

# Iranian Instructors' Practices and Criteria for Teaching English Translation

Elham Heidari

Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

Bahram Mowlaie

Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

**Abstract**—Concerning the significant role of translation as a significant field which contributes to intercultural communication, assigning valid criteria for teaching translation is necessary to make sure that the best practices are employed by instructors' to teach translation skills. This, in return, would help translation students be equipped with better translation skills. However, little research has been conducted to see what training practices translation instructors employ in their translation training classrooms. More significantly, it has been little research to determine the criteria that are behind the practices instructors employ in their translation training classroom. The purpose of the current research was to determine what practices instructors follow in their English translation classrooms and what criteria are behind these practices. To serve this purpose, the classrooms of ten English translation instructors were observed in an Iranian academic context using an observation checklist. Subsequently, the instructors were asked to write about the criteria behind their teaching practices in an open-ended questionnaire. The results of the study showed that the instructors' practices were consistent with some of the principles made in the literature an inconstant with others. The instructors referred to the criteria behind the translation teaching practices they employed in their classrooms. Implications that these findings have for the field of translation are presented and some suggestions for further research in this area are given.

**Index Terms**—teaching translation, translation instructor, teaching criteria, teaching practice

## I. INTRODUCTION

Conceptualization and further development of theoretical and practical background for translation training is an area that has attracted much attention in the field of translation studies (e.g., Hatim, 2014; Heping, 2008; Kiraly, 2000; Li, 2000a, 2000b; Pym, 2006; Wilss, 1989, 1994). The aim of this trend of research has been to determine what criteria provide the best platform for designing teaching practices that would result in the most satisfactory outcomes for translation training. Translation researchers have begun to look at real translation training situations, investigating what makes certain training translations more successful than others and incorporating their findings (Kiraly, 2000; Kelly, 2005). Teaching translation is considered as a significant phenomenon in the realm of Translation Studies. In addition, it should be noted that although academic contexts show interest toward teaching translation in different degrees and preparing trainers for future job, little attention has been paid to the translation training practices in the real world pedagogy (Kelly, 2005).

Consequently, it is necessary to conduct various pieces of research in order to improve this practice. It is noteworthy that few pieces of research have been done on teaching translation. According to Hatim (2001), translation teaching is a varied activity that subsumes the training translators, either within institutionalized settings (e.g. Universities) or outside (e.g. Self-learning), and the use of translation is a mode of achieving other goals (e.g. in language teaching).

Given the importance of teaching translation, a coherent approach to translator education would be necessary in order to achieve the best outcomes in the process of translation training. However, the field of translation teaching lacks a systematic pedagogical framework (Albir, 1999). Similarly, Snell-Hornby (1984) refers to the gap that exists between theories of translation training and real-world pedagogy.

[t]he teaching of translation has been seriously impeded by what can only be described as a great gulf between translation theory and practice. On the one hand, students express frustration at being burdened with theoretical considerations (both translation theory and general linguistics) which they feel have nothing to do with the activity of translating. On the other hand, "scholars talk scathingly of translators who are unwilling to investigate the theoretical basis of their work, thus reducing it to a mere practical skip" (p. 105).

Most of translation instructors have serious problems with a coherent curriculum design in teaching translation at universities. Some instructors are professional enough in teaching and testing, but may not be in the field of translation. While instructors are usually aware of the theories of translation, they might not have proper criteria in teaching translation.

## II. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The teaching of translation skills can take many forms and, in fact, the undertaking is pursued in different ways all over the world (see, for example, Klaudy, 2003; Lesznyák, 2003; Li, 2000a, 2000b). On the other hand, there has been a steady growth in research on translator training. The most useful contributions perhaps indicate that the current training is failing. Therefore, the need for setting specific criteria in teaching translation is nowadays more indispensable and significant than ever before since it is believed that most of translation instructors have serious problems with a coherent curriculum design in teaching translation at universities. Some instructors are professional enough in teaching and testing, but may not be in the field of translation. While instructors are usually aware of the theories of translation, they might not have proper criteria in teaching translation. Translation Studies researchers should consider teaching translation as a crucial issue in particular within the situation of teaching in universities.

