translation Studies in the West, but this does not mean that writing about translation did not exist before Cicero’s time. For instance, as Malmkjær (2005:2) points out by citing Hung & Pollard (1998), there were government officials who assumed special responsibility for translation during the time
of the Zhou Dynasty in China in the ninth century BC. Yet, if we focus on the period after Cicero’s time to the modern time, frequently-cited theorists include Horace, Quintilian, Jerome, Augustine, Dryden, Goethe, Schleiermacher, Arnold and Nietzsche (Malmkjær, 2005:4). Ample examples of other theorists are provided in Chesterman (1989), Schulte and Biguenet (1992), Lefevere (1992) and Robinson (1997).

One of the main characteristics of translation theories of this lengthy period is that the discussion was overly concerned with the dichotomy of translation methods i.e. ‘word-for-word’ and ‘sense-for-sense’ translations, which was most evidently discussed with regard to Bible translation and has also been inherited by recent Translation Studies scholars (most obviously by Peter Newmark, for example) (Malmkjær 2005:5). The statements were also subjective, biased by the commentator’s personal experiences and observations of translation. Robinson (1997:xix), in describing Thomas Secker, Archbishop of Canterbury from the 17th century, states that the most typical attributes of traditional translation theorists are their being “authoritarian” and “prescriptive”.

Holmes (1972/2004:181) does not seem to be very excited about this long period in the development of Translation Studies though, describing it as:

centuries of incidental and desultory attention from a scattering of authors, philologians, and literary scholars, plus here and there a theologian or an idiosyncratic linguist.

It is true that the translation theories from this period were not products of systematic academic endeavour, missing the vital “reality-checks” (Bortolotti 2008:22) any sound scientific discipline requires.

In contrast to Holmes’ comment (which may be described as undeservingly scathing about the historical translation commentators), Robinson (1997) presents a more enthusiastic view of this period. While conceding that translation theory is closely related to “historical contingencies and local ideological needs” (ibid.: xx), Robinson maintains that “translation theorists are also all reading each other, arguing with each other, misreading each other in their attempts to make sense of what they’re doing and why” (ibid.). As a result, an array of translation theories developed. In the discussion of this early development of translation theories, we must keep in mind the fact that in the pre-modern world there were limited means of communication apart from human contact and hand-written and printed media and that other natural, social or behavioural sciences did not exist, or were at a very primitive stage, so those scholars in and before the 19th century were not in a position to borrow scientific methodologies from neighbouring disciplines.

The main criticism of so-called (traditional) translation theories from this period is that they were not sufficiently based on scientific criteria to be called ‘theories’.
Philosophers of science may call traditional translation theories ‘metaphysics’, or ‘ethics’ about translation following a Logical Positivistic approach (Bortolotti 2008:5) or those with the Popperian approach may call them ‘pseudoscience’. From the perspectives of modern Translation Studies, Tymoczko (2007:17) prefers to call them “statements about translation” because they are written in “positive, declarative, and definitive terms” in contrast to modern approaches to translation, which are more “complex, open, and often indeterminate” (ibid.). Similarly, Rose (1997:15) prefers to call them “recommendations for adhering to accepted rhetorical practices as the recommender understands them” because they are “essentially a record of successive guides to pleasing literary taste”.

Nevertheless, as Bortolotti (2008:7) claims, in the long history of human investigations of natural phenomena (if we look at translation as a human act of translating as well as its end results, not just the text as a literary work), “the basis for the accepted theories was constituted mainly by thought experiments and unaided observations, and the contemporary distinction between science and philosophy was at best blurred.” If we observe the traditional translation theories (or statements about translation) from this perspective, the early period of humanistic translation theories should be accorded a value as a foundation for modern Translation Studies, providing ample insights about phenomena of translation.

Second stage: the post-war era

After World War II, a paradigm shift occurred in the discipline of (yet in a traditional form) Translation Studies in which scholars started to look at the problems of translation in a more logical way, rather than in a personal, authoritative or prescriptive manner, mainly by drawing on approaches from the discipline of linguistics.

Roman Jacobson is one of the first academics who brought a great shift in the paradigm of Translation Studies. In his influential paper, On Linguistic Aspects of Translation (1959/2004), Jacobson discussed translation in the international academic arena from the viewpoint of contrastive linguistics with a strong functional approach (Malmkjær 2005:13). He claimed that, just like the act of intralingual (same-language) translation can produce almost the same messages using linguistic strategies such as rewording or rephrasing, the act of interlingual translation (translation proper between different languages) can achieve the same purpose, maintaining a positive attitude to the act of translation as a possible activity (Tymoczko 2007). Unlike earlier scholars whose concerns were mainly the translatability of certain source texts,
Jacobson, in his functional approach, studied verbal communication in relation to six factors (the addresser, the addressee, the context, the message, the contact and the code) and three functions (the expressive/emotive, the conative, and referential/denotative/cognitive functions).

Catford is another scholar from the post-war period who contributed greatly to the development of modern Translation Studies, whose theory of translation is “one of the most thorough, systematic and well informed” (Malmkjær 2005:21). His approach is primarily linguistic, maintaining that “the theory of translation is essentially a theory of applied linguistics” (Catford 1965:19) and bases his theory on Halliday’s (1961) early version of systemic functional grammar. Catford explains translation procedures with reference to translation “shifts”, which are “departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL (source language) to the TL (target language) (Catford 1965:141)”, providing ample examples in a systematic method, using classification categories of extent, levels and ranks. Some academics criticise Catford’s theory because of his primarily linguistic approach, where he observes texts at a sentence level, providing only idealised and decontextualised examples (Munday 2008:61). Nevertheless, his contribution to modern Translation Studies is great and one can trace his influence in later works of other scholars. For example, Catford’s conceptualisation of translation equivalence paved the way later for Toury’s reconceptualisation of the notion of equivalence (Malmkjær 2005:21).

Nida, too, is a scholar who contributed to the paradigm shift in this period. He also adopts a linguistic approach in his programme, in his case, basing his approach on Chomsky’s generative view of languages. His major contribution to the discipline is that he introduced a sociological and communicative approach to the purely linguistic approach, shedding light on the factor of the audience and their reaction to the assessment of translation. Also, as the title of his famous monograph Toward a Science of Translation (1964) claims, he attempted to adopt a more scientific approach to Translation Studies although his attempt also attracted criticism (see below).

The linguistic approaches continued to be prominent in Translation Studies well into the 1990s alongside the development of linguistics in various directions such as text linguistics, discourse analysis and pragmatics. In this development a wide range of techniques and strategies were recommended and described, which have been extensively used by translation teachers and students.

Whether these linguistic approaches of the post-war era were purely scientific or not is, however, a matter of discussion. Saldanha (2008:149) disapproves of Nida’s approach because:

... his attempts at moving towards a ‘science’ of translation are
undermined by a prescriptive attitude that sometimes borders on the patronizing, frequent references to – and lack of definitions for – notions such as the ‘genius’ of language and ‘natural’ translation, and his insistence on the use of reader response as a measure of equivalence, particularly in the context of Bible translation, which seems to serve evangelical purposes rather than scientific interests.

Surveying the linguistic approaches of this period on the whole, Tymoczko (2007:37) is also negative about their scientific value, stating that, despite the dramatic shift in the paradigm in natural science, from positivism to postpositivism, translation scholars’ linguistic approaches in this era were still based on the “naïve, positivist, nineteenth-century views of science” (ibid.:37). Science had entered the postpositivism era in the mid-twentieth century, which was most notable in the work of, for instance, Einstein and Heisenberg in physics and Gödel in mathematics, but the science the translation scholars claimed in this era was, according to Tymoczko, out of date.

But Kuhn asserts that science is historically sensitive and whether a theory can be regarded scientific or not depends on the historical and social context of the project (Bortolotti, 2008). Chalmers (1982:27) also holds that “which facts are relevant and which are not relevant to a science will be relative to the current state of development of that science”. Although we have just looked at Tymoczko’s negative assessment of the scientific value of the linguistic approaches, she admits that the open quality of linguistics helped the questions of translation form more general theories and “without this move to generalization…the field of Translation Studies as we know it would not exist” (Tymoczko 2007:32). Passing a verdict on the scientific value of the approaches of translation scholars such as Jacobson, Catford and Nida is not the primary issue here, but given the analyses of what science is by philosophers of science such as Kuhn or Chalmers as above, the linguistic approaches of the post-war era should be regarded and valued to a certain degree as scientific efforts of that time, functioning as “essential antecedents to the emergence of descriptive translation studies” (Tymoczko 2007:40).

Third stage: the 1970s and beyond - the development of Descriptive Translation Studies

In the 1970s scholars started to make a conscious effort to raise the status of Translation Studies as a scientific field. As already mentioned in Section 1.1, in August 1972 Holmes presented what was going to be an influential paper The Name and Nature of Translation Studies (1972/1988, reprinted in 2004, which will be used for citation) to the Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics in Copenhagen and
this presentation is now widely regarded to be the first public announcement of Translation Studies as a scientific discipline. In this paper Holmes defined the objectives of Translation Studies as:

(1) to describe the phenomena of translating and translation(s) as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience, and (2) to establish general principles by means of which these phenomena can be explained and predicted (2004:184).

The discipline of Translation Studies entered the phase where scholars had built a communication field to test past translation theories, searching for empirical bases, doing (borrowing the term from Bortolotti again) “reality checks” (2008:22). The end result was the birth of a new paradigm of Descriptive Translation Studies, which was evidenced by Gideon Toury’s In Search of a Theory of Translation (1980) and James Holmes’ collection of essays Translated! (1988). Toury’s 1980 book formed the basis of his later monograph, Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond (1995), which I use for citation.

Toury (1995:16) maintains that hypotheses can be put to a real test “through studies into actual behaviour”. This stance challenged earlier studies of translation, say, Catford’s (1965) comparative linguistic studies, which tended to study decontextualised texts. Also, one of the characteristics of the paradigm shift to Descriptive Translation Studies is that the focus was shifted from a ST oriented view to a TT oriented view. As Toury (1995:29) states: “Translations are facts of target cultures”, scholars started to concentrate on studying TTs which are interpreted as a result of a TT context and culture. As a result, a wide range of new dimensions of translation have been brought in as observational targets, and at the same time, a wide range of methodologies and instruments of other scientific disciplines have been adopted into Translation Studies, including corpus studies, think-aloud protocol (TAP) studies, eye-tracking research, reception studies, methods from social sciences, etc, making the discipline an empirical science.

We have looked at the historical transformation of translation theories: the change from the humanistic statements to the theories of a scientific discipline. But then: is this transformation important? If so, for whom?

Of course the transformation is important for Translation Studies scholars because it has given us powerful tools for research into translation. But it is also important for decision-makers involved in any translation-related activities (be it project managers of translation companies, editors of translated books, and most importantly for the present study, translation teachers) as well as, at a higher political level, policy makers of national and international institutions.
Let us think of a situation regarding national education policy, for example. When a government is to set up a national policy of a primary-level literacy scheme, they would be most likely to consult the current most prevalent education theories. Without a scientific validation, spending a large sum of public money for education of the whole child population of the country would not be justified. In a similar way, the legal authorities would consult experts in behavioural science with regard to offenders’ behaviours when they decide on matters pertaining to prison management. The same knowledge may help the police decide the patrolling patterns of police officers. In this way, empirically-built theories are useful and desirable for decision-making in any institutions.

Would this situation apply to Translation Studies too? The answer is definitely ‘yes’. Theories should be consulted for implementation of better practices in translation education. The same is true for large international organisations such as the EU or commercial multi-national corporations where professional translators are employed. And if the theories are supported by empirical evidence, that would be better. However, whether theories are actually (and properly) consulted and utilised in practical situations relating to translation is not clear and I am rather sceptical about it. Nevertheless, the movement towards scientific rigorousness in research and theory building of translation has the advantage that it can provide valuable information to users who wish to make informed decisions.

1.2.6 Parameter No 6: Theories and their targets of observation

Another classification of theory can be done by examining what aspect of translation the observer investigates in building the theory. In his famous ‘map’ of Translation Studies (which is reproduced in Toury 1995:10), Holmes (1972/2004:184) posits that, under the descriptive branch of Translation Studies, there are product-oriented, process-oriented and function-oriented studies. So we can expect that those different branches of the discipline produce different types of theories because the targets of observation vary. Similarly, Fraser (1996) catalogues translation theories into product-oriented, competence-based and process-based theories. For Nida (2001), theories fall into categories based on whether they provide or are based on philological insights, linguistic insights or sociosemiotics. This relates to the paradigm to which the theory belongs, and subsequently what disciplinal principle and research method are to be used to build and support the theory.

4 In the area of oral translation (interpreting), the recent debacle regarding the outsourcing of interpreting service by the Ministry of Justice (House of Commons, 2012) provides a good example.
The consensus of what aspect of translation should be the target of research is most appropriate in the translation communities and academia at any given time has changed throughout history: in the nineteenth century and earlier, translation theories were mostly product- and competence-oriented according to Fraser’s classification and were mainly based on philological insights according to Nida’s. Since the 1980s academics have become increasingly interested in process-oriented theories, but these types of theories do not fall into any of Nida’s categories.

Setting up a categorisation system for translation theories according to the target of observation does not mean at all that any theory falls into one of the categories neatly. In a discussion about Holmes’s classification of descriptive studies of translation (i.e. product-oriented, process-oriented and function-oriented) Toury (1995:11) says, “To regard the three fields as autonomous, however, is a sure recipe for reducing individual studies to superficial descriptions” and “no explanatory hypothesis which is even remotely satisfactory can be formulated unless all three aspects are brought to bear on each other”.

1.3 Definition of theory for the present study

In this chapter I have attempted to classify translation theories using different parameters, which highlighted the fact that the definition of ‘theory’ in Translation Studies is fluid. Because the present study attempts to generate translators’ version of translation theory, it is important to decide at the beginning of the study what kind of accounts of translation are to be considered for that purpose because that decision delimits the scope of the study itself. Since the present study is to examine how translators explain their practice, it would be rational to adopt the position that any statement uttered by translators regarding translation is considered to be a target of observation in this study so that the observation will be most inclusive. This is because such a statement is expected to express an aspect of an underlying theory of translation which the utterer might be able to verbalise if asked enough questions. I will revisit this issue further in the methodology section in Chapter 4.
Chapter 2 Theory in pedagogical situations

Theories of translation are particularly visible in pedagogical situations as teaching of theory is part of the curriculum in many educational settings. This chapter will first look at the question of prescriptiveness of theory of translation, a big issue in translation pedagogy. It then discusses academics’ views on teaching theory in translation classes, as expressed in the translation studies literature. Finally it presents the results of a preliminary survey I conducted regarding the present situation of and teachers’ views on theory teaching.

2.1 Prescription versus description

The question of whether a theory should be used prescriptively or descriptively has been a bone of contention in Translation Studies.

In Can Theory Help Translators?: A Dialogue between the Ivory Tower and the Wordface (Chesterman & Wagner, 2002), the authors present an interesting debate on how theory can help practising translators. Each adopts a different position: Chesterman representing translation academics’ and Wagner representing practising translators’. The overriding nature of the discussion reflects a long-standing disagreement engendered from conflicting ideas about the nature of theories in Translation Studies. While academics think their job is to “construct a general conceptual map of the whole business” (ibid.:55), most translators “would be happy to have some concrete advice and guidelines, even doctrines, as long as they are practical and realistic” (ibid.:4). For the former, “the theory seeks to describe and explain the practice” (ibid.: preface) but the latter “look to the theory for guidance” (ibid.: preface)

Tymoczko (2007:17) reports that her translation students show a strong preference for traditional translation theories (i.e. the humanistic theories from the pre-war era) because those theories give them “ideas about how to translate” and they find it “gratifying to be given definite instructions about the process”, which Tymoczko herself is “amazed to hear”. As I indicated in Chapter 1, under the section of Parameter No 5, the main characteristics of traditional translation theories are that the discussions are overly concerned with the dichotomy of translation methods i.e. ‘word-for-word’ and ‘sense-for-sense’, and also that the statements are subjective, biased by the commentator’s personal experiences and observations of translation. In Robinson’s terms (1997:xix) they are “authoritarian” and “prescriptive”. Any translation educator would probably be able to understand or even feel sympathetic that translation students are keen to study those traditional theories because of those prescriptive
attributes.

The inclination to prescriptiveness in translation theories can be observed not only among students and translators, but among some translation scholars too. Nida (2001:107), for instance, states:

... there are several theories in the broad sense of ‘a set of principles that are helpful in understanding the nature of translating or in establishing criteria for evaluating a particular translated text’

He further says that “these principles are stated in terms of how to produce an acceptable translation” (ibid.). This concept of theory is close to that of typical students: the kind of criterion by which translations are to be evaluated by teachers. In this sense, his notion of ‘dynamic equivalence’ translation (Nida, 1964) can be comfortably interpreted as a set of principles which professional translators can adopt in their actual practices for the purpose of quality evaluation, but according to the definitions we discussed in Chapter 1 (in ‘Theories and strategies’ section), this notion falls into the category of ‘method’ rather than ‘theory’.

The concept that translation theory provides guidelines for translators is epitomized by Newmark (1981:19) in the following comment: “translation theory’s main concern is to determine appropriate translation methods”. Newmark seems to be frustrated by the state of translation theories because:

From the point of view of the translator, any scientific investigation, both statistical and diagrammatic (some linguists and translation theorists make a fetish of diagrams, schemas and models), of what goes on in the brain (mind? nerves? cells?) during the process of translating is remote and at present speculative” (Newmark 1988:21).

According to Toury (1995:17), this kind of frustration is to do with the role of Translation Studies as a scientific discipline as “it is no concern of a scientific discipline ... to effect changes in the world of our experience”. For him, translation theory’s job is not to “determine appropriate translation methods” as Newmark (1981:19) suggests. Toury admits that one can quite possibly draw conclusions from theoretical reasoning to actual behaviour in a context of, for instance, translator training or translation criticism, but he adamantly insists that it is not the translation theorists’ job to do so, but the practitioners’. Toury means here by ‘practitioners’ people such as translation critics, teachers of translation and translation planners, but not practicing translators (and presumably they do not include translation students either), and he condemns those practitioners for often “blam[ing] the ‘theory’ for their own blunders in the ‘practice’” (ibid.:17).

Although not as hostile-sounding as Toury, Gile (2010) also gives a defensive account of why translation scholars are shy of providing prescriptive theories, claiming
that it is scholars’ job (or at least for those who adopt empirical methodologies in their research) to be sceptical and cautious about any hypotheses until they are attested. If they fail to take on this attitude and make prescriptive statements, they would be criticised in the Translation Studies communities. The scholars’ role is “to explore, to describe and to compare” (ibid:253).

The descriptive attitude has been the mainstream approach in modern Translation Studies since the 1980s and Scarpa, Musacchio and Palumbo (2009) point out that this attitude is partly responsible for the current divide between theory and practice. Because of academics’ inclination to maintain a descriptive position in their research they are willing to interact only with descriptive or pure theories. As a result, applied theories, which cover issues such as translation education or guidelines on translation – the kinds of issues directly relevant to practitioners – do not receive much attention, leaving practitioners out of central discussions in Translation Studies. In addition, Scarpa et al. (ibid.) emphasise that most scholars are not practitioners themselves, which pushes their research towards description and pure theory, relegating Applied Translation Studies to the position of a second-class citizen. Hoping to correct this bias, Scarpa et al. (ibid.: 39-40) call for the introduction of ”a new type of prescription” which ”present[s] the students with descriptive norms based on solid empirical evidence drawn from professional translations but in a critical and, ultimately, prescriptive way, i.e. also offering practical solutions to translation problems”. If this new approach of what Scarpa et al. call ”activist translation pedagogy” (ibid.: 39) becomes prevalent, the gap in attitude towards theory between the academia and practitioners/students may be narrowed.

2-2 Why teach theory?

Discussions about the legitimacy of teaching theory in translation education are rife in existing literature, providing a large number of opinions expressed by academics. The list below illustrates some examples of reasons provided by academics as to why theory should be taught in translation classes:

1) They give translators more choices when generating translation./ They make creative translators. (Pym 2010; Calzada Pérez 2004; Klaudy 2003; Hörmann 1992; Baker 1992;)
2) They help translators with their decision-making in selecting the best solution. (Adab, 2000; Bartrina, 2005; Calzada Pérez, 2004; Hanna, 2009; Lederer, 2007; Pym, 2010; Schäffner, 2000; Tennent, 2005a; Zhu, 2002)
3) They make the training process efficient and speedy. (Gile, 1995; Klaudy, 2003; Lederer, 2007; Schjoldager, 2008; Zhu, 2002)
4) They give translators a common metalanguage. (Hörmann, 1992; Nord, 2005; Pym, 2010)
5) They give translators explanatory power. (Adab, 2000; Bartrina, 2005; Gile, 1995; Hörmann, 1992; Nord, 2005; Schjoldager, 2008)
6) They promote consistency in translation assessment. (Fawcett, 1998; Klaudy, 2003; Tennent, 2005a)
8) They help make predictions. (Chesterman in Chesterman & Arrojo 2000)
9) They provide guidelines for teachers. (Zhu, 2002)
10) They provide tools for observing and checking one’s own progress. (Chesterman, 1997; Zhu, 2002)
12) They give translators a better professional image. (Baker 1992; Klaudy 2003; Schjoldager 2008; Pym, 2010)
13) They make translators confident. (Baker, 1992; Kussmaul, 1995)
14) They empower translators. (Calzada Pérez, 2004; Chesterman & Arrojo, 2000; Gentzler, 2001; Lederer, 2007; Tymoczko, 2007)

It is not surprising that there are so many different justifications for the claim that theory is useful in teaching translation since teachers of translation in universities are almost all academics: they would naturally stress the value of their own trade, i.e. theorisation of translation.

We should also note that, although the list presents only positive aspects of teaching theories in translation classes, there exist a variety of, and sometimes conflicting, opinions within those views. For example, Calzada Pérez (2004) claims that teaching different kinds of theories is beneficial because, being given a number of choices, the students can learn to choose the best solution from the choices and this ability will develop the students into capable translators (points 1) and 2) in the list). On the other hand, Lederer (2007:18) argues that “the aim of training courses is to avoid would-be translators having to learn slowly by trial and error while looking for the most adequate strategies, and to offer them shortcuts to competence”. Lederer herself chooses “basic explanations of the mental operations” and “context-sensitive linguistics” (ibid.:19), or sense theory, as a theory that fits the bill. Englund Dimitrova (2005) presents a different perspective, stressing the importance of teachers’, not of students’, learning different theories of translation to support their teaching.

In addition, we should remember that the above list presents merely what translation scholars think are the reasons why theories are useful when taught in translator training. Although a large volume of anecdotal accounts as to how translation may be best taught can be found in a fairly large number of publications dedicated to translation pedagogy (Dollerup & Appel, 1996; Dollerup & Lindegaard, 1994; Dollerup & Loddegaard, 1992; Hung, 2002; Malmkjær, 2004; Schäffner & Adab, 2000; Tennent, 2005b), these claims have not yet been empirically tested and it is
uncertain if translators who know theories work better than those without (Pym 2010:4-5).

Further, the discussion about the use of theory in translation training tends to have a dichotomous nature: theory is something one can either use or not in teaching (for this kind of discussion, see e.g. Lederer 2007; Calzada Pérez 2004; Chesterman & Wagner 2002). However, this is an odd presumption, and the reason for it is obvious if we think of how theories are produced. Theories are not produced only by translation scholars. “Translators are theorizing all the time” (Pym 2010:1) too when they translate. While translating, translators constantly think “what translation is and how it should be carried out” (ibid.) and that is internal theorising within the translator’s mind. Those ideas become formed into more formal theories when they are explicitly discussed between the translator, his/her colleagues, clients, translation scholars or any persons who have a stake in the undertaking and, even better, if defended. So, even when the translator him/herself is not conscious of the internal thinking about translation, he/she is actually using a theory (be it his/her own or an authoritative one). Likewise, “[a]ll teachers of translation are in effect basing their individual teaching on one or more theoretical concepts of translations” (Calzada Pérez 2004:128). In addition, “[t]ranslation teaching is necessarily based on a number of theoretical assumptions (whether explicit or not) about what translation is and how it is done.” (Lederer 2007:17) and “[a]ny translation choice, any translation judgement reveals a theoretical position.” (Bartrina 2005:178). So, by teaching how to translate (in whatever ways), teachers (or perhaps I should say good teachers) are teaching the theory behind the practice too. Then, what should be discussed really is not whether to teach theory or not, but whether to teach the theory overtly or covertly to achieve effective teaching. If we adopt this point of view, the dichotomous discussion of whether to teach theory or not seems futile.

Vienne (2000) reports a clear example of teaching practice where the teacher teaches translation without mentioning a name of any theoretical notion while basing the teaching firmly on a translation theory (in this case, skopos theory). Vienne maintains that the first important step for a translator when taking on a translation assignment is to assess the translation situations. In order to implement this principle, Vienne recommends providing the students with a checklist for analysing the translation situation which includes not only the ST situations but also TT situations such as “who wants to send what to whom for what purpose through which media and at what time and place” (ibid.:93). This principle of analysis is obviously compatible with that of skopos theory although Vienne does not teach the principle as a piece of theory as such to the students. The main aim of the class is to heighten the students’
Awareness of the issue covered by the theory, but not to teach the theory per se.

As Shreve rightly points out:

A translation pedagogy without a theoretical basis will be a blind pedagogy. It will fail to set reasonable objectives, will be unable to create and apply methods appropriate to the learning task, will be unable to measure and evaluate results, and will ultimately fail to create the effective translators our society increasingly demands (In Forward of Kiraly 1995:x).

This statement raises two issues. One is the question of which theory should be used as the basis of the teaching. The other is the question of how to apply the theory to the teaching. The issue of application is beyond the scope of the present discussion but the next section will focus on the former issue – theories behind teaching.

2.3 Which theories are actually taught?

Having discussed (conceptually and inconclusively) the nature and role of theory in translator training, our attention moves to the question, “what theories are being taught in actual translation courses?” The survey conducted by Ulrych (2005) provides, as far as I am aware, the only comprehensive data available on what kind of theories are taught currently in translator education in the Western world (i.e. Europe and North America). Ulrych conducted a questionnaire survey of the most up-to-date situations in translator training programmes including the structure of the institutions and the content of the programmes. Forty-one higher-education institutions took part in the survey. One of the questions asked was specifically about use of theories in translation classes and 92% of the participant institutions answered that they integrate theoretical components in their training programmes. Furthermore, what is of special interest is the kind of approach the institutions adopt in selecting the theories to be taught. The results are:

- a linguistic approach 95%
- a functional approach 90%
- a cultural studies approach 85%
- a descriptive translation studies approach 85%
- a comparative literary approach 57%
- a gender studies approach 28%
- a postcolonial approach 7%
- a socio-historical approach 3%

(Ulrych, 2005)

These results are interesting in that, apart from a gender studies approach (28%), a postcolonial approach (7%) and a socio-historical approach (3%), five different
approaches are adopted by more than half of the institutions. This means that quite a
large proportion of institutions take more than one approach, possibly up to five
different ones (i.e. linguistic, functional, cultural studies, descriptive translation
studies and comparative literary approaches). Two reasons can be thought of for this
manifold approach to theory teaching. These institutions may believe that it is to
students’ benefit to learn many different theories so that they have more choices when
discussing translation and applying theory to their translation practice, eventually
helping them become better translators, a point maintained by e.g Calzada Pérez
(2004) and Bartrina (2005). On the other hand, it may be simply because the
programme is taught by academics who teach topics of their own research interests
regardless of the pedagogical benefit the theory can offer in the professional life of
translators, and the research interests of academic staff happen to encompass different
paradigms of translation. Whatever the reason, it is noteworthy that the variety of
theories being taught in institutions is extremely broad. It is even more intriguing that
two paradigms (the empirical, descriptive approach and the cultural studies approach,
which I discussed in Chapter 1) are both taught widely (both 85% of all the modules).
Also, the survey did not investigate how those theoretical components are actually
included in the curricula and Ulrych admits that “[f]urther investigations are needed to
address the problem of how best to integrate a course of translation theory within the
curriculum.” (ibid.:20). In addition, Ulrych’s survey raises the question: “Which
theories are actually taught in the institutions?” This question will be dealt with in the
following section.

The survey conducted for the present thesis

Between June and August 2011 I conducted a survey using an on-line survey
service, SurveyMonkey. Prospective respondents’ email addresses were found on the
institutions’ websites and the survey request was sent to all the teaching staff whose
profiles mentioned some activity related to translation, which ranged from practical
translation classes to more specific, academic activities such as research in
comparative literature to computational linguistics. Some institutions’ websites do not
clarify their staff’s exact teaching responsibilities, which may have resulted in some
cases where a survey request was sent to faculty staff or academics who do not teach
translation at all. Some of these people replied to inform me of that and these people
were excluded from the final figures. The survey was sent to 234 teachers at 30
universities in the UK and the Republic of Ireland and 93 responses were collected
(response rate: 39.7%).
After a pilot survey with three university teachers at different ranks, the wordings of the questions had been adjusted to produce the final survey. The main purpose of the survey was to establish the following two points.

1 What theories are taught in university translation programmes?
2 What are the teachers’ views about teaching translation theories? (Are the academics’ views expressed in the literature supported by front-line teachers?)

Question 1 asked the respondents about their status in the institution. They were asked to choose an appropriate option out of six possibilities or specify a job title if none of the options applied. Twelve respondents specified their titles. In the analysis, those titles that were obviously equivalent to one of the options were included in that option, but some were left in the “other” category (e.g. language director, programme director, senior university tutor, part-time lecturer, visiting lecturer).

![What is your academic title?](image)

Figure 1 Question 1: Academic titles

The result shows that more than 80% of the respondents hold academic posts in the institutions and more than half of all the respondents hold higher academic posts (Senior Lecturer, Reader and Professor). It is likely that the higher their status is, the more academic in nature their teaching responsibility will be. A teacher with a high academic status will probably also reflect his/her research interest in his/her teaching.

On the other hand, what this survey is partly interested in is the views of those non-academic staff who teach translation in their capacity of being experienced professional translators but not necessarily trained academically in Translation Studies. Those people are assumed to fall into the categories of Tutors or Teaching Fellow, but they account for only 17% of all respondents. There may be two reasons for
the low figure. First, they may have received the survey request but were discouraged from taking part in the survey because of a sentence in the request letter, namely:

“The purpose of the survey is to identify what theories of translation are being used in the current translation training environment in the UK and the Republic of Ireland as well as translation teachers'/scholars’ views on them.”

When a prospective respondent reads this paragraph, those who do not teach theories may consider themselves not eligible for this survey or lose interest in participating in it. The second possible reason is simply that non-academic staff account for a small proportion of the institutions’ teaching.

Question 2 asked what modules the respondents teach. This could be at MA, BA or a diploma level. They were asked to choose all applicable options.

The outcome reveals that more than half the respondents (56%) teach a theoretical module/modules. Because the respondents were allowed to choose multiple answers, the raw data were analysed to establish what proportion of the respondents teach a theoretical module/modules or a practical translation module/modules only. Here, the item “Literary Translation” complicated the analysis since the answer does not specify whether the respondent teaches literary criticism or production of literary translation. Therefore, only the items “Audio Visual Translation”, “Other Professional
Translation”, and “Translation Technology” were included to establish the number of respondents who teach at least one practical translation module, which turned out to be 66 (71%). Out of this figure, 33 (or 35% of all respondents) teach a theoretical module/modules also. Seventeen respondents (18%) teach a theoretical module/modules but not a practical module.

Question 3 asked whether the respondents teach translation theories. The exact wording of the question was:

“Do you teach translation theories or related theories (e.g. linguistics theory, literary theories) in your modules? [NB] This can take a form of either or both of the following two situations: 1) To teach theories in a theoretical component of the course. 2) To teach necessary theories alongside practical translation exercises to support the learning. If you teach practical translation without mentioning translation theories per se to the students but base the translation exercises on certain theories, then please answer ‘No’ and go to Q5.”

The question was devised in order to give respondents sufficient contexts to enable them to answer the question. As ‘translation theories’ can cover a variety of notions depending on the definition (see Chapter 1), the question attempted to provide some clarification of the notion of translation theory. The outcome shows that nearly 80% of the respondents teach translation theory in the classes.

Do you teach translation theory?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 Question 3: Teach theory or not

Question 4 intended to investigate what theories are taught by the 72 respondents who answered “yes” to Question 3. The question listed 33 names of theories and theoretical notions and asked the respondents to choose all that they teach. The list was limited to 33 items which are thought to be mainstream notions in Translation Studies because an excessively extensive list might discourage the respondents from continuing to answer. Therefore, the respondents were asked to specify any other theories they teach if they were not on the list.
Out of the 33 items, five represented dichotomous notions of so-called literal versus free translation. I discussed these notions in the previous chapter as ‘translation methods’ rather than ‘theories’, thus those five items will be presented first, separate from other items which the present study regards as theory (or theoretical notions) of translation.

What translation method do you teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domesticating vs. foreignising</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic vs. formal equivalence</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic vs. communicative</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt vs. covert translation</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary vs. instrumental</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 Question 4·1 Translation methods taught

The results of the rest of the items (27 items) are shown in the following figure:
**What theories do you teach?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>skopos theory (Vermeer, Nord)</td>
<td>83.3% (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text type analysis (Reiss)</td>
<td>70.8% (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discourse analysis (e.g. Hatim and Mason)</td>
<td>68.1% (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>register (&quot;field, tenor, mode&quot;) (Halliday)</td>
<td>55.6% (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>norm theory (Toury, Chesterman)</td>
<td>52.8% (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translation shifts (Catford)</td>
<td>51.4% (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translation universals (Baker and many others)</td>
<td>48.6% (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polysystem (Even-Zohar)</td>
<td>48.6% (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translation procedures (Vinay and Darbelnet)</td>
<td>47.2% (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theme and rHEME (Halliday)</td>
<td>43.1% (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postcolonialism (e.g. Bassnett)</td>
<td>40.3% (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender studies (e.g. Chamberlain)</td>
<td>38.9% (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patronage (Lefevere)</td>
<td>33.3% (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linguistic relativity (Sapir &amp; Whorf)</td>
<td>30.6% (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>langue vs. parole (Saussure)</td>
<td>29.2% (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grice’s maxims (Grice)</td>
<td>29.2% (Ph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevance theory (Gutt; Sperber and Wilson)</td>
<td>29.2% (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laws of translation (Toury)</td>
<td>29.2% (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translatorial action theory (Holz-Mañtäri)</td>
<td>27.8% (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speech act theory (Searle)</td>
<td>27.8% (Ph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after life (Walter Benjamin)</td>
<td>25.0% (Ph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>componential analysis (Katz and Fodor; Nida)</td>
<td>19.4% (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deconstruction (Derrida)</td>
<td>19.4% (Ph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functional sentence perspective (The Prague School)</td>
<td>12.5% (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theory of sense/ deverbalization (Seleskovitch)</td>
<td>9.7% (NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radical translation (Quine; Davidson)</td>
<td>8.3% (Ph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transformational-generative grammar (Chomsky)</td>
<td>6.9% (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenes-and-frames (Fillmore; Snell Hornby)</td>
<td>6.9% (L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5** Question 4.2: Theories and theoretical notions taught

The letters in brackets represent the orientation of each notion.

(L) A linguistic approach
(F) A functional approach
(D) A descriptive translation studies approach
(C) A cultural studies approach
(Ph) A philosophical approach

Ulrych’s (2005) classification is used as a basis of the classification, but it has been simplified by merging “comparative literary approach”, “a gender studies approach” and “a postcolonial approach” into “a cultural studies approach” category. At the same time I added another category of “a philosophical approach”, which covers both continental and analytical philosophies. “Theory of sense/deverbalization” was the
only notion which did not fit into any of the category.

Twenty-four respondents provided free answers as to what other theories they teach. Among them, the item which was mentioned most often was the sociological approach (seven respondents or 10%, of which six mentioned Bourdieu). Theories concerning process studies of translation and narrative theory were mentioned by three respondents each (4%). For narrative theory, two mentioned Baker. Two respondents (3%) mentioned minority culture and globalisation (and both respondents mentioned Cronin), ethics of translation and queer studies of translation (and both mentioned Harvey). There are also other notions in the free answer section but they were mentioned by just one respondent each.

What we can conclude from the results are:

- Skopos theory is taught by 83.3% of the respondents, which is in accordance with Ulrych’s survey (a functional approach: 90%).
- Contrary to Ulrych’s survey results which indicate that 85% of the institutions teach theories of a cultural studies approach, theories with a cultural studies approach (i.e. postcolonialism, gender studies, patronage) did not score high in this survey (between 33.3% and 40.3%).
- Although skopos theory is the most commonly taught theory (by 83.3%), a much lower proportion of the respondents (37.5%) use its associated terms “documentary vs instrumental translation” while 87.5% use the terms “domesticating vs foreignising translation”. This is odd because the latter set of terms originally come from Venuti’s (1995) ideologically laden notion of translation, which would be more suitable for discussing issues with a cultural studies approach.

Question 5 was aimed at respondents who said they do not teach theories in their translation classes (22 respondents in total). It asked them why they do not teach theories.
Why do you not teach theories in your translation class?

The module does not require the students to learn theories of translation. 63.6%
I do not mention theories per se to students, but base my teaching of practical translation on certain theories. 31.8%
I want to teach theories, but there is not enough time to do so in the modules I teach. 9.1%
I do not think learning theories helps students improve their translation skills. 9.1%
My students do not like studying theories. 4.5%
Teaching theories discourages my students to attend the class. 0.0%

Figure 6 Question 5: Reason for not teaching theories

The most common answer was that they do not teach translation theory because the module does not require them to do so. Two points are worth noting here. First, according to these answers, it is not because of a negative reason that some teachers do not teach theories (e.g. “I do not think learning theories helps students improve their translation skills” – 9.1% or two respondents; “My students do not like studying theory – 4.5% or one respondent), but rather they seem not to teach theory for sheer administrative reason (“The module does not require the students to learn theories of translation” – 63.6%). Second, a relatively small proportion of them (31.8% or seven respondents) consciously underpin their teaching with some kind of theory although they do not teach it explicitly.

Question 6 asked the respondents to rate statements about teaching theory in translation classes. The exact question stated “Some translation academics advocate explicit use of translation theories in translation classes. The following statements are some examples which explain the reason why they advocate it. Please rate all the statements according to how strongly you disagree or agree.” The respondents rated the statements with either “I strongly disagree”, “I disagree”, “I agree” or “I strongly agree”. Eighty-eight respondents answered this question. The scale points, -1, -0.5, 0.5
and 1 were assigned to the answers respectively to produce a rating average. The choice, “I don’t know” was not given any scale point. The statements were devised from existing literature, mainly from that reviewed in Chapter 1.

How strongly do you agree with the statement?
(Rating Average between -1 to 1)

They help translators be aware of translation-related matters. 0.73
They help translators in explaining their translation. 0.67
They help translators with their decision-making when there are more than one solution for a translation. 0.66
They give translators a common metalanguage. 0.51
They give translators more creative choices when generating translations. 0.49
They help make predictions about influences and effects the translation has. 0.44
They help translators in their confidence. 0.39
They help systematise translation practices. 0.34
They empower translators. 0.32
They give translators a better professional image. 0.23
They promote consistency in translation assessment. 0.12
They provide guidelines on how to translate. 0.11
They make the training process efficient and speedy. 0.03

Figure 7 Question 6: How strongly teachers agree with positive statements about theory teaching
The result shows that all statements but one ("They make the training process efficient and speedy.") received positive rating averages, confirming that almost all statements derived from the literature are, on average, supported by front-line teachers to varying degrees. The results also confirm that translation teachers tend to agree with the prevailing view in the literature that theories are for explaining, not guiding. The statement “They help translators in explaining their translation” scored a rating average of 0.73, while the statement “They provide guidelines on how to translate” received merely a rating average of 0.11, but at least it did not get a negative score. However, a quick conclusion that teachers think theory is for explaining, not for guiding, cannot be drawn since the following two statements both received a positive score:

- They help translators with their decision-making when there are more than one solution for a translation. (Rating average of 0.66)
- They give translators more creative choices when generating translations. (0.49)

The role of theory described in these statements can be interpreted as a kind of guiding role in the process of translating. Therefore, it may be fair to deduce that translation teachers do find a certain value in the guiding property of theory, but have an aversion to the expressions “guideline” or “guiding”.

The only statement which was given a negative score is “They make the training process efficient and speedy”. This is interesting because it suggests that translation teachers do not see theory as something which facilitates their own teaching, i.e. something which makes their life easier.

Question 7 asked the respondents how strongly they agree or disagree with five statements, which describe the reasons why translation theories are not necessarily useful in translation classes. The statements describe mostly the students’ negative attitude to learning theory. The statements were devised from literature on students’ attitude towards theory learning (e.g. Hanna 2009) as well as from my own impressions from the experience of teaching translation.

The results are again presented in rating averages from -1 (strongly disagree) to 1 (strongly agree).
Figure 8 Question 7: How strongly teachers agree with negative statements about theory teaching

Not surprisingly, all statements received a negative score. In addition, and more interestingly, these statements seem to have played devil’s advocate to elicit respondents’ views on theory teaching in the free answer section. The question asked the respondents to give a free answer if they had any other opinions about the issue. Twenty respondents provided free answers, 13 of which expressed an opinion about the link between theory and practice. What follows are some examples:

- Students should also be made aware of the link to practice.
- Essentially, it depends on the theory as to whether they can be directly applied – students soon learn to distinguish the strengths and weaknesses and to apply the general concepts (such as skopos) without necessarily embracing the theory wholesale.
- As long as theory is applied to practice, my experience is that students profit from it immensely and most enjoy it.
- What is needed is good, fresh, contemporary examples that go along even with the most 'difficult' approaches (and possibly using humour as a coaxing and memory-boosting technique).
- It is the skill of the trainer to be able to engage students in the theoretical ideas in a way that makes sense to them and their practice.
- It is the professional translators who have extensive practical experience who are most appreciative of the added
• value and the improvement that knowledge of theory brings to their practice.

These answers indicate that the respondents believe the value of theory teaching very much depends on the way it is taught. This reminds us of Ulrych’s (2005:20) statement: “Further investigations are needed to address the problem of how best to integrate a course of translation theory within the curriculum” (ibid.:20). The question of ‘how’ is not within the scope of the current research, but the question is worth investigating at another opportunity because, judging from the free answers, the respondents seem to have many good ideas about how to teach theories effectively.

The results of this questionnaire, particularly the ranking of commonly-taught theories and theoretical notions, will be compared with professional translators’ theorisation patterns later in the study.
Chapter 3 Translators' knowledge of translation and their capacity to theorise translation

This chapter discusses issues related to translators' knowledge of translation and their capacity to theorise translation, focusing on the methods and methodologies used to measure this knowledge and this capacity. First, eight sets of studies (and one report summarising two of them) using four different kinds of methods are reviewed. In the review of one of them (reported mainly in PACTE 2008 with a supplemented report in Neunzig & Kuznik 2007), the results of a replication study with a group of translators with the language combination of English and Japanese are presented too.

