

Rationales for Cooperative Tasks in Taiwan Translation Learning

Hui-chuan Wang

English Department, Wenzao Ursuline College of Languages, Kaohsiung, Taiwan

Abstract—In recent years, English teaching and learning have been getting considerable attention in Taiwan. Universities and colleges have been asked by the Ministry of Education to encourage language-majored students to take translation-related courses in order to raise the level of student's translation competence. To meet this need, since 2003, the Ministry of Education has included *English Translation I* and *English Translation II* as core courses and provided official syllabi and guidelines for language departments and teachers. However, the features in the official syllabi seem to be missing parts in Taiwan translation instruction. A number of studies have found that many translation teachers still utilize traditional translation teaching methods. In a traditional classroom, the instruction is more teacher-centered, so students tend to rely only on the teacher's suggestions and believe in teachers' "perfect" or "correct" translation. With the increasing importance of translation learning, and the need for a cooperative and interactive teaching method suggested by the MOE, it is necessary to develop an alternative teaching approach for translation teachers. Therefore, the researcher intends to design a cooperative translation task which meets translation teachers' and students' needs. This study is a preliminary study working on the rationales for designing a cooperative translation task. This study addressed the following research questions: (1) What rationales should be included in this cooperative translation task? (2) How can rationales be realized in the design of the cooperative translation task? Based on the literature reviews, three main rationales will be used for the design of a cooperative translation task for Taiwanese college translation learners. The first prototype of the task, the Cooperative Translation Task (CoTT), will be provided in the current study.

Index Terms—rationales, cooperative task, translation teaching, translation learning

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, English teaching and learning have been getting considerable attention in Taiwan. Among all the areas of language learning, translation learning is one of the educational goals set by Taiwanese government. In October 2002, the Executive Yuan approved the Plan for Creating an English-friendly Environment and the Action Plan for Creating an English-friendly Environment. One of the plan's nine key strategies is to cultivate professional translators. Since then, universities and colleges have been asked to encourage language-majored students to take translation-related courses in order to raise the level of student's translation competence. To meet this need, since 2003, the Ministry of Education (MOE) has included *English Translation I* and *English Translation II* as core courses for students majoring in applied English/foreign languages to develop their translation competence.

A closer look at the official syllabi and guidelines in *English Translation I* and *English Translation II* reveals that the MOE encourages more cooperation and interaction among students through such activities as group discussion and peer correction. Moreover, translation problems are not identified by only one approach, but through multiple analyses, including error analysis, translation criticism, and comparative analysis. Obviously, the TVE department expects more interactive, cooperative, and student-centered learning process through analytic tasks.

However, those features seem to be missing parts in Taiwan translation instruction. A number of studies have found that many translation teachers still utilize traditional translation teaching methods (Chang, Yu, Li & Peng, 1993; Mu, 1992). In a traditional classroom, the instruction is more teacher-centered, so students tend to rely only on the teacher's suggestions and believe in teachers' "perfect" or "correct" translation. In other words, TVE's suggested analytic tasks such as error analysis and translation criticism were taken by teachers rather than students.

Those students who are used to relying on teachers may not be qualified for real translation work nowadays. During the past decade, translation work has undergone a dramatic change, which is getting more customer-oriented; therefore, communicative translation has been more emphasized. Kiraly (1995, 2000) and Colina (2003) advocated the famous Communicative Translation Teaching (CTT), which has underlying philosophies resembling those of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). The main instructional goal of communicative translation teaching is to cultivate students' communicative translation competence and to emphasize the social contexts of texts.

Information on translation instruction in Taiwan is quite limited, especially that on alternative translation teaching methods. However, some of the studies seem to follow the new trend of communicative translation teaching. For example, Liao (2009) proposed a theoretical basis of constructivism for teaching translation in Taiwan's colleges, with the use of communicative translation teaching techniques: meaningful tasks, cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and on-line learning platforms. Although those alternative teaching approaches have found the positive effects on students'

translation learning and may complement the limitations of the traditional translation teaching, but each of them seems to only solve some parts of the existing problems and become an alternative syllabus instead of well-formed teaching method.