Teaching translation at Iranian universities is no exception to this lingering trend. A glance at the existing methodology used to teach translation courses in Iranian universities indicates that objectives of these courses have been either misunderstood or hard to achieve. As suggested by Razmjou (2002), it is imperative that translation classes shift from teacher centeredness to student centeredness so that students can have more cooperation rather than competition. She also highlights the need for change in the methodology used by instructors of translation teaching courses.

There are long-term training programmes in Iran for teaching translation offered by institutions of various kinds, increasingly by universities at BA or MA levels. Every translation program must have a syllabus which clearly defines the teaching method and its theory of translation if applicable. Therefore, the idea of different teaching theories is not an issue here; the lack of well-trained instructors is. This should also be reflected in the training process because as Wilss (1992, p.395) points out, a closer cooperation between translation teaching on the one side and translational practitioners on the other is imperative in an attempt to combine the systematic features of formal translation teaching with the practical advantages of collecting translational experience by on-the-job training, on the basis of translator-trainee-tailored apprenticeships of one sort or another. Qualified instructors can be well assisted by a comprehensive course design in which the teaching methodology, the course objectives and assessment procedures are clearly set out.

Basically, the purpose of translation teaching/ learning process is to prepare or train the students in order to be a professional translator (Hatim, 2014; Heping, 2008; Wilss, 1989, 1994). Teaching translation has been one of the major topics of translation studies. So, it is important to define the common criteria used by instructors to train translators. The tendencies in the translation teaching are an important element to be taken into account in establishing the general guidelines to follow. So, this study is purported first to consider the teaching practices that are applied by instructors, while teaching translation, and, then, to explore the criteria that are behind these practices through close observation and administration of a questionnaire to translation instructors at Islamic Azad University South Tehran Branch.

The present study focused on investigating applied techniques for teaching translation at Islamic Azad University-South Tehran Branch, which could be used by translation instructors to provide the translation students with appropriate methodology of teaching. On the other hand, the selection of teaching practices in pedagogical contexts does not happen in void and is usually guided by theoretical dispositions and principles. So, a second objective of this study was to explore the criteria that were behind the teaching practices translation instructors employed in their own classrooms.

Therefore, the present study was meant to answer the following two research questions posed on the issue of translation teaching:

**RQ1.** What teaching practices are used by the instructors in teaching translation at Islamic Azad University-South Tehran Branch?

**RQ1.** What criteria are there behind the teaching practices used by the instructors in teaching translation?

## III. METHODOLOGY

### A. Participants

The participants of the present study were ten male and female Translation instructors from Islamic Azad University South Tehran Branch. The main reason for choosing them was that they professionally dealt with teaching and testing Translation with two to thirty year experience.

### B. Instrumentation

To fulfill the aims of the study, a classroom-observation and a questionnaire was used as the instruments of this quantitative-qualitative research, based seven criteria for teaching translation chosen on the basis of a comprehensive review of literature on teaching translation. These seven criteria were selected as points of reference for the current investigation because they are believed to be the issues most significant for the process of teaching translation (e.g., Hatim, 2014; Heping, 2008; Kiraly, 2000; Li, 2000a, 2000b; Pym, 2006; Wilss, 1989, 1994).

The observations were carried out using an observation checklist which was prepared based on the principles for developing observation checklist tools (e.g., Day, 1990; McDonough & McDonough, 2014). For each of the targeted criterion categories, two observation items were included in the checklist so that the observation of the category could be deeper and as reliable as possible (e.g., for the category of **Translation Competence**, the two observation items

were “*The class material covers models of translation competence*” and “*The teaching method covers models of translation competence*”). Each observation item was rated on a five-point likert scale which extended from 1 (i. observed so little) to 5 (i.e., observed so much), with 2 (observed a little), 3 (observed so/so), and 4 (observed much) in between.

In addition, a questionnaire with fourteen open-ended items was administered to the sampled instructors in order to figure out which criteria and principles they were following in their teaching. This written open-ended questionnaire was directly derived from the observation checklist so that the instructors provide explanations for each of the observations made in their classrooms. In order to standardize the observation checklist and the questionnaire employed, they were submitted to some English translation instructors to judge their face and content validity (see Sch äffner, 2004). The instructors were 8 experts in language studies who had academic degrees and teaching experiences in either linguistics, testing, Teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL), or translation studies. The experts were submitted the questionnaire and the observation checklist and were asked give their suggestions regarding both the clarity of language and appropriateness of content of the instruments. They read the questionnaire and the observation checklist at several stages and revised and edited them when necessary. The final drafts of the instruments were therefore tuned up as the result of their kindly efforts.