3-1 The issue of measurement

In Chapter 2, the review of literature on the benefit of teaching theory in translation classes revealed that most discussions offered by Translation Studies scholars, who are often also translation teachers, are based on either conceptual notions or anecdotal and speculative accounts (or both). The lack of empirical evidence is clear, which is partly because of the lack of empirical instruments for measuring translators' or students' knowledge of translation theory (Orozco & Hurtado Albir, 2002; PACTE, 2003).

Empirical testing is difficult because we face some fundamental question at the very outset of the inquiry: “How can we measure knowledge of translation in a translator’s mind?” “How do we know whether the translators are explaining their knowledge of translation accurately?” Knowledge is invisible and imperceptible unless it is represented using language. The investigator, therefore, needs to measure their subjects' knowledge through some sort of instrument, or have them present their knowledge through language.

What we normally call ‘theories’ and ‘theoretical notions’ in academia (and what are normally taught in translation classes) are a systematically organised body of beliefs and explanations about translation composed by scholars and they are always represented in language, whether in a written or verbal form. However, even if a translator is familiar with a translation theory of this kind, or he/she performs their professional practice in line with the content of the translation theory, the translator may not overtly express it using language.

In educational settings the most common method of testing students’ knowledge of translation or translation theory is written assessment, either in the form of an annotated translation or an essay or dissertation. But these are just a few examples of
testing knowledge of translation which are specifically used in educational settings. This section will review what methods are used to test translators' knowledge of translation and/or their capacity to theorise translation in research in Translation Studies and what results have been achieved so far.

A review of literature identified eight studies of this kind, which are categorised below by the type of instrument used: questionnaire, observation of textual features of translation and written and verbal protocols. The following sections will review these studies, before discussing the epistemological issues they raise and their implications for the present study.

3.2 Empirical studies on knowledge of translation and capacity to theorise translation
3.2.1 Studies using a questionnaire


Process studies of translation have developed rapidly since the late 1980s and one major domain of such research has been the measurement of competence of translators. In this research paradigm, knowledge of translation theory has never been a mainstream research object (maybe due to operational difficulty which I will discuss in this chapter), but it has received some attention as part of studies on translation competence in which such knowledge is relevant.

The PACTE Group (Process of Acquisition of Translation Competence and Evaluation: Principal researcher, Amparo Hurtado Albir) at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona has been carrying out holistic, empirical-experimental research into translation competence (TC) and its acquisition in written translation since 1998. Having acknowledged that only a very limited amount of empirical research has been carried out on TC and that there is a lack of methods and instruments for examining TC and its acquisition, the project was set up with the aim of building a reliable model of TC (the 1st phase of the study, which has been finished and published in PACTE 2011) and ultimately of devising a method of investigating TC acquisition processes (the 2nd phase).

First I outline the theoretical framework of the project (PACTE 2011: 2009: 2005: 2003: 2002) and then review a particular part of the project, i.e. a questionnaire study for measuring people’s knowledge about translation (PACTE 2008, Neunzig and
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5 A comprehensive review of the past research on translation competence is offered in Orozco and Hurtado Albir (2002) and Göpferich and Jääskeläinen (2009).
Kuznik 2007). The overall results of the questionnaire study were published in PACTE (2008) but in a simplified form due presumably to space limitation and to its role as a feeding component to the main study. For the purpose of the present study Neunzig and Kuznik (2007) is of greater interest because, although it is published in German only, it reports the detailed process of the making of the questionnaire including the stage where the researchers recognised a fault with the design and redressed it.

The PACTE model postulates that TC is expert knowledge, which is categorical or abstract and has a wide knowledge base. It is also conscious and can be made explicit but is organized in complex structures. Basing the concept on Anderson's (2000) work on cognitive psychology, competence is understood to comprise of declarative knowledge (knowing what) and procedural knowledge (knowing how). Declarative knowledge is easily verbalized and is acquired by being exposed to information and its use is normally controlled, whereas procedural knowledge is difficult to verbalize and is acquired through practice and its use is mainly automatic. The PACTE group believes that, when translating, the latter is predominant.

In the first phase of the study, data have been collected on both the translation process (when translating from L1 to L2 as well as from L2 to L1) and the translation product involving six language combinations: Spanish and Catalan as source languages and English, French and German as target languages. Two groups of subjects were used: professional translators and language teachers. The methods used included: monitoring with user monitoring software, direct observation, retrospective and guided TAP (Think-Aloud Protocol), questionnaires and retrospective interviews. PACTE's TC model comprises the following five sub-competences as well as psycho-physiological components (PACTE 2011):

- Bilingual sub-competence. Predominantly procedural knowledge about how to communicate in two languages.
- Extra-linguistic sub-competence. Predominantly declarative knowledge comprising general world knowledge, domain-specific knowledge, bicultural and encyclopaedic knowledge.
- Knowledge about translation sub-competence. Predominantly declarative knowledge about translation and aspects of the profession.
- Instrumental sub-competence. Predominantly procedural knowledge related to the use of documentation resources and technologies.
- Strategic sub-competence. Procedural knowledge to guarantee the efficiency of the translation process and solve problems encountered. This sub-competence serves to control the translation process.
- Psycho-physiological components. Cognitive and attitudinal components
and psycho-motor mechanisms such as memory, perception, attention and emotion or attitudinal aspects.

![Figure 9 PACTE's TC model](image)

One of the important characteristics of this model is that those sub-competences are not presented as a list of competences as in other studies, but are presented and studied as factors which interact with each other to produce the holistic TC.

For the purpose of the present study, the definition of the 'knowledge about translation' sub-competence (shaded in the diagram above) and how it is measured are of special interest. PACTE defines the ‘knowledge about translation’ sub-competence as:

“Predominantly declarative knowledge, both implicit and explicit, about translation and aspects of the profession. It comprises knowledge about how translation functions and knowledge about professional translation practice.” (PACTE, 2011:33)

This sub-competence is measured by a variable called “knowledge about translation” (somewhat confusing as it has the same name as the sub-competence), which is measured quantitatively through a questionnaire.

The initial design of the questionnaire and preliminary tests

The questionnaire is designed to measure the subject’s opinions of the concepts.
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6 Orozco and Hurtado Albir (2002:375) offer a comprehensive list of such studies. For instance, Hatim and Mason (1997:205-206) define ‘translator abilities’ to be a set of abilities comprising ‘ST processing skills’ ‘transfer skills’ and ‘TT processing skills’. Each skill set comprises sub-skills such as ‘recognizing intertextuality’ ‘locating situationality’ etc.. Hatim and Mason state that “the categories overlap and the items listed are mutually influential” (ibid.:205), but empirical examination is not offered.
of translation and translation competence, covering seven factors: 1) translation units; 2) translation problems; 3) phases in the translation process; 4) methodology required; 5) procedures used; 6) the role of the translation brief; and 7) the role of the target reader.

First of all, a pool of statements covering the above mentioned factors was generated by PACTE’s research members. The members were chosen for this task because they are ‘experts’ of translation (Neunzig & Kuznik, 2007). Out of these statements, those that lack clarity were eliminated following criteria of item theory (e.g. ones in a double-negative sentence; ones using words such as ‘quite’ ‘often’; ones in meta-language such as ‘a communicative-dynamic method’).

Then, the scale level was decided on a four-point Likert scale with the answer choices of ‘I strongly disagree’, ‘I disagree’, ‘I agree’ and ‘I strongly agree’. A forced choice method was chosen to avoid respondents’ tendency to lean towards the choice of ‘neither agree nor disagree’.

With the initial set of questions, a pre-test was carried out among 36 professional translators and 24 language teachers (both groups were paid for participation) and other research group members to judge the validity of the questions. The distribution and standard deviation of the results were used as a base for the judgement and the results showed that the set of questions was appropriate. Then another test was carried out with 35 fourth-year students of Translation Studies, whose results showed that some questions generated answers with an abnormal distribution and standard deviation (i.e. the distribution was bimodal, too small or too large). Those questions were eliminated, leaving 36 statements.

Each of these 36 statements represented one of two ways of thinking about translation: ‘dynamic’ or ‘static’. The notion of ‘dynamic translation’ is understood to be translation which is textual, communicative and functional and is in line with theoretical models of dynamic translation (Nida, 1964), functional translation (Nord, 1991; Reiss & Vermeer, 1984), interpretive theory of translation (Seleskovitch 1968; Seleskovitch & Lederer 1984) and communicative translation (Hatim & Mason 1990). The latter (static translation) is defined as linguistic and literal.

With the questionnaire with 36 statements, a preliminary test was carried out with three translators and three foreign language teachers to confirm the suitability of the subjects. Each answer was given a numerical value from 0 to 3 (I strongly disagree = 0; I disagree = 1, I agree = 2, I strongly disagree = 3) and a ‘dynamic index’ was calculated using an equation: Σ dynamic points - Σ static points. Here, ‘dynamic points’ represents the points assigned to dynamic statement items and ‘static points’ the points assigned to static statements. The results showed that all six subjects produced
very similar values (with the sum of the index of three translators 37.5 and the language teachers 34.5), showing no significant difference between the two groups. From this result, the PACTE group generated the hypothesis that the questionnaire design is suitable for measuring the attitudes of educated people who work switching between two languages (and both translators and language teachers fall into this category). To test this hypothesis, they asked ten university lecturers from other disciplines (in other words, educated people who do not work constantly switching between two languages, or people who can be positioned as close to be ‘consumers’ of translation) to answer the questionnaire. The result was, however, similar to those of the translators and language teachers. At this stage, instead of abandoning the whole questionnaire due to the undesirable outcome, Neunzig and Kuznik (2007) identified a shortfall in their fundamental perception behind the design of the study, saying:

... we committed one of the most serious errors that could be committed by any scientist (since Max Weber's time), i.e. we were committed to a value judgment that a "dynamic" translation approach is something positive. However, in reality, the important thing is not whether someone has a linguistic or a dynamic attitude about translation, but whether the attitude is consistent in one's judgment or not. (my translation, original in German)

Based on this recognition, they changed the data analysis method (see below) so that the questionnaire measures how consistent the subject's perception is of the dynamic or static quality of translation (it does not matter whether they incline to dynamic or static translation) rather than whether they are dynamic or static.

Before finalising the design of the questionnaire, they sifted through the statements again and eliminated inappropriate items (though the criteria are not reported). The final design included 27 statements. Also, a decision was made to use, out of the 27 statement items, five pairs of items which clearly present conceptually opposite opinions for data analysis. This brought two advantages to the study: a) it requires analysis of the scores of only ten items, which saves time; and b) when an item did not receive an answer from a respondent, only the other item in the pair needed to be disregarded, keeping the effect on the overall results to a minimum. The remaining 17 statements were left in the questionnaire as filler questions so that the intention of the questionnaire was not obvious to the respondents.

The final questionnaire design

The finalised questionnaire included 27 statements. For each of the 27
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7 Page number for this citation is not provided as I used a copy provided by one of the authors.
statements the respondent was asked if they strongly disagreed, disagreed, agreed or strongly agreed with it. Out of the 27 answers, those for the following five pairs of statements were used for data analysis:

**Pair 1**
- Item 3: It is the client who decides how the translator has to translate a text. (dynamic)
- Item 24: When you translate a text, you should not be influenced by the target reader. (static)

**Pair 2**
- Item 10: A text should be translated in different ways depending on who the target reader is. (dynamic)
- Item 4: The aim of every translation is to produce a text as close in form to the original’s as possible. (static)

**Pair 3**
- Item 23: If you begin to translate a text using certain criteria (e.g. respecting the format of the original text, adapting the text to target reader, etc.) these should be kept to throughout the text. (dynamic)
- Item 11: All translated texts should keep the same paragraphs and divisions in the target text as in the original text. (static)

**Pair 4**
- Item 14: When translating a specialized text, terminology is not the biggest problem. (dynamic)
- Item 5: Most translation problems can be solved with the help of a good dictionary. (static)

**Pair 5**
- Item 27: If you find a word in a text that you don’t understand, you should try to work out its meaning from the context. (dynamic)
- Item 16: As soon as you find a word or expression you don’t know the meaning of, you should look it up straightaway in a bilingual dictionary. (static)

From the data two indicators were produced: a dynamic index and a coherence coefficient.

The dynamic index

Responses to the ten chosen statements were assigned the following raw points:
1 to “I strongly disagree”.
2 to “I disagree”.
3 to “I agree”
4 to “I strongly agree”.

Then, according to the combination of the points within each statement pair, a ‘dynamic point’ was assigned as the below table shows. For example, if a respondent answered that she ‘strongly agreed’ (4 points) to one of the dynamic statement but then answered that she ‘agreed’ (3 points) to the other pair statement (a combination of 4:3),
this means that she does not have any clear, consistent opinion about the concept, so according to the table, the answers receive a dynamic point of 0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Dynemic-ness” - Categories and scale points</th>
<th>Raw point for an item pair: “dynamic” ; “static”</th>
<th>Dynamic point</th>
<th>Attitude category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:2/3:2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Dynamic attitude (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1/3:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:4/2:3</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>Static attitude (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:4/1:3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From Neunzig and Kuznik 2007 with my translation)

Table 2 Dynamic point calculation table

The coherence coefficient

In order to measure how consistent the subject's attitude to translation is (not whether it is dynamic or static as Neunzig and Kuznik (2007) repeatedly emphasise), ‘coherence raw points’ were produced. For each item pair, if both of the answers showed the same orientation of attitude to translation (either dynamic or static), 1 point was given. If one statement gained a dynamic answer but the other a static answer, 0 points were given. In the table below, the former case is represented by a capital ‘D’ or ‘S’ and the latter by ‘D/S’. Then the difference between the sum of ΣS and ΣD (|ΣS-ΣD|) was calculated and from the result, a coherence coefficient was assigned.

Σ 0 - 1: does not show consistency, 0 points
Σ 2 - 3: shows some consistency, 0.5 point
Σ 4 - 5: shows consistency 1 point
Table 3 Coherence coefficient calculation table

The results

The dynamic index and coherence coefficient were calculated for each subject and then the group averages were produced. Neunzig and Kuznik (2007) compared the results of two experimental groups (one with 35 experienced translators and the other with 24 language teachers) and a control group of 10 consumers (i.e. university lecturers who do not work in a bi-lingual environment). PACTE (2008) reports on the results of the first two groups. The following table shows that the translator group demonstrates the highest mean score on the dynamic index.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Pair</th>
<th>Coherence raw point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair I</td>
<td>Pair II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S</td>
<td>D/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>D/S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From Neunzig and Kuznik 2007 with my translation)

Table 4 Dynamic index of translators/teachers/consumers

With the significance level at 0.012 (<0.05), the report concludes that translators as a group show a significantly more dynamic attitude to translation than language teachers and users of translation.
Next, coherence coefficients were calculated for each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translators</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teachers</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(from Neunzig and Kuznik 2007)

Table 5 Coherence coefficient of translators/teachers/consumers

This time, the consumers show a lower level of coherence, but with the significance level at 0.22 (>0.05), there is no significant difference between translators and language teachers, with translators showing slightly higher coherence.

Discussion

For the PACTE Group, the results of this questionnaire study form only a part of the whole project and they do not intend to come to any decisive conclusion from these results only. For the present study, however, it provides a rare example of research which attempts to measure translators’ knowledge about translation using a quantitative instrument. I particularly scrutinised above the design of the questionnaire reported in Neunzig and Kuznik (2007). This is because, in my opinion, the series of reports by PACTE (of which the 2008 report covers the questionnaire study) may give the readers the wrong impression that the questionnaire is measuring ‘how dynamic’ the subjects’ perceptions about translation are, suggesting that the whole project is based on the value judgement that translators should have dynamic perceptions about translation. Neunzig and Kuznik (2007) emphasise that this is not the case, stressing that what the questionnaire is trying to measure is how consistently dynamic or static the subjects’ perceptions about translation are. They believe that no study should be based on a value judgement (which is apparent to any modern scientist but in reality is not always easy to avoid). In order to eliminate a judgemental influence, they changed the analysis method so that a notion was always measured by a pair of statements: one representing a dynamic notion and the other a contradictory static notion and if a subject did not provide consistent answers (i.e. the respondent is ambiguous about a certain aspect related to the dynamic and static notions of translation), the answers to the pair of statements were disregarded in the scoring procedure. This change is important because the concept of dynamic translation is

---

8 I thank Dr Wilhelm Neunzig for bringing my attention to this point in our private conversation.
what has been established in a certain (and a very influential) circle of Translation Studies and eliminating a positive bias towards it is obviously a valid decision when unbiased scientific rigour is required. As a result Neunzig and Kuznik (ibid.) claim that the final design measures only consistent perceptions of translators, i.e., the more coherent and consistent a translator’s perception about translation is (whether it has a dynamic or a static orientation), the further the score of his/her dynamic index is from 0 towards either 1 (dynamic) or -1 (static, and translators’ average score was 0.273).

This change in the analysis method was meaningful for PACTE’s study because with that change the results of the questionnaire study produced a significant difference between professional translators and language teachers, which was necessary for the design of their overall project.

However, from the perspective of the present study, the initial part of the questionnaire design has a problematic element, i.e, PACTE’s research members produced the statements to be included in the questionnaire schedule. Surely researchers are ‘experts’ in translation (Neunzig & Kuznik, 2007), but their notions of translation are what Séguinot (2000) calls “institutionalized form of knowledge”, i.e. theories which institutions believe to be vital to teaching or research. If people who are not researchers, for example translators or users of translation, had generated the initial list of statements, they might have covered different aspects or notions of translation. In other words, PACTE’s study tests whether the opinions about and attitude to translation of the research subjects are consistent with the institutionalised form of knowledge about translation (or academic theories of translation) or not, but it does not measure their opinions (if any) which fall outside the universe covered by the questionnaire schedule. This is why I stated earlier that, although PACTE claim they measure “knowledge, both implicit and explicit, about translation and aspects of the profession” (PACTE, 2011:33) by this questionnaire, they are in effect measuring translators’ capacity to acknowledge particular aspects of translation when it is packaged within the frameworks of certain academic theories of translation. Surely, focusing on particular theoretical concepts as a target of measurement is beneficial (and probably necessary) from the point of operationality of the study. For PACTE it may be even better if the statements cover only the notions they teach in their institution because the ultimate purpose of PACTE’s study is to investigate the acquisition process of translation competence, part of which is knowledge about translation, using their institution’s students as participants. An important thing in any empirical study is that a researcher collects data which answer their specific research concern. In that sense, the data PACTE collected by this questionnaire is fit for purpose: they defined desirable knowledge about translation to be acquired in
translator’s learning process using academic concepts, and then tested whether the subjects acknowledge such concepts using the statements in the questionnaire.

The present study, by contrast, does not aim to measure translators’ knowledge of academic theories and remains completely open with regard to the range of notions which the participants’ knowledge covers. Pre-setting the range of theories to be observed in participants’ translation processes or knowledge would defeat the aim of the present research. PACTE’s questionnaire is, therefore, not fit for the main purpose of the present study. However, just as the PACTE group uses this questionnaire as a component of their main study, I shall replicate the questionnaire with my research participants and use the outcome to triangulate the main qualitative study (see below).

Another point which is worth making about PACTE’s questionnaire study is that, although the results showed that the translators have a more dynamic concept of translation methods than the language teachers, these results do not establish whether the translators’ dynamic orientation is a result of: a) their transferring implicit procedural knowledge gained from their professional experiences to declarative, explicit knowledge; or b) their learning theories of translation through their formal university training (if they have had such training) which was strengthened by their experience as a translator. Without the translators’ personal profiles (especially concerning translation education history) it is impossible to establish which is the case.

Replication study

As an extended review of PACTE’s questionnaire study, I replicated it with a group of translators with the language combination, Japanese and English (working in both or either directions). The purpose of the replication study is to see if translators with a different language combination show the same tendency as PACTE’s research participants who have European languages.

Forty-six Japanese-English and/or English/Japanese translators answered the same questionnaire (the English version provided in PACTE 2008) between April and October 2012. A request for participation was distributed through the mailing list of the Japanese Network, a sub-group of the ITI (Institute of Translation and Interpreting), inviting the recipients to take part in the on-line survey using an online survey service SurveyMonkey. The response rate was 28.7%. In addition, the participants in the main interview study who did not take part in the on-line survey answered it in hard-copy form.

The table below shows how my results compare with PACTE’s.
Table 6 Dynamic index of Japanese/English translators and PACTE’s translators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PACTE Translators (35)</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese/English Translators (46)</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two sets of means were compared using t-test, which yielded the significance of 0.54, way above the standard level of significance of 0.05, indicating that the two groups show a very similar average scores and distributions. This suggests that translators’ orientation towards translation may be common across different language combinations.

Next, the coherence coefficient was calculated for the Japanese/English translator group and compared with that of PACTE’s translator group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PACTE translators</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J/E translators</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Coherence coefficient of Japanese/English translators and PACTE’s translators

The results show that the coherence coefficient of Japanese/English translators are higher than that of the PACTE translators, but as Neunzig and Kuznik (2007) do not provide observation counts or standard deviation information for their translators’ group, it is not possible to establish the significance of the difference.

The comparison study above indicates a potentially interesting outcome that professional translators, whatever their language combination is, demonstrate a similar orientation towards the concept of dynamicity of translation. However, the replication study brought my attention particularly to the execution stage of the questionnaire study rather than the results. In the replication study, six of my respondents left a comment in the free answer section that the questions were difficult to answer because the questions were “too general” and the true answer to many of the questions are in fact “It depends”. In their own words, “It’s not always a question of ‘I always do this or that’” and “there is a big gap between ‘ideal’ translation practices and what translators actually do!” This, I think, depicts the reality of working translators and the importance of situationality in the professional world, and subsequently in research. Translators probably think of translation on a case-by-case basis all the time, taking into consideration the situations at the time and maybe the ability to do so is part of their competence. PACTE’s study, on the other hand, focuses on measuring the respondents’ general opinion about translation, but the reactions from my respondents raise a question as to whether it is at all important to try to gauge translators’ ‘general’ opinion about translation.

To give one example, statement pair I of PACTE’s questionnaire says:

Item 3: It is the client who decides how the translator has to translate a text. (dynamic)

Item 24: When you translate a text, you should not be influenced by the target reader. (static)

A close reading raises the question of who ‘the client’ in Item 3 and ‘the target reader’ in Item 24 are. In reality they can be the same person (if a translation is commissioned to the translator directly by the user of the translation) or different participants (a translator may call a translation agency a client, but in that case a
target reader will exist somewhere separately). Without clarification of who is who, it will be very difficult for a respondent to decide on the answer.

Having recognised this specific feature of the questionnaire, I will use the results to compare with the qualitative results of the main interview study and see if there is any correlation between the dynamic index, which I define as a measurement of overall orientation of the translator’s attitude, and their discourse when they explain their professional practice.

Katan (2009)

A large-scale survey study with 890 respondents (out of 1151 approached) was conducted. The respondents included professional translators (573 respondents) and interpreters (157 respondents) and the rest were university lecturers and translation/interpreting students. The respondents were based in more than 25 different countries (25 countries covering 98% of the respondents), most of them in Europe with Italy, Finland and the UK being the top three. Among them, 885 (or 73%) have university training (either BA, MA or PhD) in either languages, translation or interpreting. The study had two aims, i.e. to investigate, 1) "to what extent the academic theories and beliefs are reflected in the workplace"; and 2) “to what extent ... translators actually have the autonomy to intervene, to mediate or tackle conflict". (ibid.:113)

I will report the results produced for the first aim since they are directly relevant to the present study. In discussing academic theories and beliefs reflected in translators’ practices, the author is especially concerned with theories which deal with the concept of empowerment with a focus on the visibility of the translator (cf. Tymoczko 2007; Baker 2006; Wolf 1995; Wolf 2007; Simeoni 1998) and the concept of functionalism with a focus on loyalty, a concept developed by Christiane Nord (1997), although the author refers to Gentzler (2001). The questionnaire was designed to investigate to what degree the respondents believe in those specific notions.

Two questions were asked in order to survey the extent of the permeation of the functionalist concept. The first question was: “If the [translator and interpreter’s] job is considered to be a ‘good linguistic transfer of the original’, to what extent is the translator or interpreter ideally concerned with reader or listener reaction?” (Katan 2009:137) (the answers were chosen from 'Always' 'Very much' 'It depends' 'Not usually' and ‘Never’). To this question, answers from professional full-time translators and interpreters with a university qualification were analysed, which revealed that 56% of professionals think it is ‘always’ their concern. The author describes the figure as “only just over half the professionals” (ibid.:137, my emphasis). However, if we add to this
figure the percentage of the respondents who answered ‘Very much’, the figure reaches (reading from the bar graph, so it may not be completely accurate) nearly 90%, which makes the author’s description ("only just over half the professionals") sound rather imprecise. Further, the author concludes that the results suggest “the skopos theory functionalist thinking has yet to permeate the profession, and Gentzler’s prediction, ‘the future of the functionalist approach appears assured’ is certainly not (yet) the case” (ibid.:137).

The second question asked where the respondents’ loyalty lies. The answers were chosen from 1) “the original text/speech”; 2) “the reader/listener”; 3) “the client, commissioner (specifications etc.)”; and 4) “it depends, meaning yourself, i.e. your own T/I (Translation/Interpreting) choices, which may oscillate between all the above at any given moment” (ibid.:138). I will concentrate only on the results from translators here. The survey reveals that 44% of all translators feel loyalty towards the source text, 24% towards the target text, 21% towards themselves and 11% towards the commissioner (Figures are read from the bar graph). When the amalgamated figures of both translators and interpreters are compared between those with and without university training (the report does not provide separate results comparing translators and interpreters), it reveals that a smaller proportion of university-trained practitioners feel loyalty towards the source text (32% compared to 40%) and towards the target text (24% compared to 29%) and a bigger proportion towards themselves (27% compared to 18%) and towards the client (14% against 7%) (figures are read from the bar graph). These figures illustrate that in both groups the source text is the first choice, which is contrary to the functionalist belief although there is a slight shift towards functionalism when only those with university training are accounted for. What is notable with regard to the university-trained translators is the shift from loyalty towards the source text to loyalty towards the client. The author suggests that this shift may support Gentzler’s (2001: 74) claim that:

practising translators ... may also find themselves sacrificing their independence, becoming more subordinate to the initiators, authors of the brief and brokers in the definition of the text’s skopos.

With regard to visibility of translators, the survey asked the respondents to what extent a translator/interpreter should ideally be invisible. Answers were chosen from 1) Definitely agree; 2) Mainly agree; 3) It depends; 4) Mainly no; and 5) Definitely not. The majority (59%) of translators answered either ‘mainly’ or ‘definitely’ they should be invisible. Among the university-trained respondents (although only the amalgamated figures of both interpreters and translators including those who do not work professionally are presented in the report), the figure declines only to 48%, which
the author describes as a "minimal" impact of university training. Also 11% of the university-trained compared to 18% of all professionals answered 'Definitely agree', from which the author concludes that the influence of university training is limited. Those who strongly believe that translators should be visible formed the smallest group (6% of the translators) and even with the university-trained, the figure (of both translators and interpreters) goes up only to 10%. The author concludes that these data show that "the profession as a whole ... continues to underline the non-activist nature of the job" (Katan, 2009:141, emphasis in original). However, the author’s interpretation of the figures may not be completely valid because, as the author himself points out, a third of the professional translators and interpreters who responded to the survey would have graduated before 1998, and 12% before 1988, which is well before the empowerment theory became mainstream in the academic world. Indeed, when the proportion of the two most opposite views (“definitely agree” and “definitely not”) are compared between the students, teachers and professionals groups, more students and teachers answered "definitely not" (16% and 12% respectively) as opposed to "definitely agree" (just above 5% and 6% respectively) while more professionals answered "definitely agree" (18%) as opposed to "definitely not" (just above 5%).

The survey contains two other questions which are relevant to the present study. One is the question: “What makes ‘translation’ a profession?” (Katan 2009:123). Out of 22 multiple choice answers, the top three answers were: ‘skills/competences/expertise’; ‘knowledge, education’; and ‘make a living’ and the choice which has a direct bearing on translation theories, ‘translation has its own theory’ was at the bottom of the list with only 3% ticking this choice. The other question asked if there was an imaginary course of translation and/or interpreting, what modules would be most important. Respondents were asked to give 12 imaginary teaching modules a degree of importance from 'essential' 'important' 'useful' 'not essential' and 'optional'. The results revealed that most university-trained respondents answered a theory module would be ‘useful’ (nearly 40%), which shows a quite positive attitude to theory. However, if we look at the ranking of which modules were labelled 'most important' by the whole group of professional translators, a theory module came 8th out of the 12 choices and more practical modules at the top. The rankings were: 1st - Translation/interpreting (T/I) practice; 2nd - T/I strategies; 3rd - T/I electronic tools; 4th - Subject specific knowledge; 5th - Contrastive grammar; 6th - The T/I profession; 7th - Intercultural theory-practice; 8th - T/I theory; 9th - T/I ethics; 10th - Contemporary affairs; 11th - Political/public institutions; 12th - Corpus linguistics.
Discussion

Because of the large scale of the study, the results are valuable in that they provide a very general overview of the professionals’ perception of theory, which offers useful context to the present study. It is also relevant to the present study for two reasons:

1. In investigating the degree of permeation of translation theories among professional translators, the author chose two notions to investigate: empowerment of translators and the functionalist approach. The selection of the theories was based on the author’s review of the existing literature about translation theories and translators’ habitus (and the use of the word ‘habitus’ in the study reveals the researcher’s inclination regarding translation theory). As a result, as in the case of the PACTE project, the study investigated only a limited area of the existing theories based on the author’s own interest.

2. Once again, as in the case of the PACTE project, this survey does not show if the knowledge presented in the survey is as a result of: a) transferring, in answering questionnaires, implicit procedural knowledge gained from professional experiences to declarative knowledge; or b) simply representing declarative knowledge gained by the respondents through their formal university training and most probably reinforced by their professional experiences. The author implies that the former may be the case, pointing out that a third of the professional translators and interpreters who answered the survey would have graduated before 1998, and 12% before 1988, and calls for more specific surveys focusing on university-trained translators. This highlights the importance of the selection of study subjects.

3.2.2 Study using written protocol

Scott-Tennent and González Davies (2008)

The study was carried out using 21 third-year undergraduate translation students at Universitat de Vic in Barcelona. Prior to the study, the authors had developed a teaching programme to train students in dealing with translation of cultural references. The authors define for the purpose of the study cultural references as:

Any kind of expression (textual, verbal, non-verbal or audiovisual) denoting any material, ecological, social, religious or linguistic manifestation that can be attributed to a particular community (geographic, socio-economic, professional, linguistic, religious, etc.) and would be admitted as a trait of that community by those who consider
themselves to be members of it. (Scott-Tennent & González Davies 2008:783)

The programme was for translation from English into Spanish, and consisted of the skill-development of noticing (a problem), deciding (a strategy) and justifying (the decision) (the detail is discussed in González Davies & Scott-Tennent 2005). Translation of cultural reference was chosen as the material of the programme since it is a very common but under-researched translation problem. This 2008 article reports the results of the study which was conducted to measure the effectiveness of this training programme by quantitatively comparing the entire student groups’ translation abilities before and after taking the programme. Success was defined as the ability to:

(a) detect cultural references within a text, (b) provide multiple feasible options to translate them, (c) evaluate those potential options, and (d) apply logical reasoning in making a final choice from among the options. (Scott-Tennent & González Davies 2008:785)

The data were gathered in written protocols using an assessment paper which formed part of the students’ course requirements. The students were given an excerpt of about 400-500 words from a British children's novel “The Growing Pains of Adrian Mole”. Different sections of the same novel were chosen for the assessment before and after the training course. Five segments of the text had been highlighted by the investigators, which clearly contained cultural references as defined in their training course and could potentially be rendered in more than one way. The students were asked to fill in the assessment form in their own time at home. The form consisted of six sections and the students were asked to fill in each section with the following information.

a) a source text segment
b) proposed translations (as many as possible)
c) advantages of the translation (for each proposal)
d) disadvantages of the translation (for each proposal)
e) a final version chosen
f) justification of the final version

Valid data were obtained from 17 students. The results are presented quantitatively with regard to the following four factors:

1) Detecting cultural references: For this factor, data were available from a pilot study too (with 9 students). The total number of correctly identified cultural references was calculated for each student, and group mean totals were generated. In the pilot study, the pre-training score was 17.4 and the
post-training score was 25.4 (p=0.00101194). In the main study, the pre-training score was 16.4 and the post-training score was 21.5 (p=0.00196288). Judging from the similarity of the p-values, the authors consider there was a significant improvement in the students’ ability.

2) Proposing feasible options of translation: The total number of feasible translation options was counted for each student and the average number of feasible options per suitably detected segment was generated. Group mean totals were then calculated. The score of the pre-training test was 1.9 while the post-training score read 2.7 (p=0.00401818), thus the authors consider there was very little doubt that the students’ ability to generate feasible options increased after the training course.

3) Self-evaluation of options: The students were asked to present in written protocols pros and cons of each translation option. Unless the answers were clearly and completely generic (such as “I don't like it very much” or "That is a good translation"), the answers were deemed valid and added up for each student, and the total divided by the number of feasible options proposed, producing the average number of valid arguments per feasible option. Group mean totals were then calculated for pre- and post-training: the former was 1.2 and the latter was 1.3. The p-value was 0.52875858. Therefore, the authors conclude the increase cannot be deemed significant.

4) Justification of final choice: The total number of reasonable final choices was calculated for each student. “Reasonable” here means any final choice explicitly based on logical criteria (even if it does not match the examiners’ personal preferences), thus the reasons provided in the grid “justification of final version” were assessed to decide if the final choice was reasonable or not. The number was then divided by the total number of suitably comprehended segments, producing a percentage value of reasonable choices per suitably comprehended segment. The group mean totals were then calculated for the pre- and post-training tests: the former was 95.5% and the latter 93.2% (p = 0.72435001). Therefore, not only did the figure decrease after the training, but with the p-value being higher than 0.05, the authors conclude that the students clearly did not show any significant difference in the ability to justify their final choice logically.

Discussion

The relevant part of the study discussed above to the present study is its attempt to measure the students’ ability specified in 4) above, i.e. to “apply logical
criteria in selecting one of these variants as a final solution" (Scott-Tennent & González Davies 2008:792), which shows an ability to theorise about translation though at a very elementary level. In order to measure this ability, the study investigated if the students could provide valid reasons for choosing a specific translation option in a written protocol. One example given in the report is: “It is the most neutral and least confusing version. It can be applied to any educational centre” (ibid.:795). This example hardly has the level of precision and abstractness one would expect in what can be called a ‘translation theory’, but in the sense that the statement is explaining a phenomenon of translation while predicting the effect the translation will have on the readers, it would be fair to consider the statement to be a very basic version of a translation theory. The authors attempted to measure quantitatively the change in this ability between before and after a training course using the instrument of the written protocol.

The following are the points which are of special interest to the present study:

(1) Despite the fact that the pre-training score was very high at 95.5%, leaving not much space for improvement anyway, the authors suggest that perhaps this ability needs to be measured qualitatively rather than quantitatively if we want to achieve any significant results.

(2) The fact that the students’ ability in logical justification of translation choices did not improve may be to do with their developmental stage, i.e. this particular ability of articulating one's own translation practice may only be developed significantly at a later stage of their translation training. Or it is even possible that this ability does not significantly improve at any stage of translation learning.

(3) The training course whose effect is being measured in this study was solidly based on the belief that it is desirable for translators to make an informed decision rather than solving translation problems subconsciously and automatically. In order to measure the students’ ability in informed decision-making, the study used a written protocol as the information-gathering instrument. The authors conclude that the ability to justify translation choices was not improved by the training programme, and that this result may come from the fact that the data-gathering was done in a written form, i.e. justification of translation choices may be difficult in writing. Although the authors do not touch upon the issue of modality of assessment, a different form of data-gathering (such as oral examination) may have yielded different results.
The author carried out a longitudinal study to test her hypothesis that translators’ declarative knowledge of translation has a positive impact on their procedural knowledge. The terms ‘declarative knowledge’ and ‘procedural knowledge’ are used in this study in line with the PACTE group’s TC model (e.g. PACTE 2011). This study was designed with a view to refuting Orozco’s (2000) claim (and Orozco was one of the founding members of the PACTE group) that there is no necessary correlation between declarative knowledge about translation and the same subjects' efficiency in a translation task. In Orozco’s study, declarative knowledge about translation was measured by a questionnaire while efficiency of translation was measured by assessing the translations produced by the subjects (information as to who the assessor was is not revealed in this report). The experiment was carried out twice within an eight-month interval using 97 first-year undergraduate students in translation courses at three Spanish universities.

Cintrão’s study involved three groups (two of which were control groups). The first was the main group comprising eight undergraduate Spanish-language students; the second was a control group comprising seven undergraduate Spanish-language students, and the third was a second control group comprising six Spanish-language graduates with some teaching and translating experience, which the author calls a bilingual control group. The main study group received an introductory course of general written translation over 28 hours, which included both practice activities and explicit presentation of theoretical elements by means of ‘prototypical tasks and cases’ (Cintrão, 2010:171), where the term ‘prototypical’ means that the tasks are based on fundamental principles for decision-making in translation, which enables adequate execution of translation processes. Three theoretical elements were covered by them:

---

9 I feel somewhat uncomfortable with the use of this term because there are a number of definitions of a ‘bilingual’ in the literature of language education, ranging from someone who "possesses the native-like control of two languages" (Bloomfield 1935 cited in Harmers & Blanc 2000:6) to someone who “possesses a minimal competence in only one of the four language skills, listening comprehension, speaking, reading and writing, in a language other than his mother tongue" (Macnamara 1967 cited in Harmers & Blanc 2000:6) and a number of more in between these two extremities (Hammers & Blanc 2000). It would be safe to say that the general consensus in Translation Studies is that bilingual language users do not automatically possess translating competence. For example, Toury (1995) explains, in the chapter “Excurses C: A bilingual speaker becomes a translator”, the process of translators’ obtaining translational competence through a process of socialisation. The use of the term “bilingual” for this particular control group gives an impression that the author assumes that bilingual language users (and in the case of this study, language teachers) possess a competence equivalent to that of professional translators. I retain the term in this section only for the purpose of uniformity with the original.
functional aspects such as the concept of functional units (Nord, 1988) and skopos theory (the author uses a Spanish version: Reiß & Vermeer 1996); discursive concepts such as dialect and register (Hatim & Mason, 1990), cohesion and coherence, genres and text type, and relationship between language, culture and worldview or values (references not provided) and cognitive concepts such as inferential processes and problem-solving processes of translation. Concepts which were presented explicitly in the classes included the skopos rules, the essential link between language and culture and cognition (Snell-Hornby, 1988) and the concepts of translation as communicative act of intercultural mediation (reference is not provided but presumably Hatim & Mason 1990). During the period of the course, both undergraduate groups participated in four translation tests: one before the course started, the second in the middle of the course, the third after the course and the last a few days after the third test. The bilingual control group received only the first test. The student control group was involved to eliminate the possibility that translation competence is improved purely through receiving the usual language classes in their language course.

The translation texts were assessed over 18 passages in terms of two aspects: 1) whether the subject gave a positive response to translation problems using a functional approach; 2) whether the quality of the translation improved towards the end of the period using functional assessment criteria. Nine passages included rhymes which required much attention in view of the translation brief. Three passages required cultural adaptation and six included peculiar manners of speech reflecting characteristics of certain characters in the story. A positive response to each of the 18 segments was given one point and non-response was given zero points. Positive responses included any evidence of an attempt to: a) recreate the rhymes; b) make a cultural adaptation; and c) produce a playful manner of speech for the two main characters. The total of all participants’ scores was calculated and then the group average was produced as a percentage of the possible full score. The results of the analysis revealed that the main study group improved its score significantly more than the student control group (from 37% to 68% and from 38% to 57% respectively) and the score of the final test was nearly as high as that of the bilingual control group (70%).

The quality of the solutions used was assessed by giving each segment a score on a scale from 0 (no attempt to produce any functionally valid effect) to 3 (fully satisfactory solution). The report provides the criteria of assessment but does not state who assessed the translations. The total score of each group was divided by the number of participants, producing again the group average in percentage figures. The results showed that both student groups improved their scores but the main group did so much more (from 20% to 43% compared to 21% to 33%). The bilingual control group’s average
Discussion

Having analysed the results, the author claims that the teaching of declarative knowledge has a positive effect on novice translators' procedural knowledge, which seems to refute Orozco's claim. However, the study has limitations in two aspects.

(1) The author argues that sensitivity to translation theories (in this study, mainly to functional theories) is very much independent of language competence and stresses that the use of a bilingual control group proves this point. The author believes this claim is justified because the main study group's score recorded at the end of the course was close to those of the bilingual control group. In other words, their translational competence was raised from that of mere language learners to the level of the bilingual control group by receiving the translation course. Here, the profiles of the bilingual control group seem to be problematic. Although the author states that the members of the bilingual control group have different degrees of translation experiences, “none had translation as their main activity” (Cintrão 2010:173). This statement implies that the author is of the opinion that a competent foreign-language user can easily become a skilled translator if he or she has some degree of translation experience (and it does not have to be their main professional activities). This kind of belief is incompatible with the current tenet in mainstream Translation Studies, i.e. translation competence is not equal to language skills and that in-depth knowledge and complex skills which are pertinent specifically to the undertaking of translation are vital for a translator to be successful. Therefore, the bilingual control group should ideally be comprised of experienced professional translators, not language teachers with a token amount of translation experiences.

(2) The aim of the study was to test whether translators’ declarative knowledge of translation has a positive impact on translators' procedural knowledge. The subjects' translation competence was measured before, during and after the provision of the translation course, which involved both practice activities and explicit presentation of theoretical elements. The results revealed that the translation competence of the main study group was significantly higher than that of the first control group which did not receive the course, but I do not think these results constitute conclusive support for the author's hypothesis. The course provided in the study to the main study group was, according to the author's description, an “introductory course in general written translation” which “connected systematically practice activities with explicit presentation of
theoretical elements by means of ‘prototypical tasks and cases’” (Cintrão 2010:171). If one teaches translation theories together with practical translation exercises, this is not pure teaching of theory, but rather teaching of procedural knowledge backed up by related declarative knowledge. Therefore, if one wants to gauge the effect of declarative knowledge about translation on procedural knowledge of translation, the study would need another control group which receives a course which involves either practice activities or the teaching of theories only. But then, a fundamental question would arise: would it really be possible to conduct practice activities of translation without mentioning any supporting theories or touching upon any theoretical notions which support the activities? The report does not include a detailed description of the teaching contents and method used in the study, but judging from the available information, the study design seems to have failed to separate the subjects’ learning of declarative (theoretical) knowledge of translation from their learning of procedural knowledge of translation: and it is doubtful whether such a separation is in fact possible at all.

3.2.4 Studies using verbal protocols

In this section I will review 5 studies (and 1 summarising report which covers two of them) in which verbal protocols are used to examine translators’ theorisation patterns.