Therefore, with the increasing importance of translation learning, and the need for a systematic method to incorporate the various teaching techniques suggested by the Ministry of Education (MOE), it is necessary to develop an alternative teaching approach for translation teachers. Therefore, the researcher intends to design a cooperative translation task which meets the MOE's teaching goals and teachers and students' needs. This study is a preliminary study working on the rationales for designing a cooperative translation task, named Cooperative Translation Task (CoTT). This study addressed the following research questions: (1) What rationales should be included in this cooperative translation task? (2) How can rationales be realized in the design of the cooperative translation task?

II. LITERATURE REVIEWS

In the area of translation teaching, Kiraly (1995) expressed his surprise that "as late as the mid-nineties the communicative revolution seemed to have passed translation teaching by" (p.253). With this notice, the stress on language function, communicative competence, creativity, and active student participation has slowly come to the world of translation didactics (Cronin, 2005). However, a number of scholars found that many translation teachers still utilize traditional translation teaching, and the typical activities are teacher's lecture, translation exercises, teacher's correction, and appreciation of good translation works (Mu, 1992; Dai, 2003). The possible reason why teachers still use traditional teaching methods could be a lack of related research on translation pedagogy, as compared with the abundant research on English teaching methodology. Moreover, there is a lack of a systematic and well-designed translation teaching approach for teachers to shift the class into a more communicative one.

Despite a number of advantages of traditional translation teaching methods, such as delivering translation theories in lectures, some problems have been found in these methods as well. Kiraly (1995) claimed that traditional translation classes seem to lack both pedagogical guidelines and a motivating component. González Davies (2004) also found that traditional translation classrooms are usually teacher- and text-centered and writing-based, without consideration of class dynamics and interaction.

With the hope of filling the pedagogical gap and improving traditional translation instruction, Kiraly (1995) proposed communicative translation teaching (CTT) in an attempt to change a passive and singular-perspective student into an active and multi-perspective translator. To do so, he proposed to change classes from teacher-centered to student-centered by using role-plays and simulations through small-group exercises to foster responsibility, independence, and the ability to see alternatives.

González Davies (2004) further proposed task-based learning. She advocated function-, process- and product-based teaching. As she (2004) put it: "In task learning, a chain of activities are related to each other and are sequenced in such a way that they lead to a final product" (p. 23). Functional-based teaching attempts to make students aware of why, where and when the translation assignment is carried out. This is the information that should be known by students before doing translation (Nord, 1997). Process-based teaching asks for awareness of the translation strategies and solutions used by students themselves in their assignments. This approach increases their self-confidence and contributes to greater coherence, quality, and speed in their translation. Finally, product-based teaching looks at what the students achieve. In other words, it focuses on the final translation produced by the student.

Though a notion similar to communicative translation teaching (CTT) has been promoted by a number of scholars (Colina, 2003; Kiraly, 1995; González Davies, 2004), few empirical studies have been published to date. Romney (1997) specifically examines the possibilities of using collaborative learning in translation classrooms with an attempt to provide an alternative to traditional classroom structure and increase student participation. Romney (1997) claimed that in traditional classrooms, the teacher is usually the judge of the quality of the translation, so only the bravest students are dared to offer alternative translations. Accordingly, students only learn through their own individual efforts and gain limited and erroneous results. Romney's (1997) results showed that collaborative learning in a translation course can facilitate the understanding of the source text and help students reach greater degrees of grammatical correctness, accuracy, and faithfulness through discussion and negotiation. Moreover, social support is an important element in sharing the difficulties. It has been found that students gain in self-confidence and become more tolerant of different opinions, and that they appreciate the non-threatening atmosphere of group work.

Another survey study, conducted by Ulrych (2005), examined the translation teaching methodology adopted by the various institutions and the rationale underlying the features of course content. It is found that in response to the question on classroom management and dynamics, more and more instructors recently have been using collaborative discussion/corrections in class in three kinds of interactions: teacher/student, students in group, students in pairs. The underlying rationale is to train students to cooperate with others such as fellow translators or clients in their future professions.

Information on translation instruction in Taiwan is also quite limited, especially that on alternative translation teaching methods. However, some of the studies seem to follow the new trend of communicative translation teaching. For example, Lai (2002) conducted translation projects with the professional world in different fields, including a book publisher, a television station that plays movies, and a public television station. The main purposes of these intern

projects were to offer students chances of contact with real practitioners and understand the needs and challenges of a career in translation in the hopes of helping students prepare for their future careers and further study. Lai's (2002) attempt has opened the possibilities of bridging the gap between the students and the professional world, as González Davies (2004) proposed.