### C. *The Targeted Categories*

Based on a rather comprehensive review of the literature on teaching translation (e.g., Hatim, 2014; Heping, 2008; Kiraly, 2000; Li, 2000a, 2000b; Pym, 2006; Wilss, 1989, 1994), seven areas which have appealed most to researchers in the area were targeted for investigation in the present study. That is, these seven categories were used as the points of reference for discussion of the criteria and practices used by Iranian translation instructors. These seven targeted categories were employed in the current study for designing a checklist for observing translation instructors’ classrooms to see what teaching practices they would employ in their instruction. The categories were also as the basis for designing a written questionnaire to determine what criteria the instructors would mention as driving their decisions on teaching practices. In below, these seven targeted categories have been listed.

- **Models of Translation Competence**
- **The job market for translators.**
- **Source language use in translation classrooms**
- **Language teaching and learning as a part of translation training**
- **Written Translation versus Oral Interpretation**
- **Technology use in translation**
- **Use of translation theories and principles in translation classrooms**

### D. *Design of the Study*

This study aimed to investigate the instructors’ practices for teaching translation in Iran. The researchers intended to determine the most prevalent criteria adopted by the instructors at Islamic Azad University South Tehran Branch. For data collection, a questionnaire and an observation checklist were developed based on a rather comprehensive review of the literature on teaching translation in classrooms. The design of the study is of a triangulation type in that both quantitative and qualitative data were collected to find answers to the research questions posed.

### E. *Procedure*

As the first step, the researcher observed the instructors’ translation classes for hundred hours, i.e. four hours for each of them. As the next step, the chosen translation instructors were submitted the questionnaire. The questionnaire consisting of 14 open-ended questions was answered by the ten chosen translation instructors at Islamic Azad University South Tehran Branch. In the following step, data gathered from class observation and the two types of questionnaire that were to be filled out by the instructors and students were read line by line twice and in some cases more than twice, to extract all criteria considered by them. Finally, the present researcher transcribed all criteria considered by instructors in the written questionnaire for teaching translation. It means that, the present researcher made the collected data ready for the next phase of the research.

## IV. RESULTS

In the present study, it was intended to determine the most prevalent practices adopted by instructors for teaching English translation at the undergraduate level at Islamic Azad University South Tehran Branch. Based on instruments used in this research, the method of collecting and analyzing data in the present study is a triangulation of qualitative, and quantitative methods.

In other words, the number of each practice for teaching translation was counted in the observation checklist. Further, the observed instructors were requested to fill out an open-ended, written questionnaire. The aim of this written questionnaire was to see what criteria the instructors followed in using the practices they employed in their classrooms. to provide explanations and discussions on the practices observed in the instructors’ classrooms.

Following Dancey and Reidy's (2007) for interpreting descriptive data, the rating scale was divided into three mean score classes; a mean score between 1 to 2.33 shows that the teaching practice has been little observed in the classrooms, a mean score between 2.34 to 3.67 shows that the teaching practice has been moderately used in the classrooms, and a mean score between 3.68 to 5 shows that the teaching practice has been prevalently used in the classrooms. A summary of these mean scores and their interpretations has been shown in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1.  
MEAN SCORES AND THEIR INTERPRETATIONS

Mean score range*	Interpretation
1 to 2.33	Little use
2.34 to 3.67	Moderate use
3.68 to 5	Prevalent use

\*Total mean = 5

Table 1 below indicates the statistics of the observations made in the instructors' translation classrooms. The table shows how much (from 1 to 5) a particular teaching practice has been observed in each classroom. The table also included the mean score (X) for each category of observation. For ease of reference, the two checklist items measuring the same targeted category have been presented next to each other in the table. The table also includes information on how many of the observed instructors have been rated according to the rating scale. For example for the first item of the targeted category "Translation Competence" (i.e., *The class material covers models of translation competence*), the information in the table shows that, of the ten instructors observed, two of the instructors were rated 3, five of them were rated 4, and three of them were rated 5 on the observation item. As you can see from the table, the mean score is 4.1 (i.e.,  $X = 4.1$ ) for this observation item.