Fraser (1993)

Fraser conducted two studies using verbal protocols (1993, 1994), which were followed by a report (1996) providing a concluding discussion on the two studies.

Her 1993 study investigated professional translators’ translation processing when translating English local authority leaflets (this type of activity is usually considered to fall within community translation). At the beginning of the report Fraser points out that very little literature on processes of community translation is available. She also emphasises that there is no specific body of theory of translation which informs the practice of community translation. In addition, most of the literature discussing text translation in general employs a product-based approach and, using the examples of Catford (1965) and Nida (e.g. 1964), the author claims they do not apply to the actual practice of community translators.

10 This term is use here in a traditional sense, as a sister term of ‘community interpreting’. Recently, the term “community translation” has also been used as a synonym of “volunteer translation” (Pym 2011:78) or “user-generated translation” (O’Hagan, 2009), which roughly means a translation generated by members of a user community for no financial remuneration.
Against this background, the study was carried out with four aims (Fraser, 1993:326): 1) “to review existing translation models and their applicability to community translation”; 2) “to identify the approaches community translators themselves took to the translation process by means of verbal protocols describing their strategies”; 3) “to assess whether these approaches might contribute to the broader debate on translation theory”; and 4) “to evaluate the usefulness of the verbal protocol method in such research”.

In the study 12 community translators translated an English local authority leaflet which gave information about exemption from the poll tax (thus containing a great deal of reference to British society, the legal system, etc.) into seven community languages (Arabic, Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Punjabi, Urdu and Spanish). The subjects also tape-recorded their comments about their processes using the immediate retrospective TAP (Think-Aloud Protocol) method, recording a comment each time they had finished a section of translation rather than giving simultaneous commentary. They were allowed to handle the tape-recorder freely, pausing or resuming, and no time limit was imposed on the recording. They were specifically asked to comment on cultural differences relevant to the translation.

This method was employed because letting the participants deal with the recording by themselves causes minimum intervention on the side of the investigator while letting them recount directly after translating a section of a text rather than after translating the whole text maximises the accessibility to short-term memory (Zimmermann & Schneider, 1987). According to Garrod (1986), immediate retrospection can also capture the formulation of conception of the text content more than actual, literal meaning of the words because short-time memory filters out details but concentrates more on principles and processes. The investigator only asked the subjects some questions for clarification if necessary at the end of the recording.

Fraser concludes that comments made by the participants covered broadly the following five topics: translation of terms specific to British society; the extent to which English terminology was borrowed; translators’ own perception of their role and status; training issues for translators; and user education (but the quantitative distribution of these topics was not reported). From those comments, Fraser identified a tendency among the translators to make functional and reader-oriented choices, i.e., the decisions were governed by the pragmatic constraints and the situation of the specific community or the decisions were made according to the level of knowledge and experience their readers already had. The author also points out that the translators’ perception of and involvement with the minority community concerned influenced their decision making in translation.
With regard to the method, the author considers immediate retrospection was appropriate in light of the fact that the participants were able to account very fully for their broader translation strategies compared to much of the existing body of studies in which concurrent reporting was used and the subjects (mainly students, not professionals) focused mainly on individual lexical or grammatical difficulties.

As for the reader-oriented approaches of the translators, the author emphasises that the existing body of translation theories is thin on the process (as opposed to product) aspect of the reader-orientation of translation and claims that professional translators’ accounts of this issue can make a valuable addition to existing theories. She also stresses that professional translators’ accounts with regard to pragmatic aspects such as translator and user education, like those produced in this study, can not only develop new translation theories but also lead to improvements in their working conditions.

Fraser (1994)

Fraser carried out this study a year later using a different group of professional translators. The aim of the study was to identify good professional practice from skilled translators’ translation processes which would be worth integrating into academic training of translators. Twenty-one freelance commercial translators working in the UK translated a French newspaper article about universities in France into English. Their brief said that the translation would be published in The Times Higher Education Supplement. This piece of text was chosen to give the participants enough challenge so that they would recognise the difficulty and verbalise issues in their protocols. This decision was made to avoid the well-reported risk of TAP research that participants may not verbalise processes which are well automated in their professional practice as a result of long experience in that particular type of work. While translating, the participants produced verbal protocols about their translation processes using, this time, a concurrent mode of TAPs, instead of the immediate retrospection method as in the previous study. Disappointingly, the author does not give a reason for the change in the method in the second research (from immediate retrospective to concurrent TAPs)\textsuperscript{11}. In the analysis of verbal protocols, following Krings (1987:8), the author identified categories and notions which gradually emerged from the protocols themselves by close analysis of them rather than pre-set categories.

\textsuperscript{11}Later it turned out in email correspondence with the author (04/10/2012) that this was not a conscious change of method but that in the 1993 study the subjects adapted the concurrent TAPs method in the way that was easier for them to deal with, which resulted in an immediate retrospective method. The author regards both methods as modes of concurrent TAPs methods.
and fit to the data. The categories which emerged in the analysis include: TL readership, the style of ST including register, the importance of knowing the purpose of translation, translation of cultural concept, (non-) use of dictionaries and reference books, the role of context in translating meaning, the influence of working method e.g. a word processor, translators’ personal quality and self-perception, time pressure and user education (but the quantitative distribution of these categories was not reported). The author identifies the following three realisations of good professional practice and one implication: 1) Professional translators consider the purpose of the assignment and the target readers to a great degree in deciding what an appropriate (not the right) translation is; 2) Professional translators have the confidence not to rely on dictionaries too much; 3) Professional translators pursue high-quality translation which is often described in emotional as well as professional language, in other words, translators’ personality may generally be such that they are more likely to be affected by feelings; and 4) Employers of translators need to be educated about realistic expectations of translators.

Fraser (1996)

This 1996 paper summarises the two studies reported above. Having critiqued some of the mainstream translation theories including, again, Catford (1965) and Nida (e.g. 1964) for their linguistic- and product-orientation as well as literary theories (e.g. Venuti 1992) for their limited application and their idealistic notions, the aim of this paper is to consider whether translator education will be most efficient if it is product-oriented or process-oriented, and also whether it is governed by theory or appropriate practice.

In the protocols generated during the two pieces of research, two issues were identified as common topics recounted by the participants, i.e. register of the TT and translation of culture-specific items. A wide range of strategies were reported, and having examined the accounts, the author hypothesises that...

... there is no such thing as ‘the’ right way to translate a text but lots of ‘right’ ways, and that the ‘rightness’ of any one translation will depend, solely or largely, on the nature of the TL readership and the translator’s own perception of his/her role. (Fraser 1996:93)

Based on this hypothesis, and taking into consideration the fact that the participants focused in their accounts much less on individual translation problems but more on their general approaches to translation, the author suggests that what is valuable to teach in translation training would be not individual and prescriptive strategies but more general approaches which constitute “a working set of principles.
for producing a translation” and “a framework for resolving any individual difficulties which occur” (ibid.:94).

Discussion

Fraser’s two pieces of research are particularly relevant to the present study primarily because the aim of the studies overlap with that of the present study. i.e. having acknowledged the use of verbal accounts provided by translators as a valuable source of information to complement existing academic theories, the author “wishes to see academic instruction integrating the lessons of professional practice in a more systematic and explicit way.” (1994:131) Among the outcomes of the studies, the following two points have strong implications for the present study.

First, some translators’ thought processes were successfully documented so that the study broadened the area of observation from textual strategies to procedural strategies of professional translators. For instance, the 1993 study concluded that the translation process model which emerged from the translators’ protocols is a strongly reader-oriented one. One of Fraser’s examples showed, for instance, that a straightforward formal equivalence was first considered and then rejected if the translator judged that the translation may extend a disadvantageous influence to the target readers’ minority community. Fraser concludes that this “reader-oriented emphasis on processes could be a useful addition to the body of theory for both translators and learners” (1993:339). The notion of reader-orientation has been well-discussed in Translation Studies, but this 1993 study identified it from the protocols independently of existing academic concepts. In this way the notion was not discussed any more as an idealistic view of academics (as in Fraser’s critique of Nida 1964) but as an empirically attested fact.

Second, they succeeded in bringing the social context of the translators and their professional practices under observation by avoiding examining just the immediate processes of translation under more experimental conditions. This was realized by employing the following four methods: 1) (in the first study) by prompting the participants to talk about cultural aspects of translation; 2) (in the first study) by using the immediate retrospection TAP method instead of the concurrent method (although in reality this method was employed rather incidentally as explained in the footnote above); 3) (in both studies) by using professional translators rather than students as subjects; and 4) (in both studies) by giving the participants the kind of task they normally undertake in their own professional environment.

However, the value of the TAPs produced is limited by its restriction to the production process starting from the moment the translator is given the source text.
and ending when he or she finishes translating. This excludes the processes before and after translating, including the client’s decision to commission a translation, the commissioning of the work, the proofreading and editing, and the end-user’s reception of and use of the translation. The translators’ protocols indeed imply such stages according to Fraser’s reports. For example, they provide accounts of the translators’ roles in the translation process. In this way some social elements were evident in the verbal protocols, but they were treated just as one of the outcomes, without receiving special attention in their own right.

In addition, Fraser’s evaluation of the nature of the verbal protocols produced by her research subjects deserves more discussion. She concludes in the 1996 paper that participants focused in their accounts much less on individual translation problems but more on their general approaches to translation, and as a result she suggests that what is valuable to teach in translation training will be not individual and prescriptive strategies but more general approaches. At the same time she rightly points out that the information accessible by TAP methods varies according to what is in the translators’ short-term memory, and that how each subject handles the verbalization task also influences their accounts. I would also add to her observations that her subjects may have talked more about their general approaches to translation than individual strategies because:

- Individual strategies are internalised to such a degree that subjects forget to verbalise them (Séguinot 2000:88).
- Subjects do not have the linguistic ability (the kind of terminology and discourse) to articulate individual strategies since (though this is not confirmed due to the lack of personal profiles of the participants in the report) they have possibly not received formal translation education.
- Approaches are easier to verbalise than strategies.

What is striking in Fraser’s observation is her emphasis on the usefulness of the verbal protocols. She claims that the methods employed generated a useful amount of verbal protocols for the purpose of her study, and she reiterates this point in a subsequent article (2000:118) describing it as “my experience of the eloquence of a group of translators producing TAPs” (my emphasis). Interestingly, this claim contradicts the comment made by González Davies and Scott-Tennent (2005:161):

…. it often happens that full-time translators may experiment (sic.) difficulty in verbalizing their declarative and operative knowledge, probably because they have become automatized …
It also contradicts the anecdotal view by a translation teacher\(^{12}\) that professional translators who come to her university to study translation often find it extremely difficult to explain their practice verbally. This is related to the second point above, i.e. translators may or may not have sufficient linguistic ability to articulate their translation and translation processes and I do not think Fraser’s studies were designed to measure this point objectively, hence her observation of the translators’ eloquence remains impressionistic.

The question of eloquence of research subjects is a tricky issue but a relevant one when looked at from the perspective of the present study. On the one hand it can be controlled to some extent by a research method: Fraser (1993) prompted the subjects to talk about cultural aspects of translation in the experiment. On the other hand, in TAP studies, researchers can never be certain how much of the subject’s knowledge and thinking is actually verbalised and how much is not. In that sense, the issue of eloquence always remains a research limitation.

Englund Dimitrova (2005)

The study investigated how differences in amount of translation experience correlates with translator’s translation processes, particularly with how they plan the task and how they generate and revise the TT with special reference to explicitation strategies. Nine translators took part in the study; 4 professionals, 2 translation students and 2 language students. The ST was a 438-word long excerpt from a Russian art book and the participants translated it into Swedish. Their brief told them that the translation would be used for an exhibition in a Stockholm art museum. The participants’ keyboard movements were recorded using keylogging software. They also produced concurrent TAPs which were audio-recorded and transcribed. The verbal protocols were provided in Swedish, and English translation was provided in the report. The translation activities were also video-taped to record what resources (such as dictionaries) were used as well as the participants’ general behaviours. Data on the participants’ background was collected informally.

In the study four aspects of translation processes were investigated and compared between experienced and novice translators:

- Time spent in completing the task at the stages of pre-writing, writing and post-writing, and the number of times the translators went through these stages.
- How translators plan the pre-writing stage (time spent on the stage and

\(^{12}\) In an interview with Dr. Nadia Rahab at London Metropolitan University on 23/05/2011.
approaches to it).

- The segmentation patterns in the writing stage.
- The revision patterns (in both writing and post-writing stages).

The method used to analyse the fourth aspect, the investigation of the revision patterns, is of particular interest to the present study. Englund Dimitrova picked up the sections of keylogging data where the translator added a revision to the translated text (either in writing or post-writing stages) and studied the TAP data which accompanied the movement. She assumes that the TAP data represents how the translators evaluate translation problems they encounter in the revision processes. Based on Hayes et al.’s (1987) categorisation method, she categorised the TAP data into six groups:

- Non-specified evaluation: very general verbalisation such as ‘you say that’, ‘I don’t know if you can say that’, ‘I like that’, ‘it sounds good/OK/fine/childish’ etc.
- Stylistic evaluation: it indicates a more sophisticated indication of metalinguistic stylistic awareness than the previous category, such as ‘it’s (not) dramatic/poetic/journalistic/like in a fairy tale’, ‘sounding (more/less) Swedish’.
- Semantic evaluation: either comparison of the TT with the ST, such as ‘it does not have the same meaning’, or comparison of the TT with extralinguistic reality, such as ‘I cannot write “fight” because it actually was not a fight but an endeavour’.
- ST-based evaluation: an evaluation in relation to the corresponding part of the ST, e.g. ‘I don’t know how to translate this’, ‘this solution does (not) cover the meaning of the word in the ST’.
- Intention-based evaluation: this type of evaluation is made by comparing the author’s intention (or the text’s purpose) with what is actually written. Elements such as text type and future readers are often considered.
- Maxim-based evaluation: this type of evaluation is made according to some established guideline such as standard handbooks.
- Rule-based evaluation: this type of evaluation is made according to the standard rules of the TL such as grammar, orthography and punctuation rules.

Subsequently, the author analysed the TAP data quantitatively in the two translator groups (professionals and students) and came to a conclusion that (Englund Dimitrova 2005:125):
• Both students and professionals use Non-specific evaluations most often (67% and 47% respectively), but students do so more markedly than professionals.
• Amongst other categories professionals use Stylistic and Semantic evaluations as well as Intention-based and Rule-based evaluations more frequently, and more markedly so for the two latter categories.

In summary, problem representations verbalised by the professionals were both more varied and more specific than those by the students.

Discussion
The following two points are of particular interest for the purpose of the present study.

(1) The author found that her professional subjects used Stylistic and Semantic evaluations as well as Intention-based and Rule-based evaluations more often than other evaluation patterns (apart from Non-specific evaluations). This is similar to Fraser’s conclusion in her 1996 report that her translators talked often about the register of the ST as well as cultural-specific items, which roughly correspond to Englund Dimitrova’s Stylistic evaluation category and Intention-based evaluation category. This may suggest that this is a typical pattern in professional translators’ discourses. However, there is a big gap between Englund Dimitrova’s and Fraser’s study outcomes in that Englund Dimitrova found that nearly half the evaluations (47%) done by the professionals were Non-specific evaluations (such as ‘that sounds good’) whereas Fraser did not discuss Non-Specific evaluations in her TAP data at all. This gap is intriguing, and may arise from the difference in the researchers’ interests (i.e. Fraser may not have been interested in non-specific accounts and may not have considered them worthy of attention). In any case, it seems reasonable to say that Englund Dimitrova’s classification system is more comprehensive than Fraser’s.

(2) In this study the point of departure of the analysis is the revisions which were actually made and recorded through keylogging. In other words, translators’ decisions which were not executed via a revising process did not receive attention. This can be considered a strong point of the research design because the researcher does not have to worry about occasions where the translators may or may not be evaluating their translation strategies. The design is, however, still not foolproof because, as the author explains, in some places the subjects revised a section of a text without verbalising any reason for their
revision (Englund Dimitrova 2005: 122). As mentioned above in my discussion of Fraser, the same applied to her study: individual strategies may be so internalised that subjects may forget to verbalise them (Séguinot 2000:88).

(3) Englund Dimitrova (2005:76-77) notes that the working definition of ‘professional’ in her study is that they had been earning at least half of their income from translation activities for at least 3 years. All 4 professional study subjects studied Russian at university but “had taken only shorter courses specifically aimed at training in translation and interpretation” (ibid.:77). She does not clearly state if she believes that this background could have affected the way the subjects evaluate their translations and it is not clear what kind of theoretical learning these ‘shorter courses’ offered. On the other hand, two of the student subjects were translation students in their final year. This may indicate that they have had a greater and more recent exposure to theoretical discourses about translation than the professional subjects, but this variable does not receive attention in this section of Englund Dimitrova’s study.

Pavlović (2010)

Pavlović investigated how student and professional translators verbalise their translation processes when arguing for the right translation strategies. The ultimate aim of her study was to investigate how L2 translation (in her case in the context of Croatian-into-English translation) can be better taught compared with L1 translation (English-into-Croatian). Pavlovíć believes that the subjects’ verbalization patterns and the distribution of justification methods reveal what kind of translation problems student translators encounter in L1 and L2 translation and how they solve them, which will eventually be useful for improvement of pedagogy of L2 translation.

Pavlović collected information through collaborative translation protocols (CTP) by grouping 12 Croatian translation students into 4 groups and having them discuss translation problems while translating texts together, one into L1 (Croatian) and the other into L2 (English). The participants completed the tasks at the end of the final year of their BA translation course. Pavlovíć emphasises that CTP is an effective method to elicit verbalization related to the decision-making processes because 1) the environment is more natural than that in TAP studies because the participants talk to (a) partner(s) instead of producing a monologue. As a result, the verbalization is more spontaneous; 2) it produces a larger amount of verbalization compared to TAP; and 3) the verbalization demonstrates how the participants integrate world knowledge with their understanding of the text while they gradually build the meaning of the text through conversation (Pavlovíć, 2009:83-89). To elicit as much data as possible no time
limit was set on the translation tasks.

The study aimed to test two hypotheses: a) similar types of arguments can be found in decision-making processes in L1 and L2 translation of general-language texts; and b) the distribution of arguments differs depending on the direction of translation. The collaborative translation sessions were audio- and video-recorded with no investigator present in the room. The audio-recordings were later transcribed and analysed. As only students were used as subjects in this study, and the variable was the directionality of translation, which is not directly relevant to the present study, those hypotheses are not of direct interest here. However, the verbal protocol data collected and the way they were analysed and classified are of special interest to the present study as they offer an analytical model of translators’ theorisation patterns, so this review will focus on that area.

The participants produced a translation in a group of three and during the translation process discussed which translation solutions were the best, so Pavlović’s analysis model can be called an ‘argument model’ in comparison to the ‘evaluation model’ of Englund Dimitrova’s (Hui, 2012). Pavlović used a grounded theory approach to develop the categories of classification of arguments, which is similar to Fraser’s analytical method (I will explain grounded theory later in the methodology section as the same approach will be used in my own study). Pavlović developed the following 9 categories and explains what notion is associated with each:

- ‘Sounds better’: (key notion: ‘feeling’)
- ‘It’s (not) said that way’: (key notion: usual/unusual)
- Pragmatic/textual reasons: (key notion: formal/informal, clear/unclear, long/short)
- ‘Rule’: (key notion: correct/incorrect)
- ‘Sounds as if …’: (key notion: inappropriate)
- ‘What they wanted to say’: (key notion: faithful/unfaithful)
- Target text reader: (key notion: accessible/inaccessible)
- Free association: (key notion: reminiscent)
- Personal preference: (key notion: I like/I dislike)

These classification categories overlap with some of categories used by Englund Dimitrova (2005), about which Pavlović notes that “the classification ... bears some similarities to that used by Englund Dimitrova (2005:123-134), but it is not clear from the report whether her generation of the categories were influenced by Englund Dimitrova’s classification (though, according to the grounded theory’s principle, they should not be influenced by any pre-existent categories). Below are the categories of Pavlović (on the right of the symbol “≈”) which are similar to Englund Dimitrova’s (on
the left of the symbol ≈):  

- Non-specific ≈ Sounds better  
- Stylistic ≈ Pragmatic/textual reasons  
- Semantic ≈ Sounds as if  
- ST-based & Intention-based ≈ ‘What they wanted to say’ & Target text reader  
- Rule-based ≈ ‘Rule’

On the other hand, what is present in Englund Dimitrova’s classification but not in Pavlović’s is Maxim-based evaluation and what is present in Pavlović’s classification but not in Englund Dimitrova’s are Free association and Personal preference.

The cumulative outcome (in both language directions) shows that the participants used the ‘Sound better’ argument most often (34%), followed by ‘What they wanted to say’ (20%), ‘Sounds as if’ (13%), ‘Pragmatic/textual reasons’ (12%), ‘It’s (not) said that way’ (8%), ‘Rule’ (8%), ‘Free association’ (3%), and ‘Target text reader’ (1%).

**Discussion**

1. The most-often used argumentation in Pavlović’s study was ‘Sound better’ (34%). This corresponds to Englund Dimitrova’s finding that Non-specific evaluation was most often used by her subjects. Englund Dimitrova’s study, however, uses experience (and as a result proficiency) as a subject variable and her results show that the student translators used the Non-specific evaluation method in 67% of all occasions of evaluation while the professionals used it in 47% of occasions, which suggests, according to Englund Dimitrova, that “the relative proportion of Non-specified evaluations diminishes with growing experience” (2005:125). Pavlović acknowledges that this claim is supported by a number of other studies (she mentions Kovačić (2000:101) and Tirkkonen-Condit (1997:69)), but then presents a cautious but interesting interpretation. She suggests that experienced translators have more face to maintain as a professional, thus specific and articulate accounts in their protocols may be more for maintaining the stake in their relationship with the researcher, rather than presenting pure internal monologues. She also treats the category of ‘Sounds better’ with a more positive attitude and suggests that experienced translators may use the category more often than other categories because they know a solution is good or good enough in the professional situation judging from their wealth of experience and knowledge of translation norms, so giving more specific explanations is a waste of time for them. In other
words, non-specific (or intuitive) accounts about their translation strategies are signs of greater proficiency. If they are, however, pressed to give a more detailed account, they may be, Pavlović says, capable of doing that. Furthermore, Pavlović points out that this may have to do with the translator’s’ training and professional history, i.e. “to what extent rationalization and theorizing have been part of their training and work experience” (2010:81). This is a poignant point in relation to my study and I will return to it below.

(2) Pavlović’s study used a mixture of a qualitative method (generating in-vivo categories from the protocol) and a quantitative method (examining the frequency and the distribution of different argumentation methods). This is similar to Englund Dimitrova’s methodology, but Pavlović did so more consciously and positively, placing value on the qualitative approach.

(3) Pavlović regards her participants as suitable for her study because their translation competence was expected to be relatively well developed (or at the stage of ‘conscious competence’ in González Davies’ (2004:40) terms), but at the same time they were expected to encounter problems as novice translators and to be able to articulate their translational decisions well. They also had the advantage that they had experienced both individual and collaborative translations in their university education, including experimental situations. However, as Pavlović admits (2010:67), the participants’ previous contact with translation had been mostly in the educational setting, therefore we cannot expect to be able to observe any influence of real-life professional experiences in this study design. For example, in the verbalisation data, subjects mention ‘Target reader’ on only 1% of all the justification occasions. This may be because of their lack of experience of working in a professional environment.

Hui (2012)

Hui’s doctoral project (2012) attempts to infer translators’ risk disposition by observing their justification patterns in verbal protocols. The study used 15 student translators as subjects (the language combinations involved were Chinese, German, Korean and Spanish translated out of or into English). The ultimate aim of the study was to examine how the experience of playing a client’s role in a role-play simulation affects the way risk is managed in translating. The study also attempts to examine if the translation situation (i.e. whether the translator has access to the client for help)
will change the way they translate. The students were divided into two groups and engaged in role-play simulations in which one group played the role of the clients first and the other engaged in the role of the translators first. When in the translator role, students were divided into an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group translated a text in pairs and recorded their discussions while translating. They were also allowed to contact the students who were in the client role during the translating process. After translating the experimental groups had a presentation and Q&A session with the students in the clients’ roles. The control group translated the text individually for the researcher and did not have anybody playing the role of client.

The project generated the following data: pre-and-post experiment questionnaire responses, translations, screen-voice recordings, video recordings, and post-project interviews. What is particularly of interest here is the voice recordings of the translators in the experimental group during the translation sessions and presentation/Q&A session. Their discussions about their translation solutions were recorded and transcribed, and were then classified into 7 categories. Working from Englund Dimitrova’s evaluation model and Pavlović’s argumentation model, Hui used the following classification model (which she calls the ‘justification’ model).

- Non-specified
- Target-language convention usage
- Pragmatic/textual
- Rule-bases
- "Sounds as if ..."
- ST-based
- Client-based
- TT reader-based

She mostly used the classification model qualitatively, observing how each subject used the justification patterns in their verbal protocols in order to infer their risk-management dispositions, but she also presents quantitative data as to how frequently the subjects used the justification methods when discussing their translation solutions.

Discussion

(1) Unlike Fraser’s and Englund Dimitrova’s studies, but similarly to Pavlović’s study, Hui’s study used only translation students as subjects. This absence of experienced translators as subjects may be considered a limitation of the study. However, a role-play type simulation was used to compensate, giving the students opportunities to experience more professional-oriented
situations. The incorporation of presentations and Q&A sessions with the participants in the clients' roles is an ingenious idea, which brought social and interpersonal elements of translation into the study design.

(2) As in Englund Dimitrova’s and Pavlović’s studies, the justification category that was used most often by the subjects in Hui’s study aggregately was Non-specified (47% · 107 instances out of 237 justifications).

(3) A unique category in Hui’s justification model is ‘Client-based’. This is understandable because the study design incorporated the role of client in the simulation, so presumably the translators were more inclined to think of the client in their discussions.

In this section I have reviewed 5 studies (and 1 summary report covering two of them) in which verbal protocol was used to examine translators’ theorisation patterns. These studies offer a useful precursor to the present study in the following three respects.

First, in all the studies (apart from Fraser’s two studies) translators’ accounts (elicited from verbal protocols) were linked to outcomes of translation processes (keylogging data). This means that the point of departure for the subjects’ theorisation of translation is a textual strategy executed in the actual translation. This study model is effective for a triangulation purpose, but it would impose a limitation on my own study in that the verbal protocols may not include elements covering real-life elements which may exist outside the execution of textual strategies.

Second, Pavlović (2010:80) discussed the element of ‘face’ of professional translators as study participants. Hui (2012:128) reports that one pair of translators gave a contradictory account in the post-translation Q&A session to the players in the client role to what they said in their verbal protocols during translating and “projected a confident image to the clients by quickly addressing clients’ concerns, although they made use of half-lies”. This issue of stakes of translators in discourse seems to be ignored in Fraser’s studies, in which the issue seems to be naively interpreted as the “eloquence” of professional translators (Fraser 2000:118). As my participants are all professional translators, this issue is worth considering when deciding on the study design.

Third, we can see in these studies a move from the cognitive-psychological framework of process studies towards a social scientific approach. In process studies using verbal protocols (such as TAP studies) the researcher can never know how much of the research subject’s thinking is actually verbalised. To overcome this limitation of process studies using verbal protocols, a great deal of effort has been made to refine the
research method (for an extensive discussion see Krings 2001). In my opinion, however, there is another way of overcoming the limitation: a solution which requires an epistemological turnabout. Instead of examining verbal protocols as a mean to access the subjects’ internal knowledge and thoughts, we can consider the protocols themselves as a target of observation. This is an ethnomethodological approach, which derives from social sciences. One fundamental difference between this approach and that of experimental psychology such as TAPs is that it abandons the idea that knowledge is a relatively solid entity which can be accessed with the use of an instrument, but instead takes the stance that knowledge is what is constructed by people through the use of language (Willig 2008:94).

The studies reviewed above position themselves within the empirical paradigm of Translation Studies, which has been greatly influenced by traditional experimental psychology. The verbal protocols are treated, at least on the surface, as a means to tap into the translators’ thoughts on translation processes. Traditionally, process studies do not place importance on how the analyst interprets the data as in social scientific studies. The focus is on knowledge, not on language. In the studies reviewed, it is keenly felt that the researchers’ concerns are placed beyond this process study domain. The movement is embodied, for example, in the way the classification of categories of evaluation/justification/argument is generated by coding the protocols qualitatively (e.g. the use of in-vivo coding in Hui (2012) and a grounded theory approach in Pavlović (2010)). Fraser used a similar approach without naming an existing methodological framework).

When a study aims to observe the subject’s translational action through language, there is no guarantee that the language observed and the actual action undertaken are linked solidly. Hui (2012:128) notes that her subjects said one thing in their verbal protocol while translating but gave a different account when they came to justify their translations in their presentation to their clients. This raises the fundamental questions: What is a faithful illustration of reality? Is it at all possible to describe a fact or a phenomenon completely objectively using language? These questions are relevant to any research which involves interpretation of verbal protocols. In my own study, I will deal with them by using a theoretical framework in which the questions can be used constructively, as explained in the next chapter.
Chapter 4 Methodology

This chapter first defines the research questions of the present study in light of the discussions in the prior chapters. It then discusses the epistemological issues relevant to the methods used, followed by an illustration of the methods.

4.1 Research questions

In light of what have been discussed so far, I formulate the research questions for the present study as follows.

(1) How do English/Japanese translators theorise their translation practice in their accounts of dispute situations with clients?
   Here, the question of ‘how’ is asked from three different angles.

   (1a) What concepts do the translators use to justify their practice?
   I pointed out in Chapter 3 that in PACTE (2008 among others) and Katan (2009) the authors’ concerns are to test whether translators’ knowledge about translation is in line with received academic theories, particularly with those theories which coincide with the researchers’ beliefs. Both studies are particularly concerned with the theoretical notions of dynamic translation (Nida, 1964) and functional translation (Nord, 1991; Reiss & Vermeer, 1984). In contrast, the present study remains completely open with regard to the range of concepts and notions with which the translators’ may be concerned. The study aims to identify those concepts by examining the accounts collected in semi-structured interviews.

   (1b) How do they use the concepts to organise their accounts?
   I will examine how the translators organise their accounts using the concepts and identify prominent narrative structure in their stories.

   (1c) What discursive features are prominent in their discourse?
   As discussed in Chapter 1, translation practice can be theorised at different levels of abstraction and rigorousness and with different approaches. I aim to identify what kind of discursive features the translators use (or do not use) in constructing their accounts. This research question is derived from the review of Fraser (1993, 1994, 1996), to test her claim that translators can explain their practice eloquently.

   (1d) Is there any correlation between the findings and the dynamic index of translators?
   In Chapter 3, I reported on a replication study of PACTE’s questionnaire survey that I carried out with Japanese/English translators and calculated the dynamic index of each respondent and the whole group. I will compare the index with the results of
(1a) and see if those two sets of results match each other.

(2) How do the findings compare with the notions discussed in received academic theories?

To answer this question I will go back to literature on the often-taught theories as well as other comparable theories and compare them with the theorisation patterns identified from the interview data.

(3) What are the implications of the findings for the pedagogy of translation?

The answers to the questions above will be discussed in the context of translator education, focusing on how they can be applied to improve or supplement current pedagogical situations.

4.2 Epistemological issues

In order to answer the research questions, I will principally use qualitative methods when analysing the interview data. I will use quantitative methods to support my qualitative observations.

In a qualitative analysis, the researcher needs to interpret the meaning in the data. In a qualitative study researchers "uncover ... meaning, or significance, by interpreting what people do" (Rosenberg, 2008:21). This is a fundamental difference from research designs which are comprised of observations of the 'black box' of the translator's mind through the 'window of the mind'. Rosenberg stresses:

"The correct interpretation of human actions enables us to navigate successfully in a society of other human beings. When we step back and consider how reliable our predictions of the behaviour of others are, we cannot fail to be impressed with the implicit theory that growing up in society has provided us. This theory, known as "common sense" or "folk psychology," tells us obvious things we all know about ourselves and others." (Rosenberg 2008:21)

Folk psychology enables us to predict by identifying the meaning of behaviour -- by showing that it is action undertaken in the light of beliefs and desires. ... Social science, it is argued, is and should be the extension and development of this theory. It inherits the predictive strength of folk psychology." (ibid.:22)

So, using Rosenberg's term, the present study strives to identify translators' folk psychology.

In order to carry out an interpretive analysis, the present study will use interviews as its data-collection method. Interviews allow the researcher to collect and generate data which are suitable for interpretation.

It is important to note that the present study is not designed to investigate what translators actually do in their professional practice, but instead aims to investigate
the way translators construct their own accounts about their practice. As discussed in Chapter 1, a theory's job in an academic situation is to explain and predict phenomena (Bortolotti, 2008:53). 'Prediction' is important for natural sciences because natural phenomena are governed by laws and the discovery of those laws is the aim of natural science. However, the present study places a strong focus on the 'explanation' side of the function of theory, adopting the epistemological stand that, as Susam-Sarajevo (2002:204) succinctly states citing Gillham (2000:12), “[t]heory is understanding and explanation, and not only ‘something there and established’”. I also assume that “[a]ny translation choice, any translation judgment reveals a theoretical position” (Bartrina, 2005:178) thus any translator has a theoretical position as an active and crucial participant of translation. Then, why not let translators reveal their theoretical positions by letting them talk and explain? As Pym (2010:1) says (as mentioned in Chapter 2), “translators are theorising all the time”. For the present study, this short statement by Pym is significant because it supports the premise on which the present study stands: when translators talk about their transnational actions and products, they construct their own versions of theory. By talking about translation, they do not reproduce knowledge which already sits in their minds, but instead, they construct their own version of theory about what they do and how they see the world.

This line of thinking subscribes to the principle of social constructionism. According to Burr (2003), thinkers of social constructionism do not assume that knowledge is a solid entity which waits to be discovered by scientists, but instead knowledge is something “historically and culturally relative”, which is constructed between people through “the goings-on between people in the course of their everyday lives” (ibid.:4). Therefore, for the thinkers of social constructionism, essential entities such as opinions, attitude or beliefs do not exist, but instead, people construct those entities in their everyday life and in that process, language plays a vital role.

This is why the present study employs a discourse analysis approach and uses translators’ discourse as the object of examination. In interpreting translators’ discourse, it is important to remember that we cannot take what they say at face value. Bazeley (2007:80) states:

Interpretive analysis takes account of more than the content of what was said. How things are said, and the way in which the text was structured by the interviewee - the discourse and narrative features of the text - are also revealing.

Therefore, discourse analysis needs a solid analytic method. The following sections illustrate the methods to be used for the analysis.
The methods chosen for the present study are eclectic, being drawn from three different methodologies: grounded theory, narrative inquiry and Discursive Psychology. These are methodologies which have been developed as qualitative research methodologies. Grounded theory and narrative inquiry are used extensively in areas such as education studies and nursing studies. Discursive Psychology has been used, often as part of or under a strong influence of conversation analysis for the observations of various social settings such as phone-in conversations in a charity organisation (Potter & Hepburn, 2003), conversations between doctors and patients (e.g. Haakana 2001), and political speeches (e.g. Hanson-Easey & Augoustinos 2010). The use of those three methods in an intertwining manner is unique to the present study. I am aware that some literature on methodology (e.g. Richards & Morse, 2007; Starks & Trinidad, 2007) maintains that grounded theory, narrative inquiry and discourse analysis are three separate research methods, all of which have their own way of approaching data, thus researchers should select just one to apply to research. However, for the purpose of answering the particular research questions in the present study, an eclectic approach is necessary for the reason I explain below. In addition, although the present study is primarily a piece of qualitative research, when judged necessary, quantitative analyses will be carried out to support quantitative investigations\(^\text{13}\).

The sections below explain the reason for adopting the eclectic approach and provide a description of each of the three methods.

4-3-1 Grounded theory

The purpose of the present study is to examine how my participants, all successful translators, construct their accounts of their professional practice, in other words, to identify the way they theorise their translational practice. My assumption is that the way they theorise their practice may not be in line with received academic theories, in which case the gap will provide information that may be useful in pedagogical situations where translation theories are taught. In order to identify the gap between the translators’ theorisation patterns and the discourses of received academic theories, special care needs to be taken to analyse the data with minimum a priori expectations, especially the kind of expectations which derive from existing academic discussions such as the concept of dynamic translation, the skopos of

\(^{13}\) In her methodological discussion of conversation analysis, Maynard (2004) emphasises the importance of supporting qualitative data with quantitative evidence.
translation etc. To achieve this goal, a grounded theory approach will be adopted.

Grounded theory was originally developed by two American social scientists, Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss in a seminal monograph The Discovery of Grounded Theory (1967)\textsuperscript{14}. In grounded theory empirical data are analysed to identify commonly occurring concepts and categories in an inductive manner, aiming eventually to generate a theory which is grounded in the data. The method aims to generate and suggest plausible categories, but not to test existing concepts or hypotheses.

According to the analytical practice illustrated by Richards and Morse (2007:177-183), there are two stages of analysis in grounded theory: open-coding and category search. In open-coding the analyst picks up segments of a transcript which represent a certain concept or a topic and labels (or codes) them with the concept or the topic. In doing so, it is important that the generation of concepts from the transcript is not “contaminated by concepts more suited to different areas” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967:37) such as well-discussed theoretical notions. Instead, the analyst should “literally … ignore the literature of theory and fact on the area under study” (ibid.:37) and let concepts emerge from the data. In the next stage (category search), the analyst searches common categories or concepts which emerge from the coding process and generate more abstract notions or themes. This process is carried out by comparing the concepts identified in open-coding, identifying relationships between the categories. Although these two stages consist of different kinds of procedures, in reality, they are conducted in parallel. Eventually, fairly abstract categories, or core categories, are generated and the analysis builds a theory using those core categories. The actual analytical methods will be further explained in the data analysis section in Chapter 5.

4.3.2 Narrative Inquiry

As part of the process of generating concepts from the interviewees’ accounts, the narrative structure of the stories will be examined too. This is an analytic method offered by a qualitative study called Narrative Inquiry. By studying the narrative structure of a story, we can observe how the speaker organises his/her experience, i.e. what the world is about for him/her. Referring to Sarbin (1986), Burr (2003:148) explains that:

... human beings impose a structure on their experience, and ... this

\textsuperscript{14} In the 1980s and onwards Glaser and Strauss published separate publications, in which they argued for conflicting coding styles. Their dispute and the difference in their analysis methods are widely discussed in the area of social scientific methodology (e.g. Charmaz, 2000). However, it is not my intention to strictly limit my research method to the method of just one of them. Instead, I will adopt the basic approach of grounded theory shared by both Glaser and Strauss in such a way as to suit the present study.
structure is present both in our accounts of ourselves and our experience that we give to others, and in how we represent those things in ourselves. This structure is a narrative structure: we organize our experience in terms of stories.

By examining how the interviewees start their stories, and how they develop and end them, we can examine the translators’ “organized interpretation of a sequence of events” (Murray, 2003:113). In the interviews, I will ask the interviewees about their experiences of dispute situations with clients. This interview question will be suitable because:

The use of narrative is particularly pronounced in everyday understandings of disruption. .... We all encounter disruptions to our everyday routines. Such disruptions include personal problems, family problems, financial problems, and health problems. These challenges to our daily routines encourage attempts by us to restore some sense of order. Narrative is a primary means of restoring this sense of order. (Murray, 2003:114)

Therefore, the narrative structure will be valuable to examine each story provided in the interviews for finding out if there is any particular pattern in the translators’ accounts, which we can understand as their way of organising their experiences.

4.3.3 Discursive Psychology

I have explained grounded theory and Narrative Inquiry as the methods to be used in the analysis of the interview data. In the analytical process, the direct object of the study is texts, or more precisely, translators’ discourse. Understanding what people say is not straightforward because understanding discourse inevitably involves a certain level of interpretation of the meaning. In other words, without an appropriate micro-level analysis tool, an analysis of texts may lack consistency and, subsequently, trustworthiness.

In the present study, as a micro-level analysis tool, the analytic practice of Discursive Psychology (DP) will be used. Originally conceptualised by Potter and Wetherell (1987) and further developed by Edwards and Potter (e.g. 1992 among many others), DP is a domain of discourse analysis located in social psychology and is a rubric of social constructionism (therefore, Burr (2003:63) calls DP “micro social constructionism”). Influenced greatly by speech act theory (originally developed by Austin, 1962) and taking a strong social constructionist approach, DP is based on a belief that language is used constructively for a variety of functions (such as assessing, instructing, blaming, showing anger etc.) and a single phenomenon can be described in a number of different ways (or ‘versions’), producing considerable variation in accounts.
The aim of DP is to examine the use of language in those different accounts when a particular function is carried out. DP strongly focuses on everyday social interaction of human beings where language is used, and is clearly and intentionally different from more traditional psychological studies which employ experimental methods to collect perceptual and cognitive data.

DP is also fundamentally different from the linguistics-oriented branches of discourse analysis, which participants of Translation Studies may be more familiar with. In Translation Studies, when discourse is discussed, it is normally the discourse within the STs or TTs in translation situations, and discourse analysis is normally concerned with either the development and organisation of a discourse within a text whose understanding influences the performance of the translator (e.g. Hatim & Mason, 1990; Schäffner, 2002) or with the translator’s or the reader’s cognitive understanding of discourse (e.g. Krings, 2001; Kussmaul, 1995; van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). In contrast, receiving a strong influence from Conversation Analysis, DP is concerned with the use of language (normally everyday use) which performs the function of discourse (thus is suitable for a study of interview data).

Attribution is one of the main areas of study in DP and is particularly relevant to the present study. According to Edwards and Potter (1993:23), traditional attribution theory (originally by Heider, 1958) has been concerned principally with perceptual and cognitive aspects of language. A typical study involves an experiment where the subjects are provided with linguistically formulated vignettes such as “John laughed at the comedian” and the subjects are asked “why” (McArthur, 1972). Language is used as a means for communication between the investigators and the subjects to assess the subjects’ causal thinking. Having reviewed the perceptual basis of this kind of study models, PD developed a fundamentally different observational model where “causal attributions, both inside and outside the laboratory, can fruitfully be studied as social acts performed in discourse and not merely as cognitions about social acts” (Edwards & Potter, 1993:23).

To provide a set of principles for this new mode of attribution study, the Discursive Action Model (DAM) was developed (Edwards & Potter, 1993:23-24). DAM covers three main topics: Action, Fact and Interest, and Accountability, which are summarised below:

1) **ACTION**: Attribution is a discursive action and is situated in a certain activity sequence such as blaming or defences.