Following the trend of humanistic teaching and constructivism in recent years, Liao has been promoting communicative translation teaching and attempted to provide a more creative and student-centered approach of instruction. Liao and Chiang (2005) explored the possibilities of using portfolios as an alternative method to teach translation. Students accepted this approach and learned how to be responsible translators, aware of their own learning process and progress. The survey results showed that 92% of the students believed that portfolios facilitated their learning, and all of the students agreed that it improved their English comprehension.

In 2009, Liao (2009) proposed a theoretical basis of constructivism for teaching translation in Taiwan's colleges, with the use of communicative translation teaching. Meaningful tasks, cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and on-line learning platforms have been included as teaching techniques. That study found that generally students had a very positive view of the course design. Students were aware of the major difference in the teacher's role; the teachers became facilitators of the learning process.

Reviewing the above theories suggested by Taiwanese leading scholars in translation teaching and learning, the present research notices that they contribute significantly to the development of alternative translation pedagogy, despite the fact that at present, research focusing on the areas of translation teaching is still very scarce. It is still worth emphasizing that the newly promoted teaching methodologies analyzed above have shifted from transmitted knowledge to transformational knowledge, teacher-centered to student-centered, individual work to collaborative work, and molecular learning to social-constructive learning. These teaching methods can train students as more autonomous problem solvers and efficient communicators between the source and target text. These methods also meet the needs of modern translation practice.

College learners' translation studies should not only focus on the use of language but also the development of qualified professional translator, especially for the students at a technological university. Cooperative team work and management skills for their translation projects should be included. With my growing research interests in incorporating collaborative learning in translation instruction, the present study will follow that new trend and continue my research orientation to explore the possibility of realizing cooperative learning in translation classrooms. The purpose of this study is to explore the rationales through literature reviews and to design the first prototype of a cooperative translation task, named Cooperative Translation Task (CoTT).

III. RATIONALES OF THE DESIGN

To design a new task, it is critical to start with the development of its design rationales. The following are the related literature reviews and how each rationale is developed. The cooperative translation task in the current study will be constructed based on the following rationales and the theories in translation learning and teaching.

A. *The Teaching Guidelines in the Official Syllabi for English Translation I and English Translation II (2003), Issued by the Ministry of Education (MOE)*

In Taiwan, the official syllabi are provided for the curriculum developers to open core courses and for teachers to teach those new courses. The syllabi for the courses *English Translation I* and *English Translation II* provided by the MOE are constructed for technological university teachers based on the translation-related professors' advice and it is expected that when these two courses are offered in a language department, translation teachers could follow the suggested syllabi and teaching principles. The official syllabi include not only learning goals, objectives, weekly learning content, but also teaching guidelines and principles, and suggest that a translation teacher flexibly uses a variety of learning activities such as peer correction. The MOE also expects a translation teacher to help students incorporate translation theories and practice in a systematic way and build students' problem-solving abilities.

However, most of time, the university departments in Taiwan do not actively provide this information to teachers. As a result, some teachers whose field is not translation may rely more on textbooks and follow traditional ways of teaching, which is more teacher-centered, text-centered, and writing-based. According to Dai's survey (2003), around 80% of translation teachers in Taiwan actually study other areas, such as TESOL, literature, or linguistics. This is due to the shortage of teachers in translation fields, so language teachers in other fields need to help with the instruction of translation courses. There is no doubt that those 'temporary' translation teachers tend to confront difficulties in knowing what to teach and how to teach. With translation textbooks in hand, most of these teachers may solve the problem of what to teach, but the problem of how to teach and what learning activities to conduct still exists, especially when little research has been done on translation pedagogy and the MOE's official syllabi are not provided by the department when they are assigned to teach the courses.

To solve the existing problems about translation instruction, the first source of the rationale goes to the teaching principles and guidelines in the MOE's syllabi. Those principles and guidelines have been developed by the professors in translation and TESOL fields through years' expert counseling and literature reviews. Adopting those principles in a translation task can solve teachers' problems in how to teach and even transform a traditional classroom into a more

interactive and cooperative one. Therefore, the current study will take teaching principles and guidelines in MOE's official syllabi as the main framework to explore other possible rationales.