TABLE 2.  
THE RESULTS OF THE OBSERVATIONS MADE IN THE INSTRUCTORS' CLASSROOMS

Targeted Category	Observation Description	1	2	3	4	5	X
<i>Translation Competence</i>	The class material covers models of translation competence.	0	0	2	5	3	<b>4.1</b>
	The teaching method covers models of translation.	0	1	2	4	3	<b>3.9</b>
<i>Market Needs</i>	The material taught in the class was in harmony with market needs.	3	4	2	1	0	<b>2.2</b>
	The teaching methods satisfy market needs.	2	1	4	2	1	<b>2.9</b>
<i>Source Language Use</i>	The English language communication skills are presented.	2	3	4	1	0	<b>2.4</b>
	Trainer works using only the English language in the class.	3	2	3	2	0	<b>2.6</b>
<i>Language Teaching and Learning Processes</i>	Second language learning was considered as a part of the training process.	4	3	3	0	0	<b>1.9</b>
	Second language Teaching is a part of the training process.	5	4	1	0	0	<b>1.4</b>
<i>Written Translation vs. Oral Interpretation</i>	The trainer makes students do written tasks more than oral interpretation	0	1	2	5	2	<b>3.8</b>
	The curriculum makes students do writing assignment more than oral interpretation.	0	2	1	4	3	<b>3.8</b>
<i>Use of Technology</i>	Technology has been integrated into the teaching.	4	5	1	0	0	<b>1.7</b>
	Technology helps the trainer.	5	2	3	0	0	<b>1.8</b>
<i>Translation Theories and Principles</i>	Translation principles are taught explicitly.	1	2	2	4	1	<b>3.2</b>
	Theories help the trainees.	0	1	3	4	2	<b>3.7</b>

#### A. Observation 1 (Models of Translation Competence)

The results of the two observation items under this category indicated that the materials and the instructors' teaching methods appropriately covered models of translation competence. As Table 1 shows, the instructors' mean scores on the first item and the second item under this category were 4.1 and 3.9, respectively. Both of these mean scores belong to the third mean score class set earlier (3.68 to 5). Therefore, these mean scores show that models of translation competence were prevalently used both in the materials covered and the teaching methods used in the classrooms.

#### B. Observation 2 (Market Needs)

The results of the two observation items under this category indicated that the materials observed did not satisfy the market needs, but the teaching methods for translation training were moderately in harmony with such needs. As Table 1 shows, the instructors' mean scores on the first item and the second item under this category were 2.2 and 2.9, respectively. The former mean score belongs to the first mean score class (1 to 2.33) whereas the latter mean score belongs to the second mean score class (2.34 to 3.67). These results show that the training materials used did not satisfy the market needs while the teaching methods for translation training were moderately in harmony with such needs.

#### C. Observation 3 (Source Language Use)

The results of the two observation items under this category indicated that the instructors made moderate use of the source language in their training. As Table 1 shows, the instructors' mean scores on the first item and the second item under this category were 2.4 and 2.6, respectively. Both of these mean scores belong to the second mean score class (2.34 to 3.67). Therefore, these mean scores show that the instructors' language use was moderately divided between the source language and the target language.

#### D. Observation 4 (Language Teaching/Learning Processes)

The results of the two observation items under this category indicated the instructors did not consider second language teaching and learning processes as a part of their training program. As Table 1 shows, the instructors' mean scores on the first item and the second item under this category were 1.9 and 1.4, respectively. Both of these mean scores belong to the first mean score class (1 to 2.33) which shows that the instructors consider translation training and second language teaching/learning as two separate processes. In other words, in the instructors' opinions, the classroom was the place where translation skills and principles, and not the second language, should be taught and learned.

#### E. Observation 5 (Written Translation vs. Oral Interpretation)

The results of the two observation items under this category indicated that the instructors paid more attention to teaching translation than oral interpretation in their classrooms. As Table 1 shows, the instructors' mean scores on the both items under this category were 3.8. Both of these mean scores belong to the third mean score class (3.68 to 5), showing that the instructors focus on more written translation materials than on oral interpretation materials.

#### F. Observation 6 (Use of Technology)

The results of the two observation items under this category indicated that the instructors made little use of technological advancements in their classrooms for teaching English translation. As Table 1 shows, the instructors' mean scores on the first item and the second item under this category were 1.7 and 1.8, respectively. Both of these mean scores belong to the first mean score class (1 to 2.33) which shows that the instructors made little use of technology and technological advancements in their classrooms.