2) **FACT AND INTEREST**: An act of attribution immediately raises a dilemma of stake or interest and the speaker manages the interest by performing
attribution. One of the major ways of doing this is by factual reporting. The speaker's descriptions are likely to be designed so that the version of description will not be refuted, undermined as false, partial or interested. The following example is taken from Pomerantz (1980:193 in Potter et al., 1993): A patient calls a doctor's surgery to re-book a broken doctor's appointment by saying “I called in on Thursday to see if I could make an appointment to see Mr XX. I haven’t heard anything. I was wondering if I could possibly see him one day next week.” Here, the caller is displaying partial knowledge in a context where the recipient has full knowledge without being heard as complaining. To do so, the caller says only the fact she knows (i.e. what she did) without stating any other elements (e.g. the receptionist may have forgotten) that are a possible source of complaint. This is an example of disinterested and unmotivated description. Other methods include: (1) detailed narratives and perceptually graphic descriptions; (2) mentioning of source of knowledge; (3) systematic vagueness (e.g. use of metaphor); (4) reports of unusual phenomena: e.g. narrative connections: ‘at first I thought (mundane X), but then I realised (extraordinary Y)’.

3) ACCOUNTABILITY: When the speaker reports an event, he/she will attend to agency (causality) and accountability (responsibility). It is not only the agency and the accountability of the persons described in the talk, but also the agency of the speaker himself/herself in the event reported as well as in the act of reporting. For example (Potter et al., 1993:19-20): In a television interview the then Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher talked about the resignation of her Chancellor, Nigel Lawson, saying “I tried very hard to dissuade the Chancellor from going but he had made up his mind and in the end I had to accept his resignation and appoint someone else.” This description can be interpreted as an attempt by the speaker to display her lack of blame for his resignation and consequently her current competence to head the government.

Applying DAM to the analytical practice of the present study seems to be a sensible methodological choice. The present study aims to find out how translators theorise their translational practices, in other words, how they explain their translational actions. The questions to be given to participants in the interviews are “Have your clients ever had disagreements/issues with the quality of your translation? What did they say to you and what did you say to them?” These questions are designed to prompt the interviewees to explain to the interviewer how they justified their translational choices to their clients. These particular questions have been purposefully chosen because "[a] principal discursive location for the production of factual discourse is where there is an issue, conflict, or dispute" (Edwards & Potter, 1993:24). In
describing how the conflict or a dispute with clients occurred and how they convinced (or tried to convince) the clients that their translational decisions were correct ones, the interviewees will perform an act of attribution, explaining either why a problem occurred, i.e. attributing the cause of disagreement to certain factors and elements or why their solution is correct, i.e. attributing their solution to the success of the translation. In doing so, they are most likely to try to make the best descriptions possible to prove to the interviewer the point they make in a manner which is as factual and convincing as possible.

We can safely make this assumption because of the situationality of the interviews. The descriptions are to be provided in an open-ended interview with the conductor of the research (i.e. myself). I am a translator as well as an academic researcher and the interviewees are aware of this fact. Therefore, the interviewees will try to make the description factual and convincing at the level they think is most appropriate in the particular interview setting. When a professional person talks to another professional in the same field or to an academic who is conducting a study about the profession, it can naturally be assumed that he or she will try to look and sound the most competent and professional by talking in a highly factual way, using the concepts and linguistic devices which they deem to be most effective to convince the listener. This level of factuality and convincingness is valuable for the purpose of the present study because thanks to that, it can be assumed that the accounts they produce are effectively equivalent to the best possible explanation and justification they can provide, which can subsequently be considered to be equivalent to what they consider to be the most convincing form of theorisation of their practice.

One point is, however, worth noting here: when the interviewees are asked what they said to their clients or what the clients said to them, we cannot expect that the interviewees report exactly what was said in the communication. Verbatim memory is notoriously unreliable (Hjelmquist, 1984) and people tend to manage their accounts of past events according to their personal stake in them (Neisser, 1981). This is related to the issue Pavlović (2010:80) discussed with reference to the notion of the translator’s ‘face’ (which I discussed in Chapter 3). In the case of the interviewees of the present study, the important point to remember is that they will be managing their personal stake in relation to me (the interviewer). Although they must have tried to convince their client (or whoever they had a dispute with) about their rightness regarding their translation service when the reported dispute incidence happened, in the particular interview setting, they are trying to convince me about their rightness as a translation professional by telling me the story. It is thus important to be aware that what I can observe from their talk is how they manage their stake in relation to me, not to their
client (although the topic talked about in the interview is about how they discussed with the client) or any other stakeholders in the story. And the more the interviewees try to manage their stake in the conversation with me, the richer and the more valuable the produced accounts will become for the purpose of the present study.

Adopting the principle of DP, the present study does not assume that the interviewees' accounts are objective descriptions of their professional practice or reality. I assume that interviewees are providing an account which they consider serves the purpose of justifying their translation actions in the best, most convincing way possible. Below I summarise the analytical model employed in the present study in line with the framework of DAM.

1) ACTION: In a sequence of the activity of justifying their translational decisions in an interview setting, the speaker will perform an act of attribution by explaining why a problem occurred, i.e. attributing the cause of disagreement to certain factors and elements or by explaining why their solution is correct, i.e. attributing their solution to the success of the translation. The discourse is understood as an action of justification, not a true verbal reconstruction of a fact.

2) FACT AND INTEREST: In attributing the cause of the conflict to certain factors and elements in the course of the justification, the interviewee faces a risk of interest, i.e. being understood by the listener as having a self-interest in the situation and as giving an account on that basis (e.g. “Of course a translator would say that as an excuse, wouldn't they?”). The interviewee is most likely to manage this dilemma of interest by factual reporting, i.e. making the account discursively as factual as possible so that they are not accused of making excuses.

3) ACCOUNTABILITY: The interviewee will describe in the talk who was accountable for the conflictive event. In doing so, he/she will manage the accountability of not only the participants in the event (translation clients, users as well as him/herself as a translator) but also him/herself as a speaker of the account.

Lastly, it would be important to make clear that the present study does not replicate a typical research design of DP. Potter and Wetherell (1987:35) say: "the constructive and flexible ways in which language is used should themselves become a central topic of study" and authentic DP research examines this language use in

---

15 There is a very good example to illustrate this point. After conducting an interview with one of the interviewees, I noticed by coincidence that on an on-line translators’ forum of which both the interviewee and I are members, the interviewee had posted his opinion about some translation procedure and that opinion was incongruent with what he told me in the interview with me. This event confirms the claim of DP that people ‘construct’ stories for different purposes in different situation.
everyday lives. The table below shows some examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object of study</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The modal 'would'</td>
<td>(Edwards, 2006)</td>
<td>Police interrogation</td>
<td>Formulating actors' disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of numbers</td>
<td>(Potter, Wetherell, &amp; Chitty, 1991)</td>
<td>TV documentary production</td>
<td>Exaggerating the large/small property of a phenomenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughter</td>
<td>(Haakana, 2001)</td>
<td>Doctor-patient conversations</td>
<td>(Used by patients) showing awareness of the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The phrase “you know”</td>
<td>(Stokoe, 2012)</td>
<td>Interview with a pharmacist about selling Viagra</td>
<td>Indicating that it is common knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My doctor (or an authoritative figure) says ...”</td>
<td>(Edwards &amp; Potter, 1992)</td>
<td>Various situations</td>
<td>Category entitlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Examples of DP studies

The object of these DP studies is the linguistic device, or the ‘hows’ of the language use. In contrast, the present study’s main aim is not to identify any particular discursive features in translators’ discourses (unless it is extremely obvious and deserves special attention), but instead, it intends to investigate how translators construct their explanation, or more specifically, to what factors and elements the interviewees attribute the problem they are talking about. So the object of the study is the ‘whats’ in the language use. In this endeavour, the kinds of linguistic features employed in the interviewees’ accounts, which are normally direct study objects of DP, will, in the present study, play the role of a signal which displays where and when the interviewee is doing attribution.

Here are some examples from my data. In an account given by one of the interviewees (Story 01-01)\(^\text{16}\), the interviewee says:

They, the client, the agency, they would not normally have that much time. If they are told that there was a problem by the end client, they would not normally have read the whole document themselves and they wouldn’t say immediately, “Oh, yes, that’s probably because it was a very poor copy.”

In this account, the interviewee used the modal “would” three times (where underlined). According to Edwards (2006), the “third-person dispositional would” is used when the speaker wants to emphasise that the description is about a disposition of the person he is talking about. Therefore, when the analyst notices the use of the modal, her attention is drawn to what kind of disposition the speaker is talking about and this information can be important for the analysis.

Another account (Story 04-01) shows some examples of the use of numbers and

\(^{16}\) The data organisation system of the current study will be explained in Chapter 5.
... <on the previous day> the project manager sent me the pdfs of the documents they wanted me to look at. They wanted me to be there for **four hours** and in that time give them a rough idea of what was in these emails. And this was a court case between two parties about some damage to the ship. Very expensive damage and who was responsible. And very, you know, **big money involved**. ... And then I saw his email and I opened the attachment and there were about **two hundred pages** ha-ha-ha, of the email in cases between these people. But I went anyway and I said, well look, I'll do what I can for you. And then I was there for **two hours** looking at these documents and after two hours the client, the solicitor, said, “I'm sorry this is too slow. You are not making any progress.”

What is noticeable in this account is that, first, the translator clearly states the duration of time he was given to complete a translation assignment, which was 4 hours (as underlined). We can interpret this number as a means for emphasising that the time given was short. Following that, he describes what the document was about: it was about a very serious court case with a lot of money involved, which implies that he was about to assume a big responsibility of translating this serious document and it would require special attention and concentration of the translator. Then he explains about the document the agency sent him by email, in which another number (200 pages) is mentioned. Although he is laughing when he mentions this figure (underscored with a wavy line), in reality, he is making the point that 200 pages is too much to go through in the time available (4 hours). The laughter here is informative. Following Haakana (2001), we can interpret this laughter as an indication that the interviewee is emphasising that the volume of the document was seriously large and problematic. As a result, the researcher’s attention will be drawn to the items emphasised by those discursive tools and the discursive tools play the role of an aid for the analysis. In this way, the outcomes of DP studies become useful analytical tools for the present study.

In this chapter, I have explained the methods and methodologies adopted in the present study. The next chapter will describe the actual data collection and analysis processes and their outcomes.
This chapter reports the process and the results of the main study. The data collection and analysis processes are explained first followed by the outcomes.

5·1 Data collection

5·1·1 Selection of interviewees

The main prerequisite of interview candidates was that the person was a successful translator. The main criterion for the measure of success was whether the person was much in demand in the current translation market. This was measured by the average number of words they translate for remuneration every week and (in the case of a freelance translator) how many enquiries for availability they receive from their existing or prospective clients. Although their experience in terms of length of time was not a requisite for selection, the interviewees were asked how long they have been working as a translator. If the interviewee undertook other work alongside translation (e.g. teaching or tour guiding), the two years of working time as a translator was counted as one. Although I intended to recruit translators, not interpreters, for the study, it is common that a translator takes on occasional interpreting work. For those translators, the number of working years was not adjusted. However, I excluded from this study people who mainly work as interpreters and take on translation as an additional activity. Most interviewees were freelance translators but two were in-house translators. Participants were selected from among translators in the language combination of English and Japanese (either direction, hence both English and Japanese native speakers) who are members of the ITI (Institute of Translation and Interpreting) and/or the Japanese Network (the language-specific branch organisation of the ITI) or were recommended by a member of these organisations.

It was not easy to find suitable candidates who were willing to give an interview because many translators who I approached said they did not have any experience which would answer my question (i.e. a dispute case with their clients). Some did not want to give an interview because it is time consuming.

The following table shows the profiles of the interviewees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee No.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Native Speaker of</th>
<th>Experience (years)</th>
<th>Average number of source words (English) or characters (Japanese) they translate per week</th>
<th>Average number of enquiries received weekly</th>
<th>Dynamic index</th>
<th>Education in Translation Studies?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5000 (J) 5000 (E)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10000 (E)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9000 (J)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10000(J)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5000 (E)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2000 (E) 600 (J)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16000 (J)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10000 (J)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2000 (J)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15000 (E)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25000 (J)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1000 (E)</td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12000 (J)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 hours (J)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14000 (J)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 hours (E)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25000 (J)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Profiles of interviewees

Notes about the profiles:

- Interviewee 06 was, at the time of the interview, a student studying MA Translation Studies at a UK university. She had worked as an in-house translator prior to the study and, at the time of the interview, she was accepting a small amount of work from the same employee alongside her study, thus her work output was small at the time of the interview. For the same reason, she was not receiving any enquiry from other prospective clients.
- Interviewee 09 was translating only 2000 words per week on average because until recently she had worked as an in-house translator, but at the time of the interview she worked as a language teacher and a part-time translator.
- Interviewee 12 did not answer about the average number of weekly enquiries
and her translation output was small because she recently shifted the focus of her work to tour guiding. However, she had long experience of translation (26 years as a part-time translator which I converted to 13 years of full-time experience).

- Interviewee 13 was a project manager of a translation agency. I collected interview data from her as a test case to check if project managers’ accounts were worth including in the present study. After examining her interview data, I decided not to include project managers in the study as it would unnecessarily expand the scope of the study. However I am keeping her in the list of the interviewees for convenience of data-number referencing.

- As it is common practice in the translation industry that translators start working as in-house translators before moving on to a freelance status, two of the interviewees (No 15 and 17) worked as in-house translators at the time of the interviews. They provided the number of working hours translating instead of a number of translated words or characters.

- Interviewee 17 did not state her age, but she seemed to be in her late twenties or early thirties.

- Interviewee 18 had only one enquiry a week on average because he recently shifted the focus of his work to writing a book, and at the time of the interview, he had a steady flow of translation work from a small number of clients.

Considering these points, I deemed all interviewees eligible as interviewees for the present study.

All interviews were carried out face-to-face either in the interviewee’s home or work place, or in a quiet place near their home or work (such as a café) except Interviewees 06, 10 and 14 who lived too far away for me to visit in a day using public transport. Interviewee 08 also chose not to have a face-to-face interview because of ill health. In those cases the interviews were carried out using the video communication facility Skype.

Each interview typically lasted about one hour, but the longest interview lasted more than two hours and the shortest 10 minutes. The total recording time of the interviews was 957 minutes. All interviews were conducted in the interviewee’s native language (English or Japanese) and recorded with a digital voice recorder.

5.1.2 Data generation and collection

I fully recognized that the nature of the accounts given by the interviewees would be determined to a great degree by the interview question. Taking this limitation
(or flexibility) of the research method into consideration, the main interview question was carefully generated, but as the interview process progressed, it changed several times. At the beginning of the recruitment process, I presented to prospective interviewees the following question: “Have you had a dispute with your client in the past? Why? What did they say to you and what did you say to them?” I presented this question in English to both English-native and Japanese-native translators as English is the language I used in the recruitment process. Interestingly, I soon found out that the word ‘dispute’ was a deterrent for the translators to take part in the study as most translators claimed they never had a dispute with their clients. As a result, I altered the initial question when approaching prospective interviewees several times and it turned out that the question that attracted the most prospective interviewees was “Have your clients ever had disagreements/issues with the quality of your translation?”. I did, however, retain the expression ‘dispute’ in the official consent form and in the report below as a general expression to illustrate a conflicting situation between participants in the translational process17.

So, the interviews were loosely structured, starting with the initial question, “Have clients ever had disagreements/issues with the quality of your translation?” Throughout the interview, the interviewees were encouraged to elaborate their accounts by questions such as “What did your client say to you?” “What did you say to them?”

I, as the interviewer, played an important role in the interview too. As the interviewees knew my position as a former professional translator who was conducting academic research on translators, they would construct their stories in such a way that the stories were understandable and convincing for me. This is what Gubrium and Holstein (2009:41) call “activation” of a narrative, where “the facts of experience are locally configured as storytellers and listeners actively take part in discursive exchanges”. In this study, it was assumed that the interviewees would use vocabulary and concepts which would be intelligible for professional translators. They would also give their accounts in a logical and convincing way so that the stories were suitable for academic scrutiny. In addition, I possessed what Collins (2007:30-33) calls “interactional expertise” in translation, which is a kind of expertise that encompasses both the language used in the domain and expertise gained through practical experiences. Interactional expertise, according to Collins, enables the interviewer not only to ask questions but also to have a conversation about the matter. Collins

---

17 I mean by ‘translational process’ not only the process when the translator produces a translated text, but the process which starts with an occurrence of a need for a translated product followed by a commission of the translation and ends with the delivery of the product to the end client and its actual usage.
advocates this form of interview in research as a way of eliciting rich data. Thus, during the interview I presented a sympathetic attitude to the interviewees as a fellow professional in the hope that they would be encouraged to provide detailed accounts of their experiences, making the data rich. At the same time, I took care not to ask questions which might lead them to talk within a framework which was influenced by received academic theories.

The interviews were first transcribed using a modified version of Jefferson’s transcription system, following mainly Edwards and Potter (1992) for English transcription and Nishizaka (2008) for Japanese, and in some cases, a combination of both (for the transcription system, see Appendix One). Developed for the purpose of Conversation Analysis, those systems notate detailed verbal features such as pauses, emphases and speed, which is useful in the data analysis as the atmosphere of the interview and the demeanour of the interviewee can easily be recalled, which facilitates data interpreting\textsuperscript{18}. However, for the reporting, the transcripts are tidied up, with ‘ers’ and ‘ems’ eliminated and grammatical mistakes corrected, for ease of reading. Proper nouns of people and companies are all coded with initials to conceal their identities in the transcriptions and the report. All translations of Japanese transcripts into English are mine followed by ‘[J]’.

The transcriptions were then imported into NVivo qualitative data analysis software. NVivo was chosen because it enables a researcher to categorise (or ‘code’) sections of data into different concepts and let them be cross-referenced between the categories both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Typically, an interview session consisted of several separate stories told by the interviewee. The interview with Interviewee 01 produced a particularly large number of stories, providing as many as 33 accounts. He was able to give a large number of accounts primarily due to his long experience as a translator (27 years) and also because in addition to his freelance translation and interpreting work, he runs a small translation business in which he acts as a project manager and a proofreader. Thus he provided a wide range of stories including such issues as quality of translation, financial matters, business practice and employment issues\textsuperscript{19}. An investigation of the 33 stories provided by Interviewee 01 revealed that some stories were solely about financial matters such as cases where the client failed to pay the translation fee. As a

\textsuperscript{18} As seen in the transcript data provided in Appendix Two.

\textsuperscript{19} Tracing back the history of translators in Europe to medieval time, Pym (1993: 161ff) points out that both currently and traditionally translation has been a profession where life-long, full-time employment is extremely rare and translators often work in different professional capacities throughout their careers or at some points during their careers.
close reading of the transcripts revealed that these cases (total number of 15) did not provide relevant data to answer my research questions, they were excluded from the analysis. Also, stories told as an interpreter (total number, 4) were excluded from the analysis to keep the research project focused on the field of written translation. I also decided to interview only translators (not interpreters) in the subsequent interviews. However, stories told from the standpoint of a proofreader, editor, and translation project manager of written translation work were included in the analysis since for the purpose of the present study, which specifically aims to observe the way translators justify their translation practice, all accounts are relevant as long as the interviewee justifies his/her translational choice against a claim made by a third-party participant, be it a client, proofreader (in the case of an account provided by a translator) or a translator (in the case of an account provided by a translator working as a proofreader). Also, some stories were told as second-hand stories about another translator. Here again, as long as the interviewee sided with the third-party participant in the recounted story and explained the reason why he or she took their side, the account was deemed to provide valid data for the present study. Therefore, in the subsequent interviews, the interviewees were requested to talk only about quality-related stories about written translation (not interpreting) work but they were allowed to talk about their experience as a non-translator participant such as a proofreader, an editor or a project manager.

As a result, 93 stories told by 17 translators were identified as valid for analysis. In this report each story is labelled with a number, e.g. Story 01-01 means that it is the first story produced by Interviewee No 1.

In addition to the interview data, I requested the interviewees after the interviews to provide me with any supporting evidence to their stories such as email correspondences or translated texts in question. Most interviewees were reluctant to meet this request because of confidentiality issues. Although the interviewees had been briefed about the participation and confidentiality conditions of the study and had agreed to them, it was understandable that they were concerned about these aspects. As a result, I could gather only 8 supporting documents from 5 interviewees, which were consulted in the analysis process but were not substantial enough for systematic use in the study.

5.2 Data analysis

5.2.1 Narrative structure

First, the narrative structures of the stories were examined, which revealed
that the translators produced two types of stories: one in which the interviewee was confident that he or she had delivered the best possible translation and the other in which they admitted that there was a problematic element in the translation. The stories belonging to the second type fell under two sub-types: one in which the translator deemed that the cause of the problem was out of the realm of his or her responsibility and the other in which the translator admitted that it was his or her mistake. There was also another type of story, which can be categorised as peripheral stories, as they did not directly answer the interview question but were related to the topic and might provide valuable data for the research.

Figure 12 Narrative structure of translators' accounts

I. A story in which the translator was confident that he or she had supplied the best translation and they explained that the client (or other party) should not be dissatisfied and why. 20 Stories belong to this category.

Examples
The end-client complained that the translation of a patent claim was written in bad English. The translator explained that that was the style particular to patent documents (Story 03-02).

In a court case where a translation was used, a barrister questioned the correctness of the translation saying that a word used in the translation was
different from the dictionary definition. The translator explained why a
dictionary definition sometimes cannot be used in translation (Story 18-05).

II. A story in which the translator admits that a dispute was instigated by
insufficient quality of the translated product, but there was a valid reason for
the shortfall in quality and the translator explained the reason to the client.
39 stories belong to this category.

Examples
The end-client complained that the translation included wrong terminology.
The translator explained that that was because no terminology list was
supplied at the beginning of the assignment (Story 02-01).
The user of a translation complained that the translation was not correct. The
translator argued that the user was expecting the translator to add
information not supplied in the source text, which was not possible for the
translator to do. (Story 01-03)

III. A story in which the translator admitted having made a mistake in the
translational process and he/she addressed the problem. How the mistake was
addressed was explained in the story. Nine stories belong to this category.

Example
The agency raised a query about a technical term used in the translation. The
translator sought advice from fellow translators on a translators’ mailing list,
found a more suitable term and corrected the term in the translation (Story
04-02).

IV. Stories which do not fall under any of the three structures above such as a
story which summarises stories already told or a story where the interviewee
talks about his or her more general belief about translation rather than a
particular incident. 25 stories belong to this category.

Example
In Story 01-33, Interviewee 01 says “I suppose the only other thing I’ve then
written down here are some of the conclusions that I’ve made from the various
problems and disputes.” He then lists all the points he had made in the
interview, summarising what he had said in the interview.

At this stage I expected that the stories belonging to Narrative Structures I and
II would provide rich data for the present study because in those stories the
interviewees would attempt to justify their translational acts most strongly, but stories
belonging to Narrative Structures III and IV were included in the analysis too as they
might have some elements that would provide valuable data (and later this proved to
The objective of this analysis is to identify to what factors and elements the interviewees attribute a problem in building their accounts in order to justify their translational acts. Here, the notion of ‘a problem’ is tricky because the analysis of narrative structure brought my attention to the fact that there are two types of ‘problem’ for the interviewees: one is a problem with regard to the quality of a translated product and the other is a problem which caused a dispute even though the interviewee thinks there was no problem with the translated product itself. In other words, there were two aspects the interviewees focused on in their talks in reply to the interview question: the translated product and the dispute itself.

When their talks focused on a dispute, they talked about the reason why the dispute was caused but the reason was not necessarily directly related to the quality of the translated product (number 6 in the diagram below). When they talked about the translated product, however, the methods of justification were more diverse. A close scrutiny of the data identified the following six methods: 1) explaining what factors affected the relevant feature of the translation; 2) explaining a policy he/she followed in producing the translation; 3) explaining what strategies he/she used when producing the translation; 4) explaining what criterion was used for judging the quality of the translated product; 5) reporting what consequence the delivery of the product induced. The interviewees did not only talk about these items as a past event; they sometimes talked about them as general principles. Both descriptions (past and general) were treated equally in the above categories. The diagram below illustrates the kinds of justification methods, followed by some examples from the data.
1) explaining what factors affected the features of the product.
Example: “They cut the rate by one third. That is quite a lot, isn’t it? It’s not 10%, but 30%. So I told them that I could not do bi-lingual proof-reading. I told them I could only do mono-lingual proof-reading, checking only the Japanese and …” (Story 02-02) [J]
“… if you more or less stick to an area where you are familiar, where you are qualified, you know, and you don’t translate with a bad hangover or something like that, you know.” (Story 03-07)
In the first example, the translation fee is described as a factor which affects the features (or in this case, the quality) of translation because with a lower fee the interviewee would be prepared to proofread only the target text (TT) without consulting the source text (ST). In the second example, the interviewee says taking on work only in his specialist area (i.e. chemistry) is important for maintaining a high quality of work (or certain features of translation) and adds (although jokingly but not necessarily dishonestly) that if he translates when he has a hangover, the quality of the translation will suffer.

2) explaining what policy was followed when translating.
Example: “… it has to read like a patent, I mean … people say that when you
translate a patent you have to have three languages. You have to have the source language, the target language and Patentees you know. (Story 07-01)

Here the interviewee explains what policy she follows when she produces translation and justifies the quality of her translation saying that her translation was of high quality according to this policy.

3) explaining what strategies were used when producing the translation.

Examples: This, this one is not such a good example, but sometimes, you know, sort of comma, mata dadadada, comma, mata or soshite or something like that. It can be easier to understand if it’s actually three shorter sentences instead of one long one. (Story 03-03)

It would be helpful to have the documents in advance or look them [sic.] on the train or something. They said, right, we’ll send them to you by lunchtime. (Story 01-06)

In the first example the interviewee talks about a textual strategy, and in the second, an operational strategy (for the definition of textual/operational strategies, see Chapter 1).

4) explaining what criterion was used for judging the quality of translation.

Examples: … this is different from the reference document you gave me but that’s because that’s grammatically incorrect in English (Story 11-07).

The proofreader said the expressions were inconsistent. So I think he wanted to see the desumasu style in the power point document too, but a desumasu style would not fit in nicely. (Story 05-02)[J]

In these examples, grammatical correctness and a stylistic fit in the text respectively were used as justification of the translational acts.

5) reporting what consequence the delivery of the translation induced.

Example: “It was a final email. I sent that final email and I never heard another word about it. But I have subsequently had offers of work from that agency so I didn’t conclude that they were completely furious with me.” (Story 07-01)

In this example, the interviewee says that the translation agency offered more work to her even after a case of dispute with another end client. This report can be understood as a way of her strengthening her case to show that she was the winning party in the dispute because the translation agency still offers her work.

6) explaining what caused the dispute
Example: “The agency told me later that probably the end client wanted to negotiate the fee. They probably wanted to use the quality of translation as an excuse to lower the translation fee, or even to get away with not paying at all. The agency said that was possibly the case.” (Story 05-03)[J]

This is a rare example in which the interviewee quotes an account she heard from her translation agency as to why she was not paid for the translation she had delivered.

In the analysis, passages in the transcripts which do one of the above were identified and coded at that category of justification method. Some passages were coded at more than one category if applicable. For example, a passage from Story 03-07 tells us:

“Unless I have a really tight deadline, I never read through on the day I translate something like that. Always leave it overnight. Makes such a difference to have a night’s sleep and then look at it again in the morning. Not so much for picking up mistakes or missing bits, but oh, you know, there’s a better way of saying that or something like that ....”

This passage was coded both at 2) ‘explaining what factors affected/affect the features of the product’ and 4) ‘explaining what strategies were used when producing the translation’ as it explains what strategy the interviewee uses when translating (allowing himself to have enough sleep before revising a translation) but he also says doing that improves the quality of translation.

5.2.3 Generation of concepts

The analysis now entered the stage in which concepts used for the acts of justification were to be identified. This was done by following the grounded theory approach (see the previous chapter for detail). First, segments of transcripts which represent a certain concept or a topic were selected and labelled with (or coded at) the concept or topic (open-coding). First, I used 8 transcripts (or 45 stories) of very experienced translators (with experience of 10 years or more, i.e. Interviewees No 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 07, 12, 18) to generate concepts. Eight was the number I chose because it is a manageable number for an initial analysis. It was also assumed that accounts of experienced translators would generate authentic concepts relevant to translators.

In open coding I was aware of the importance of my being totally open to the concepts which may emerge from the data because an aim of the present study is to "create understanding from data as the analysis proceeds" instead of starting with
hypotheses or with an understanding to be tested (Richards & Morse, 2007:73). This was implemented by using the “constant comparative method” of grounded theory which involves “a constant comparison of incident to incident, and then when concepts emerge, incident to concept” (Glaser, 1992:39). In the grounded theory method, what the analyst endeavours to do at this stage is to “look for patterns so that a pattern of many similar incidents can be given a conceptual name as a category” (ibid. 40) (or what I call in this report a concept of a higher level of abstraction, or just a concept – see below).

Open-coding is not a straightforward process as it involves trial and error, i.e. comparing different combinations of incidents as well as comparing all possible meanings the interviewees may have put to the incidents. Here is one example: in Story 03·01, Interviewee 03 did not agree with the proofreader (who was also the author of the ST) about the corrections the proofreader made to his translation. He said in the interview, ‘I asked that my name be taken off the translation’. So, in this story, the analyst analyses the incident of the translator’s asking the translation agency to take his name off the translation. In analysing this incident, the analyst compares this incident with other occasions when the same translator was not happy with a proofreader’s corrections, with occasions when he was happy with a proofreaders’ corrections, or with other translators’ accounts of a similar situation, etc. The analyst asks him/herself questions such as “What did he do when he was happy with the correction?” “What else did he ask the translation agency to do when he was not happy about the correction?” “Are there any other translators who talked about a similar incident?” In comparing incident to incident in this manner, the concept of ‘name of translator’ emerges as something that bore significance in the story, so the analyst creates a concept of ‘name of translator’ and codes the segment at the concept.

One point is worth mentioning here. In talking about his name being taken off, the translator was talking about his visibility as a translator. But if the word ‘visibility of translator’ is used to label this concept, there is a danger that the concept generated may be contaminated by the existing notion of Translation Studies, i.e. Venuti’s well-cited notion of the translator’s visibility and invisibility (Venuti, 1995). Therefore, what is called ‘in-vivo coding’ was carried out here, using a word which was used by the interviewee as the label of the concept for coding, i.e. ‘name’ of translator. Also, I made a conscious effort to avoid reading existing Translation Studies literature during the main period of analysis. Of course, as a researcher and a translation teacher, it was impossible to avoid reading literature totally (as I needed to read literature for other purposes), but intensive reading of one particular theory or notion can affect the researcher’s analytical practice, so this particular effort was necessary and was, I think,
worthwhile.

In this way, a large number of concepts were identified initially. I then carried out a category search, checking for duplications and overlaps of concepts so that more abstract notions would emerge from the analysis. For example, the concepts of ‘dictionary’ and ‘interpretation’, which both had only one passage coded at them, were merged into the concept of ‘meaning’ after reading the surrounding parts of the transcripts of the passages and confirming that the concepts of ‘dictionary’ and ‘interpretation’ were used in the same sense as ‘meaning’. Other examples include the following (the arrow means the concept on the left was merged into the concept on the right):

- To ask, Communication → Discussion about translation
- Reputation → Relationship
- Cost, payment, insurance → Money
- Ambiguity → Meaning
- Industry convention → Text type
- Word-for-word, direct translation → Loyalty to ST → Natural or Literal translation
- Comments about participants → Disposition of participants
- Arbiter → Authority
- Trust → Relationship
- Moral → Satisfaction

In this way, concepts were streamlined from 62 into 36 larger concepts. In grounded theory, a concept of a higher level of abstraction is called ‘category’ (hence this stage of the analysis is called ‘category search’) but in this report I keep calling those concepts of a higher level of abstraction ‘concepts’ as the term will make sense for any readers even if they are not familiar with the grounded theory terminology.

I then continued the same analytical process with the rest of the data, which were provided by less experienced translators (with less than 10 years of experience) (48 stories from 9 scripts). This process (or ‘theoretical sampling’ in grounded theory’s terms) is carried out to test whether the 36 concepts were valid with this group of data too (or the data is ‘saturated’). The new group of data used for this purpose produce “slices of data”, which will “give the analyst different views or vantage points from which to understand a category and to develop its properties” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967:65) In this process, one new concept, ‘responsibility for consequence’, was generated. Thus, all in all, 37 concepts were generated from the interview data.
I said in the previous methodology chapter that the methodology used in the present study is eclectic. If I were to use grounded theory as the only method of analysis of data, the next step of analysis would be to build a theory by identifying the relation between the concepts identified above. However, in order to focus my analysis on the very relevant part of the data, i.e. where the translators justified their translational practices, I left the grounded theory method here with the fruit of 37 concepts and moved on to measure the significance of each concept generated by examining how often those concepts were used when the interviewees justified their translation. This was done by identifying overlaps of coding between each of the concepts with each of the justification methods identified above. The frequency of overlap was measured in two ways: 1) by counting the number of stories in which at least one occurrence of such overlap happened; 2) by counting the actual number of instances of overlap in all the stories. The results of the measurement are shown in the following two tables. I measured the frequency of overlaps in these two ways to avoid any possible influence from personal discursive tendencies: if one interviewee mentions a single concept multiple times in one story, the number of overlaps will be recorded multiple times, but that does not necessarily mean that the same concept was used often in other stories too. In other words, the concept may be only specific to a single situation or a particular interviewee. To test if there is any imbalance in the numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing translation</td>
<td>Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition of participants</td>
<td>Reference material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of use of translation</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Repeated commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Responsibility for consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Role of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language knowledge</td>
<td>Satisfaction (or lack of -)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Source text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic features</td>
<td>Specialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of translator</td>
<td>Text type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native speaker</td>
<td>Time and effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or literal</td>
<td>Translator's note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well-being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 Concepts generated from translators’ accounts

5.2.4 Significance of the concepts
of overlaps of coding between methods 1) and 2), a scatter plot diagram was generated (Figure 5·3). The diagram shows that all the concepts are located in a near-linear manner, which suggests that no extreme influence from personal discursive tendencies exists in the outcomes.

The results, however, need to be read with a caveat. Due to the coding method employed, if the same passage or part of the same passage is coded at more than one justification method and/or more than one concept, that part is counted more than once and appears in different intersections of the matrix, but it is in fact invalid to count them more than once. In other words, stringent measurement of coding overlaps is not possible when following this analysis method. However, as the present study is primarily a qualitative study, we do not assume in principle that significance of concepts can be measured by sheer numbers of mentions in talks, but that an indication of what concepts are used more often than others is sufficiently informative. Therefore, the outcomes presented in the tables and figure below were used as indicators of significance and in-depth qualitative analyses were carried out in the next stage.
Table 11 Number of overlaps between a concept and a justification method: counted by the number of stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role of participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or literal</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and effort</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic features</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference material</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition of participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of use of translation</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text type</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source text</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing translation</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of translator</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (or lack of -)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for consequence</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translator's note</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 Number of overlaps between a concept and a justification method: counted by the number of overlaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification method</th>
<th>Total of 1) - 6) (excl. overlaps)</th>
<th>1) Factors which affect features of translation</th>
<th>2) Policy of producing translation</th>
<th>3) Strategy used for producing translation</th>
<th>4) Criterion used for judging the quality of translation</th>
<th>5) Consequence of delivery of translation</th>
<th>6) Reason for dispute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role of participants</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or literal</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and effort</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language knowledge</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic features</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference material</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source text</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialisation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminology</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native speaker</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition of participants</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text type</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of use of translation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of translator</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing translation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (or lack of -)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated commission</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translator's note</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for consequence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14  Correlation between the number of stories and the number of references for each concept and the keys
(The concepts in bold are the 10 most used concepts apart from the concept of role of participants.)
5.2.5 Grouping concepts

As mentioned in the previous section, the analysis of my data generated 37 concepts. Those concepts are of different kinds, depending on what the accounts are about: some are about people such as clients and users as well as translators themselves (e.g. disposition, relationship, language knowledge); some are about operational aspects (e.g. translation technology, time and effort, instruction, feedback); and some are about a translation product itself (natural/literal translation, meaning, style). Some concepts fall into more than one kinds; for example, the concept of ‘source text’ is to do with translation when one talks about the relationship between translation and its original text, but it is to do with operation if one talks about what kind of source text the client did/should provide to the translator when commissioning the work. So the concepts can be loosely grouped depending on the foci of description (people, operation, translation). I say ‘loosely’ because some concepts belong to more than one group.

In the discussion about classification of translation theory (Chapter 1), I reviewed existing theories and pointed out that different theories are based on different approaches depending on the target of observation, reflecting the interest of the observer. This includes disciplinary interest (such as psychology or sociology). The three groups of concepts I identified above can be deemed to belong to the same kind of classification, which reveals what the translators’ interest is in explaining their practice.

![Figure 15 Three groups of concept](image)

Having understood that the concepts can be loosely grouped into those three groups, a concept map was generated. Each circle in the map illustrates a concept the translators used for justifying their practice. The bigger the circle is, the more frequently the concept is used in justifying their practise using any of the justification methods. In this map I used the number of coding overlaps to indicate the frequency.
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As mentioned in the previous section, the analysis of my data generated 37 concepts. Those concepts are of different kinds, depending on what the accounts are about: some are about people such as clients and users as well as translators themselves (e.g. disposition, relationship, language knowledge); some are about operational aspects (e.g. translation technology, time and effort, instruction, feedback); and some are about a translation product itself (natural/literal translation, meaning, style). Some concepts fall into more than one kinds; for example, the concept of ‘source text’ is to do with translation when one talks about the relationship between translation and its original text, but it is to do with operation if one talks about what kind of source text the client did/should provide to the translator when commissioning the work. So the concepts can be loosely grouped depending on the foci of description (people, operation, translation). I say ‘loosely’ because some concepts belong to more than one group.

In the discussion about classification of translation theory (Chapter 1), I reviewed existing theories and pointed out that different theories are based on different approaches depending on the target of observation, reflecting the interest of the observer. This includes disciplinary interest (such as psychology or sociology). The three groups of concepts I identified above can be deemed to belong to the same kind of classification, which reveals what the translators’ interest is in explaining their practice.
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Having understood that the concepts can be loosely grouped into those three groups, a concept map was generated. Each circle in the map illustrates a concept the translators used for justifying their practice. The bigger the circle is, the more frequently the concept is used in justifying their practice using any of the justification methods. In this map I used the number of coding overlaps to indicate the frequency.
Figure 16 Concept map 1

5.2.6 Significant concepts

During the stage of the generation of concepts and identification of their significance, two concepts and one group of concepts stood out particularly because of the richness of data: 1) Role of participants; 2) Natural or literal translation; and 3) the concepts used for story organisation. ‘Richness’ here is measured by the frequency of instance. This naturally means they yielded a large amount of information to be analysed. In this section I will discuss those concepts qualitatively.

5.2.6.1 Role of participants

In the previous section 37 concepts were generated from the interviewees’ accounts. What has become obvious from the quantitative outcomes shown above is that the interviewees used the concept of ‘role of participants’ much more frequently
than any other concept. Further scrutiny of the interview data revealed that this is because in their talks a concept is often developed into a talk about other participants involved in the translational process in question, especially about the roles of the participants in translation. This may not be surprising because in the interviews the interviewees were asked to talk about a situation of conflict with their client: in a conflictive situation there are always more than one participant. One may say that this research design might have encouraged the interviewees to talk about the roles of the participants in translation more than other concepts. However, when it comes to justifying one’s own translation, we can assume that it would also be possible to do so without mentioning other participants in the situation (like many academic translation theorists do). During the interviews I encouraged the interviewees to give me detailed accounts by asking, “What did you say to your client?” In the effort to recall their exchanges with the clients (though, of course, they may not have recalled them correctly), I would argue that it must have been possible for the interviewees to choose a concept apart from ‘role of participants’ too. I think, therefore, that the frequent references of the concept of participants in their discourse deserves attention.

The participants mentioned in the interviews include the following. The list is provided to define the terminology used in this report:

- **Translator**: a person who translates a ST.
- **Translation agency (or company)**: a business entity which liaises between the translator and the end-client. An individual who deals with a translation project is often called a project manager.
- **End-client**: a business or an individual who commissions a translation agency to translate a document. It is called the ‘end-client’ not just the ‘client’ in this report because translators sometimes call an agency ‘a client’ in the transcripts. However, such a ‘client’ will be re-phrased as the ‘translation agency’ or ‘translation company’ in the report although the term ‘client’ may remain in the transcript.
- **User**: a person who uses the translated product. Sometimes the end-client of the translation project is the user of the product too.
- **Direct client**: the end-client may directly commission translation to the translator, by-passing an agency. In this case, the end-client is called a ‘direct client’.
- **Proofreader**: Somebody who checks the quality of translation. A translation agency may hire an external proofreader, very often a freelance translator, to take on the proofreading responsibility, or have an in-house employee who fulfils the function. A proofreader may be
called a reviewer or a checker.

- **Editor**: an editor engages in a similar role as a proofreader, checking the quality of translation, but the duty includes a larger responsibility in that he/she has more discretion to decide on the content of the final product beyond the quality of translation.

- **ST author**: a ST author is the person who produces the text to be translated.

Here are some examples of how a concept actually becomes developed into a concept of participants in the interview data. In Story 01-01, the interviewee says that he was given by the agency a ST which was not very clearly typed and, as a result, he mistranslated the Japanese word shimeru (tighten) as yurumeru (loosen).

[From Story 01-01]

But there was also a quality issue because the original was not very legible[1]. There was one place, it was a technical document, where it said this thing needs to be ... tightened but I misread the character as it needs to be loosened. Shimeru and yurumeru, if the character is blurred, it's easy to be mistaken. And so I translated it in the wrong way. Their client spotted the error. They said this must be tightened rather than loosened. So it was not a problem but their client did highlight it as an issue and they complained to me about this. And I said "Well fine, give me a better copy next time[2]."

In the early part of the account (the segment [1] marked by a wavy line), Interviewee 01 is attributing his mistake to the poor quality of the source text. Thus this segment is coded at the category ‘Factors which affect features of translation’ and the concept ‘Source text’. But in section [2] further down the transcript (also marked by a wavy line) he further develops this concept into an aspect of an action (or here, rather, the lack of it) by the translation agency that they did not supply a clear copy of the ST to him. The interviewee says he had said to the agency, “Well fine, give me a better copy next time.” One would not assume that these are the exact words he said to the agency, but this passage can be interpreted as showing that Interviewee 01 attributes his mistranslation to the fact that he did not receive a better copy of the source text, i.e. the agency not fulfilling their role.

In Story 02-01, Interviewee 02 was commissioned to translate a text about the screen interface of some medical equipment. After she delivered the translation, the agency approached her with negative feedback from the end-client and asked her to give her opinion about the feedback.