A closer look at the MOE's official syllabi and guidelines in *English Translation I* and *English Translation II* reveals that the MOE suggests a variety of learning activities for teachers to utilize in the classroom, including (a) group discussion and presentation, (b) peer correction, (c) error analysis, (d) translation criticism, and (e) comparative analysis. These activities seem to share two main features. First, they encourage more interaction and cooperation among students through such activities as group discussion and peer correction. Second, problems are not identified by the instructor alone, but also through students' error analysis, translation criticism, and comparative analysis. In other words, to foster students' abilities in translation analysis and review is one main learning objective.

These two features thus contribute to decide the way of grouping and the nature of learning activities to this cooperative translation task. First, group work should be included in the task, including: (1) group translation exercises, (2) group discussion, (3) group presentation, and (4) peer correction. Students need to learn how to cooperate with within-group and between-group members in exercises, discussion, presentation and correction. Second, during group discussion and peer correction phases, it is important to involve analytic tasks, such as error analysis, translation criticism, and comparative analysis.

B. Five Major Features of Cooperative Learning

To realize the effective group work, it is essential to include the features of cooperative learning. There are five main features of Cooperative Learning, which make it more effective in learning: (a) positive interdependence; (b) face-to-face interaction; (c) interpersonal and small group skills; (d) individual accountability; and (e) small and heterogeneous groups. Johnson, Johnson and Holubec (2002) asserted that positive interdependence is the first and the most important element of cooperative learning. They believed that when students believe that they sink or swim together, learning activities become meaningful (Johnson & Johnson, 1994) and the students become an alternative source of positive reinforcement for one another. According to Johnson and Johnson (1994), positive interdependence can be achieved through mutual goals (goal interdependence); sharing materials, resources, or information with group members (resource interdependence); division of labor (task interdependence); assigning complementary and interconnected roles (role interdependence); and giving a joint reward (reward interdependence). These interdependences can make students aware of what they need from each other, and collaboration can take place.

To create positive interdependence, the current study chose Johnson and Johnson (1994)'s principle of role interdependence. Each group needs to play two roles as Translator Group and Comment-giving Group. When they are translating texts, they play as Translator Group. When they are reviewing another translator group's work, they are Comment-giving Group. Given that situation, the two groups need to exchange their translations for peer reviews, so the interdependence can be constructed. Because students expect their works to be reviewed seriously by Comment-giving Group, they will try to take the same serious attitude when they are doing peer reviewing as Comment-giving Group. Therefore, during between-group peer response activity, the instructor needs to randomly select two groups to exchange translation products for translation reviews and each group writes down comments for each other. This activity is named **Written Peer Response**.

The second feature goes to face-to-face interaction. Face-to-face interaction engages students in higher-level thinking skills, such as analyzing, explaining, synthesizing, and elaborating (Hilke, 1990). Several studies have proven that interaction facilitates comprehension better than conditions without the interaction component (Gass & Varonis, 1994; Loschky, 1994; Polio & Gass, 1998). With face-to-face interaction, knowledge can be comprehended better through students' stimulating talk and the integration of various perspectives. In the study, face-to-face interactions will be used in both within-group and between-group activities. First, to prevent Translator Group from just assigning jobs to each member without any within-group discussion, face-to-face interaction with members has to be created in class to facilitate students' higher-level thinking skills such as analyzing. Second, there is a need for Translator Group to have face-to-face interactions with other classmates to collect more revision suggestion, so another activity is needed. Translator Group meets up the members of the other groups. This activity can be named as Translator Seminar. This new heterogeneous grouping will contribute more skills learning in error analysis, translation criticism, explaining, and problem-solving. All together, two face-to-face interactions will be held, named **Within-group Discussion & Translator Seminar**.

The third one is individual accountability, which should not be neglected because when members have a sense of personal responsibility, they will contribute their shares to the groups' success (Hilke, 1990). Individual accountability is the key to ensure that all group members are strengthened by cooperative learning (Slavin, 1997). However, making students understand their personal responsibility to help others for the group's success is a difficult task for teachers. Johnson and Johnson (1994) provided some suggestions to structure individual accountability. First, teachers should keep the size of the group small. The smaller the size of the group is, the greater individual accountability will be. Second, students can be randomly called on to present a group's work to the teacher or to the entire class. Third, teachers should observe the interactions within each group and take note of each member's contribution to the group work. Fourth, it is important to assign one student in each group the role of leader, and one of his/her responsibilities is to make sure that each member participates. Finally, teachers should give students a chance to teach what they have learned to others, which is called simultaneous explaining.