#### G. Observation 7 (Translation Theories and Principles)

The results of the two observation items under this category indicated that the instructors observed made ample use of translation theories and theoretical translation principles in their training. Table 1 shows that the instructors' mean scores on the first item and the second item under this category were 3.2 and 3.7, respectively. The former mean score belongs to the second mean score class (2.34 to 3.67), showing that the instructors made moderate use of translation theories and principles, while the latter mean score belong to the third mean score class (3.68 to 5), showing that the instructors made prevalent use of translation theories and principles in their training.

### V. DISCUSSION

As you remember, seven categories were identified, based on a rather comprehensive literature review, for observation of English translation classrooms. In the following paragraphs, the results of the data presented are discussed, with each category subheaded consecutively. Extract from the instructors' answers to the written questionnaire are presented to show what criteria were behind the teaching practices observed in the instructors' translation classrooms.

In this section, these in-depth explanations for the seven target categories would be discussed to make firm conclusions. Extracts from the instructors' answers to the questions in the written questionnaire are provided to support the conclusions made based on the observations of the classrooms. Then, implications of the study's findings for teaching English translation are argued. Finally, suggestions for further research on teaching English translation in the Iranian context conclude the section.

#### A. Use of Models of Translation Competence

As the results showed, the instructors put much emphasis on the models of translation competence in their training. One basic element of the majority of translation competence models is that translation is not an individual activity; rather, it should be seen as a continuous interaction between different partners (e.g., translator and reader, translator and editor, translator and translator, etc.) (Göpferich, 2009). Specifically, the instructors observed made use of cooperative translation activities, interactive translation assignments, team-work translation, etc. Another "basic element of translation competence is the ability to analyze a variety of translation situations" (Vienne, 2000, p. 92). The observation demonstrated that the instructors asked their students to translate a wide variety of texts with different topics, discourses, difficulty, etc.

Similarly, most of the instructors contended that implementing and covering models of translation competence, through both materials and teaching methods, should be part of any translation training program. Two of the instructors, for instance, stated that

*providing novice translators with whatever materials & tools needed for helping gaining translation competence should be a basic part of teaching students the translation abilities and techniques. (Instructor 7)*

*translation materials should be organized in a way that they equip the learners with abilities to translate different types of English texts. Competent translators are able to cover and translate different text types. (Instructor 4).*

The instructors, however, seemed to disagree with each other on the definition of communicative competence. Some of them gave reference to Bachman's (1990) model of communicative competence which is not, in fact, a model of translation competence at all.

*By translation competence we mean pragmatic competence in Bachman's words. (Instructor 4)*

*Translation competence consists of communicative competence, transfer competence, instrumental competence/ psycho-physiological competence, and strategic competence. (Instructor 2)*

Definitions like the above should not surprise us since some of the instructors observed had academic backgrounds in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) and, thus, their definitions of translation competence had been blurred by their previous academic backgrounds in TEFL. Fortunately, some of the instructors presented definitions more appropriate to the concept. One example is the following extract:

*Translation competence consists of the set of abilities a translator should acquire to be able to cope with translation challenges. So, a competent translator is one who uses suitable translation strategies, is proficient in both languages, is experienced, and is familiar with the content of the text to be translated. (Instructor 1).*

To sum up, the instructors made use of particular teaching techniques to boost their students' translation competence. Also, even though they offered different definitions of the concept of translation competence, they emphasized that translation competence should be the objective of training translation programs.

### *B. Satisfying Market Needs*

In recent years, there has been much discussion that there should be a consistency between translation theory in academic contexts and translation practice in the real world (e.g., Anderman & Rogers, 2000; Li, 2000a, 2000b; Szczyrbak, 2008). In other words, prospective translators should become ready for translation challenges they will face in their future careers.

*Market needs are various and translators may be requested to handle various translation assignments. So, training programs should address these market needs as it helps the students get better jobs or have better opportunities. (Instructor 2)*

However, according to Anderman and Rogers (2000), translators are increasingly facing challenges for which they have not been prepared before. Unfortunately, the observations of the classrooms showed that the materials used to teach English translation were not so much in harmony with such needs. The instructors themselves were aware of this shortcoming.