[From Story 02-01]

.... the feedback contained comments like ‘this seems to be an error (in
translation’) or ‘the translation does not sound like natural Japanese’ or ‘this translation does not fit in the medical context’ etc. (...) and they asked me, “What do you think about the feedback?” But I thought “Why are you asking ME?”, because whether they want to use the term ‘sukurin rakudatsu’ or ‘futekigo’ or ‘futekikaku’ is what the end-client needs to decide[20]. It would be different if they had supplied me an authorised terminology list before the project started, but while they didn’t have one, how can they say that I used a wrong term? [J]

At the first stage of the analysis, this segment was coded at the concept of ‘authority’ (because she is talking about what/who should decide what the final translation should look like, in this case, a terminology list or the end client) as well as at ‘factors which affect features of translation’ since Interviewee 02 says the lack of a terminology list decided the translational feature. If one reads a wider section around the passage, however, it can also be interpreted as showing that she was also talking about the roles played (or not played) by the other participants, in this case, the translation agency and the end client: the end-client did not supply a terminology list or did not decide which term was to be used in the final translation and the agency wrongly asked the question of the translator. By saying in section [3] “whether they want to use the term ‘sukurin rakudatsu’ or ‘futekigo’ or ‘futekikaku’” is what the end-client needs to decide”, she is explaining what role the end-client should play. Similarly, by using a rhetorical question (“Why are they asking ME?”), she makes it clear that the role of the translation agency should involve resolving the issue between the agency and the end client, not asking the translator (because it is not her responsibility). In this way she is constructing the argument that the fact that the agency and the end-client did not fulfil their roles caused the problem.

Translators talk about their own roles too. Interviewee 04 was dispatched by a translation agency to a law firm to read Japanese email correspondence and produce its gist in English.

[From Story 04-01]

... [on the previous day] the project manager sent me the pdfs of the documents they wanted me to look at. They wanted me to be there for four hours and in that time give them a rough idea of what was in these emails. And this was a court case between two parties about some damage to the ship. Very expensive damage and who was responsible. And very, you know, big money involved. ... And then I saw his email and I opened the attachment and there were about TWO HUNDRED PAGES, ha-ha-ha, of the email in cases between these people. But I went anyway and I said, well look, I’ll do what I can for you. And then I was there for two hours looking at these documents and after two hours the client, the solicitor, said, “I’m sorry this is too slow. You are not making any progress.” ... I

[20] [J] indicates that the original transcript is in Japanese and English translation is provided by me.
said I didn't know anything about the background until last night when I first saw the email and it's hard to get the context just from these email messages[4]. Anyway they said, well look, if it's alright with you, we'd like you to stop now and we'll then get in touch with the agency and discuss what we want to do next. The problem was they wanted it done in a big hurry. They wanted the results immediately [laughs][5].

In this account, Interviewee 04 attributes his failure to complete the task to the client’s satisfaction to two factors: his lack of knowledge about the particular court case [4] and insufficient time allocated [5]. Therefore these sections were first coded at the concepts of ‘Time and effort’ and ‘Context’. But section [5] can also be interpreted as showing that he is blaming the client for wrongly expecting him to complete the task in four hours, which was not possible in reality. Thus, in this narrative, the translator is also talking about roles of participants, in this case, that the other participant has a wrong idea about a translator’s role (i.e. overestimating what a translator can do without adequate background knowledge within a limited time).

Translators do not only talk about negative aspects of participants’ roles. Although in the interviews the interviewees were mainly concerned about dispute situations, interviewees sometimes talked about favourable events to contrast with dispute cases. Interviewee 03 says:

[From Story 03-03]

To be honest I like to work with agencies particularly where it's obvious that when you send them the translation, they check it thoroughly. That's actually quite reassuring. That tells me that they are a good company. They are thorough, they are professional.

This section was first coded at the concept of “Disposition of participants” i.e. a translation agency’s being thorough, but it can also be interpreted as showing that Interviewee 03 is talking about a role which should be played by an agency, i.e. checking translator’s translation and he appreciates that this particular agency does play that role.

In this way many of the concepts used in the translators’ accounts to justify their translational acts are, in the same accounts, developed in relation to the concept of ‘role of participants’. Considering the large number of references coded at the concept of role of participants across the data (198 passages in 51 stories), and how a concept was developed into an aspect of participants' roles as we saw above, the concept of ‘role’ does not seem to situate itself at the same level as other concepts. Instead it seems to be operating at a higher level when translators explain their practice. Thus the concept map was provisionally revised as below.
Next, I focused the analysis on the passages coded at the concept of “role of participants” to identify distinct patterns of explanation. This analysis revealed that the interviewees talked about two different kinds of roles: (i) other participants’ roles; and (ii) their own role.

(i) Other participants’ roles

The following table demonstrates examples of translators’ accounts of other participants’ roles and related concepts. The interviewees often talked about other participants’ roles by claiming that other participants did not fulfil their roles in the translational process. The first column illustrates what happened in the story (i.e.
what roles were not fulfilled by other participants); the second presents some examples of accounts; and the third lists the related concepts which were mentioned in the accounts.

Table 13 Other participants’ roles – examples from translators’ accounts (negative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What happened in the story?</th>
<th>Interview data [Story number]</th>
<th>Related concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good source text not provided</td>
<td>... the original was not very legible. ... and I said &quot;Well fine, give me a better copy next time.&quot; [01-01]</td>
<td>ST Native speaker Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They [the authors of ST] might be a native speaker who doesn't understand a language very well ... they will draft a letter and they have mistakes in it ...and I have to say, well this [the translation] is wrong because of that. [01-03]</td>
<td>Time and effort Reference material Consistency Terminology Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can't you do something about the English? Can't you contact the people who write the English and tell them to write the English better because it's wrong in English as well to repeat the noun so many times? [16-01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good reference material not provided</td>
<td>That was because they had not managed the translation memory properly. A lot of old rubbish was accumulated in it. [02-01][J]</td>
<td>Instruction Consistency Terminology Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I looked at the English translation they already had &lt;which was given as a reference&gt;... it wasn't very good ... it was inconsistent in its use of terminology.[04-01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... towards the end of this exchange, I was like, “By the way, did they have this glossary right from the start?”, like, “Could they have sent this to me at the start?” [08-01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some translators in the HQ and they make a terminology list. All translators in all different countries have to use the terms in translations but sometimes those terms are strange. [15-02][J]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction not clear or no instruction given</td>
<td>I was reflecting &lt;the prior feedback&gt; on my proofreading then a different reviewer started to tell me completely different things [02-01][J]</td>
<td>Native speaker Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That’s impossible without an authorised terminology list from the client [02-01][J]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... the original instruction didn’t say please make it as identical as possible. He just said, “Use it for reference”. [04-01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong choice of translator</td>
<td>... for this kind of job it might be better to use a Japanese native speaker …[04-03]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... they did concede that they were using Japanese-native English and French translators because of budget. They couldn’t afford the translators they wanted. [08-01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They used a Chinese person or somebody who can speak Japanese. [12-2][J]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happened in the story?</td>
<td>Interview data [Story number] [J] = originally in Japanese  (&lt;\cdot\cdot\cdot) = information which is implicit in the speech</td>
<td>Related concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wrong choice of proofreader</strong></td>
<td>they will have somebody inside the company who says I speak English or I speak Japanese and they will look at it and will not be a translator and also they will not have an understanding of the subtle nuances of the text. ([01\cdot03]) And a lot of the feedback was totally wrong, and his Japanese was not actually that good as I realised. ([1\cdot04]) And it turned out that the client, the agency’s client, they had never dealt with patents before. ([03\cdot02]) My translation was correct but he &lt;the proofreader&gt; thought I was wrong … I was wondering for a long time who the proofreader was. Judging from the features of his handwriting, it seemed to be a student of that school. ([10\cdot01][J]) You can’t play a Christian hymn in such a Muslim location. And eventually they … swapped it out for another song, but again they just had no concept of what the problem was. ([11\cdot03]) My boss does not have much knowledge about economics. That’s why he gave me this kind of &lt;negative&gt; comment. ([17\cdot01][J]) … but who checks Toda Natsuko? Who checks her? ([18\cdot09])</td>
<td>Language knowledge Native speaker Experience Specialisation Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| What happened in the story? | Interview data [Story number] [J] = originally in Japanese  
<--> = information which is implicit in the speech | Related concepts |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Translation not checked by an appropriate method | The end client ... had rewritten it but ... they had not changed the translation. They had written a new text effectively. They looked at our translation, took a little bit of it and wrote a new text in the target language. [01-03] The person who checked my translation should have decided himself what was good and changed it himself, but the agency came back to me to ask. [02-01][J] ... basically he changed my translation quite a lot, but he didn't change technical aspects of it. He changed my English, like the style of my English. [03-01] ... more than one person was proofreading <my translation>. Sometimes one proofreader specified a term to use but I was told not to use that term by a different proofreader several months earlier. So their requirement was not consistent. [10-02][J] When I delivered a translation to one agency, probably the project manager understood some Japanese. She checked my translation using machine translation. ... She probably fed the source English text into machine translation and saw what terms will be returned then compared them with my translation. [10-05][J] ... it <a correction> would be written by hand, as they'd draw a circle around something, and they'd say, “Please check”. It's like, “Check what?” Do you think it's a mistranslation or is there a missing word? What is it that you want me to check? [11-06] But they would sit down with the English manual and the other language manual and they would go through them line by line. [11-06] ...because Company F-X kind of sat in the middle and handled the order and handled speaking to the client, but I think they felt that they needed to do more. They needed to justify their place in the process and so they did this quality checking. But, it just created problems that weren't there. [16-01] | Consistency  
Language  
knowledge  
Authority  
Relationship |
| Translation not checked at all. | They sort of said, IT'S YOUR MISTAKE and I said no, it's not my mistake. You didn't give me the chance to check it. It's the printer's mistake. [01-07] I thought my translation would be proofread later ...but they seem to have sent my translation straight to their client. [12-01][J] | Time and effort |
| No feedback given. | ... these people are ... patent attorneys. They tend to be very busy and maybe he was just too busy to get back in touch. [04-01]. I’ve never been told exactly what the end client said about the matter. The agencies keep that to themselves in my experience. [07-01] | Feedback  
Time and effort |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What happened in the story?</th>
<th>Interview data [Story number] [J] = originally in Japanese  &lt;--&gt; = information which is implicit in the speech</th>
<th>Related concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Flaw in overall project management | ... they <translation agency> are in the middle and they don’t want to tell their client that your document is rubbish [01-03]  
The staff turnaround of Agency B is very fast, I mean, people come and go very quickly so what I told them does not get passed to new people and they come back to me and say the same thing. [02-01][J]  
If I get paid more, I would write down my knowledge <about the project> and hand it over to them so that they can train other translators, but they never asked me for anything like that. They have no sense of risk management. If I become unavailable, nobody will have any idea what to do. [02-02][J]  
... some producers are better at negotiating than others, which is fine and some producers didn’t want us to make changes because then they would have to go and negotiate. It was extra work. [11-03]  
... they didn’t want to go back and ask Company S. They thought it made them look bad. [11-05]  
I suggested to him <the in-house project manager> a couple of times that, from my point of view, it’s more professional if you are confident and it’s almost your job to educate the client. “Look, we’re the translators.” Otherwise you are just dictating what they say. It’s just silly. [16-01] | Relationship  
Money  
Time and effort |

These are all negative descriptions of how other participants did not fulfil their roles, but some interviewees made comments that they did appreciate other participants’ fulfilling their roles properly. The table below shows some examples.
Table 14 Other participants’ roles – examples from translators’ accounts (positive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fulfilled role</th>
<th>Interview data [Story number]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[S]tor[y number] [J] = originally in Japanese</td>
<td><code>&lt;~&gt;</code> = information which is implicit in the speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sufficient reference material provided</strong></td>
<td>The script was presented together with the texts on the screen, so it was difficult to understand which sentence should be translated in what style, but they had sent me some reference materials too, so with those reference materials it was possible to distinguish which sentence belongs to the PPT and which to the audio script. [05-02][J]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thorough proof-reading carried out</strong></td>
<td>To be honest, I like to work with agencies particularly where it's obvious that when you send them the translation, they check it thoroughly. That's actually quite reassuring ... that sort of tells me that they are a good company. [03-03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She does a bi-lingual check and she says I think maybe it's more usual to use this word in this case and she points me to resources I could use on the internet and so on, which is really really helpful. Wonderful. [04-04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s lucky that he cared because most of them don’t. ... That’s the problem with translation ... who checks the translators? [18-12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback given</strong></td>
<td>... as an example of really excellent practice there’s a guy who provides translation to one of the hospitals in London, and he is an absolute pleasure to work with and there was something I translated for them ... and there were some queries ... about the use of please rather than you must and some queries and one or two of the terms used. And I answered them in a translator’s note and ... they got back to me and said, “Very clear, well-thought-out translator’s note. They couldn’t imagine there would be any further queries.” It was nice to hear. [07-01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good overall project management</strong></td>
<td><code>&lt;The project manager&gt;</code> was very articulate. When I pointed out some problems, she asked me to give her some specific pieces of information like this and this and this, and once the information is supplied, she sent me an email asking me, “I’m going to send this email to the client. Are you happy with this?” [02-02][J]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The agency totally accepted what I said. They said, “We understand now. We’ll send your comments back to the client and see how they react”. So I think the agency forwarded my report directly back to the client. [10-01][J]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... they came back to me with comments from the proofreader, which were quite negative, which, you know, which was understandable. ... But they were actually lovely about it. The company was very nice about it and they weren’t negative with me at all. I think she said something like ... let’s work on these together and let’s both improve. [14-01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was quite relieved that ... the agent had quoted to me explicitly right at the beginning that the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related concepts

- Reference material
- Time and effort
- Feedback

Relationship Authority
(ii) Translators’ roles

The interviewees talked about their own roles too. In such accounts, a clear pattern was that they claimed their role as a translator was misunderstood by other participants in the translational process and the other participants’ misperception about their roles caused a problematic situations or a dispute between them. The following table presents some examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fulfilled role</th>
<th>Interview data [Story number]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[J] = originally in Japanese  &lt;-••- = information which is implicit in the speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translator must be comfortable with what she says ... because then I could take it back to them at the end and say you know you pointed out that I must be comfortable and so I really don’t want to go into changing it any further than this. [07-01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... they were actually really constructive during the project and they did give me quite a bit of creative freedom because ... [08-02]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: So does the translator have the final say about &lt;translational&gt; decisions? A: Yes, that is the case and I appreciate that. They trust me so that helps me a lot.[10-02][J]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... we did get to a certain point with them, where they agreed to give us less checks, which meant we had more time to work and everybody was much more relaxed with that, especially the desktop publishers. [11-06]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related concepts
### Table 15 Translators’ roles – examples from translators’ accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wrong perception</th>
<th>Interview data [Story number]</th>
<th>Related concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A translator can translate (or proofread) very quickly</td>
<td>I ended up cutting up little bits of paper with the translation on and sticking it on to the original and send them back to them because I was quite annoyed with the way that they were expecting me to do all of the formatting and everything like that. [01-01]</td>
<td>Time and effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think he didn't understand how complex it would be... so people will often say here is a sheet of Japanese. Can you translate it? And I'll say, well, maybe but it might take me an hour. And they'll say, but this is one sheet. I'd say, yes, but still, you know, if I'm translating something I need to do it properly. I need to have time to look at it. I might have to look things up. It is not a simple thing of saying I know what this means. [01-06]</td>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He wanted the third version, that that was even more close to the first version... to the existing translation... And then I thought well [laughs] this is, this is too much. [04-01]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... we were hoping that you would be able to read through all 200 pages in about four hours and tell us what they were saying.... the problem was they wanted it done in a big hurry. They wanted the results immediately. [04-03]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They often think correcting translation or proofreading it is just a little add-on to translation so they expected me to do it within a few hours. But once I looked at the translation, it was so bad that a few hours was not enough at all. But they would not pay for the actual time spent on the job, would they? [10-05][J]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And I said well, er, I know it's not very much writing but actually it is a poem and it's a lyric and that takes a lot of effort if you want to put that into something that looks good. [18-07]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A translator is willing to work for small remuneration.</td>
<td>It is reasonable to set the 100%-match fee at 30% of normal fees because proofreading does normally take about 30% of effort compared to translating it from scratch. It does take at least 30% effort. But &lt;this agency&gt; pays only 10% of normal fees for pre-translated segments. ... It does not pay if I want to do the job properly. [02-02][J]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;The client said&gt; It’s only five hundred letters here and you’re charging us too much money. [18-07]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**

- [J] = originally in Japanese
- <-> = information which is implicit in the speech
### Related concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wrong perception</th>
<th>Interview data [Story number]</th>
<th>Related concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A translator understands what kind of translation the client wants without a proper instruction.</strong></td>
<td>I think he wanted to know the judgements. That's probably what he wanted, but he wasn't clear. [01-06] I normally use the source text and the comments I have received from the clients in the past to decide which person would want a natural translation and which one a literal translation, taking into consideration what each individual person has told me before – I use all the information at hand together – but this particular reviewer criticised my translation as if I was stupid or something because I didn’t use a particular name in the translation. But there was no way I would know the name. [02-01][J] But it was impossible to re-translate it without any concrete direction, so we spent about one month just to find out what kind of translation he wanted. [05-01][J]</td>
<td>Instruction Natural/literal translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A translator can produce a translation even if the ST is not in order</strong></td>
<td>... the text they gave me was very poor quality. It consisted of a lot of diagrams, the diagrams were not electronic. It was not possible to type over the top of them and they just said translate this ... [01-01] ... the problem was not so much in the translation. It was that the source document had been very badly written and we had mentioned to this agent at the beginning and they said, well, just do whatever you can. ... sometimes we can change it and we can improve it, but quite often it is not our job to improve it. [01-03] The ST didn't mention such things at all ... &lt;The client&gt; corrected my translation and said my translation was awful. I asked them to show me the corrected text ... and I found out that they were adding internal information which only they could know such as some proper nouns. [02-01][J]</td>
<td>ST Meaning Context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The qualitative analysis above identified concepts which are closely related to the concept of role of participants. Now the importance of these concepts in relation to the concept of role of participants was measured quantitatively by counting the number of overlaps of coding between the concept of role of participants and other supporting concepts. The results are shown in the following table.
### Table 16 Ten most related concepts with the concept of role of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related concepts</th>
<th>No. of overlap of coding with the concept of role of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language knowledge</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and effort</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source text</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural or literal</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native speaker</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagram below highlights what concepts are closely related to the concept of role of participants in the translators’ accounts: 10 concepts identified to be quantitatively significant are shaded in grey and the concepts identified as qualitatively significant are in square shapes.
Figure 18 Concept map 3

It is notable that three of the top four related concepts are human-related concepts (Relationship, Language knowledge and Authority).

[R-i] Relationship

An interesting point about the results of the analyses is that the translators often use human factors as requirements for production of successful translations. For example, translators often claim that relationships between participants influence their translation production. Naturally it will be preferable for the translators if they are in a good relationship with the translation agency or the client, but it is not only their own personal relationships that matter. Perhaps thanks to their wealth of
experience they are even aware of the relationships between other participants (e.g. the agency and their client) and say that their relationships influence how they translate too. This include matters such as the staff turnaround in a translation agency or the translation agent’s attitude to their clients (whether they are willing to discuss matters with their clients or not). Relationships with other participants or between other participants are important for translators because they influence their working conditions by way of the quality of the ST and availability of reference material. If the quality of the ST and the amount of reference material (if any) are not sufficient for the translator to carry out the job satisfactorily, it will be crucial that the translator is in a position to be able to ask for or search for what he/she needs. In this respect, relationships with other participants are crucial issues for translators.

[R-ii] Language knowledge

Language knowledge is another notable human-related concept used by the interviewees and this is an intriguing one. The concept demonstrates a translators’ claim that translation is a special kind of linguistic activity, not just a simple linguistic transfer between two languages, and that other participants often do not understand what is special about this linguistic activity. For them, language knowledge and knowledge of translation are clearly two separate things. As a result, people with some knowledge of foreign language(s) tend to assume wrongly how translations should be assessed and overestimate their own judgement about translation, which annoys translators very much. Translators think that a competent proofreader should have knowledge of two languages at the native speaker’s level, but they know that is not possible in most cases. They are frustrated because other participants do not recognise the complexity of the operation of translation and also because they wrongly assume that good language knowledge is what is required for translators. This underestimation of the complexity of the activity of translation, they say, often results in a small remuneration (which is told in the concept of money) for translators.

[R-iii] Time and effort

The interviewees are pragmatic when they talk about how other human agents work. Particularly, the matter of how much time and effort other participants will spend on their roles, is an important issue for translators. It is vital that all participants of translation spend enough time and effort to fulfil their own role in order for the translator to produce the best possible TT. Translators get frustrated if other participants do not understand this point and expect wrongly what translators can do without proper contributions from them.
[R-iv] Authority

The concept of authority is also important for the translator. It is important not because translators believe the translator should assume full authority in the production of translation, but because they believe there should be somebody apart from the translator (normally the agency or the client) who asserts authority properly over the translator and gives appropriate instructions to him/her.

5-2-6-2 Natural or literal translation

In the previous section, I showed that the concept of roles of participants has a special status amongst the 37 concepts generated. Amongst the rest of the concepts, the concept which was used most often for a justification purpose was the concept of natural or literal translation: 14 interviewees out of 17 used the concept (in 31 stories in total). In this section I will highlight this concept by exploring how they used this concept in their accounts.

In the interviews the concept was described using different terms and expressions as the following table illustrates. In this report the terms ‘natural’ and ‘literal’ are used to label the concept as these are the terms which were used most often by the interviewees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural</th>
<th>Literal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fluent</td>
<td>unnatural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural</td>
<td>direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日ナチュラル(nachuraru or natural)</td>
<td>awkward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>意訳(yaku or sense translation – an often-used Japanese word for ‘natural translation’)</td>
<td>cranky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>不自然 (fushizen or unnatural)</td>
<td>word-for-word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>忠実(chujitsu or loyal)</td>
<td>stiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>誠実(seijitu or faithful)</td>
<td>直訳(chokuyaku or direct translation – an often-used Japanese word for ‘literal translation’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 Terms used to describe natural/literal translations

The concept of natural/literal translation was also presented by using different expressions instead of the words shown in the above table. For example, the concept of natural translation was expressed by saying that the translation “sounds right” [16-}
or it is "good English" whereas the concept of literal translation may be articulated by saying that the translation is produced "in line with the original language".

The present analysis aimed to pin down these concepts with no value-laden preconception. The deciding factor in the analysis regarding what is 'natural' and what is 'literal' translation was whether the TT is similar to the ST or not. The notion of 'similarity' was not drawn on in the analysis as an existing assessment criterion, but was identified as notable in the analysis of the interview data as a result of a category search. The analysis revealed that, for translators, the notion of 'similarity' can be decided by two different criteria: 1) the extent to which the TT is recognised as sounding 'right' by a native-speaker's standard; or 2) how much information contained in the ST is presented in the TT using surface linguistic representation (i.e. words). The latter case becomes relevant either when the translator decides an extra piece of information is necessary for the TT reader to understand the text and such information is linguistically added to it, or when the translator deems some information is not necessary in the TT so he/she omits it. The concept of 'natural and literal' in this analysis encompasses all of these cases.

This concept of natural/literal translation corresponds to Englund Dimitrova’s Non-Specified (2005:123), Pavlović’s “Sounds Better” (2010:68-69) and “It is (not) said that way” (2010:69-70) and Hui’s Non-Specified (2012:82) categories. All of these categories scored the most frequencies of mention in their studies too (for both professionals and students), so the fact that my interviewees used the concept of natural/literal translation very often (coming second in frequency, after the concept of roles of participants) supports their claims with regard to this. We cannot say categorically here that this way of theorisation is evidence of the eloquence (a term used by Fraser (2000:118)) of my professional translators or lack of articulation in their accounts (as we do not have a benchmark for such judgements), but below I will examine how this concept of natural/literal translation is related to other concepts to observe successful translators’ theorisation patterns in more detail.

The concept of 'natural/literal translation' was notably used in the interviewees’ accounts when they explained what policy they followed/when they translated/translate (justification method 2) and what criterion they used/use for judging the quality of translation (justification method 4). An interesting point discovered is that the question of which end of the continuum (natural or literal) is used for justification is fluid: the interviewees used both concepts flexibly to justify

\[21\] indicates a story number
their translational practice. Looked at quantitatively across all the stories collected, the concept of 'natural' translation was used more often than that of 'literal' translation when they justified their own translational choices, but both concepts were present.

(i) Use of the concept of 'natural translation'

Let us first look at some examples of using the concept of 'natural' translation for justification.

Table 18 Examples of accounts (natural translation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story No</th>
<th>What happened in the story</th>
<th>Interview data: [J] = originally in Japanese, &lt;-&gt; = information which is implicit in the speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-13</td>
<td>The interviewee sub-contracted another translator to do a translation and he proofread the translation, which he thought was not of a good standard.</td>
<td>... it doesn’t’ read as a source language document. It reads as a translation, chokuyaku [a Japanese word for direct translation]. The style is bad. It is very cranky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-01</td>
<td>The client instructed the translator to translate as closely to the ST as possible. After the delivery of the translation, they complained that the TT is not close enough to the ST.</td>
<td>In Japanese that definitely would not sound natural for the end client. [J]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-01</td>
<td>The interviewee delivered a translation, which was revised by the original author. The interviewee did not agree how his translation was revised.</td>
<td>... when the revised copy came back, it was completely unnatural. I pointed this out &lt;to the agency and&gt; ... (reading out the email correspondence he sent to the agency) It does not look as if it were translated by a native English speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01</td>
<td>In an in-house translation project of documents written for engineers, the interviewee’s colleague, also a translator, criticised her translation saying that she was leaving out some parts of the ST from the TT making the TT ‘lack faithfulness’.</td>
<td>I didn’t think it would be necessary to include &lt;in the translation&gt; something that does not mean much to the engineers. [J]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-02</td>
<td>The interviewee revised other translators’ translations and thought they were not of a good standard.</td>
<td>It didn’t read naturally at all. When you read a translation, you can hear the other language on the other side, so I could hear the structure of Japanese when I was reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-01</td>
<td>The interviewee’s translation was corrected by the end-client. She did not agree with the corrections.</td>
<td>The reviewed text contained many mistakes which a normal person who reads Japanese newspapers or Japanese writing on a daily basis would not make. [J]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-01</td>
<td>As an in-house proofreader, the interviewee did not agree with her boss about how translation should be done.</td>
<td>Coming at it from a European translation point of view where you expect the translation to be native level standard. ... I was checking, supposedly making the English sound like native English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Soon after the interviewee started his career as a translator, his end-client commented that his translation was ‘too stiff and formal’ and ‘doesn’t sound right’.

...the English I produced was very reflective of the Japanese sentence structures...I was literally translating what the Japanese said.

In order to strengthen the concept of natural translation, the interviewees used some additional concepts as below.

[N-i] Native speaker

Most notably, many interviewees mentioned the concept of native speaker as an important element of natural translation. When this concept is used for justification, translators insist translation needs to sound like it was written by a native speaker. So, in the case of English as a TT, the TT needs to “sound like native English” [16-01]. Ideally, “you have to be a native speaker of both languages to be able to do the best translation” but you “are never a native speaker of both” [01-03], and even for experienced translators, the production of natural sounding translation is not always easy as Interviewee 02, who has 16 years of translation experience, said:

“As you know, the first time you translate a text, even if you try to detach yourself from the <original> English, you often get pulled towards the English. So if somebody says to me, ‘this sounds unnatural. It would normally be said like this.’, then I would have to say, ‘Yes, you are absolutely right’.[02-02][J]

This matter is not only a problem for the translator. When a translation is proofread by a non-native proofreader, the translator may feel that the resultant reviewed text “does not look as if it were translated by a native English speaker [03-01]”. One interviewee focused on a situation of this kind, saying

“And a lot of the feedback was totally wrong, and [the proofreader’s] Japanese was not actually that good as I realised. And he thought that he was good and within the company he was the person who could speak Japanese, but his Japanese was not really that good.” [01-04]

It is not only the translator who considers this element important, but end-clients deem it important too. If the translation quality is not satisfactory, the end-client may “complain saying that the text must have been translated by a non-Japanese person” [Story 05-01][J] even if the translation was produced by a native translator. Therefore, if a non-native person is used as the translator, the TT (in this case, Japanese) will result in “a translation in which the Japanese [is] incoherent.” [12-02] Translators are aware of this issue and do not accept a job when asked to translate into their L2 saying “I can’t do that. I can’t possibly because I'm not a native
speaker.” [18-09] But some translation agencies are not aware of this point and commission translation work to a non-native translator, possibly “because of budget” i.e. “they couldn’t afford the translators they wanted” [08-02]. This reminds us of the operational issues identified in the previous section related to the roles of participants in a translational process, where I highlighted that translators claim that the quality of translation is affected adversely when other participants (in this case, a translation agency) do not play their roles properly, and the selection of an appropriate translator was identified as one of these roles. Further, besides the translator and the proofreader, the issue of native speaker status concerns the original author of the ST too. This is because STs are sometimes produced by a non-native speaker of the source language (“Some texts were apparently written by a non-native speaker and especially if that is a marketing type of text, it is impossible to understand the original meaning” [02-02][J]). Even if the ST author is a native speaker of the source language, he/she “might be a native speaker who doesn't understand language very well ... let's say a business man or even a lawyer” [01-03]. If the ST was produced by such an author, the ST may “have mistakes in it” [01-03].

[N-ii] Language knowledge

The concept of language knowledge is another notable concept the interviewees used and an intriguing one, which was discussed related to the concept of roles of participants too. I will elaborate the concept here.

This concept of language knowledge is related to the matter of assessment: when quality of translation is assessed, be it by a proofreader, a project manager or the end client, the assessor has his or her own criterion for assessment and the interviewees constructed their argument saying that this criterion is influenced by the assessor’s language knowledge.

When an assessor, for example a translation agency, has no knowledge of the other language, a dispute is unlikely to occur simply because the agency cannot assess the quality of the end product: they will have no choice but accept what the translator delivers. And in the interview data this was not a rare case because all the interviewees in the present study were translators who translate between English and Japanese and not many translation agencies in the UK have knowledge of Japanese.

... they have nobody in the house who can check the work. So I give them work, I supply the translation to them, they supply it to their client.” [01-03]

So as long as the work delivered by the translator is of a good standard and the end-client is happy with it, no problem will occur. If the translation itself has a problem
and the end-client becomes aware of it, then a dispute may occur, but we saw in the previous section that translators explain it as an operational problem related to the roles of participants (i.e. not checking the quality of translation) rather than a problem related to translation itself.

When an assessor has some knowledge of the other language, however, a dispute tends to occur more often. This is primarily because “the other party does not understand enough Japanese or English, so they mistakenly point out a problem” [18-01] and the problem is often related to the issue of natural or literal translation. For instance,

I was working in-house so it’s the line manager, who was Japanese and had reasonable English, but not brilliant English. That seemed to be the problem that the people have a reasonable level of English but not enough to appreciate that it doesn’t sound right. [16-01]

In this particular story, the interviewee was working as an in-house localisation manager in a translation company in Japan (or as a ‘checker’ as it is commonly called in Japan) checking English translations produced by Japanese-native translators. When she was checking an “English translation which already read as a really literal translation from the Japanese” [16-01], she suggested that the translation should be changed to more natural-sounding English, but the Japanese line manager opposed her suggestion because:

I guess he didn’t understand the nuance of the Japanese, probably like imi (a Japanese word for ‘meaning’). If you translate imi, what do you think, what is it actually saying? [16-01]

Another interviewee talked about a similar experience as an in-house project manager where in-house proofreaders were checking translations:

... they had French, Italian, German, Spanish, Finnish, Norwegian, Danish ... Finnish. And they could have up to twelve or thirteen languages. Brazilian Portuguese and everything. And they couldn’t read all of those. There’s no way they could speak that many languages. But they would sit down with the English manual and the other language manual and they would go through them line by line. And then they would try to compare the structure of the sentences. And of course they’re not the same. Languages aren’t structured in the same way. [11-06]

Interestingly, it is not only a limited level of language which can cause a dispute about naturalness of translation, but even an excellent level of language of an assessor can too. In Story 06-01, the interviewee was working as an in-house translator. Her colleague, another in-house translator, criticised the interviewee’s translation saying that “her translation, which omits <some ST expressions>, lacks faithfulness to the ST” [06-01][J]. The interviewee described this colleague as somebody who “was raised and
educated in America, therefore very confident in her American English, even to such a level as to be convinced that she was absolutely right about language issues” [06-01][J]. In the story, the interviewee constructed an argument that her colleague's translational decision leaned towards literal translation because of her confidence in her bilingual command of English and Japanese whereas the interviewee herself was a Japanese-educated Japanese native speaker, but that she was qualified to do the translation work because she had knowledge of the marketing activity which her employer engaged in and she understood the employer's needs.

Language knowledge is not confined to human knowledge. Reflecting the recent advancement of translation technology, one interviewee told a story where a project manager of a translation agency chose to use a machine translation programme to check the interviewee's translation.

When I delivered a translation to one agency, a staff member of the agency, probably somebody who has some Japanese, checked my translation using machine translation [10-03][J]

Not surprisingly, the interviewee attributes the wrong assessment of her translation to the use of machine translation.

So, when an assessor has some command of both languages involved, there is a danger, translators claim, that they follow a literal translation policy and in that case, the translator's endeavour to produce natural translation may be unfairly negated. Translators are aware of (and annoyed with) the wrong assumption of other participants that translation (and its proofreading) is possible for anybody who has a good command of two languages. In other words, even if someone has a certain command of a foreign language, they do not recognise or understand the complexity of translation, the kind of complexity only translators can understand. When other participants have wrong ideas about this point, the translators claim a dispute tends to occur.

[N-iii] Meaning

In order to produce natural translation, it is also important to understand the meaning of the ST correctly. Looking back at his translator's career, Interviewee 18 talked about the importance of the reproduction of meaning in order to produce natural translation:

I was literally translating what the Japanese said because I didn't have enough experience to realize that you should express in English what is meant by the Japanese, not literally what is said by the Japanese. You have to read through the language sometimes. [18-02]
Further, the translation must be natural for the reader of the translation. This policy was explained when one interviewee said, “<The expressions the client wanted me to use> would definitely not sound natural to the end-client when they read it.” [02-01]

Culture

One interesting concept generated which relates to natural translation was culture. All the interviewees were translators of Japanese and English, so in the present study, culture denotes Japanese or British (or European) culture. Some interviewees expressed their belief that Japanese people prefer literal translation to natural translation. For example, in Story 18-02, an end-client, who was a Japanese civil servant working in diplomacy told the interviewee that “the content is fine but the tone is wrong”, saying (in the client’s word as quoted in the interview) “from my experience of reading British documents, English documents, this doesn’t sound right”, and the interviewee said that was what he had “very rarely been told by a Japanese person” [18-02], principally agreeing to what his client said. Interviewee 16 was more explicit about the same point. Talking about her partner translator in a joint translation project, she said, “All her translation experience has been in Japan and she’s done legal translation mainly so her style was quite literal” [16-02]. And the interviewee presumes that “she learnt translation in Japan so she probably absorbed the Japanese translation <method>” [16-02]. With regard to her own translation policy, the interviewee said, “Coming at it from a European translation point of view where you expect the translation to be native level standard” [16-02]. Here, the concept of ‘culture’ is used to justify a natural-translation policy.

A particularly intriguing point here is that the concept was highlighted all by English-native translators when they talked about how Japanese translators tend to translate or how Japanese people tend to think about translation. They seem to think that Japanese translators produce more literal translation than western translators or that there is a tradition of literal translation in Japan. This contrast in the perception of and preference for natural/literal translation between the two language communities may be able to be explained with reference to the role of kanbun kundoku (literally "Chinese writing Japanese reading") in the development of the Japanese literary system since the 8th century, but this is beyond the realm of the present study.

Authority

Another concept used for the same purpose was authority, i.e. translators need
to be given authority to produce natural translation and they seem to enjoy it too. One interviewee said this is why he could produce natural translation in a production of an English version of tourist material about Japan.

They <the translation agency> were actually really constructive during the project and they did give me quite a bit of creative freedom. Because there's not always the space to translate everything so I was obviously capturing important information but as well to be a little bit more fluent with the sentence structure and how much turned into English. So I actually really enjoy this project. [08-02]

In contrast, if the translator is not given authority to decide how natural the translation should be, then the translator may have to resort to a literal translation policy22. This point will be discussed in the next section.

(ii) Use of the concept of 'literal translation'

In the previous section, we looked at some examples where the interviewees used the concept of 'natural translation' to justify their translational decisions. In contrast, in some stories, the interviewees justified their translational decisions using the concept of literal translation. Although there were fewer cases of such stories across the whole interview data, I will look closely into these cases to identify how they did it. The table below shows some examples.

Table 19 Examples of accounts (literal translation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story No</th>
<th>What happened in the story</th>
<th>Interview data [J] = originally in Japanese  &lt;-:-&gt; = information which is implicit in the speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-03</td>
<td>The interviewee translated a text with a difficulty because the ST was not written well. The end-client complained saying that the translation was unusable.</td>
<td>You translate a bad text, it ends up as a good translation but still a bad text and then the end-user in the other language says this is a bad translation ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-01</td>
<td>The interviewee delivered a translation. The end-user reviewed the translation and complained that the translation was not good enough.</td>
<td>(Commenting on the reviewed and edited translation) It was not translation. &lt;The reviewer&gt; cut all ambiguous parts. He cut all the parts he said he didn’t like. So all the parts which were difficult to translate were cut. He also added extra sentences at the beginning and the end of the text. [J]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 Interestingly, Prunc (2007b) debates the same point in the context of the history of translation, illustrating the relation between the dispute over whether “literal” or “free” translation and the issues of power games involving social forces. He offers the example of Cicero’s and Horace’s integrating the concepts and textual structures of the ancient Greek texts into the Latin texts, a phenomenon which Prunc claims is supported by the cultural power of the expanding Roman Empire.
The interviewee, a patent translator, was asked by the end-client if she could change a singular noun in the translation so that the noun could seem to be in the plural form, instead of singular.

... there is no indication that plural rather than singular was intended. Because in my experience, if they had intended plural, they would have said so. And they didn't.

The interviewee, an in-house translator, translated an economic term by choosing the word from a dictionary of economic terms but her boss said the term in the translation was difficult to understand.

I always try to translate by keeping the <nuance of> the ST as much as possible. I wanted to leave the nuance of the original so I translated the term as hidentoteki. [J]

The interviewee was commissioned to translate Paul McCartney's poetry book into Japanese. The Japanese editor asked him to change the expressions in the translations to make them less direct.

He < McCartney> wanted what he said to be reflected in the Japanese. He didn't want it to be made beautiful. He wanted it to be what it was as much as possible...I probably made some compromises but basically I was trying to insist that it be a bit more direct, you know.

By examining what other concepts are related to those stories, it seems that the stories are closely related to two other concepts: context and authority.

[L-i] Context

First, I will examine the stories in which the concept of context plays a role. Story 01-03 provides a clear example of such a case, so I will illustrate this story at length (all the sections in inverted commas are direct quotes from this story).

When the translation assignment was first commissioned to the interviewee, he noticed that “the source document had been very badly written” because “the English was not written by a native English speaker”. He notified the translation agency of this, but the agency said, “Well, just do whatever you can”. So the interviewee translated the text as best as he could and delivered it to the agency. A while later, the agency contacted him saying that “the end client … had seen this and said it doesn’t make any sense so they had rewritten it”. The interviewee saw the re-written text and found that “they had not changed the translation. They had written a new text effectively…. They looked at our translation, took little bits of it and wrote a new text in the target language”. Then he explained to the agency (who were unable to read Japanese) what the end-client did in the reviewing process in order to prove that he had supplied a good translation in the first place:

“... so I took the first sentence and I said in English it says this. In Japanese it says that. This part of the Japanese does not exist in English. He is making it up. Yeah? Next sentence, same thing. The English says this, the Japanese says this. They are totally different.”

He explained further in the story:
“I quite agreed that the Japanese text created by the client in Japan is a better text and it works very well, but I do not agree that ours was a bad translation. As a translation, it was an accurate translation.”

“If you have a bad source text … it ends up as a good translation but still a bad text and then the end-user in the other language says this is a bad translation”.

In this story, the translator used the surface similarity between the ST and TT as the benchmark of translation quality and claimed that “a bad ST” will turn into “a bad (target) text”, but importantly, not “a bad translation”. Effectively the translator constructed the argument that his translation was good because the intrinsic ‘badness’ of the ST was transferred to the TT. The criterion for quality here was the similarity to the ST and the interviewee called the resultant product “an accurate translation”.

Why did the translator decide to stay close to the ST? Why did he not add to the TT the kind of information the end-client wished to be included in the TT? He explained that it was “because we are not experts in this particular company. We do not know everything that that company does”. He argued that if the translator does not have enough background knowledge about the content of the ST, or about the translation project, the translator has no choice but to stay faithful to the ST.

Story 05-01 provides a similar example. The interviewee produced a translation of a user manual for some computer equipment. An end-user of the manual checked the translation and claimed that it was not a good translation. When the reviewed translation came back to the translator:

“It was not translation. <The reviewer> cut all ambiguous parts. He cut all the parts he said he didn’t like. So all the parts which were difficult to translate were cut. He also added extra sentences at the beginning and the end of the text”. [05-01][J]

She argued that if one cuts some parts of the ST or add some parts in the TT, “it is not translation” [05-01]. In other words, for the translator, reproducing in the TT what is in the ST, nothing more or nothing less, is what translation is. This description is very much in line with my working definition of literal translation: being similar to the ST. On the other hand, the end-user who reviewed the translation uses the translated manual in his own situation, i.e. he has his own contexts when he uses the translated product, so it is not surprising that he changed the TT to suit his own contexts. It is also not surprising that the translator defended her translation in this way because the contexts were not available to her.

[L·ii] Meaning

As we have just seen, context is an important factor in translation as another
interviewee said, “Can we translate a text if we understand the words? No. The same verb will be translated differently depending on the context” [02-02][J]. And the concept of context is closely related to the concept of meaning. As was discussed in the previous section about natural translation, the degree of understanding of the ST meaning affects the decision of how natural or literal the translation can be.

[L·iii] Reference material

When the translator does not have enough background information about the ST or the translation project itself to understand the meaning of the ST, he/she will look for reference material. Across the entire interview data four kinds of reference material were mentioned: ‘reference material supplied by the client (including a terminology list and translation memory)’, ‘people (as source of information)’, ‘publication (such as a handbook of translation)’ and ‘web search’. However, if the end-client or the translation agency does not supply reference material to the translator (and such cases were reported by several interviewees; see the previous section), he/she may decide to translate literally.

This reminds us the earlier discussion about the concept of ‘roles of participants’. In the analysis of the concept of role of participants and its supporting concepts, it was discovered that translators claim that it is other participants’ (i.e. the translation agency’s or the end client’s) role to supply necessary materials to facilitate translators’ understanding of the meaning of ST. This can be appropriate reference materials or a good quality ST. It can even be an arrangement of good personal relationships between the participants of translation so that the translator can solicit necessary support from other participants when necessary. The concept of role of participants seems to be influencing translators’ decisions whether to produce a natural or literal translation.

[L·iv] Authority

Next, I will examine the stories in which the concept of authority is at work.