Based on Johnson and Johnson's (1994) suggestions, several components are included in peer review activities. First, when students are having oral peer reviewing or discussion in class, the instructor should observe their interactions and ask them to take notes of their discussion results. Second, students need to present their discussion results to both the instructor and the class. Thus, after Within-group Discussion & Translator Seminar, the instructor needs to give students some presentation time. As it is hard to present written notes to the whole class, oral presentation is preferred. As such, there will be an **Oral Peer Response** activity. A within group is randomly selected to orally present their discussion results. Each member of the group needs to express his/her own opinions based on their individual notes.

Finally, it is found that one potential barrier to effective group learning is a lack of sufficient heterogeneity (Johnson & Johnson, 1994). For example, with similar ability, some groups perform better than low-achiever groups, as they are all high achievers, which demotivates low-achievers. Hilke (1990) suggested that students be placed in groups that are mixed in academic ability, social skills, personality, and race or gender. It is believed that students should not form their groups based on friendship or cliques. Heterogeneous groups are most conducive for elaborate thinking, more frequent giving and receiving of explanations, and wider perspectives in discussing materials. Johnson and Johnson (1994) claimed that this kind of grouping increases the depth of understanding, the quality of reasoning, and the accuracy of long-term retention. Therefore, heterogeneous grouping can be used in a cooperative translation task to help students elaborate on their opinions and examine the materials from multiple perspectives.

In this cooperative translation task, both homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping are used for different phases and purposes. As university students in Taiwan are more used to making their own groups for translation exercises and within group activities, homogeneous grouping is still needed. However, this grouping may not stimulate more critical and high-level thinking, especially for translation reviewing activities. Therefore, heterogeneous grouping should be added after within-group activities. For example, after each translator group finishes within-group translation exercises. Between-group peer response can be conducted for Translator Group to collect more revision suggestions. The second heterogeneous activity is Translator Seminar, which has been mentioned above, for a translator group to listen to comments from various sources. These arrangements can complement a lack of variation in the peer comments as a homogeneous group tend to produce similar responses. According to Liu and Hansen (2005), when students form their own peer response group, they show a strong preference to find the people who are similar in ability, backgrounds, attitudes and so on. As a result, they tend to produce similar responses. Therefore, heterogeneous grouping activity should be conducted, but after the homogeneous grouping one.

C. Related Literature on Peer Response and Teacher Response

Peer response is also integral to the design of peer correction activity in a cooperative translation task. Therefore, there is a need to decide how response activities are conducted. First, we need to consider if teacher response should be included in the learning activity. Previous research has found that in comparing preferences for teacher response, peer response, or self-response, students prefer first teacher response, then peer response, and finally self-response (Nelson & Carson, 1998; Zhang, 1995). In Liao and Chiang's (2005) survey of the use of portfolios in translation learning, Taiwanese college students preferred teacher evaluation, then translation assignment, peer evaluation, and finally self-evaluation and correction. Liao's study showed that in translation learning, students hold similar attitudes toward teacher and peer response. Most of the students believe that feedback from the teacher will be more helpful to their learning. We may infer that if teacher response are excluded, students might distrust the learning outcomes of the learning task. Thus, it is essential to include teacher response.

However, teacher response may form student over-reliance on the teacher's advice, and this over-reliance may hinder the development of learners' real-time editing ability, which is needed by independent translators. To solve this problem, I employed Liu and Hansen's (2005) two solutions. First, they suggested that the teacher should take a supporting rather than an authoritative role in peer activities, serving as a peer. Hence, to change the role of the teacher, a teacher will join discussion with students. As a teacher can only take part in one group's peer reviewing activities, and s/he also needs to monitor the whole class' group peer review process, a guest teacher can be invited.

When the instructor is monitoring Within-group Discussion in Session 2, the guest teacher can join Translator Seminar as a peer. Because the participants in Translator Seminar include one translator group and one member from each group, the guest teacher has a chance to observe how this heterogeneous group works on translation reviews. This teacher sits with a translator group and answer the questions from the seminar participants, as others in the translator group do. Here, the teacher's job is not to give comments or even criticize the translator group's translation. Instead, s/he plays as a one member of the translator group and tries to respond the student participants' questions about the translation and at the same time, discusses with the translator group about how to solve the translation problems.