In the previous section I discussed the relation between the concept of authority and the concept of ‘natural translation’: when the translator is given the freedom (or authority) to be creative in producing translation, he/she is happy to produce natural translation. The concept of authority also has relevance to the concept of literal translation: the translator decides to produce a more literal translation when he/she places the authority in other participants.

Interviewee 15, an in-house translator for a Japanese bank in London, provided a story in which she chose to produce an unnatural-sounding translation not because she believed that it was the right rendition but because her manager told her to. When
she produced an English translation of Japanese presentation material, her manager, who was also the author of the ST, asked her to change the syntax of some sentences so that they would sound syntactically closer to the original Japanese sentences. The translator told him that that would sound strange, but her manager was adamant about the change. Following a discussion between them, the translator decided to meet his request because “rather than engaging in a prolonged argument, I have other jobs to finish so I must compromise and come to terms with some sort of an agreement” [15-01][J]. Here, the manager has the authority to make the translational decision because of his position in the organisation: the relationship between the translator and her manager determined her final translational decision although she was not happy about it.

In Stories 18-09 and 18-10, the interviewee placed the authority on the ST authors. These stories are notable in that the ST authors were famous artists: a legendary film director in the former case, and a world-famous pop star in the latter. When the ST author is a prominent figure, it is understandable that the translator feels loyal to the author when translating (or when proofreading in Story 18-09). However, in those stories, other participants (the translator and the editor respectively) had, as part of a marketing strategy, a policy of smoothing expressions in translation to cater for the prospective audience (“They <the publishing house> were going surely it doesn’t mean that because that’s too direct and too brutal” [10-10].) However, the interviewee felt the ST features should be translated more faithfully:

You know it is not offensive enough in Japanese [10-09].

... it was just misrepresenting the force of the film which was clearly about the brutality of the way in which people in military are treated and all that [10-09].

[L-v] Relationship

In both cases the interviewee talked directly with the ST author (by telephone in Story 10-09 and face-to-face in Story 10-10). This kind of direct communication may also have an impact on the decision making of the translator. This is a matter of relationships between participants which was highlighted in the discussion about roles of participants. The concept of relationship seems to be important for the decision-making process of translators as to whether to produce a natural or literal translation.

[L-vi] Text type and [L-vii] Experience

Translators also think that text type conventions have a controlling power over their behaviour and a translator can gain such knowledge from experience of working
as a translator. In Story 07-01, a dispute occurred when the end-client asked the translator to add a translator's note to the English translation of a patent document to state that it is possible to interpret a singular noun as plural (because Japanese does not have a grammatical distinction between singular and plural). The end-client requested this because they wanted to use the translated patent document in litigation and the possibility of interpreting the word concerned as plural would have created an advantageous situation for them. The interviewee, who is an experienced patent translator, was, however, adamant that she could not meet this request because “from [her] experience in translating patents, if [the ST authors] mean plural, they would say so” [07-01]. She has a strong sense of loyalty to the ST and her conviction is based on her experience as well as her knowledge of the patent convention:

> Patent translation is a legal document and you cannot change the ambiguity. You can’t limit the ambiguity or extend the ambiguity. The ambiguity has to be as ambiguous as it is in the Japanese and I wasn’t prepared to limit it. [07-01]

Here, the translator recognised authority not of the end-client but of the ST, the text type convention and her experience.

The examples above show that translators justify their translational decisions by bestowing authority on different participants or entities. And the matter of authority ultimately concerns the relationship between the translator and other participants in the translational process: whether the translator is subordinate to the other participant, whether the translator has a communication channel to the other participants, how powerful the other participants are in relation to the position of the translator – all these factors seem to dictate the position of the translator in the translational process, which subsequently influences how translators justify their translational acts.

I have discussed the concepts which, according to my interviewees' accounts, influence their decision to produce a natural translation or a literal one. The diagram below summarises those concepts in relation to the concept of natural/literal translation.
(iii) Co-existence of the two opposing concepts and the notion of dynamic index

The above analysis revealed that the concept of natural or literal translation is not deterministic: across all the stories collected, the interviewees used both concepts of natural translation and literal translation depending on the situation. Notably, in the cases of Interviewees 01, 15 and 18, both concepts were used by the same informant but in different stories. For example, Interviewee 01 criticised another translator’s work saying that the translation was ‘cranky’ and ‘reads as a translation’ [01-13], supporting natural translation, while when discussing his own translation, he said if the ST was written badly, he would produce a translation which was very close to the ST and justified the decision saying, “it’s not what the source says” [01-03].

Interviewee 02’s account is also indicative of the fluid nature of the concept of natural/literal translations. In Story 02-01, she explicitly stated:

I normally use the source text and the comments I have received from the clients in the past to decide which person would want a natural translation and which one a literal translation, taking into consideration what the individual person has told me before – I piece together all information I have. [J]
She was talking about a project she had been involved in over a long period in which several reviewers reviewed her translation at different times. The comments she received from the reviewers were inconsistent between different reviewers: some wanted natural translation and some preferred more literal translation. Interviewee 02 was taking into consideration these differences between reviewers, accommodating the individual preferences to different pieces of translation in the same project.

This finding is particularly significant because it raises questions about PACTE’s questionnaire survey of knowledge of translation, which I reviewed in Chapter 3. In Chapter 3, as part of the review of PACTE’s study, I replicated the questionnaire study with 46 Japanese/English translators. The respondents include the interviewees of the current main study. As the following table shows, out of 17 interviewees, 13 yielded positive scores and three interviewees yielded a score of zero (but no one yielded a negative score). According to PACTE’s study, this means that most interviewees demonstrated a consistently dynamic orientation towards translation. However, my interview data showed that 7 interviewees (in 9 stories) used the concept of literal translation in at least one story to justify their translational practice. The table below shows the profiles of the 7 interviewees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee No.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Native Speaker of English</th>
<th>Experience (years)</th>
<th>Dynamic index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 Interviewees who used the concept of literal translation in their accounts and their dynamic index

The average dynamic index of those 7 translators is 0.329, which is higher than the average of the 46 English/Japanese translators (0.256) who answered the same questionnaire as part of the preliminary study.

This suggests that translators do not essentially have a deterministic attitude or policy about the naturalness/literalness of translation, but they instead use either of them flexibly depending on the situation. This does not imply that translators are right or wrong in being inconsistent in the use of the concepts in their accounts and it is by no means the aim of the present study to make such a judgement. It simply shows that the translators’ choice of concepts for justifying their translational acts is not deterministic but is influenced by the situation in which the instance occurs, and the
situation encompasses elements related to translation and operation, as well as elements related to the people involved in the translational process.

We have witnessed in the analysis above that those elements can also be extended to include the concept of the role of participants, as we did in the foregoing section. Who is involved in the translational process; what the relationship is between them; what entities and information are exchanged between them; simply said, who was there and who did what, they say, the important elements for the translators that influence the way they justify their translational acts. The important point the present analysis suggests is that the concept of natural/literal translation should always be discussed in relation to the particular situation of the translation project rather than as a personal, rule-like concept which may govern all translational situations.

5·2·6·3 Concepts used for story organisation

In Section 5·2·1, I identified four types of narrative structure in the stories provided in the interviews: Types I, II, III, according to how much the interviewee acknowledges his/her own wrongness in the incident concerned, and Type IV which does not include stories about a dispute situation but related stories about general beliefs or a summary of what participants have talked about in the interview.

Focusing on the first three types of stories, I examined what concepts were used in organising the stories. By telling a story in the interview, the interviewees were “trying to organize the disorganized and to give it meaning” (Murray, 2003:114), so examining what concepts they used for the organisation will reveal how they understand the experience.

First, what was prominent in the analysis was that, in many stories, the interviewees started the story by explaining what kind of source text was involved, especially the text type of the ST (underlined in the examples below).

... thinking back, the first one I can remember was about 4 months after I turned freelance. I did some environmental translations for K. University about all sorts of things, mostly to do with bio-diversity. [03-01]

Last year I had a request for a very straightforward patent translation. [07-01]

The first one was actually a while ago. I think it was very, very early in the last year or so. I was still relatively a new translator. I was translating something for a translation agency in London. And it was quite a document. It was a shipping report for a harbour in Australia. [08-01]
As the examples show, an explanation of the text type seems to be an important element to set the scene for the story.

Second, an examination of how the interviewees ended their stories was revealing. In ending a story, the interviewee normally provided some kind of assessment as to whether their claim was vindicated or not. To do that, they often used the concepts of money, feedback and repeated commission.

The concept of feedback was used when they described how their translation was assessed by clients, but the interviewees (exclusively when they work as a freelance translator) often talked about the lack of it.

A: I went through the whole thing one more time, made a few more changes and …
Q: And was he <the client> happy?
A: I never heard another word from him [laughs]. [04-01]

I've never been told exactly what the end client said about the matter. And, you know, the agencies keep that to themselves in my experience. [07-01]

I normally don't see any of these changes. Because once a freelancer has done their job, and has produced the initial translation, the translation then gets sent on to a desktop publisher, an editor, whatever. And most of the time I never see it again. And so I have no idea what changes I've made to anything I've done. [11-07]

When the translator does not receive any feedback from the client after the delivery of a translation, he/she may understand it as a good sign.

I wrote back to the agency as he suggested and basically <they said> OK, thank you. We'll tell the client and that was that. I never heard any more from them so very relieved. [04-02]

It didn't come back. Yeah. It doesn't, it didn't come back to me. Sometimes, they come back again, but this one didn't. So my assumption is that the proofreader agreed with me. [14-04]

The interviewees suggested two other indicators to measure the success of their translation. One of them is a subsequent commission of work from the same client:

... I didn't hear anything after that at all. It was a final email. I sent that final email and I never heard another word about it. But I have subsequently had offers of work from that agency so I didn't conclude that they were you know completely furious with me. [07-01]

They still gave me work after that, so it was not a big issue. [01-01]

And anyway, I didn't hear anything more about that job whether they were satisfied or not. But I got paid very quickly and they turned out to be a very good client actually. I got more jobs from them. Thankfully no more
They also use payment of the translation assignment as a judging criterion.

... it took many hours to do this, but once we had done that, the client accepted it and they paid us the full fee.

So, it was not so much of a conflict for me. It was a problem, but it didn't mean that they refused to pay the money or anything like that.

The diagram below illustrates a typical narrative structure of translators’ accounts.

![Diagram of narrative structure](image)

Figure 20 Concepts used for story organisation

It is important to keep in mind, however, that the results above demonstrate what the interviewees use for their justification of their practice, not what exactly happened in the incidents.

5.2.7 Discursive aspect

One of the aims of the present study is to identify prominent features of translators’ discursive practice. Fraser (2000) emphasised the eloquence of the translators who provided verbal protocols in her study, but I am aware that it is difficult to measure eloquence without specific measuring criteria.

One such criterion would be the degree of abstractness of the account. As discussed in Chapter 3, Fraser judged her study participants’ accounts about translation to be eloquent because the participants talked more about general approaches to translation rather than individual translation problems or strategies. For Fraser, eloquence means generalisation and higher level of abstractness of
In the present study the interviewees were asked to describe and explain individual instances of dispute cases from their experience. One interviewee (No 16) found it difficult to recall individual instances, saying “I’ve been thinking about this. It’s sometimes difficult to sort of identify individual incidents, but I’ve definitely noticed a kind of trend” [16-01]. She started telling her stories by explaining what she thought was the general cause of dispute cases, and she then moved on to explaining individual examples. However, most people willingly started the interview by explaining individual instances, as one interviewee started his interview by saying, “I’ll just give some examples. That’s the easiest way rather than trying to have general principles.” [01-01]

The interviewer’s (i.e. my) prompt in the interview also played a role. In the course of an interview, if I wanted the interviewees to elaborate on their explanation, I asked them, “What did you say to the client (or any other person in the story)?” as a strategy to encourage them to talk more about the points I wanted to investigate, i.e. how they justify their translational acts. It is probable that this particular question discouraged the interviewees from telling their stories at a higher level of abstractness.

That being said, some variations of discursive style were evident amongst the interviewees. I have already examined how the concept of natural and literal translation was told in the interviewees’ stories. Many interviewees used the concept as a matter-of-course, pre-existing concept, using the words ‘natural’ and ‘literal’, without going into detail about the concept itself. ‘Natural’, for example, is a very pregnant term when it comes to translation. Saldanha (2008) criticises Nida (1964), in his so-called ‘scientific’ enquiry into translation, for not defining the term ‘natural’ clearly. In a similar vein, translators tend to talk about ‘natural’ translation without defining the meaning as in the example below.

I’m giving them something that’s normal and natural. That’s sort of a key word. It’s natural in English and they’re happy with that. And sometimes I just say to them, look, I know you like this quite literal style, but if you want a more natural version. I’ll just put in a comment. I’ll just say it would be more natural to say this. It’s not grammatically incorrect to use the more literal version. People understand it. But it sounds translated, it sounds strange, it sounds like you’re not a native speaker of English. If you want to get rid of that kind of unnaturalness, then you can say this instead. [11-08]

However, one interviewee (No 18) was outstanding in that, when he talked about the same concept, his accounts developed to explain the cause of it at a higher level of abstractness:
...every language has what you might call a gravity field. Because each language has developed its own way of expressing itself, then there's a tendency to think in a certain way because of the structure of the language. And you have to try to stop yourself thinking that way when you translate. You have to translate behind the words into the gravity field of the other language. You have to express what has been said through the gravity field. Do you understand what I mean by gravity field? It's the essential structures of that other language. You have to get away from one language in order to put it in the other language. And I think that's the hardest thing of translation altogether, you know.

He uses a metaphor, ‘a gravity field’, to explain the intangible notion of naturalness of translation, and in my opinion, the use of this metaphor is making this account powerful and persuasive. In contrast, when the entire interview data of all the interviewees were examined, a striking feature of their discourse was the scarcity of metaphor: only a limited number of figurative expressions were identified in their discourse. One example is when an interviewee said “And the style guide is basically in my head.” [03-02] when explaining that he remembered the content of a translation style guide very well. Another interviewee explained how she was treated by her colleagues when she worked as an in-house proofreader, saying, “They treat you like a god. ... like royalty, yeah.” [16-2] However, when they talked about the translation process or the function of translation, what translation is or should be, the lack of metaphor was striking as only two instances were identified (those in italic below), one of which has just been presented above:

I can only see through a window · the window is very small · but I am trying to use my imagination as much as possible to replace the expression with a more generally used one so that the client can understand it easily. [02-02][J]

...every language has what you might call a gravity field. [18-02]

This finding is interesting because the relation between metaphor and theory is a topic of discussion both in sciences and humanities, including Translation Studies. I will come back to this point in the next chapter.

Going back to the account provided by Interviewee 18, after presenting the metaphor of the ‘gravity field’, he talks about the relation between the human thought process and language, saying, “there’s a tendency to think in a certain way because of the structure of the language”, which reminds us of the hypothesis of linguistic relativity (Whorf, 1940). He also talks about the cognitive process of translating, saying, “And you have to try to stop yourself thinking that way when you translate”, and the account which follows reminds us of interpretive theory of translation (e.g. Seleskovitch
& Lederer, 1984). I asked the interviewee at a later date whether he had those theories/hypotheses in mind when he was interviewed, and his answer was no, but he told me that he was currently writing essays about translation, aiming to publish them in book form. From this piece of information, although there is only one example here, it may be fair to hypothesise that the high level of abstractness of his accounts about translation is a consequence of his practice of writing about translation: he is used to theorising his translation practice due to his writing activity. In other words, ‘doing’ translation and ‘talking about’ translation may be two separate activities, and both need specific practice or training to master the skill. This supports Pavlović’s (2010:81) claim that whether a translator can produce a plausible explanation about their practice “has to do with the way individuals have learned the skill, i.e., to what extent rationalization and theorizing have been part of their training and work experience”.

As I discussed in Chapter 1, at the other end of the abstraction continuum of translation theory are translation strategies. Fifty-one fragments of the interview data were identified as explanations of translation strategies used. Following the categorisation system I discussed in Chapter 1, 37 (or 73%) were operational strategies and 14 (27%) were textual strategies. The operational strategies included methods of terminology search (16 cases) such as which source to consult or who to ask. Others (22 cases) were more general strategies such as an addition of a translator’s note to the translation [03-01][07-01][11-07], how to use a function of software [02-01], use of coloured pens on a printed text to work out the sentence structure [03-02], time management [03-07], use of a third-party proofreader [03-05], and asking questions or requesting reference material of the client [01-06][02-02][15-12][18-10]. There was one reference related to the well-being of the translator and life-work balance (“I’ve given up hangovers especially with toddlers.”)[03-07] and one to anger management (“you have to go make a cup of tea and calm down”)[08-01].

Textual strategies included the following:

- Dividing a long sentence into two or more sentences: 3 references
- Use of a cultural substitute for a cultural reference: 3 references
- Paraphrasing: 2 references
- Use of neologism; use of loan word, use of gloss, omission, change of style (between desu-masu and dearu styles in Japanese): one reference each

This outcome about textual strategies is interesting as a source of information as to what kind of strategies are used in real-life translation processes and are deemed significant by the translators (if they mention it in justifying their translational acts, they must deem them powerful enough to use them in justification). However, with only 14 references provided by 9 interviewees, it does not seem to be quantitatively
significant. This is probably related to the research design: unlike in the studies by Englund Dimitrova (2005), Pavlović (2010) and Hui (2012), my interviewees’ accounts did not have a textual feature as the point of departure, so it is not surprising that they did not focus their talks on the textual features involved in the case they talked about. Thus, the quantitative significance of the accounts of textual and operational strategies of the interviewees cannot be recognised as a meaningful finding.

To summarise, what the outcomes of the present study demonstrate regarding discursive aspect of translators’ accounts is that the level of generalisation and abstraction is low with very little use of metaphors.

5.3 Summary of the analysis

In summary, the findings of the analysis for each research question set up in the previous chapter are as below:

(1) How do English/Japanese translators theorise their translation practice in their accounts of dispute situations with clients?

(1a) What concepts do the translators use to justify their practice?

Two concepts were identified as significant concepts which the interviewees used for justification: ‘role of participants’ and ‘natural or literal translation’. They also used other, narrower concepts to back up their justification related to the two broader concepts.

Role of participants

The interviewees talked about the roles of other participants extensively. They reasoned that a translation project is not successful if other participants than the translator does not fulfil their roles properly. A concept which was used most often in this category was relationship. They talked about their relationship with direct contacts in the job (the translation agent, the editor of the book or their line manager etc.) as well as about indirect relationships such the relationships between the translation agent and the client. It is notable that they seem to have a bird’s-eye view of how the whole translation project works.

The concept of language knowledge was used by the interviewees to make the point that good translation and good language use are two different things. Being fully aware of the complexity of translation, the interviewees claim that other participants (such as project managers or proofreaders) should have knowledge of translation and that a good level of language is not enough or is sometimes a hindrance in translation projects, particularly in assessment phases.
The concept of time and effort was often mentioned as something vital for successful translation. The interviewees were frustrated that other participants had a wrong idea about time and effort in translation. They claimed that good translation requires a lot of time and effort. This may sound obvious, but the concept is probably worth paying attention to when we think of the recent trend of emphasising speed of translation. Translation companies and translators are increasingly expected to produce translation products extremely quickly, and the prominence of this concept implies that my interviewees are aware of the threat of this trend to the quality of translation products, but are frustrated that other participants are not.

Authority was another concept the interviewees used in relation to the roles of participants. This concept was not used by the interviewees to exert their own authority in the translation project. Quite contrarily, the interviewees expressed their wish that other participants in translation such as the translation agent should exercise proper control over translation projects. When it comes to translation quality, they often think it is the client’s or the proofreaders’ role to exercise authority over the final decisions about the translation relating to, for example, terminology or register of the text. The way they gave their accounts suggests that my interviewees are not power freaks. Instead they recognise they are part of the whole team engaged in translation and that translation is an activity which can be realised successfully only when all participants play their own roles appropriately.

Natural/literal translation

This concept was told with different words such as ‘fluent’ or iyaku (for natural translation) and ‘unnatural’, ‘direct’, ‘awkward’, ‘word for word’ etc (for literal translation) or by explaining the level of similarity of and/or the amount of information in the TT segment and its corresponding ST segment. The terms ‘natural’ and ‘literal’ may seem to be impressionistic and simplistic, but they are the terms used most often (particularly the term ‘natural’). A noticeable point is that they used the concept flexibly depending on the situation. The concept was not told as a categorical, personal translation policy of the translator. They also supported their justification with other concepts too.

When they said they think the translation should sound ‘natural’, they often connected the argument with the concept of the native speaker. They used it as a benchmark of a standard, i.e. the translation should sound natural for native speakers or a good ST should be written and the TT text should be assessed by native speakers.

Language knowledge was also used to support a natural translation in a similar way to the way in which it was discussed in relation to the concept of roles of
participants. Here, it was particularly emphasised by the interviewees that a problem tends to occur not because other participants do not know much about the foreign language involved, but because they do know quite a lot about the foreign language. If a project manager or a client has some knowledge of the foreign language, but is not aware of the complexity of translation, they tend to judge the quality of translation by the level of similarity between the ST and TT, thus often making a wrong judgement about the quality.

Authority is another concept mentioned often by the interviewees. However, what is noteworthy is that the concept of authority is used in a distinct way when it comes to a creative type of translation such as marketing materials where natural-sounding texts are desirable. I discussed earlier that the translators want other participants such as project managers to exercise their authority with regard to issues such as terminology or register of the TT. However, when the naturalness/literalness of the translation is the point of discussion, translators tend to think that in order for them to produce ‘natural’ translation, authority for decision making needs to be delegated to translators. In those circumstances, my interviewees enjoy the authority as a room for creative freedom. If authority is not delegated to the translator, then they may resort to more literal translation. Therefore, the concept of authority seems to be used in a versatile way depending on the type and genre of the translated text.

One curious concept identified here is culture, or in this study, the contrast between British (or European or western) culture and Japanese culture. Some native-English translators seem to think that Japan has a culture of literal translation and they argue that their preference for natural translation should be prioritised.

The interviewees used the concept of literal translation to justify their translation too though not as often as they justified their natural translation. They used the concept of literal translation for their justification notably when the situation prevented them from knowing enough about the context for the ST. This kind of situation was caused when appropriate referential material was not supplied or the ST was badly written. In these circumstances, they say a good translation has a surface similarity to the ST. Another occasion when they say they produce literal translation is where they place authority with other participants such as their line manager or clients. Even if they are not happy with the quality of translation (because it sounds too literal), they say they have to compromise because the relationship between the authority holder and themselves dictates the final textual features. Here, again, the concept of relationship plays its role. Text type was a prominent concept used in the interviewees’ accounts over all, but there is one particular text type which was mentioned several times in relation to the notion of literal translation, namely patent
translation. Because patent translation, as a form of legal translation, requires a high level of literalness in the TT, translators use the concept of literal translation to justify their translation. This is where the translator’s loyalty to the ST is high. In contrast, marketing text was mentioned as a text type where a high level of naturalness is required.

(1b) How do they use the concepts to organise their accounts?

The significant pattern recognised in the translators’ accounts is that their stories tend to start with the concept of text type and ends with the concepts of feedback, money and repeated commission. This suggests that my interviewees think the translation process should be dependent on the text type. Also, for them, the judgement of the success of the product was made through the feedback, the payment and whether they get a job from the same client again. This seems reasonable, but at the same time, raises the question of the extent to which the translation agency or the client share the same concepts. In that sense, the narrative structure leads us to a potentially critical area for the development of workplace studies.

(1c) What discursive features are prominent in their discourse?

It was particularly notable that my interviewees hardly used metaphors in their discourse to describe the function of translation or the translator’s role. The level of abstraction of the stories was generally low.

(1d) Is there any correlation between the findings and the dynamic index of translators?

I compared the interviewees’ accounts where they used literal translation to justify their translation with their dynamic index. However, no significant correlation was suggested between the way the translator theorises and his/her dynamic index.

On the basis of the findings from above, the next two research questions will be discussed in the next chapter.

(2) How do the findings compare with the notions discussed in received academic theories?

(3) What are the implications of the findings for the pedagogy of translation?
Chapter 6 Discussion: comparison of the translators’ theorisation patterns and academic theories and implications for translation pedagogy

In the previous chapter I investigated how professional practitioners of English/Japanese translation explain their translational acts, focusing on the way they justify their translational acts when a dispute occurs with their clients. This chapter will compare the outcomes with popular academic translation theories. Once differences and similarities have been identified, their implications for pedagogical situations will be discussed with regard to how the outcomes can be used to strengthen current translation pedagogy. First, I will examine whether commonly taught theories and notions (those top-ranking ones from my questionnaire survey) cover the issues identified in the translators’ accounts. Second, I will compare my interviewees’ theorisation patterns the theories they resemble most closely. Finally, I will discuss the areas which were missing in my interviewees’ accounts but may be relevant to pedagogy.

6.1 Theory as discourse about translation

If we think of a translation theory as a certain type of discourse about translation, we can say that a translation class is a place where a discourse of the teacher’s choice is taught. In institutional settings, students of translation learn about translation by producing translations, by listening to lectures on translation, by reading books and other materials about translation, and by discussing translation with teachers and peers. This process of knowledge attainment always takes place through a discourse. The students learn the discourse, how it is told and what is told, at the same time as they learn about translation, and this process eventually shapes their own discourse when they talk about translation.

Edwards (1993:213), in the domain of Discursive Psychology, expresses the relation between knowledge and discourse, though, in this case, with regard to primary-school-age pupils.

All discourse has a history; even when children are inventing novel explanations for new phenomena, even under controlled experimental conditions, they can do so only by employing discursive resources, modes of explanation, and terms of reference that they have at their disposal, whose precise history (for the children) is unknown.

If we apply this claim to translation students, a translation class is a place where a history of discourse on translation is shaped, and translation students learn that history, which gives them certain “discursive resources, modes of explanation and
terms of reference” (ibid.:213).

Therefore, the choice of which theory to teach in a classroom will have a significant implication for the students’ discursive practice. In institutional settings, a large part of assessment is conducted in written form, such as annotated translation, essays or dissertations. In the learning process, which includes the stages of listening to lectures, reading literature, and writing essays and commentaries about translation, certain discursive patterns are fixed in the students’ minds. In other words, students are being trained to talk and write about translation in a certain discursive manner during the course of their studies of translation.

The present study wishes, then, to contribute to this aspect of the pedagogy of translation. It stands on the premise that if we use successful translators’ discourses to complement and strengthen the discourses used in classrooms, this will better prepare the students for future professional environments.

6.2 Postulated pedagogical situations

No teachers of any discipline would disagree that teachers want to improve their teaching continuously, and translation teachers are no exception. It would be ideal if a blanket measure for improvement could be offered for all translation teachers, but that is not possible as each teaching situation is different.

Cook (2008:99) points out rightly in the context of foreign language teaching that when academics and teachers talk about improvement in teaching, they talk about it from a sheer belief that improvement is a good thing, but the definition of ‘improvement’ is different between individuals, in the same way as people say democracy is a good thing but their ideas of democracy are different. This point is very much relevant to translation teaching too.

Differences in teaching situations may stem from institutional requirements. Some universities require master’s degree candidates to write a 15,000 to 20,000-word-long dissertation at the end of the course, which will require candidates to demonstrate advanced knowledge of translation theories. On the other hand, some universities split the required credits into smaller units and require candidates to engage in a different type of project for each set of credits. This may involve an end-of-the-course annotated translation project which includes a written commentary of, say, 3000 words. In this case candidates have much less space to demonstrate their theoretical knowledge and thinking. This difference in assessment methods is likely to at once reflect and influence the teaching contents, and consequently the idea of improvement in teaching. Student profile is another vital element when thinking about teaching improvement.
Students who wish to become professional translators upon completion of the course on the one hand and students who aim to move on to PhD study on the other are likely to have different attitudes to the learning of theories.

So, before we enter a discussion about the pedagogical implications of the findings of this study, it is important to agree on what kind of educational situation we are talking about and what kind of improvement we strive for. This agreement is, in fact, not easy to reach, because while there are a number of translation courses offered by UK universities, the teaching contents and research cultures vary significantly between them. (I have witnessed this in my experience of five UK universities as a student, a teacher and an external examiner). For the purpose of a meaningful discussion, therefore, I postulate that the current discussion concerns pedagogical implications of the findings of the study for an MA Translation Studies degree course offered by a UK university (as it is more common in the UK to offer translation at MA level than at BA level). I postulate that the objective of the teaching is to train the students so that they are equipped with some (if not all) vital skills required to become professional translators, either in-house or freelance, upon completion of the course, and a 15,000-word-long dissertation is one of the requirements for award of the degree (thus the students are required to develop a solid understanding of theories of translation and be able to demonstrate it in a written form). I assume that those students do not have professional experience of translation before enrolling on the course, but that they have a good command of at least one foreign language. In this particular teaching setting, the improvement we strive for is to design the teaching so that it can prepare the students for future professional environments while equipping them with enough theoretical knowledge to fulfil the academic requirements.

In this discussion I will not limit my argument to a situation of a specific language combination although the empirical part of the present study was conducted with Japanese/English translators. This is because many MA translation courses at UK universities offer theory or theory-oriented classes in non-language-specific classrooms and also because I believe the outcomes have some universal applicability for this purpose.

6.3 Comparison of the outcomes with commonly-taught theories of translation

In Chapter 5 I identified the main features of English/Japanese translators’ discourses of dispute situations as follows:

(1) They concern essentially the concept of roles of participants.

(2) They deal to a great degree with the concept of natural/literal
translation, but the concept is used flexibly depending on the situation.

(3) Those large concepts of roles of participants and natural/literal translation are supported by other smaller concepts such as ST (source text), native speaker, relationship, time and effort, reference material, consistency, terminology, etc.

(4) They organise their accounts by starting their stories with the concept of text type and finishing them with the concept of feedback, money and repeated commission.

(5) They use hardly any metaphors in their discourses to describe the function of translation or the translator’s role.

The preliminary survey conducted with translation teachers (which was reported in Chapter 2) revealed that the following theories or theoretical notions (including what I categorise as methods of translation) are the five most often-taught theories or theoretical notions in university translation classes:

1 Domesticating vs foreignising translation (87.5%)
2 Dynamic vs form equivalence (83.3%)
3 Skopos theory (83.3%)
4 Text type analysis (70.8%)
5 Discourse analysis (68.1%)

In the following sections I will compare these theories and theoretical notions with my study outcomes.

6.3.1 Domesticating vs foreignising translation/dynamic vs formal equivalence

First I discuss the two top-ranking items together in this section as they denote similar concepts. Broadly speaking these notions describe dichotomous methods of translating. Historically, this dichotomy of translation methods has been labelled differently by different scholars: in the questionnaire, I included five different labels: domesticating vs. foreignising translation, dynamic vs. formal equivalence translation, semantic vs. communicative translation, overt vs. covert translation, and documentary vs. instrumental translation.

These labels are important when we think of their ideological leaning. The concept of domesticating/foreignising translation is what Venuti (1995) developed on the basis of Schleiermacher's (1813/2004) view about translation. Venuti's concern is mainly with the unequal power relations between big nations (i.e. the USA and the
UK) and smaller ones (whose languages have a smaller geopolitical presence in the world). He fiercely criticises the Anglo-American tradition of translation (mainly of literary work), describing it as “ethnocentric violence” and advocates the foreignising translation method as “a strategic cultural intervention in the current state of world affairs, pitched against the hegemonic English-language nations and the unequal cultural exchanges in which they engage their global others” (ibid.:20). For Venuti, foreignising translation method is “a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism” (ibid.).

The notion of dynamic vs formal equivalence translation was developed by Nida (1964) originally for an evangelistic purpose, and contrary to Venuti, Nida prefers a dynamic method. This is because, in the case of Bible translation, where the ST is translated from a big language into small ones, it is sometimes necessary to “suggest [the reader] a particular type of behaviour” through translation, and to achieve that, the translator is recommended to “make a minor adjustments in detail so that the reader may understand the full implications of the message for his own circumstances” (ibid.:158). Nida provides an example of translating the word ‘repentance’ into a Shilluk phrase, ‘to spit on the ground in front of somebody’ in the case of a translation for Sudanese Bible readers, making use of the indigenous custom regarding court cases where the plaintiff and defendant spit on the ground indicating that the case is closed (ibid.).

Despite the ideological leanings in the conception of the notions, the reason why the notion of ‘domesticating and foreignising translation’ was ranked top in the survey may be simply because of the popularity of the terms. Paloposki (2011:40) states:

Despite the ideological leanings in the conception of the notions, the reason why the notion of ‘domesticating and foreignising translation’ was ranked top in the survey may be simply because of the popularity of the terms. Paloposki (2011:40) states:

During the recent years, the concepts of domestication and foreignization have developed into a convenient shorthand to describe two opposite ways (strategies) of translating ... in many cases losing their earlier (Venutian) link to an ethics of translation and becoming (often allegedly value-free) analytical categories in descriptive studies.

This is probably true of Nida’s terminology too, and the lack of popularity of the labels ‘documentary vs. instrumental translation’ can perhaps be explained with the same logic: translation teachers may be teaching the concepts of skopos theory and text type analysis (which are taught by more than 80% of translation teachers as reported in Chapter 2) while using the Venuti’s or Nida’s terms as convenient value-free analytical categories.

In the previous chapter, the analysis revealed that the dichotomous notions of two translation methods form an important part of my interviewees’ concerns too, being labelled most often as ‘natural’ or ‘literal’ translation methods by them. With
regard to this point, it is particularly interesting that the concept of natural/literal translation was being used as a flexible means of justification: the interviewees changed their position on the natural/literal spectrum according to the particular situation such as availability of context or who has the authority to make decisions in the translation project. For example, Interviewee 01 used the notion of literal translation to justify his translation, saying that he had produced a literal translation because he did not have any background knowledge about the content of the ST, namely, what the end-client’s business is about. On the other hand, regarding a different event, he criticised other translator’s work saying that it was not natural enough when there was no reason she should produce a literal translation. With regard to authority, Interviewee 08 said he could become creative in deciding on the textual features of his translation because the translation agency gave him freedom (authority) to decide how much he could go away from the ST (i.e. how natural he could make the TT for target readers). On the other hand, Interviewee 16 wanted to make the TT sound fluent for target readers, but her line manager did not allow her to do so. In this case, it was the line manager who had the authority to make the final decision. In other words, personal relationships between the translator and other participants in the translation process influence the textual features of translation.

If we look at Venuti’s and Nida’s programmes with their contexts in mind, we can see that their theories are also relative to certain translation situations: the former to literary translation in the Anglo-American publishing industry and the latter to translation of the Bible into the languages of remote lands. However, instead of being understood as a flexible tool for moving between the two ends of the natural/literal spectrum, their notions are commonly known for their respective ideological orientations: for the former, foreignising translation (to present the original author’s intention more faithfully), and for the latter, dynamic translation (so that the user of the translation can effectively influence the readers of the translation). In other words, Venuti is always understood as an advocator of foreignisation and Nida as a proponent of dynamic equivalence translation. My interviewees also constructed their views as to whether to adopt natural or literal translation, but that was explained always by linking the decision closely to the individual situation. Seemingly, for those translators, there is no such thing as a consistent personal approach to translation, but rather, an approach is determined by the situation on each occasion (contrary to PACTE’s belief which is evident in their study design. See my review in Chapter 5, Section 3-2-1). I have come to this conclusion because some interviewees used in the same interview, but in different stories, two opposite notions (natural and literal translations) to justify their translational decisions. Also, the analysis revealed that the interviewees’ use of
Another point which has become highlighted by comparing my interviewees’ theorisation patterns and Venuti’s and Nida’s frameworks is that the latter have a deterministic stance about the value of the ST, i.e. they place an unconditional value on the ST. The aim of both frameworks is to fulfil the purpose of the ST, namely, for Venuti, to deliver the literary value of the original text to foreign readers, and for Nida, to convert foreign non-Christians to Christianity. In both cases, the ST is supposed to carry the ultimate value and the mission of translation is to transport the value from the ST to the TT. On the contrary, my interviewees did not always have the same view about the value of a ST. In Story 01-03, for instance, Interviewee 01 said “If you have a bad source text … it ends up as a good translation but still a bad text and then the end-user in the other language says this is a bad translation”. In this event, the translator did not have great respect for the ST because it was badly written. Because of this, he decided to translate the ST literally, and claimed that the resultant translation was “a bad text” but still “a good translation” (which reflects an extremely literal notion of translation). In this particular story, the translator’s perception of the ST is starkly different from those in Venuti’s and Nida’s frameworks. This example demonstrates the reality of the lives of working translators – ST is not always well-written, which I do not think can be explained by either of Venuti’s or Nida’s programmes. In other words, a comparison between the two sets of theories has highlighted the idealistic attitude about the quality of ST which supports Venuti’s and Nida’s notions.

In a pedagogical situation, because of the deterministic and idealistic nature, which relate to their restricted scope (literary/Biblical translation), Venuti’s and Nida’s notions may suggest to students of translation that there exists such a thing as a blanket approach to translation, something like a personal rule of translation which is advocated to adhered to as a principle. However, my interviewees’ accounts contradict such thinking. Moreover, it was found in Chapter 5 that there is no correlation between the way the translator theorises and his/her dynamic index.

Here, I argue that by using the concepts identified from my interviewees’ accounts, translation teachers can demonstrate that the dichotomous notions of natural and literal translations are fluid and complicated ones, which are governed by those concepts. By learning about those concepts the students can be made aware that they are the ones who decide which pole of the dichotomy of these notions they should situate themselves at in individual cases, and in that decision in a professional situation, what factors are likely to influence their decision and how. In this way teachers can avoid the kind of teaching where the notions of natural/literal translations
This breaking away from normativeness in teaching is important because it frees us from the idea that translation teaching is simply teaching norms of translation for students to follow. I will come to this point later in the context of norm theory, but the notion of norms in translation can lead to the translator being treated as a submissive actor. If the study outcomes are used to inform the teaching of the dichotomous notions, it will have the benefit that the students will be equipped with knowledge regarding the kinds of factors they should be aware of in the professional environment when they make translational decisions, which may supplement what they learn from textbooks or theory books. This knowledge will make them conscious of what effects (both beneficial and adverse) those factors can have on translational processes involving multiple stakeholders. Subsequently, it will help them establish themselves as responsible and, most importantly, empowered participants in translation, instead of resigning themselves to being submissive actors who blindly follow what they think (or are taught to think) are the behavioural norms of the translator with regard to production of foreignising or domesticating translation or formal or dynamic translation equivalents.

6.3.2 Skopos theory

Taking the word ‘skopos’ from a Greek word meaning ‘purpose’, skopos theory was originally developed in Germany. Its inception is thought to be marked by the German monograph Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie written by Katharina Reiss and Hans Vermeer (1984). Although skopos theory has been one of the most influential theories of translation (which has been demonstrated in the results of the translation teachers’ survey which showed that it ranked top as the most-often taught theory in translation classes, see Chapter 2), its English translation was published only recently (Reiss & Vermeer, 2013). I also refer to an English translation of one of Vermeer’s papers on skopos theory (Vermeer, 1989/2012) for the review of the theory.

Considering translation as a form of human action, the principle of the theory is that the feature of translation is determined by its purpose (skopos). In the 1980s, this theory proved to be “mildly revolutionary” because by shifting the focus from texts to actions, it “challenged the idea that a translation has to be equivalent to a source text” (Pym, 2010:44), which was the prevailing approach at that time.

One of the striking characteristics of this theory is its prescriptiveness: a large number of ‘should’ and ‘must’ are used in the (English version of) 1989 paper (Vermeer,
1989/2012). For example, the theory states that “skopos and mode of realization must be adequately defined if the text-translator is to fulfil his task successfully.” (ibid.:192) This statement is strongly supported by my informants’ data: my translators said a problem occurs when not enough information (such as a good ST and some adequate reference materials with a clear instruction) is provided by the client. Thus, it would be fair to say that skopos theory does deal with translators’ real-life concerns. However, skopos theory seems to be limited to listing the requirements for successful translation prescriptively without dealing with the mechanics of how those requirements can be met in real-life situations. Vermeer does admit this nature of the theory, saying “I am aware that this requirement involves a degree of wishful thinking; yet it is something to strive for.” (ibid.:199) and fleetingly mentions that the requirements “involve e.g. a consultant’s information on a regional economic or political situation, etc.” (ibid.:191) but does not go beyond that point.

With regard to the translator, skopos theory regards them as ‘the expert’. Indeed, the word ‘expert’ is repeated 11 times in the relatively short text (Vermeer, 1989/2012). It declares:

> It is usually assumed, reasonably enough, that [translators] “know what it’s all about”: they are thus consulted and their views listened to. Being experts, they are trusted to know more about their particular field than outsiders. ... His voice must therefore be respected, he must be “given a say”. (192)

Although real-life translators would wish this were the case, my analysis revealed that it is not always so. If the translator is to know “what it’s all about”, they will require certain conditions to be able to achieve that knowledge, such as receiving a good ST or adequate reference materials. This requires an involvement of other parties. Skopos theory, however, does not deal with those requirements to a great extent, but instead places all the responsibilities on the translator’s shoulders:

> If a commission cannot be realized, or at least not optimally, because the client is not familiar with the conditions of the target culture, or does not accept them, the competent translator (as an expert in intercultural action, since translational action is a particular kind of intercultural action) must enter into negotiations with the client in order to establish what kind of “optimal” translation can be guaranteed under the circumstances. (ibid.:200 with my emphasis)

If the translator is expected to enter into negotiations, surely other participants have to be present. Where are the other participants? Should they not take actions too? How about the relationships between these participants? In the interviews, my interviewees discussed concepts such as roles of other participants or other participants' language knowledge, indicating that they are vital to achieving an ideal
working condition for the translator. They also talked about their relationships with other participants or the relationships between third-party participants. However, these kinds of associated factors do not seem to be receiving due attention in skopos theory. In fact, Reiss & Vermeer (2013:1-2) emphasise that skopos theory “describe[s] the process of translating and interpreting, its product (the translatum), and the relations between them, i.e. how they are interdependent”. They also clarify that, in order to reduce the complexity of the process, and “for pedagogical reasons” (ibid:2), other factors than those two, which may be involved in a real situation, will be excluded, including factors such as “a client or commissioner (e.g. a translation agent) mediating between the text producer and the translator/interpreter, an actor in a drama production, or a newsreader in a TV broadcast, who act as secondary senders” (ibid.:2)

Responsibility (or accountability) is another issue skopos theory highlights in relation to the translator, saying that the translator “is responsible for the performance of the commissioned task, for the final translation” (ibid.:192) and “as an expert he is therefore responsible for deciding whether, when, how, etc., a translation can be realized” (ibid.:199). However, my analysis identified an opposing sentiment among the translators. One of the concepts generated from the interview data was “responsibility of consequence”. This was a concept consisting of only four references provided by three early-career translators, identified in the second stage of the analysis when relatively novice translators’ discourse was brought into the analysis. Despite the small number of references, I kept the concept independent, instead of merging it with another concept, because it is strikingly different from other concepts generated in the first stage of the analysis (with data from very experienced translators). Basically, those three translators did not want to put themselves into a position where they may eventually be required to take the responsibility for a negative outcome caused by their translation. I present here an example from each:

Certainly ... we <the translators> are not the people who write the original email text. If in any case an accident or something was caused by the technical issues in the email message, could we take the responsibility? I thought, hmm, certainly that is true <that I cannot take the responsibility>. Of course the legal department would help me as I was working as an employee then, but I still felt very worried about it. [Story 06-01][J]

<After completing a proofreading assignment> if the client comes back to me and tells me this is really a bad translation, I don't want to take the responsibility. But that kind of situation did happen a few times. [Story 10-05][J]

If you want us to put that <sentence> in, we will put it in but you are responsible for anything that happens as a result of this translation. And
sometimes that would be enough to make them stop and say like, oh, no, no, no, if you think this is going to be a problem, then yes, please change it. [Story 11-06]

This aversion to responsibility as a translator is contrary to skopos theory’s tenet. In skopos theory’s terms, those translators are not acting like experts. However, we should not forget that these translators work in certain situations in which they think they are justified not to accept responsibility: in the first case, the translator was dealing with technical texts which could affect a large-scale project in a big technology company. In the second case, the translator was asked to proofread somebody else’s translation which was of low quality and she was given a tight deadline. In the third case, the translator thought that the proofreader did not have enough language knowledge to carry out a proofreading assignment appropriately. But this kind of situationality (i.e. the size of the organisation, the domain of the ST, the quality of the original translation, time given to complete the assignment, language knowledge of participants) is what skopos theory chose not to deal with directly although it recognises it, saying:

What the skopos states is that one must translate, consciously and consistently, in accordance with some principle respecting the target text. The theory does not state what the principle is: this must be decided separately in each specific case.” (ibid.:198)

Instead,

... the skopos theory merely states that the translator should be aware that some goal exists, and that any given goal is only one among many possible ones” (ibid.:198).

It does not answer our question of what factors decide each specific case. This aspect can instead be explained by saying that in the terms defined in Chapter 1, skopos theory is a ‘big’ theory. On the other hand, my interviewees’ accounts were, while still having a property of a big theory attending the universal mechanism of translational processes, also included within them a number of ‘small theories’ attending to smaller concepts which work within the larger mechanism of a translational process.

The primary purpose of skopos theory is to provide a general theory of translational action (Reiss & Vermeer, 2013). For that purpose, skopos theory focuses on the translator (the actor of the action) but pays less attention to other participants or related situations which are created by these other participants (although it claims that individual cases are influenced by such situations). In other words, skopos theory is exceedingly translator-centred, which is good for translator’s self-esteem and will be useful for providing a good code of conduct for the translator. However, because of this
very focus on the translator, it does not attend to a number of crucial factors which concern translators seriously. The comparison of skopos theory with my interviewees’ theorisation patterns has highlighted this paradox hidden within this most-often taught translation theory.

Here I argue that using the concepts generated in the present study will contribute to strengthening the teaching of skopos theory. They can augment the model of translation offered by skopos theory (which involves the translator, his/her action and the resultant product) with other related elements which cannot be ignored when the translator works in a professional situation. The danger of a general (or a big) theory such as skopos theory is that the students may find a virtue in its applicability to many situations and that they may rely on the principle as a definite “rule” of translation. By introducing the concepts identified in the present study, translation teachers can show the importance of consideration of concepts at the micro level in addition to the principle of this general theory of translation.

6.3.3 Text type analysis

Katharina Reiss’s Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik: Kategorien und Kriterien für eine sachgerechte Beurteilung von Übersetzungen [Possibilities and limits of translation criticism: categories and criteria for objective translation assessment] (1971) offers text typology of translation based on, again, the German functionalist approach. I use the English translation of one of the chapters of this book (Reiss, 1971/2004) for the review of this approach. Reiss maintains that every written text belongs to one of three text types depending on the function of the text – the informative type, the expressive type and the operative type – and presents a method of identifying which text type a written text belongs to using actual examples. Reiss argues that after identifying text type, the translator should analyse the text style (or the “text individual”, i.e. a particular textual surface), which she says is “of supreme importance, because the translator’s ‘decisive battle’ is fought on the level of the text individual, where strategy and tactics are directed by type and variety” (1971/2004:174). Then she moves on to explain the reverbalization phase of translation, where, again, many examples of textual strategies are presented. This link between text typology and translation strategies is of pedagogical value for translators, so it is not surprising that nearly 80% of the teachers who responded to my survey use this theory in their teaching.

How, then, does this theory compare with the way my interviewees theorised their practice? ‘Text type’ was indeed one of the prominent concepts my interviewees used in their accounts. The translators often used this element for the organisation of
narrative structure by mentioning it at the beginning of the story. From this, we can construe that the study of text type does have a high degree of relevance to translators' concerns. They probably mentioned the text type of the ST at the beginning of an individual story because, by doing so, shared knowledge regarding the background of the story can be established between the interviewee and the interviewer. A certain type of text requires a certain way of translating (as Reiss maintains), but this knowledge often remains as translators’ tacit knowledge. If, in an interview setting, the interviewer has the same level of knowledge regarding the relation between text type and textual features of translation (which was the case in the present study), the interviewee can, by mentioning the text type at the beginning of the story, establish shared knowledge with the interviewer regarding what kind of textual manipulations were required in the specific translation assignment. In other words, what was provided by mentioning the text type in the narrative was, actually, not only information about text type itself, but the translator's belief about what is needed to satisfy the specific textual requirements. Subsequently, many translators indicated in the stories that the requirements were often to do with other participants, particularly with other participants' roles in the translational process.

One example is Story 03-02 in which the interviewee started the story saying “This was for a UK agency. This was a patent translation and it was a chemical patent.” In the story, the interviewee, an experienced patent translator, translated a long source language (SL) sentence into an equally long target language (TL) sentence following the convention of patents documentation. However, because the end-client did not know the convention, they complained to the translation agency. The translation agency did not have the knowledge about the text convention either, so they simply forwarded this complaint to the translator. When the translator gave an account of this incident, he emphasised that the translation agency did not play their role properly, failing to address the client’s complaint by themselves. According to his opinion, the agency should know the text-type conventions of the product they are handling and be able to deal with the client's complaint using this knowledge.

Another text type which my translators seem to find problematic often is marketing text. In Story 01-03, which the interviewee started by saying “It was a translation of marketing type of document”, the translator said that it was impossible to produce a directly usable translation without having sufficient background knowledge of the client’s company. As a result, the interviewee assumed that it was the client’s role to adapt the translated text for their optimal use. So, in his explanation, the role of the end-client (in this case the role of adapting the translated text) is a requirement for a successful translation of this particular type of text.
The comparison of Reiss's theory of text type analysis and my interviewees' theorisation patterns has identified a gap between the two: the former focuses on the textual process of translation within the responsibility of the translator, but the latter goes beyond the remit of the translator's responsibility and sheds light on other participants' involvement, which is required for a production of successful translation of a specific text type. This gap is, not surprisingly, similar to the gap identified in the section above regarding skopos theory as both skopos theory and Reiss's text type analysis are based on a strong functionalist approach. Therefore, it can reasonably be construed that the functionalist approach to translation has great pedagogical value because of the translator-centeredness (and it is not surprising that the majority of translation teachers are using the theories in their teaching), but does not go far enough to cover professional translators' other real-life concerns such as the responsibility of other participants, which are vital for a successful execution of a translation assignment. I would, thus, suggest that my study outcomes can contribute to the teaching of text type analysis by relating the process of the analysis to other related elements (such as knowledge of the translation agent) to make the students aware of possible complications in professional environments.

6.3.4 Discourse analysis

The topic of the link between discourse analysis and translation is discussed in, for example, Trosborg (2002), Malmkjær (2005:134-167) and Baker (1992:180-216), and in the questionnaire I attached the names of Hatim and Mason (1990) as an representative example of this theoretical notion in translation. Interests in discourse analysis in Translation Studies is based on the assumption that an understanding of the ST at the text level is essential for the translator to be able to produce a successful TT. For this purpose, linguistic notions concerning the discourse within a text such as coherence and cohesion, register, and the thematic structure of texts are discussed. Hatim and Mason (ibid: xi) define the aim of their study as ‘to relate an integrated account of discourse processes to the practical concerns of the translator’. In other words, the cognitive aspect of understanding textual discourse both in ST and TT is the primal interest of their study: without understanding the discourse of the ST, it is impossible to understand the meaning of the ST, and without understanding the discursive mechanism of the TT, it is impossible to produce an understandable translation for the reader, who is supposed to share the same knowledge regarding the discursive mechanism of the TT. So the study of discourse in translation (both in the ST and TT) involves two parties: the translator and the reader: and the target of the
study is primarily the texts. The introduction of text linguistics such as discourse analysis to Translation Studies was regarded as an advancement in the 1990s as it allowed the study to depart from the views strongly linked to the comparative linguistics paradigm, elevating the understanding of translation from the notion of equivalence on the sentence level to that on the text level.

Some interviewees in the present study did provide discourse-analytic accounts too but they did not do so very often. Across the transcripts of 17 interviewees, just 14 segments were identified as segments explaining textual strategies, of which only 5 segments (from 4 stories) dealt with discourse-analytic issues. Here are some examples:

I took care to decide whether to use da-style or taigendome-[substantive stop] style because it is in a PPT [Power Point Text] or to use desumasu-style because it is in the text of the speech. [Story 05-02][J]

... what I've developed in terms of my style is, for example, techniques to deal with it, so using more colons and semi-colons as a way of combining what I think should be two English sentences using the semi-colon for example. [14-01]

I'd say things you need to make the connection between the sentences clearer. ... You have to use different kinds of prepositions in English to link things up and I think you need to add ... bits to clarify or ... [16-01]

Expressed in terms of ‘style’, the issue of register of the TT is explained in the first and second examples, and the issue of cohesive markers are explained in the second and the third examples (so the second example is dealing with two aspects of the discourse of the TT).

As I discussed in the previous chapter, this kind of text-related accounts were not prominent in the interviewees’ accounts compared to operation- and people-related topics. As I mentioned above, the study of discourse analysis of translation concerns primarily the processing of discourse, therefore the parties involved in the discussion are the translator (who interprets the discourse of the ST and produces it in the TT) and the reader (who understands the reproduced discourse of the TT). Other people involved in the overall translational process in the real situation are not the target of the study. This is the essential difference between the discourse analysis approach to translation and my interviewees’ theorisation, but this does not necessarily mean that translators do not care about the issues of discourse in texts. It may mean, instead, that their analysis of text discourse is so automatic that they do not think about it consciously or they deal with text-level aspect of translation so competently that the issue does not become highlighted when they talk about dispute situations. Whatever the reason is, if a researcher wants to observe translators’ theorisation about discourse
analysis in the translational process, the research method will need to be adjusted, i.e. the interview schedule will need to be devised in such a way as to elicit answers related to text-level discourse. Alternatively, TAP study may be appropriate (as in Englund Dimitrova, 2005; Hui, 2012; Pavlović, 2010 as reviewed).

6.4 Comparison of the outcomes with sociological theories of translation

In the previous section I reviewed the academic translation theories and theoretical notions that are commonly taught in university translation courses and examined the differences between those and my interviewees’ theorisation patterns. It was made clear from the comparison what areas are thin in academic theories and I discussed its implications for pedagogy.

It has been shown in Chapter 5 that one of the strongest features in my translators’ theorisation patterns is its focus on roles of participants. Role is an important concept in sociology, which was developed by a German sociologist, Siegfried Nadel (1957). Nadel maintains that the norms and regularity (and eventually the structure) of society can be examined by observing the constructs of role (though he concludes that one can only observe a fraction of social structure but not the whole entity). In his framework, role can be observed by three methods (ibid.:25): 1) by “establishing the frequency and regularity with which the attributes assumed to make up the role appear together”; 2) by “examining the explicit statements and assertions of the people (made with a given degree of consensus and authoritativeness) as to the conduct appropriate to given roles”; and 3) observing the “maintenance machineries of the society, that is, by the sanctions, of whatever kind, which forestall or follow deviant behaviour”. Following this framework, we can deduce that the interviewees of the present study recognised the roles of other participants and the expected roles of themselves through method 3). If a translator receives a sanction, for instance by receiving bad feedback from the client, that makes him/her aware of what role they are expected to play in the social (translational) situation. However, in reality, the translator may not agree to play their expected role because it is incongruent with what he/she assumes to be the normative role of a translator (and we can observe this in the translators’ accounts by method 2) above). At the same time, the translator has their own ideas about other participants’ roles (again observed by method 2)) and my interviewees emphasised that other participants’ fulfilment of their roles are crucial to a successful translation (although whether the translator can apply a sanction to other participants or not is a different matter here). In the interviews, the interviewees talked extensively about the participants’ roles (including their own). In other words,
they talked extensively about the “maintenance machineries” of the society surrounding translation, or more precisely, how and why the maintenance machineries do not sometimes work.

Nadel also claims that roles are of a fluid type and the same role can have different attributes depending on the situation. (He uses an example of the role of a mother, which can, for example, have a caring attribute at home but may have an aggressive attribute when she defends a child outside the home.) Role and occasion are always linked. In the present study, in the interviewees’ observations of the roles of participants, situational elements associated with roles were also brought to the fore in the form of other generated concepts.

So, it would be fair to say that the interview data collected in the present study have revealed the social structure surrounding translation by highlighting the roles of participants and their associated situational elements. Subsequently, in order to reflect further on this social aspect of translation, the following sections will focus on the academic theories of translation which deal with social aspects of translation and compare them with the study outcomes.

Sociological studies of translation have been rapidly developed in the last decade or two, but the very beginning of this paradigm can be witnessed in earlier works. Schäffner (2010:243) says that it is Toury’s development of norm theory in translation that “prepared the ground for opening translation research to … wider social aspects”. Chesterman (2006:16) points out that skopos theory can be seen to have sociological viewpoints in that it is concerned with people not only the translator but also the client and the reader. I have already discussed skopos theory above, so the review of sociological translation theories in this section will begin with norm theory.

6.4.1 Norm theory

Norm theory is a popular theory amongst translation teachers: 52.8% of the teachers said they teach it in their translation classes and the theory ranked 5th in the survey (excluding translation methods). I touched upon the concept of norm in relation to the definition of ‘model’ in Chapter 1, but we now revisit this concept in comparison with my study outcomes.

According to Malmkjær (2007:13), the notion of norm was introduced to and developed in Translation Studies by Gideon Toury in the late 1970s onwards. The notion was clearly documented in his essay “The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation Studies”, which was first published in In Search of a Theory of Translation (1980) and was reproduced in Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond (1995)
which I will use for the review.

According to Toury’s norm theory, relations between the ST’s and TT’s textual features are regulated by norms. A norm is an invisible and implicit entity, which is shared by the members of the community (in our case, the community which is involved in an undertaking of translation). According to Toury, there are three sub-types of target text norms: preliminary norms (regarding the overall translation policy and the choice of texts); initial norms (regarding the translator’s decision about the position of the target text between the source and target norms); and operational norms (which concern actual textual-linguistic strategies used in the TT, thus the term ‘operational’ is used in a different sense than is used in the present study).

Norm theory postulates that the regularities of the relationships between a ST and its corresponding TT are governed by norms. Therefore, Toury maintains, by observing those regularities in texts, one can investigate and elicit the governing norms and he advocates studying the regularities manifested in the texts (across the ST and TT, but particularly in the TT). He adds that the studies can be supplemented by examining extra-textual elements such as translation policies, translation critiques, activities of ‘school’ of translators, etc. (Toury 1995:65), but the main target of the studies under his programme is texts.

The norm notion is extremely abstract. A norm cannot be observed directly but rather, it is something that operates tacitly in translators’ minds. Therefore, it is not surprising that my informants did not talk about the concept of ‘norm’ explicitly in the interviews. Norms are also changeable according to the time and changes in society. Translators assimilate norms through “sanctions – actual or potential, negative as well as positive” (Toury, 1995:55). Here we draw attention to similarity between the notion of norm (as discussed by Toury) and that of role of participants (as discussed by my interviewees and linked with Nadel’s view on role in Section 6.2). Nadel (1957:25) claims social roles are recognised by people through the “maintenance machineries of the society, that is, by the sanctions”. Given the similarity between the notion of sanction in norm theory and in Nadel’s role theory, it can perhaps be assumed that we can examine the translators’ discourse as an avenue to elicit what they think the governing norms are. By observing how the roles are described by the translators, we can probably investigate which norm is governing (or the translators think is governing or should govern) their translation. In other words, translators may never consciously think about the norm which is governing their professional practice, but by talking about their professional practice using the concept of role, they are unwittingly describing the norms they think are governing (or should govern) their (and the other participants’) behaviours.
In this regard, I claim that my study outcomes can offer a valuable extension to norm theory in two respects: one in connection with the negotiation aspect of norms; and the other regarding the socialisation process of translators.

First, I discuss the negotiation aspect of norms. Toury’s programme is said to have a strong sociological bent in that the focus is on the norm, which is a social concept. The primary object of study is, however, still texts, not people: Toury advocates studying the relationships between textual features of the ST and TT to elicit norms. This suggests that a set of norms exists in individual culture, in the case of translation, in the ST culture and the TT culture, subsequently suggesting that there are two sets of norm systems in translation. In a later paper, however, Toury (1999) shifts part of his attention to the concept of the negotiation of norms, shedding more light on to where the two sets of norm systems (particularly the TT norm) are formed. Negotiation is, according to Toury (1999:14), a process through which “agreements about actions” are reached “with or without intervention of language”. Toury himself states that studies of translation should enquire as to where (in which group of people) those negotiations take place. This line of enquiry includes questions such as “How homogeneous (or heterogeneous) should the group be taken to be?” “Would it include acting translators only ... or persons playing other, adjacent roles as well?” and “What about...consumers of translated utterances?” (1999:20) Having posed those questions, however, he admits that “translation scholars seem to know precious little, beyond a small number of accounts of isolated individual cases” (ibid.:21). In reply to this 1999 paper, Pym (1999:111) critiques Toury’s view saying that his focus is still biased towards two (or more) sets of norm system as if they were separate entities. Further, Pym maintains that we should instead aim to “find norms in the intersections or overlaps of cultures, in the intercultures where ... a lot of translators work” because “the center of our interest ... has now shifted from the nature of the norms themselves to the social confrontations in which they are, indeed, negotiated” (ibid.:112).

With regard to this, my study outcomes will offer valuable information for the kind of research programme Pym advocates. My interviewees’ accounts were primarily concerned with people (more specifically with people’s roles) so the target of the enquiry is people, not texts. Also, while talking about people, the interviewees often talked about how those people negotiate (verbally or tacitly) about the norms which govern the translation projects they deal with. Even better, they often complained about the occasions where explicit negotiations did not take place, such as when the translation agency did not give the translator any feedback. These aspects of negotiation were highlighted in the concepts such as money, repeated commission, authority, feedback, instruction, terminology, reference material, and relationship.
Thus, detailed examination of the individual cases coded at those concepts will provide valuable insights into an area which is weak in Toury’s research methodology.

Second, let us think about the socialisation process of translators. For Toury, a successful translator is somebody who has internalised a certain set of norms of appropriate behaviour in particular translational situations. He calls the process of internalising norms “socialisation” of translators (1995:250). The process of socialisation takes place when the translator receives feedback from the commissioner, but Toury admits that research into the process of socialisation is difficult. Referring to Harris and Sherwood’s (1978) study on bilingual children and their competence as translators as providing rare data which might be used to inform an attempt to build a model of translators’ socialisation process, Toury concludes that it is difficult to conduct a study of the socialisation process for three reasons:

1) The study needs to be based on theoretical frameworks and method which are pertinent to Translation Studies (i.e. the unit of analysis needs to be the translation event, not some random incidences involving bi-lingual communication).

2) The study has to be longitudinal.

3) The data collection method has to be systematic and the amount of data needs to be substantial so that raw data (as opposed to a processed version) can be collected which are suitable for direct comparison.

It was in 1995 when Toury admitted these limitations on studies of the socialisation of translators. Twenty years on, there does not seem to have been much progress. This is, however, where I would claim that the outcomes of the present study can serve as a valuable set of supplemental data for the study of the socialisation of translators. This is because: a) by encouraging the informants to talk about the same type of translation events (i.e. conflict situations), the present study satisfies constraint 1) above; and b) the point of observation in the present study is fundamentally different from Toury’s. Since Toury’s research model concentrates on eliciting norms of translation from observations of texts, it cannot describe the process through which translators recognise, learn and assimilate the norms, which forms the core of their socialisation processes. In contrast, the present study has succeeded in collecting data which extensively cover events which are relevant to translators’ socialisation processes. The diagram below illustrates the different vantage points of Toury’s and the present study.
Caution is in order here, though. The present study is a discourse analysis of translators’ metalanguage about translation. It observes how the translators claim that they have recognised the norms or have assimilated them, which does not necessarily correspond to what they actually recognised or assimilated. In order to observe what they actually recognised or assimilated, a study would need to be designed in such a way that it met Toury’s constraints 2) and 3) mentioned above. Nevertheless, I believe that the present study offers valuable data as to the translators’ conscious views on this matter, which must shape at least part of (and I believe important part of) the observation of how translators go through a socialisation process in the real world.

With this caution in mind, let us look at what my interviewees said about what Toury calls translators’ socialisation process. In the analysis of the narrative structure of the translators’ accounts, it was shown that translators use the concepts of ‘feedback’ ‘money’ and ‘repeated commission’ to end their stories (see Chapter 5 Section 5-2-7)) and provide a judgement as to whether their behaviours are vindicated or not. Feedback is indeed the main socialisation method identified by Toury (1995:248 ff) and nobody would disagree with the claim that translators learn how to translate appropriately (according to a norm) through feedback, good or bad, from the client or the user of their translations. In a similar way, it will be safe to conclude that the other concepts – ‘money’ and ‘repeated commission’ – are also common means of socialisation of translators, i.e. translators consider that their translations were successful if they have received a payment for the work or receive another commission from the same client. But is such a judgement really correct?

In a debate on translation norms involving several leading academics (Toury & Hermans and others, 1999) Jean-Pierre Mailhac raises a question as to how sanction of
non-compliance with a norm can be identified. In reply to this question, Theo Hermans says:

The sanction could be quite immediate, of course, in that the translator could lose his or her job. It could also be that the sanction is not really visible, in the immediate sense, but the translator might not get another contract. (ibid.:87).

So academics are aware that non-payment or a lack of repeated commission functions as sanctions for translators. However, as Mailhac's reply to this comment shows – “In terms of a specific research project, these are putative sanctions.” (ibid.) – sanctions in these forms are often invisible, and my concern is that even experienced professional translators may not be aware of how the sanction mechanism really works. Admittedly, my concern is supported only by anecdotal evidence, but I believe this particular piece of evidence is worth presenting here. When I was working as a project manager in a small translation agency in Japan in the 1990s, when a freelance translator delivered a translation of insufficient quality, the owner of the agency used to instruct project managers (myself included), “Pay him as agreed and never contact him again.” This was the translator evaluation policy of this particular owner: payment – yes; feedback and repeated commission – no. Supposing (only supposing as I have no empirical evidence) this practice is prevalent in the translation industry, my interviewees are proved wrong in the way they judge the success of their translation. (For instance, my interviewees said: “I wrote back to the agency as he suggested and basically <they said> OK, thank you. We'll tell the client and that was that. I never heard any more from them so very relieved.” [04-02]; “<The translation company> didn't come back to me. Sometimes, they come back again, but this one didn't. So my assumption is that the proofreader agreed with me.” [14-04]).

As I pointed out, the present study cannot establish the accuracy of the participants' judgements, as it is not a report of observation of actual events. What can be highlighted by the present study, though, is that the translators' accounts can very possibly be a rich source of information regarding the socialisation process of translators.

Now, I suggest how these study outcomes can contribute to the teaching of norm theory, particularly in redressing the issue of normativeness in translation education. This is a similar point to that discussed in Section 6-3-1 (regarding teaching of the notion of domesticating vs foreignising translation and dynamic vs formal equivalence).

The submissive nature of translators is a worrying issue in translation education. The notion of norms and how they (supposedly) govern translation does, in my opinion, cause a submissive disposition in translators. Simeoni (1998:6) notes this point:
Toury is adamant that the horizon of the successful translator heralds near-complete submission to the norms effective in the subsector(s) of society in which s/he is professionally active.” (ibid.:6)

I have seen this tendency of “near complete submission to norms” in the students I have taught. Students tend to worry excessively about following the norms of translation, which will pressure them into, for example, constantly looking up genre conventions and correct terminology to produce successful translations. I should imagine that is what most translation teachers encourage the students to do in practical translation classes, but those activities may prevent the students from becoming creative and empowered translators. In this respect, my study outcomes will have a benefit for the teaching of norm theory by offering the observation points of negotiation and learning of translation norms. Rather than being thrown into the profession with (unnecessarily) obsessive feelings of having to follow norms of translation all the time, which can be a lonely and frustrating endeavour if no appropriate guidance is in place, they can be prepared for what to expect in the professional environment so that they can go through a socialisation process effectively and confidently. For instance, my interviewees talked about not receiving correct instructions from the client or not being given the authority of making the final choice of terminology. They also talked about feedback, money and repeated commissions which they deem to be the final stage of their assignment and where they measure the success of their work. These are the points translation teachers can incorporate in the teaching of norm theory. To take an example, in a discussion of norm theory students can be encouraged to think how they will examine and learn governing norms, including the points such as at what stage of a translation assignment, from whom and through what mode of communication. The study outcomes can be presented as real-life examples. In this way, the teacher can provide the students with systematically and empirically assembled information in the framework of norm theory. As a result a discussion related to norm theory, which tends to be abstract, can be augmented with more concrete contexts, which will be beneficial for preparing students for real-life situations.

6.4.2 Theory of translatorial action

The theory of translatorial action (henceforth TTA) was developed by a German academic, Justa Holz-Mänttäri who was based in Finland in the 1980s. According to the preliminary survey reported in Chapter 2, TTA is being taught by 27.8% of the teachers who responded and ranked 19th in the survey (out of the total of 33). Although Holz-Mänttäri developed the theory separately at around the time of Vermeer and
Reiss's skopos theory, it is similar to skopos theory in that it focuses on the function of translation rather than the textual features of translation. For this reason, both tend to be considered as functionalist approaches to translation. Because her monograph Translatorisches Handel: Theorie und Methode (1984) was written in German and has not been translated into English, the application of the theory has been mainly within the German research community (some examples are listed in Snell-Hornby (2006:59-60)), but some pieces of research have been reported in English e.g. Risku (2004). In the present discussion Schäffner (1998, 2009, 2011) and Snell-Hornby (2006) are used for the review of the theory.

TTA, like skopos theory, shifts attention from textual features of translation. Drawing, again like skopos theory, on action theory, TTA's focus is on actions of participants, and the related external aspect of translation in the contexts of professional translation. This external aspect includes factors such as the aim of translation, the mode of translation, deadlines and fees to be paid (Schäffner, 2009:119). Also, TTA focuses on the concept of function of translation and sees the translatorial action embedded in the social order. In order for a successful production of translation, participants involved in the translation need to "agree (explicitly or implicitly) on who is responsible for which tasks" (Schäffner, 2011:159).

This way of explaining translation is strikingly similar to how my interviewees gave their accounts in three ways. First, my interviewees talked extensively about actions of participants – who did or did not do what – but they did not talk much about the textual features of translation. Schäffner (1998:3) notes that “[i]n [TTA’s] conception, neither source- and target-text comparison, nor linguistics, has any significant role to play”. Second, my translators were largely concerned with roles of participants and often attributed an unsuccessful translation to other participants’ failure to fulfil their roles, or having wrong ideas about the translator’s role. The perception of roles was situated very much in the centre of my interviewees’ discourse. In addition, the roles discussed are identical between my study and TTA though terms used are different (I use Schäffner’s (1998) English equivalents here in square brackets): the end-client [the commissioner], the author of ST [the text producer], the translator [the translator], the proofreader [the target-text applicator], the user [the receptor]. Third, my interviewees talked about various factors which affect translational actions, e.g. money, time, feedback. TTA places importance on those external factors too.

Finding clear similarities between the principles of TTA and my interviewees’ theorisation pattern is exciting, but probably not surprising: because Holz-Mänttäri is a translator turned academic (Snell-Hornby 2006:68), it seems natural that her
observations and discourse about translation should be in tune with how practising translators give their accounts about their practice. This may be why TTA has been criticised for presenting an ideal translational situation, not a description of a real situation, lacking in empirical evidence (Schäffner, 2011). Holz-Mänttäri herself admits this point. According to Schäffner (2011:161), Holz-Mänttäri acknowledges that

... in the real world, the power of clients may constrain professional expertise. She argues, however, that this does not affect the theory of translatorial action which is not intended to describe actual facts, but rather to model variables and their interrelations as a system.

If this is the characteristic of TTA, the outcomes of the present study can probably contribute (though tentatively) to TTA by empirically identifying the variables and describing how they interact with each other, offering strong evidence in support of the principles of TTA. (I say ‘tentatively’ because as explained in the Methodology section, the present study is not a survey of what actually happens in professional environments. Instead, this is a study of discourse which examines what the translators say happened. This is an epistemological and methodological issue. If we are to support the principles of TTA in a rigorous manner, studies with an ethnological approach will be needed.)

Now, I will move my argument to pedagogical implications.

My study has shown that the principles of TTA have great affinity with my interviewees’ theorisation patterns. The preliminary survey of translation teachers showed that TTA is being taught by 27.8% of the teachers and is ranked 19th in the survey (out of the total of 33). The ranking is not very high, but in reality, there may be more cases of teaching the principles of TTA, not under that name, but in practical exercises of translation, particularly in a role-play teaching model. Because of the emphasis on the roles of participants, I would argue that my study outcomes can contribute to translation classes where a role-play model is used.

Role play is a teaching method where roles are assigned to students to simulate professional situations. Kelly (2005:101) states that it is one of the “standard methods or techniques used with small groups, ... being the most frequent or most useful in translator training”. Vienne (1994) is one of the earliest proponents of the role-play teaching model. In his article, Toward a Pedagogy of ‘Translation in Situation’, Vienne reports on the curriculum he devised for the translation course at his institution. ‘Translation in situation’, as opposed to ‘translation in a void’, is a translation assignment exercise given by a teacher to students. If an assignment is not set in a specific situation (i.e. ‘translation in void’), students will find it difficult to analyse the text, ending up “rejecting [the text analysis] entirely as both sterile (since it was
fruitless) and a nuisance (as it has only slowed them down)” (ibid.:52). To avoid this situation, Vienne suggests that the teacher acts as ‘a requester’, who requests that the students translate certain texts (of pragmatic sorts, not literary texts) as if he/she was a commissioner of translation in a real situation (hence ‘translation in situation’). The task of the students is to make a list of questions for the requester (such as ‘Who is the reader?’ or ‘Do similar texts exit in the source language already?’). By seeking answers to the questions from the requester, the students learn how to analyse the text and eventually to produce successful translations. In this teaching method, the students learn how to fulfil the role of the translator while analysing the texts (both source and target) assuming that it is situated in a commercial and professional environment.

Kiraly’s monograph A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education: Empowerment from Theory to Practice (2000) is another influential publication which recommends a role-play teaching model. Drawing on a social-constructivist approach, Kiraly maintains that translation is most effectively taught in an environment which replicates a real professional environment using group work. In Kiraly’s teaching model, the teacher takes on the role of a project co-ordinator, not a teacher (thus similar to Vienne’s idea), and the students take on the roles of participants involved in the translation process, including translators and proofreaders.

Probably under the influence of these publications, there seem to be quite a number of uses of the role-play model in translation teaching: I have witnessed the application of this teaching method in several university courses and have also seen it reported at translation conferences on many occasions. It seems that the role-play model is being used widely in institutions. Typically in a role-play model of teaching, a small number of students (normally 4 or 5) are grouped together and each member is assigned a role such as a project manager, translator, terminologist and proofreader. The teacher gives a text to the group (or the student acting as a project manager sources a text) and the group members work together to produce a translation. The students are normally assessed by their contribution to team work, actions they take and their reflections (in a written assessment) on the team-work process.

Of course there are different ways of implementing this teaching model, but it would be reasonable to assume that any teaching practice using this model must have (consciously or unconsciously) the principles of TTA as a theoretical framework. In this kind of teaching environment, students can learn how the actual professional environment is organised and experience the roles of different participants, which will enforce (and if necessary, correct) their understanding of how translation is realised in

---

23 Hui (2012:32-34) presents three examples of use of a role-play model in translation education.
the real world.

There is, however, a concern as to how similar the teacher can make the simulated situation to the reality of professional environments. The roles and interactions between them will be, though a simulation of a real situation, still artificial and the authenticity of the particular scenario will depend very much on the teacher’s knowledge and beliefs about the professional world. Teachers with no or little experience of professional translation will be at a disadvantage in this respect. The scenario will also be biased by the teacher’s idea of an ‘ideal’ situation.

This is, I argue, where the outcomes of the current research may be useful. Let us use an analogy of a machine to the organisation of the role play. If we think of each part of the machine as a student taking part in the role-play exercise, my study outcomes can work as a lubricant which enhances the smooth and efficient working of the machine. The teacher can provide the students with the lubricant, explaining what the substance is made of and what beneficial effect it can have on the whole working of the machine when applied appropriately (and at the same time, what kind of adverse effect it can have when applied wrongly). In doing so, the teacher can highlight the elements which have been identified in the current study. For instance, one of the translators’ concerns in relation to the concept of the roles of participants was feedback. The present study revealed that translators wish to receive feedback to establish how they performed their roles in assignments, but clients and translation companies do not always provide feedback. As a result, translators use the concepts of repeated commission and payment as indicators of quality instead. These concepts (feedback, repeated commission and payment) can provide the classroom with food for thought when it comes to a discussion of translation. The students can think of the issue of translation quality not only within the realm of the text and translation competence, but in the context of real professional situations, bringing in aspects relevant to not only the translator but also to other participants and their roles. In this way, the study outcomes may enable the teacher to teach what elements may influence the performance of each role and how this may happen, instead of teaching what is supposed to be a normative role of each participant.

TTA was developed nearly 30 years ago and the survey shows that only 27.8% of translation teachers teach the theory at present. In light of the outcomes of the present study, it may be about time that translation teachers re-discovered the educational value of TTA, particularly in a role-play situation, where my study outcomes can contribute by augmenting the teaching contents. In this way, the teacher can train students so that they are well prepared for real-life situations in the professional environment.
6·4·3 Bourdieu's field theory and his notion of habitus

Bourdieu’s field theory and his notion of habitus have become popular with translation academics recently, but it does not seem to have permeated translation classes: only 6 out of 93 teachers said in the preliminary survey that they teach Bourdieu’s theory. However, these 6 answers were collected in the free answer section of the survey, which indicates that there are a small number of strong supporters of this theory among translation teachers.

Bourdieu is a French sociologist whose central concepts include “that of the field, within which agents (i.e. for us, translators and other participants in the translational process) compete for positions of status and power” and habitus, which is “the basic psychological-emotional disposition of agents (in a field), including notions of role model, self-image and group identity” (Chesterman, 2006:13). Simeoni (1998) applied the concepts as an antidote to the cognitive-science-oriented research paradigm which was being developed rapidly then in the Translation Studies research community. For him the research community “seem[ed] to have closed their eyes lately on the socio-symbolic, representational and interactive realities of cognition in the wider world of practice” because of its tendency to “rest on the strong hypothesis that the inner workings of the mind of Homo sapiens can be studied independently of its socio-cultural environment” (ibid.:3, emphasis in original). Simeoni also drew on Bourdieu’s framework as a remedy for the shortcoming of Toury’s norm theory, which I have already discussed in Section 6·4·1. Simeoni maintains that the notion of habitus is important because of its “structuring mechanism” (ibid.:21), which actively shapes the structure of norms, and emphasises the importance of observing translators’ habitus in research as “the pivot around which systems of social order revolve” (ibid).

Since the publication of Simeoni’s 1998 paper, an increasing number of scholars have adopted sociological approaches in research and many of them advocate an application of Bourdieu’s theoretical notions of field and habitus for explaining translational phenomena (see for example the special issue of The Translator edited by Inghilleri 2005). For instance, Gouanvic (2005) investigates the new genre of science fiction in the post-war French literary field and discusses how the genre was developed in France under the influence of translators’ habitus. Another example is Hanna (2005), which studies how the translators’ habitus influenced early Shakespearean translation in Egypt. Both works look at translators’ habitus as a deciding factor of translation and the establishment of the emerging genre.
I will not review individual contribution to this body of literature any further, but what I want to stress here is that the academic explanations about translation using Bourdieu’s theory are notably different from the translators’ theorisation patterns identified in the present study in that, in the latter, the emphasis on the psychological-emotional disposition (or habitus) of participants, which is the core of Bourdieu’s theory, is not felt so keenly. According to Simeoni (1998:21), habitus is “the nexus of dispositions” which has been “acquired and shaped” “in the course of individual social lives” or their “trajectory”. This includes upbringing, education and vocational training. In my analysis of the translators’ accounts, a similar concept was indeed generated as the concept of ‘disposition of participants’. There were 21 segments which were coded both at the concept of ‘disposition of participants’ and at one of the justification methods. When examined closely, 10 segments were about participants (both translators and others) being arrogant, five were about lacking confidence, four were about being confident, and another four about being kind. Other dispositions included being careful, artistic, entrepreneurial, indifferent, relaxed and uncommunicative, each of which had one or two segments coded at them. Here is one example.

... but the problem is that if you have a bad source text, often the person who wrote the source text doesn't want to be told that. [Story 01-03]

From this account we understand that the end-client had a stubborn and uncooperative nature (I grouped it under the label of ‘being arrogant’). Because of that, even if the translator found the quality of the ST unsatisfactory and notified the translation company of it, the translation company was reluctant to ask the end client to improve the ST because they knew the end-client would not be happy to be asked that. As a result the translator was put in the position of having to translate a poor-quality ST, which affected the textual features of the translation. At another point in the same story, the interviewee talked about his fellow translator’s disposition, saying:

“...if you are a good translator, you do look at the details like that.” [01-03]

The logic is simple: if the translator has a careful and meticulous disposition, he/she will look at the detail of the texts, and as a result, produces a better quality translation.

What is prominent in both examples is that the description of the disposition of participants is strongly linked to the participant’s resultant actions. In the first example, because of the end-client’s disposition, the translation company did not obtain a good quality ST. In the second example, the translator’s careful disposition made her
spend a lot of time and care in translating. Although the disposition of the participant may have influenced the resultant translational features strongly (if we subscribe to Simeoni’s argument), the translators’ concerns identified in the analysis shed more light on the resultant actions, and the translators constructed their arguments saying that it was those actions that linked the two factors: the disposition of a participant and the resultant translation. In the examples above, the actions concerned were, for the first example, to ask (or not ask) the end-client for a better ST, and for the latter, to read the ST carefully. So in the translators’ accounts, although disposition of participants was sometimes mentioned, what was identified as an important factor was not what those dispositions were but the actions taken (probably) because of the disposition: my interviewees demonstrated a strong emphasis on participants’ actions.

In contrast, in the works in which Bourdieu’s framework is applied, the habitus of the translator is dealt with as if that was the direct cause of specific textual features. For instance, in the study of three French translators who introduced American literature to France between the 1920s and 1960s, Gouanvic (2005) focuses on the translators’ habitus as a factor which influenced their literary taste. One of them is Maurice-Edgar Coindreau, who, after passing the competitive French academic examination to become a professor of Spanish, emigrated to America and discovered the literature of the south. He particularly felt close to Faulkner because of the similarity between his and Faulkner’s personal involvement in historical and political events: for Coindreau, the failure of the counter-revolution of the Chouannerie in France, and for Faulkner, the failure of the southern Secession. In the case of Boris Vian, a translator of American science fiction into French, Gouanvic attributes Vian’s contribution to this literary field to his educational background in engineering at an engineering college saying, “owing to his habitus, he was not afraid of mixing science and technology with literature” (ibid.:161). Of his translation, Gouanvic says that “Vian enhanced the rhetoric of American authors while bringing out the particular poetics of the texts” (ibid.:161). Gouanvic maintains that these very trajectories of the translators determined their literary taste, saying that the textual feature of translation (or ‘discourse’ in Gouanvic’s terms) “proceeds from the actualisation of the writer’s habitus in the literary field” (ibid.:158). It sounds indeed logical and rational that the translators’ personal histories (including education) influence their literary taste and textual features, but the direct link between the translator’s habitus and textual features seems to be rather speculative, and was not evident in my interviewees’ accounts.

Some translators did talk about participants’ dispositions as an attribute which was evident at the time of the dispute in question, but they did not particularly touch
upon the personal history or ‘trajectory’ of the translator. I took a grounded theory approach in the analysis of the data, in which no theoretical concepts were drawn on at the beginning of the analysis. If, instead of using grounded theory, I had analysed the interview data drawing on the concept of habitus from the beginning, which concerns greatly the personal history of participants, I would have probably coded several segments at the concept of habitus. The following extract would be one of them.

Q: .... it's quite brave to go into medical translation, isn't it?
A: Ah, well, you see my partner is a doctor.
Q: OH YES.
A: Both parents are doctors. My grandparents are doctors. Everyone is a doctor in my family [Q: OK]. So it's fine.
Q: So you're the black sheep.
A: yeah.
Q: And you didn't become a doctor.
A: No, but now I'm doing medical translation.
Q: Yeah, so now, it's great isn't it? You can ask questions and... I see. That makes sense.
A: But also, we just always have medical journals and medical magazines around the house so it's very easy to understand the style of writing and all those things, so .... [Story 14-01]

Indeed, the account above can possibly be understood as one about the translator’s habitus if the analyst draws on the notion at the outset of the analysis: because the translator was brought up in a doctors’ family and her partner is a doctor, her habitus made her become a medical translator and she does the job well because of her habitus. This line of thinking, however, would be only possible if the analyst examined the discourse with a predetermined notion of habitus in mind. In my analysis this segment was coded at ‘specialisation’ and ‘reference material (people as information source)’. As I explained in the data analysis section (Chapter 5), generation of concepts was performed through a constant comparative method. In comparing different accounts across different informants, the concept of habitus was not identified as an independent notion, and the above segment was eventually included in the generated concepts of ‘specialisation’ and ‘reference material’.

Bourdieu’s notion of habitus has a strong explanatory power when the right kind of material is chosen for analysis, such as the above extract from Story 14-01. After all, the argument that an actor’s disposition influences his/her social behaviour is common sense. And this may be one of the reasons why Bourdieu’s theory has recently been popular amongst translation scholars, especially in discussions of literary translation. Bourdieu's theory, however, at least for the behaviours described in the data provided by the present study, does not seem to offer a strong model of how the
translator’s habitus influence their behaviours and eventually the resultant textual features. This is because it lacks a clear account of the connecting elements between habitus and behaviour. In contrast, the present study identified some elements which, the translators claim, influence directly the textual features. They are, for example in the case of Story 14-01 above, ‘reference material’ and ‘specialisation’. These elements are of more direct concerns to the translators, and as far as the translators’ real-life practice is concerned, the notion of habitus does not seem to be necessary or relevant.