The second solution given by Liu and Hansen's (2005) is that peer response and teacher response may be given on different drafts. As most of the Taiwanese students are in favor of the teacher's response, if two kinds of response are given simultaneously, students will definitely ignore peer response and choose teacher response. Once students find that their response is not taken seriously, they are not willing to spend time and make efforts in reviewing peers' translation. As a result, students only follow teachers' suggestions and rarely reflect up their own translation process, styles, and problem-solving skills. Thus, teachers' response should not be given to students' first draft when Comment-giving Group is giving response. A teacher's responses can be given after all the peer reviewing activities. This activity can be

named as **Oral Teacher Response**. It is hoped that by utilizing that Liu and Hansen's (2005) two solutions, the possibilities of over-reliance on teacher response can be reduced to a minimum.

This cooperative task ends with the last activity, final revision, which is to ask students to make final revisions based on their collection of peer and teacher response both in written or oral. This makes **Final Revisions** activity. After students collect all the comments from classmates and the teachers, they make final revisions and turn in their final products with revised marks to the instructor.

IV. THE FIVE SESSIONS IN THE COOPERATIVE TRANSLATION TASK

Now, those activities need to be arranged in a learning order. They can be separated into three stages in terms of the time of the students' presentation. Before the presentation (pre-presentation stage), each group needs to translate assigned texts and exchange drafts with another group for between-group translation review. During the presentation stage (presentation stage), there are both within and between-group discussions, oral peer response, and oral teacher response. After the presentation (post-presentation), each group needs to make their final revisions.

The definitions of activities here may be too general and confusing for translation teachers to follow, so this study follows González Davies' (2004) definition of tasks to name those activities. Her definitions distinguish the relationships among the three instructional actions: activities, tasks, and steps. González Davies (2004) defined a task as follows:

Task will be understood as a chain of activities with the same global aim and a final product. The full completion of a task usually takes up several sessions. In each of these, the activities lead along the same path towards the same end. (p. 23)

Based on her definition, a task consists of sessions. Accordingly, instead of using a general term for each activity, "Session" is used for each activity. Table 1 shows the five sessions in three stages. This cooperative translation task starts after each translator group finishes their first draft.

TABLE 1
FIVE SESSIONS IN THREE STAGES OF THE COOPERATIVE TRANSLATION TASK (COTT)

Stage	Sessions
Pre-presentation	Session 1: Written Peer Response
Presentation	Session 2: Within-group Discussion & Translator Seminar Session 3: Oral Peer Response Session 4: Oral Teacher Response
Post-presentation	Session 5: Final Revisions

Below are detailed descriptions of each session. The learning objectives, the procedures, and the expected learning are introduced.

Pre-presentation Stage

Session 1: Written Peer Response

Session 1 aims to promote peer cooperation and reviewing ability. Two randomly selected translator groups exchange translation drafts and produce written peer response for each other. Each group writes comments and suggested translations on a peer response sheet and sends it back to the translator group by email. Each group uses their peers' critiques to revise their draft before presenting it in class. The translator group could make decisions on whether to accept peers' suggestions and make revisions.

Presentation Stage

Session 2: Within-group Discussion & Translator Seminar

Session 2 attempts to create two kinds of communication: within-group discussion and translator-seminar participant discussion. After a translator group's presentation of their translation, each group assigns one member to Translator Seminar to ask either the translator group or the guest teacher questions. This member is required to prepare at least one question about the translator group's works, and the translator group has the responsibility to answer his/her questions. The rest members of each group have a within-group discussion to prepare individual oral comments. During seminars and discussions, all the students are encouraged to keep detailed notes of peer comments, questions, and suggestions in notebooks. It is hoped that the two face-to-face communications can create a close cooperative relationship among members, and students learn to improve translations through negotiation.

Session 3: Oral Peer Response

In Session 3, within-group students share their discussion results with the whole class. A group is randomly selected as the comment-giver group to give a public sharing. Each member of the comment-giver group needs to express his/her own opinions by reading aloud their notes. When each member speaks, other members stand beside him/her as supporters. The translator group can provide explanations for or arguments against these comments. Debate between the translator and comment-giver group is encouraged to enhance students' awareness of their own translation styles.

Session 4: Oral Teacher Response

In Session 4, the instructor and the guest teacher give their oral advice on translation. This session is especially arranged after students' oral comments in order to prevent students from simply repeating the teachers' suggestions.

The two teachers raise the acceptable and unacceptable translations. It is suggested that this session includes more than one translation teacher so that more suggestions from various perspectives can be elicited.

Post-presentation Stage

Session 5: Final Revisions

The goal of Session 5 is to motivate students to use the comments from their peers and teachers. Students are asked to revise their work again, referring to the responses from teachers and students. They need to turn in their final translation products and underline the revised translation for the instructor.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study is to explore the rationales for a design of a cooperative translation task, named Cooperative Translation Task (CoTT), which is suitable for university students in Taiwan technological universities. Later, the researcher will have a circular implementation and modification of this cooperative translation task in different education settings to see its effects on students. The rationales found in this study contribute the core components and procedures in this translation learning task. Most importantly, the innovation and the developed rationales can improve translation instruction beyond the conventional form.

REFERENCES

- [1] Chang, P., Yu, Y., Li, Z., & Peng, M. (1993). English to Chinese Translation Courses. Taipei: Bookman.
- [2] Colina, S. (2003). Translation teaching, from research to the classroom: A handbook for teachers. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- [3] Cronin, M. (2005). Deschooling translation: Beginning of century reflection on teaching translation and interpreting. In M. Tennent, Training for the new millennium (pp. 249-266). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [4] Dai, B. (2003). The translation instruction in English and Applied English departments in Taiwan. Master thesis, Fu Jen University.
- [5] Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 283-302.
- [6] González Davies, M. (2004). Multiple voices in the translation classroom: activities, tasks, and projects. Benjamins translation library. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub.
- [7] Hilke, E. V. (1990). Cooperative learning. Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa.
- [8] Johnson, D. W., & Johnson R. T. (1994). Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- [9] Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec E. J. (2002). Cooperative Learning in the Classroom. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- [10] Kiraly, D. C. (1995). Pathways to translation: Pedagogy and process. Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press.
- [11] Kiraly, D. C. (2000). A social constructivist approach to translator education. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.
- [12] Lai, S. (2002). Translation Practicum at University Level: A Report. *Studies of translation and interpretation*, 7, 377-397.
- [13] Liao, B. S. (2009). The implications and implementation of communicative translation teaching. *Compilation and translation review*, 2, 65-91.
- [14] Liao, B. S. & Chiang, M. Y. (2005). The use of portfolios to teach translation. *Studies of translation and interpretation*, 9, 291-312.
- [15] Liu, J. & Hansen, J. (2005). Peer response in second language writing classrooms. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- [16] Loschky, L. (1994). Grammar and task based methodology. In G. Crookes & S.M. Gass(Eds.), *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice*. (pp. 123-167). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- [17] Mu, L., (1992). Translation Teaching in China. Taipei: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- [18] Nelson, G. L. & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(2), 113-131.
- [19] Nord, C. (1997). Translating as a purposeful activity. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- [20] Polio, C., & Gass, S. (1998). The role of interaction in native speaker comprehension of nonnative speaker speech. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 308-319.
- [21] Romney, J. C. (1997). Collaborative learning in a translation course. *The Canadian Modern language Review*, 54(1), 48-67.
- [22] Slavin, R. E. (1997). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- [23] Ulrych, M. (2005). Training translators: Programs, curricula, practices. In Tennent, M. (2005). *Training for the new millennium: pedagogies for translation and interpreting*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- [24] Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantages of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4, 209-222.



Hui-chuan Wang was born in Taiwan, Jan. 2nd, 1978. She got her doctoral degree (TESOL program) in 2010 at Department of English, National Chengchi University (NCCU), Taipei, Taiwan, R. O. C. Her major field is in English teaching and translation pedagogy. Her doctoral dissertation is "Design-based Research on Developing Cooperative Translation Tasks." Before she graduated from NCCU, she worked as a part-time instructor in 7 universities in central Taiwan. Now she is a full-time assistant professor at Department of English, Wenzao Ursuline College of Languages and teaches translation and interpreting. She published one translation learning textbook in Taiwan for college teachers and students "翻譯easy.com." and has presented more than 10 research articles relating to translation instruction in Taiwan.