6·4·4 Actor Network Theory

Actor Network Theory was not included in the questionnaire of the translation teachers’ survey, nor was it mentioned by any respondents in the free answer section, and it seems to be unknown to most translation teachers. Although ANT has not been applied to Translation Studies as extensively as Bourdieu’s theory, Buzelin (2005) claims that ANT is useful to Translation Studies as a conceptual tool which augments Bourdieu’s theoretical framework when studying translation from a sociological viewpoint. On a similar note, I argue here that ANT offers useful concepts and methodology for understanding my study outcomes.

Actor Network Theory (commonly known as ANT) was originally conceptualised and developed for use within the sociology of science and technology by the French sociologists Bruno Latour and Michael Callon and further developed by proponent scholars such as John Law. Latour (1983/1999), for example, uses ANT for a sociological study of the working of scientific laboratories. ANT advocates a research method in which the researcher observes objects and traces the processes they go through rather than trying to categorise people (the traditional object of study in sociology) into different groups (Latour, 2005). ANT denies that there exist such observable entities as society and social forces exerted by human actors (as can be seen for example in Bourdieu’s framework, which Latour criticises as limiting the mode of existence of participants of society as “a ‘mirror’ [which is] simply ‘reflecting’ social distinctions” (Latour, 2005:84)). ANT’s proponents maintain that “society, organisations, agents and machines are all effects generated in patterned networks of diverse (not simply human) materials” (emphasis in original) (Law, 2000:854). Those materials are called ‘actors’ in ANT, and ANT claims that society can be studied by observing the processes and traces of the negotiations between those actors, rather than the products of the negotiations. This claim is based on the assumption that orders of society are generated through a negotiation between the actors. With its ethnographical approach, it strives to observe how actors move and what traces they leave through the processes
within a network.

ANT is unique because of the definition of ‘actors’. In ANT, ‘actors’ can be either humans or non-humans as long as the entity bears agency, as Law (2000:855) explains: “... these networks are composed not only of people, but also of machines, animals, texts, money, architectures ... any material that you care to mention”. Buzelin (2005) maintains that the conceptual tool of actors offers a major advantage to the study of translation since, by drawing on the notion of the actor, which can be either human or non-human (and multiple actors can exist in one network), we do not have to think of translation as an affair based on a simplistic dichotomy (Buzelin uses the example of the dichotomy of translators and translation tools such as CAT). As a result, “this concept enables us to grasp both the complexity – and nonlinear character – of the translation process, and the hybridity of the translating agent” (ibid.:212).

Another unique notion used in ANT is that of ‘inscription’. In ANT, the network is formed through a negotiation between actors, where a focal actor persuades other actors to recognise it as the authority of the network. In this process, an actor which is recognised as or transformed into an authority is called inscription. To achieve the status of inscription, actors undergo “negotiations, intrigues, calculations, acts of persuasion and violence thanks to which an actor takes or causes to be conferred on itself the authority to speak or act on behalf of another actor” (Callon & Latour, 1981:279). An inscription can take any form but often takes the form of a text (such as a correspondence, logbook or research paper) and Latour (1983/1999), for example, observed how scientists use this instrument to exert their power and authority in the scientific circle. Inscription can have power in a social structure because an actor in a textual form can gain credibility more easily than those not in a textual form since an entity in a textual form can travel time and space. In other words a dominant actor (here, ‘dominant’ means dominant not necessarily quantitatively but by the degree of its authority) becomes inscribed into a recognisable form, most probably in a textual format, and this inscription travels within the network, influencing other actors. In this way an inscription governs the power structure of the whole network even at distance.

Recently ANT, with an emphasis on the concept of inscriptions, was applied to the study of translation by Abdallah (2012) in her doctoral thesis of translation workplace studies. Abdallah finds a methodological value in the concept of inscriptions because by observing which actor possesses the ability to circulate inscriptions within

\[\text{24 In ANT, this act of recognition is called ‘translation’, so an actor is ‘translated’ into an inscription. ‘Translation’ is a key term in ANT, but the term is extremely confusing for us in ‘Translation’ Studies, so I chose to avoid the particular term in this discussion.}\]
the production process of translation, the researcher can understand the power structure of the network. Her case study is in the Finnish subtitling industry, whose work supply structure experienced a major change in the late 1990s. In the new structure a small translation company succeeded in securing a large contract with a leading pay-TV provider, and the company addressed the increase in the amount of work by using translation students as cheap labour. The company, not surprisingly, received complaints from the client about the quality of their translation products and went out of business eventually. In this study Abdallah demonstrated that the reason why the student translators were in a weak position in the economic network of the industry was because they had no inscriptions regarding quality. She means by inscriptions in her case study factors such as the translation company's house rules, emails, billing instructions, purchase orders, bills, and copyright waivers: and she argues that the most powerful inscription in the actor-network in her study was the business contract between the client and the translation company. The translators did not possess the inscription (the work contract) and the power to circulate it: the participants who did (i.e. the translation company and the end-client) were far more powerful than the translators in the actor-network. Abdallah (ibid.:30) concludes:

When translators become involved in such economic networks, they are confronted by a rationale quite different from that involved in traditional, expertise-based dyadic relations between the client and translator, as presented in standard translation theories which emphasize translator expertise (Holz-Mänttäri, 1984; Reiss & Vermeer, 1984).

Again, as with the notion of actors, it is claimed that the notion of inscription helps researchers observe the complicated non-dyadic mechanism of translational processes.

The concepts of actors and inscriptions of ANT, advocated as useful conceptual tools for studies on translation and translators by Buzelin and Abdallah, seem to be useful for the discussion of my study outcomes too in two ways. First, I argued above that the principles of Holz-Mänttäri's TTA are similar to the translators’ theorisation patterns in that they focus on participants’ roles and that they place importance on external, situational factors related to the situation. However, the external factors identified in the translators’ theorisation were heterogeneous: they included both concrete objects and abstract concepts. I also attempted to group them into three categories depending on the approach (i.e. people, translation, operation), but it became evident that concepts cannot be categorically grouped as they are of a hybrid nature (for instance, ‘ST’ can be grouped into the category of translation as well as operation). If the concept of actors is drawn on from ANT, however, all of these hybrid elements, whether concrete or abstract, do not have to be grouped into some categories but can
instead be treated at an equal level, which will bring great flexibility to interpretation of the translators’ discourse. As a result, the translators’ justification pattern about the roles of participants can be tentatively summarised as below using ANT’s framework.

![Concept map using ANT's framework](image)

**Figure 22** Concept map using ANT’s framework

In the inner box of the diagram are the concepts which were identified as related to the concept of roles. The diagram shows that, because actors can be either concrete objects, abstract concepts or people, we can appreciate the heterogeneousness and plurality of the concepts used in the translators’ accounts; we can discuss ‘money’, ‘native speaker’ and ‘relationship’ on a level playing field, i.e. in the same actor-network. At the same time, as ANT frees the observer from a dichotomous understanding of the object, we do not have to position ‘the translator’ against ‘the translation agency’, or ‘the translation agency’ against ‘the end-client’. Without a dichotomous framework, those participants who take on different roles can be described as just one of the nodes in the network without being arranged in a rigid
dichotomous manner and their positions can change fluidly depending on how the actors negotiate with each other. In an authentic ANT study, the relations between each concept (actor) (as indicated in the internal box in the above diagram) will be observed in detail using an ethnographical method. However, it will not be pursued here as it is not the aim of the present discussion to apply ANT to the informants’ data. This ANT-inspired diagram, however, suggests that ANT helps us make sense of the generated concepts in relation to the larger concept of roles of participants and the main participants in the translational process.

Second, the concept of inscription also seems to be useful for the researcher when he/she observes how the translators theorise their translational practice. In the interviewees’ accounts, the informants used the concepts of ‘repeated commission’, ‘money’ and ‘feedback’ in arguing for the quality of their translation. They complained that clients often did not give them feedback about their translation, but they claimed their translation can be deemed successful if they received a payment for the assignment or another commission afterwards. This means, using ANT's terms, translators accept feedback as a legitimate inscription in the translational process, but other participants may not recognise feedback as a form of inscription, or they simply do not circulate it in the actor-network. As a result the translators have to compromise with what they can access in the situation, i.e. payment and repeated commission. Another concept my interviewees used often in explaining their own roles was ‘instruction’. They said other participants often have a wrong idea that a translator can translate well even without a proper instruction. This concept of ‘instruction’ can be understood as a form of inscription: the translator needs this form of inscription in order for him/her to produce a good quality translation, but other participants may not recognise an instruction as a form of inscription. Due to the incongruence in their recognition of inscription, a problem occurs. ‘Name of translator’ and ‘qualification’ can also be understood as forms of inscription, but probably as weak ones. When the translator is not happy with the end result of his/her translation (due perhaps to inappropriate corrections by the proofreader), he/she may refuse to put his/her name on the text as a translator. The translator has the power to decide whether to circulate this inscription or not (as long as the client agrees with the decision), but the decision is a negative one (i.e. deleting his/her name from the text) rather than a positive one (for instance, adding his/her name to the existing text). Consequently, the effect of the inscription is very likely to be weak. ‘Qualification’ is another concept which can possibly work as an inscription in the actor-network. If qualification (such as a master’s degree in Translation Studies or membership of a professional organisation) is recognised as one of the requisites in a recruitment process of translators, then
translators will have the power to circulate this inscription in the actor-network. However, the concept of qualification was mentioned only by one informant in the present study, and that was in a negative sense: the translator said translators with impressive qualifications are not necessarily competent translators [in Stories 01-13 and 01-18]. Therefore, ‘qualification’ will not work as an inscription in the actor-network of translation in reality. In this way, whether in a negative or positive sense for translators, some of the concepts generated from the translators’ discourse can be interpreted in a new light by drawing on the ANT framework, which can possibly reveal a new dimension of translational processes.

In this section, I have discussed my study outcomes using some concepts offered by ANT. In the current study a number of concepts were generated using a grounded theory approach. For post factum understanding of the relationships between those concepts, the notion of actors and inscriptions seem to be very useful for the researcher to make sense of them: the pluralistic and heterogeneous features of the concepts generated from the analysis can be explained nicely with ANT for one thing, and the incongruence in the definition of roles between participants can be explained well using the concept of inscriptions for another. Bogic (2010:182) concedes that “ANT has been criticized for being too rooted in the local situation and local causes that no general principles can be derived from it”, but the empirical evidence provided in the present study demonstrates that this emphasis on local situationality is the vital part of translators’ theorisation and that ANT can help significantly in interpreting the situationality. Therefore, translation teachers will be able to use the framework and notions of ANT to explain the concepts generated in the present study in translation classrooms, which will facilitate the students’ understanding of how the professional translation operation works in the real world.

6.5 Other points for discussion

6.5.1 Use of the outcomes as a complete teaching material

I have discussed so far possible methods of application of the present study’s outcomes to translation classes. I have focused on how the study outcomes (my interviewees’ theorisation patterns) can be used to reinforce existing teaching settings and contents. I would add here an alternative method of using the study outcomes, i.e. to use the study outcomes as a complete package, presenting it to the students as a description of the reality from the translators’ point of view and encourage them to discuss what they think about the translators’ attitudes, behaviours and status in the industry. This teaching model is supported by Cronin (2005:263):
... it may be necessary to go beyond the more traditional translation theory courses and offer “Translation in Society” courses that would be a hybrid of political science, sociology, economics, and translation history and which would offer students the conceptual tools and historical knowledge to become visible not only as signatories of translation texts but as fully-fledged intellectuals in their own right.

In this type of translation class, the teacher will be able to utilise the outcomes of the present study as a model to describe the translator’s position as a crucial actor in the network of translational processes.

6.5.2 What is missing in translators’ accounts? The issue of metaphors

So far I have discussed the pedagogical implications of the study outcomes intending to use them to add to our current understanding of translation pedagogical situations. Here I seek to identify what is missing in my interviewees’ theorisation patterns, relative to what is in fact taught in translation classrooms, and discuss whether it is worth teaching.

In Chapter 5 I touched upon one interviewee who was outstanding in his eloquence in explaining translation. I found out after the interview that he was writing a book about translation in addition to his work as a translator. However, he seems to be an exceptional case. Normally, professional translators do not have many opportunities to discuss translation, let alone write about translation. As a result it is assumed that they do not have many opportunities to develop certain discursive resources to explain their translation. In the present study, metaphor was identified as such a discursive resource. In what follows I will focus on this discursive resource and argue why they may be worth teaching in translator education.

Metaphor is a linguistic feature which has been understood by linguists in two main ways: one as a sort of figurative and ornamental language used for an aesthetic purpose (typically in literary work), and the other as a linguistic resource which performs the task of accounting for human perspectives on the world (Schön, 1993:138). It is the latter concept of metaphor that will be discussed in this section.

In the history of discourse about translation, the practice of translation has often been described using metaphors. “Les belles infidèles” (the beautiful unfaithful) and “traduttori, traditore” (translator, traitor) are probably the best known metaphors used to describe the role of translators. Other examples include, taken from St André’s (2011:84) list of examples, a bridge between cultures, slave to the author, copyist, mirror, conduit, maestro or master chef, bumblebee, a blind man describing an elephant (all of these as metaphors for the translator), and pouring old wine into new
bottles, bearing truthful witness, and alchemy (as metaphors for translation as an act). St André (2011) points out that there is a tendency in recent Translation Studies for scholars to disregard traditional passive metaphors of translation and translators and to adopt more positive ones to avoid doing harm to the practice and status of translators.

Metaphors play an important function in building theories. Iser (2006) maintains that in building theories in arts subjects (such as literary studies and art history) metaphor plays the role of bringing closure to a conceptual framework. It represents the “keystone idea” and leads from the framework to the formation of a theory. Examples include expressions such as “polyphonic harmony” in phenomenological theory and “fusion of horizons” in hermeneutics (ibid. 2006:6).

The power of metaphor is recognised not only in humanistic discourse but in the sciences too. Petrie and Oshlag (1993:581) explain that metaphors are:

integral parts of the very structure of a theory at any given time in its development. ... their usefulness consist of both their ability to help us learn the theory and their inductive fruitfulness in guiding further research in the theory.”

Metaphors which have the power to develop a scientific theory is called ‘theory-constitutive metaphors’ (Boyd, 1993). This kind of metaphor is “one of many devices available to the scientific community to accomplish the task of accommodation of language to the causal structure of the world” (ibid.:483, emphasis in original). They include examples such as “worm-holes” in general relativity, “electron cloud” which describes the spatial localization of bound electrons, and the description of atoms as “miniature solar systems” (ibid.:486).

Taking into consideration this explanatory power of metaphor, it is intriguing that the interviewees of the present study hardly used metaphors in their explanation of translation. The reason for this is not clear from the outcomes of the present study alone, but two possible explanations can be deduced. First, if we think of metaphor as a tool for theoretical thinking, a tool which elevates one’s belief to the level of more abstract and credible discourse, translators’ not using a metaphor in their metalanguage may indicate that they generally do not have many opportunities to think about and discuss their practice. When one does not have a chance to discuss translation, one will not acquire a tool for discussing translation. This assumption is supported by my informants’ accounts that they seldom hear back from their clients about an assessment of their translation. If this is true, translators do not have many opportunities to discuss their translations with other stakeholders, so they do not have a chance to reflect upon their practice and develop theorisation tools such as metaphor.
In other words, translators may not have a stock of metaphors to use in a discussion of translation due to a lack of opportunities to ponder upon translation in their day-to-day practice. Second, the interviewees may simply believe that the use of metaphor in a professional setting is not appropriate. In the interviews I asked the interviewees how in a dispute situation they justified their translation. The interviewees may have thought that using metaphoric language is not suitable or effective in that particular dispute situation because of the common association of metaphors with the aesthetic and ornamental roles they play in literary work. In other words it may be a pragmatic matter of spoken language in professional environments, not a matter of the translators’ discursive ability to explain issues about translation.

Whatever the reason, what are the implications of the issue of the use of metaphor for translator education?

The effect of the use of metaphors in education has been studied in Educational Psychology. Petrie and Oshlag (1993) offer a comprehensive review of studies which examine the educational effectiveness of metaphors in the teaching of sciences. Having acknowledged that there are views in cognitive psychology that metaphors are primarily for aesthetic purposes and that the power of metaphors to enhance understanding of what is being taught and learnt is limited, Petrie and Oshlag challenge these views and maintain that metaphor has a number of important cognitive and educational roles including aiding the acquisition of new knowledge.

Learning must always start with what the learner presently knows. When the learner recognises that there is a gap between his/her old knowledge and what is presented to him/her for the first time (new knowledge), and if factual presentations of the new knowledge is difficult to grasp because it is unfamiliar or complex, a metaphor is a very effective devise to enable the learner to bridge the gap. Once the concept is understood with a help of metaphor, the learner can comfortably engage in a related activity in the real world and observe the results, which consolidates the learning. In this way, the process consisting of 1) recognition of anomaly, 2) provision of metaphor, and 3) actual acting in the world followed by an observation of results – or what Petrie and Oshlag call a “triangulation” of a problematic situation (1993:598) – can be an effective teaching method when introducing a new concept to students. Petrie and Oshlag support their claim with empirical evidence, which includes: use of the metaphor of children on a seesaw to teach the mechanism of the manometer, a U-shaped instrument for measuring between gas pressure and atmospheric pressure (Garde, 1986); use of a basketball analogy for a psychology experiment (Polyson & Blick, 1985); and, although in a non-scientific subject, describing the study of philosophy as an orange (it requires effort to remove the tough, bitter covering but is sweet and
nourishing inside) (Haynes, 1978). All these studies report positive educational results of using metaphors in secondary school and college science classes.

If there is pedagogical value in the use of metaphors in scientific subjects, that may be the case for translation classes too. This particular pedagogical value of metaphor has been recognised by a small number of scholars in Translation Studies. Chesterman (2000:81) claims that role metaphors of translators (e.g. bricklayer, copier, artist, mimic) are useful to make students aware of the various roles of translators. González Davies (2004) builds on this claim and suggests a class activity in which students think and discuss the roles of translators using metaphors. In this class activity, the teacher presents students with a list of metaphors which describe the role of a translator and asks the students to discuss which one best describes the role of translators as well as the notion of translation. The teacher then explains the sources of the metaphors (for instance, the metaphor of a bricklayer comes from Classic Greek literature and represents translating as an act of rebuilding, whereas the metaphor of a copier comes from early Biblical translations and describes the act of translating as copying). After this stage, the students will be introduced to main approaches to translation (such as Linguistics and Cultural Studies approaches), where the learning of metaphors at a previous stage should make the understanding of these approaches easier for the students.

Bartrina (2005:180) similarly states that "[s]ome thought on the metaphors related to translation at a particular moment is useful, as it can enlighten us with regard to the predominant attitudes towards translating." If, like those academics, we regard metaphors as stimuli for conscious deliberation on translation, then teaching theories in the form of metaphor will be useful for future translators.

However, Boase-Beier (2010:27-28) maintains that caution should be exercised in applying metaphor in translation practice, saying:

I would argue that the danger of naïve application, which treats theoretical description as though it had the status of a law, is less acute with theories from outside the area in question. A theory of translation is potentially more dangerous to translation practice than a theory of meaning, of literature, of the text, or of the reader. This is especially true when that theory is based on a metaphor: translation is like performing on a stage, like melting and re-freezing an ice cube, translations are windows, not veils: these are metaphors used by Willard Trask (Honig, 1985:14), Margaret Sayers Pedan (1989:13) and Eavan Boland (2004:11) respectively.

For Boase-Beier, a theory is “a partial description (mental or perhaps written down) of a segment of perceived reality” (ibid.:26). Because theories are explanatory, there is a danger that we may apply them naively to practical situation (like
translation) as if the theoretical description had the status of a law. She, instead, advocates a use of theories from outside translation, such as linguistics theory, communication theory and reader-response theory.

Here, Boase-Beier is talking about translation practice, not specifically about pedagogical situations of translation, but I think her point has a strong implication for pedagogy too. If we assume that metaphor is to be used in a translation classroom, and if Boase-Beier’s claim is considered in the context of the triangulation of a problematic situation in the cognitive aspect of learning, which we have looked at earlier, namely, 1) recognition of anomaly, 2) provision of metaphor, and 3) actual acting in the world followed by an observation of results, it is reasonable to assume that the danger of using metaphor in teaching lies in the third stage of the triangulation process, or rather, in not carrying out the third stage properly. The third stage involves an activity in the real world related to the metaphor in question and observations of the results. For a translator, the activity is no doubt an act of translating. Therefore, at this third stage, other theories or theoretical concepts apart from a theory in a metaphorical form will be needed, which, according to Boase-Beier’s recommendation, may be theories “of meaning, of literature, of the text, or of the reader” (Boase-Beier 2010:28) (or more specifically, she suggests as those theories Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) theory of cohesion discussed by Malmkjær (2005:134-45), relevance theory of Sperber and Wilson discussed by Gutt (2000), or the reader-response theory integrated into Díaz-Diocaretz’ (1985) approach to translation). Metaphor is not concrete and specific enough when describing the actual application to and activities in the real world. It seems that what Boase-Beier describes as ‘dangerous’ corresponds to what Petrie and Oshlag call “laziness” of metaphor (1993:579) (though they later argue that this interpretation is not always correct).

Metaphors are used when one is too lazy to do the hard, analytic work of determining precisely what one wants to say. Consequently, metaphors encourage sloppy thought. In addition, metaphors can be tremendously misleading. There are a number of different ways in which metaphors can be understood and so the possibility of mistake abounds. If metaphors are eliminated, there will be fewer mistakes. (ibid.)

Because all the translators who participated in the present study are successful translators, and it was they who hardly used metaphor in their theorisation of translation, we can tentatively claim that the ability to use metaphorical expressions in accounts about translation does not have much influence on the actual translating performance of the translator. However, on the basis of the evidence from Educational Psychology as well as the claims by a small number of Translation Studies academics, I claim that the use of metaphor in translation teaching can be a valuable educational
resource if used in conjunction with more analytic theories related to translation.
Chapter 7 Conclusion

This chapter provides a conclusion to the present study. First, it restates the background of the present study and its research questions. Second, it provides a brief explanation about the methods used. Third, a summary of the outcomes is provided. Fourth, the theoretical implications of the outcomes are discussed. Fifth, it discusses possible applications of the study outcomes. Finally, future research possibilities are discussed.

7.1 Background and research questions

The present study has investigated professional translators’ theorisation patterns in their accounts of their professional practice and compared them with accepted academic theories of translation. The ultimate purpose of the study was to discuss the implications of the study outcomes to the pedagogy of translation. The context for the study was that the gap between theory and practice has been keenly felt by participants in translation (both theoreticians and practitioners), and has also been discussed repeatedly in Translation Studies, but that the issue has not been addressed by way of empirical research. Therefore, the study aimed to narrow the gap by bringing professional translators’ perspectives into academic discussions.

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

(1) How do English/Japanese translators theorise their translation practice in their accounts of dispute situations with clients?
   (1a) What concepts do the translators use to justify their practice?
   (1b) How do they use the concepts to organise their accounts?
   (1c) What discursive features are prominent in their discourse?
   (1d) Is there any correlation between the findings and the dynamic index of translators?

(2) How do the findings compare with the notions discussed in received academic theories?

(3) What are the implications of the findings for the pedagogy of translation?

7.2 Methods used

In order to answer the research questions, professional translators’ accounts were collected in interviews with 17 professional translators. In the interviews, the informants talked about their experience of disputes with their clients about the
quality of the translation they delivered. Using the interview data, the study generated a translators’ version of translation theory using the eclectic analysis method of grounded theory, narrative inquiry and Discursive Psychology. Further, the outcomes were compared with various academic theories (both those often-used in actual classrooms as well as the ones which belong to sociological domains of Translation Studies), focusing on the differences at the conceptual level as well as at the discursive level. Finally, the implications of the results of the comparison for the pedagogy of translation were discussed.

7.3 Summary of findings

The study showed that my interviewees used two concepts most frequently to justify their translational practice: one is the concept of the role of participants, and the other is the concept of natural/literal translation.

My interviewees emphasised that it is not only the translator’s behaviour which affects the quality of translation, but that the roles played (or not played) by other participants are crucial to the production of good-quality translations. At the same time they stressed that other participants have wrong perceptions about what the translator’s roles should be. This demonstrates that, most probably thanks to their wealth of experience in the profession, they seem to have a bird’s-eye view of how the whole translation project works. In order that they can produce high-quality translation, they say other stakeholders need to play their roles properly and they also claim that other participants do not sometimes understand what translators are able to do realistically in a limited timeframe. They are particularly conscious about their positions in relation to other stakeholders of the translation project, or even about relationships between other stakeholders (such as the client and the translation agent) where they are not directly involved. Human elements mean a lot for professional translators.

These outcomes, which mainly shed light on the social aspects of translation practice, will contribute greatly to translation pedagogy. In the present study I pointed out that the way the interviewees theorise their translation practice using the concept of roles of participants is in affinity with the principles of the theory of translatorial action (TTA) (Holz-Mänttäri 1984) and subsequently I argued that it will be able to feed the pedagogy by strengthening the teaching where the TTA framework is used. Particularly, a role-play teaching format will be suitable for this purpose where students play the roles of different stakeholders of translation whereby they learn how various social elements affect the production of translations and eventually the quality
of translated texts. In this teaching model students can learn the relation between social elements and translation products – the two areas which have traditionally tended to be treated as two separate areas in translation pedagogy. Based on the principle of the social constructivist approach (Kiraly 2000) the concept of the role of participants, as generated from my interviewees’ accounts, can embrace both the theoretical and practical aspects of translation and offer a holistic model for translation education.

I also argued that other theoretical frameworks which can benefit from the study outcomes are norm theory and skopos theory. Norm theory has been extremely influential in Translation Studies, but the danger of this powerful theory is that it tends to treat translators as a submissive actor (Simeoni 1998). As a former professional translator and now as a translation teacher and a researcher, this issue of the submissive nature of translators is something I have been aware of and concerned about too. In this regard, consideration of the concept of the role of participants, however, will benefit us when we discuss norm theory in translation as it draws our attention to two areas: negotiation of norms and socialisation of translators. These are areas which have tended to be neglected in discussions of norm theory (Pym 1999:111), thus the concept of the role of participants and its associated smaller concepts can augment and highlight those areas in translation education. By discussing translation in line with the translators’ theorisation patterns, students will become more aware of their own process of socialisation and how they can or should negotiate norms with other stakeholders.

Skopos theory is another influential but very general theory of translation. I have seen many students use this theory as the theoretical framework in their academic work, but the extremely general nature of the theory often causes a shortfall in their discussions. Skopos theory emphasises the role of the translator as the expert of translation, which is in itself empowering for translators, but which does not provide us with enough details with regard to other elements which affect the role of the translator. I believe that the concepts generated in the present study, particularly those concerning the role of participants, will provide translation teachers and students with more concrete notions to consider when the framework of skopos theory is adopted in their discussions.

The second significant concept identified in the analysis was the concept of natural/literal translation. The identification of this concept can be interpreted in two ways. In one way, we can say that it is not surprising because the dichotomous notions of natural and literal translations (historically under various labels) have always played a central role in discourses of translation. However, we can also say that it is
surprising that successful professional translators, like my interviewees, still rely heavily on the dichotomous notions of translation when they justify their practice. Indeed, Englund Dimitrova (2005) and Hui (2012), for example, label this kind of justification as “non-specified” evaluation or justification, implying that translators do not have any more specific or articulate ways of explaining the features of their translation. This is rather a negative evaluation of translators’ discursive practice. In contrast, Pavlović (2010) offers a more positive evaluation of this kind of discursive practice of translators (naming it the “Sounds better” and “It’s (not) said that way” arguments), claiming that perhaps competent professionals know intuitively what translation features are successful so they do not have to articulate it any more specifically than that.

In the present study, by examining the “natural/literal” arguments the interviewees offered in their accounts intricate insights of successful translators came to light, which, I argue, can complement traditional discussions regarding the notion including Venuti’s (1995) and Nida’s (1964). Particularly two interesting points were revealed. One is that the interviewees did not seem to have a personal policy with regard to the natural/literal argument, which consistently governs their translational practice. Instead, my interviewees flexibly used both notions of natural and literal translations to justify their practice according to the situations they were in for the particular translation project. This conclusion was arrived at through the comparison between the interviewees’ individual dynamic index (Neunzig & Kuznik, 2007; PACTE, 2008) and the use of the concepts in their accounts. This may suggest that the popular target-reader-oriented discussion of translation (as stressed in, for example, PACTE’s research design in PACTE (2008)) may not necessarily reflect the real-life concerns of professionals, but may actually be an academics’ idealistic notion of what translation should be. We may not be able to prepare our students for professional situations just by teaching them the virtue of dynamic translational features (as opposed to formal translation using Nida’s (1964) terms) or the reader-oriented approach. The present study revealed that even successful translators sometimes rely on an extremely ST-oriented discourse of translation in their justification. And why? This is where the related smaller concepts generated in the analysis come into light. My interviewees used some supporting concepts to back up their use of the notions of literal/natural translations such as native speaker, language knowledge, meaning, culture, authority, context, and experience. The concept of authority is a particularly interesting example: translators seem to take an active role in producing natural translation when they are given more authority in the translation project. On the other hand, when they feel they have no or not much authority in the project, they tend to resort to literal translation.
Also, if the translators feel they are in a position of not being able to know much of the context of the ST, they tend to justify the ST-orientedness of their translations. In this way, different elements play a role in the translator’s decision making with regard to natural/literal translation. In a similar way, as in the case of the concept of roles of participants, I argued that those elements would offer valuable components for the teaching of the dichotomous notions of translation, making the students aware of the possible real-life scenarios and widening their views so that they can link the academic discussion of text features (such as the notion of foreignising vs domesticating translation) with the actual decision-making processes in professional circumstances.

In addition to the two significant concepts identified, an analysis of the narrative structure of the translators’ accounts was revealing too: it indicated that translators place importance on the concepts of text type, feedback, money, and repeated commission when they talk about their practice. From this, I argued that text type of translation is important for translators (and is significant for the researcher) because when mentioned in an interview setting, it established shared knowledge between the speaker and the listener as to what kinds of textual manipulations are expected in a translation project of that particular type of text. The concepts of feedback, money, and repeated commission were also identified as forming valuable information for researchers as they provide us with evidence of negotiation and socialisation processes of translators. My attention was, however, drawn to a somewhat worrying point: there is no guarantee that other stakeholders such as translation companies or clients have the same recognition about these concepts as the translators. For example, translators may think that a prompt payment from a translation company indicates the company’s satisfaction with the final product, but in reality, the translation company may pay the translator promptly because they are not happy with the product and want to end the relationship with the translator. Although the present study is not designed to extend its scope to investigate translation companies’ behaviours, these areas merit further attention, the results of which will be able to contribute eventually to improving professional translators’ working conditions.

In the enquiry into research question (1c) regarding the discursive features of translations, what I was particularly struck by regarding the discursive features of translators was the paucity of the use of metaphors in their accounts. Having reviewed literature from related areas (including Educational Psychology for use of metaphor), I argued that metaphor can be a very powerful educational tool because it can help students’ understanding of unfamiliar translation-related notions. Therefore, it is somewhat puzzling that my interviewees did not use metaphors as a tool for justifying their translation. I argued that metaphors can play an important role in the teaching of
translation theories, but as Boase-Beier (2010) maintains, it should always be used in conjunction with other more specific theories because a theory in a form of a metaphor does not explain the regularities in translation in the same way as the theories from other disciplines do such as linguistics or reception studies.

In the present study I examined how successful English/Japanese translators theorise their practice when they talk about their experiences of dispute situations and compared the theorisation patterns with academic theories. Translators' discourses brought about many concepts which have not been addressed fully in received academic theories. The relations between the concepts were revealing too, shedding light on my interviewees' concerns in professional situations. The present study contributes to knowledge by adding professional translators' theorisation patterns to the discourses of existing academic theories. In this way, academic discussions in translation classrooms will be strengthened with real-life insights, and this will eventually help narrow the gap between theory and practice of translation in education.

7.4 Theoretical implications

The present study has theoretical implications in two respects: research and pedagogy.

Research

The present research has been an attempt to identify the similarities and differences in the ways the views on translation are described and explained by two groups of people: translators and Translation Studies academics and teachers. Jääskeläinen, Kujamäki and Mäkisalo (2011) explain the division between the two groups using the concept of “translation subculture”. Drawing on the notion of “translation culture” developed by Prunč (1997, 2007a), which refers to “a variable set of socially structured norms, conventions and expectations that frame the behaviour of all interactants in the field of translation”, Jääskeläinen et al. (2011) say translation culture is formed by several subcultures and stress the importance of recognising the differences between different subcultures. Jääskeläinen et al. use this notion particularly in their argument about how to redress the shortfall of process-oriented research programmes. Pointing out that professionals often underperform compared to students in experiments of process study research, Jääskeläinen et al. argue that the reason is the incongruity of definitions of translation competence between researchers and professional translators (and the biased emphasis on expertise as against professionalism). Because researchers incorporate their own (academic and idealistic) understanding of translation competence and expertise in their research designs,
professional translators often do not perform well in their experiments. Jääskeläinen et al. present this argument as an admonition about the way Translation Studies research projects (especially process study projects) have been designed and conducted, saying “the research designs may not reflect the reality of the professionals’ workplace” (ibid.:148). Subsequently,

... the question is whether we as researchers and teachers of translation are sufficiently aware of the norms and expectations that prevail on the translation market to, on the one hand, describe it adequately in research and, on the other, to prepare our graduates to enter it after graduation. (Jääskeläinen et al. 2011:149-150)

The findings of the present study add substantially to our understanding of “the reality of the professionals’ workplace”. In fact, efforts to observe the “reality of the professionals’ workplace” have been evident in much recent research which employs, for example, ethnographical research methods. Literature on the development of research methods within this paradigm include Hubscher-Davidson (2011) and Risku and Windhager (2013), and studies using ethnographical methodologies include Abdallah (2012), Risku and Pircher (2006) and Koskinen (2008). The present study is not an ethnographical study proper because it did not conduct direct observations of actual practices but instead used translators’ discourse as the source of information, but I regard it as belonging to the same paradigm of research as it shares the same stance, approach, and objectives. I argue that this growing body of knowledge, including the outcomes of the present study, serves to provide descriptions and explanations of translators’ views on their profession and the social mechanism of the translation workplace. Subsequently, the findings can inform researchers about what Jääskeläinen et al. warn is missing in many of the current research programmes, i.e. “the norms and expectations that prevail on the translation market” (Jääskeläinen et al. 2011:149-150).

I wish to make clear that the current study does not undervalue process-study research programmes. I stress instead that sociological concerns of researchers and their research outcomes can serve as a method of redressing shortfalls of existing process-study research programmes (as discussed in Jääskeläinen et al. 2011). This convergence of the two different research paradigms seems to be essential for further development of Translation Studies at this crossroad of the discipline: approximately four decades after the psychological turn and two decades after the social turn.

Pedagogy

The ultimate aim of the current study has been pedagogical. In Chapter 2, I
touched upon the notion of “activist translation pedagogy” suggested by Scarpa et al. (2009). This new notion has been proposed as a remedy for the bias towards pure, descriptive translation theories as opposed to applied translation theories such as theories for educational application. Scarpa et al. maintain that with this new trend of teaching, translation teachers do not need to shy away from being ‘prescriptive’, a seemingly no-no word in current translation pedagogy. In other words, if the descriptive norms to be taught in the classroom are based on solid empirical evidence, even if the teaching is seemingly prescriptive, it is legitimately so. I discussed in Chapter 6 that the empirical evidence provided from the present study offers valuable contents to be incorporated into classroom teaching. The contents are consistent with the concepts derived from translators’ discourse, reflecting the reality of the workplace. The study outcomes of the present study therefore assists in the development of this new trend of activist translation pedagogy.

7.5 Application

The present study was carried out with the specific aim of pedagogical application, which was discussed in Chapter 6. In that chapter I focused on the application of the outcomes to translation education, which recommended supplementing current teaching practice with the study outcomes. This included re-evaluation of the educational value of TTA and incorporation of the identified elements of the current study into teaching in a role-play format, augmentation of theoretical teaching of norm theory, skopos theory and dichotomous notions of translation with the concepts identified in the present study, and use of metaphor in translation.

Apart from this pedagogical application, the present study can be used for three other purposes.

First: for professional translators, although translation as an academic subject has been taught at many higher-education institutions, many translators still enter the profession without formal translation education. For those people, whether they are working as a translator already or aim to do so in the future, the outcomes offer useful information about the insiders’ views on the professional world.

Second: for other stakeholders in the translation industry. The outcomes will be useful for other stakeholders in the translation industry, including owners of translation companies and project managers who work for these companies. They can gain information as to how their service subcontractors view the industry, what they think about their own and other participants’ work, how best they can draw out the full potential of their translators to provide high-quality translation service to the end
client. The same can be said for company managers who hire in-house translators for their business operations.

Finally: for researchers. As suggested in the previous section, the outcomes will substantially enhance researchers’ understanding on how translators work in the real-life workplace, or the translators’ “subculture”. This understanding will subsequently benefit their research by assisting them in strengthening (and correcting if necessary) their research designs.

7-6 Future research possibilities

As a study using discourse analysis of translators with a social constructionist approach, the current study was designed to observe certain aspects of translators’ reality, i.e. their world views on their profession and professional practice. Unlike a survey of a particular event (such as an accident report), the present study did not aim to present an unbiased, attitude-free picture of dispute incidents. Therefore, it is recommended that further research be undertaken in the following areas:

- The study outcomes revealed that the translators’ concerns are very much related to other participants of translation. Further research might investigate these other participants to cross-refer their views and behaviours against those of translators. Of specific interest are project managers of translation. Further research regarding the role and attitude of project managers, in conjunction with the outcomes of the present study, would produce valuable findings which would contribute greatly in providing effective recommendations to the translation industry, as well as to translation education.
- The present study generated 37 concepts from translators’ discourse. Each concept is generated because it is of particular concern to translators. Therefore, each concept will serve as a base for future studies. Particularly, the concepts of feedback, payment and commissioning deserve attention because this seems to be the area where translators and project managers have different views. Similarly, any area where a gap is detected between the translators’ views and other participants’ views will deserve attention in an attempt to narrow the gap.
- The concept of ‘culture’ may deserve further attention. The concept was generated mainly from accounts provided by English-native-speaking translators. They seem to think that there is a tendency for literal translation in Japan or amongst Japanese-native-speaking translators. This perception can perhaps be explained with reference to the role of kanbun kundoku (literally “Chinese writing Japanese reading”) in the development of the Japanese
literary system since the 8th century, which was out of the realm of the present study.

- The present study focused on the whats of translation theory in pedagogical situations, not the hows. Having investigated which academic theories are similar or different from the translators' theorisation patterns, the pedagogy of translation will benefit from future research into how those theories are best taught. This would require a longitudinal study with valid control group(s).
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## Appendix One: Transcription Notation Table

(These are used for transcripts included in the attached CD-ROM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| //     | Overlapping or simultaneous speeches | A: That was the impression that very // clearly  
B: In other words, your ... |
| *, **  | Pauses (roughly the number of seconds) | His wife was * uh I don’t know .... |
| (      | Noticeable pause (less than a second) | I misread the character as (.) it needs to be loosened. |
| ·      | Abrupt stop | You know and· I really think ... |
| ::, :::, :::: | Elongations of the previous sound (the more colons, the longer the elongation) | So: so it has to be, you have to...  
We’ll sa:::y, it, it depends ... |
| abc    | Added emphasis | and I estimate that it will take me 10 hours |
| ABC    | Louder | the lecturer said THAT’S A RELLY STUPID QUESTION. |
| ↑, ↓   | Intonations | I’ve probably sued uh 15 times↑ |
| . (before a word) | Audible intake of breath | .sh  
.hh  
.tt (click) |
| >abc<  | Faster pace | I said to him >and he says, yes, yes, yes, I know that. I know that.< |
| <abc>  | Slower pace | OK, I will charge you this much per <hour of work> |
| Italic | Words in foreign languages | Koreshite, areshite, that kind of ... |
| ( )    | Inaudible or there is doubt about its accuracy | I had the documentation which proved that it (should have been) set up properly. |
| [ ] | Deliberately omitted transcript or clarificatory information | Who is [the interviewee's name]? |
| (h) and (h) | Utterance while laughing | (h) really yeah (h) and I said |
| ¥ | Short laugh | let me see I've got ¥ I keep all my old emails |
| ¦and ¦ | In quiet voice | I thought ¦ well ¦ [laughs] |
Appendix Two: Transcripts of Interviews

The transcripts of the interviews are provided on the attached CD-ROM.
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Next, I focused the analysis on the passages coded at the concept of “role of participants” to identify distinct patterns of explanation. This analysis revealed that the interviewees talked about two different kinds of roles: (i) other participants’ roles; and (ii) their own role.

(i) Other participants’ roles

The following table demonstrates examples of translators’ accounts of other participants’ roles and related concepts. The interviewees often talked about other participants’ roles by claiming that other participants did not fulfil their roles in the translational process. The first column illustrates what happened in the story (i.e.
It is notable that three of the top four related concepts are human-related concepts (Relationship, Language knowledge and Authority).

[R-i] Relationship

An interesting point about the results of the analyses is that the translators often use human factors as requirements for production of successful translations. For example, translators often claim that relationships between participants influence their translation production. Naturally it will be preferable for the translators if they are in a good relationship with the translation agency or the client, but it is not only their own personal relationships that matter. Perhaps thanks to their wealth of

Figure 18 Concept map 3
Caution is in order here, though. The present study is a discourse analysis of translators’ metalanguage about translation. It observes how the translators claim that they have recognised the norms or have assimilated them, which does not necessarily correspond to what they actually recognised or assimilated. In order to observe what they actually recognised or assimilated, a study would need to be designed in such a way that it met Toury’s constraints 2) and 3) mentioned above. Nevertheless, I believe that the present study offers valuable data as to the translators’ conscious views on this matter, which must shape at least part of (and I believe important part of) the observation of how translators go through a socialisation process in the real world.

With this caution in mind, let us look at what my interviewees said about what Toury calls translators’ socialisation process. In the analysis of the narrative structure of the translators’ accounts, it was shown that translators use the concepts of ‘feedback’ ‘money’ and ‘repeated commission’ to end their stories (see Chapter 5 Section 5-2-7)) and provide a judgement as to whether their behaviours are vindicated or not. Feedback is indeed the main socialisation method identified by Toury (1995:248 ff) and nobody would disagree with the claim that translators learn how to translate appropriately (according to a norm) through feedback, good or bad, from the client or the user of their translations. In a similar way, it will be safe to conclude that the other concepts – ‘money’ and ‘repeated commission’ – are also common means of socialisation of translators, i.e. translators consider that their translations were successful if they have received a payment for the work or receive another commission from the same client. But is such a judgement really correct?

In a debate on translation norms involving several leading academics (Toury & Hermans and others, 1999) Jean-Pierre Mailhac raises a question as to how sanction of