*The students are not trained for the required market. Most of the graduate students find a job other than what they expect (Instructor 9).*

*Training programs should help the students to cope with different types of texts and in different contexts. I am not sure if the materials used to instruct translation can help the students acquire this ability or not (Instructor 4).*

The bright side of the picture is that the instructors made use of appropriate methods and techniques for teaching English translation as observed in their translation training classrooms. Though the instructors themselves did not mention about the appropriateness of their teaching methods and techniques, the appropriateness can be attributed to the long years of experience the instructors had in teaching English translation in academic settings (and, maybe, non-academic settings as well). These findings show us that, although sometimes the available materials for teaching English translation remain outdated and irrelevant to market needs, the Iranian instructors teach their students translation techniques and strategies that are appropriate for such needs.

### *C. Source and Target Language Use*

As the results of the study demonstrated, the instructors' language use was moderately divided between the source language and the target language. These results are consistent with suggestions in the literature on translation teaching that both the source language and the target language should be amply used in the classroom (Hatim, 2014; Hatim & Mason, 1990; Kiraly, 2000; Pym, 2006). One of the instructors' stated that:

*translation is neither about the source language nor the target language. Essential to translation is the transfer of ideas expressed in the source language to the target language. Learners should have the ability to get the idea from the source language and transform it into the target language. Both languages should be used in the classroom. (Instructor 5)*

Yet, some of the instructors expressed that the relative importance of the source and target languages in translation classrooms cannot be determined in advance; rather, it depends on the objectives on the program.

*When oral interpretation is taught, it is the source language that should be given more attention to. In this situation, students can easily handle their own mother tongue. When written translation is taught, both languages become important equally. (Instructor 9)*

*Source language and target language are used in translation classroom according to our needs. (Instructor 3)*

Given that the previous translation literature contended that language use should be moderately distributed between the source language and the target language, it therefore seems that the instructors observed have operated based on firm theoretical grounds.

### *D. Integration of Language Teaching/Learning and Translation Training*

Most researchers contend that translation classrooms are not second language learning classrooms as the two have been set up for different objectives (e.g., Hatim, 2014; Jettmarov 2004; Zdanys, 1987). As a matter of fact, they stress

that translation students be already proficient in the source language so that the classroom time don't be wasted on source language learning (Zdanys, 1987).

As the results of the study showed, the instructors observed in this study kept source/second language learning and teaching out of their translation training classrooms; i.e., they stuck to the idea that translation teaching and language teaching are two separate processes (Hatim, 2014).

*My duty as a teacher is to teach my students how to be good translators. Before entering my classroom, the students should have a good command of the second language as it helps a lot to begin with students who can use the second language efficiently. Teaching translation is not teaching language. (Instructor 5)*

*Translation students should proceed their language learning outside of the translation classrooms. Of course, students can learn some English language in the classroom, but they have come to the classroom to lean translation, not language. (Instructor 3)*

The above extracts clearly show that the instructors believed that translation training and language learning are separate. The results showed that they acted according to this belief when teaching their students.

#### E. Written Translation and Oral Interpretation

The instructors devoted more of the classroom time to written translation assignments. The instructors' teaching practice in this category can be partially attributed to the practicality of teaching written translation and oral interpretation. Fraser (2004) states that teaching oral interpretation in crowded pedagogic classrooms is highly impractical and cannot bear fruitful results. In a similar vein, the instructors told that

*teaching oral interpretation needs particular requirements, including voice recorders, computers, language labs and so on. Teaching written translation is more suitable when these requirements cannot be met. (Instructor 2)*

*Written translation is easier to teach than oral translation in Iran's classrooms. It takes much more time to teach oral translation and the end results are not usually satisfactory. (Instructor 8)*

Further, one instructor referred that written translation is more suitable for the Iranian context as the market for oral translation is limited.

*People who are able in English written translation will find a job. Finding a job as an English oral interpreter is more difficult and job opportunities are small in number for oral interpreters. (Instructor 6)*

#### F. Use of Technology

The results of the study demonstrated that the instructors observed made little use of technology and technological advancements in their translation classrooms. This is disappointing because, nowadays, technology plays a significant role in professional translation and translation instruction all over the world (Olohan, 2011). However, the instructors themselves cannot be blamed for the under-use of technological advancements in their own classrooms. As a matter of fact, the under-use of technology in translation classrooms can be attributed to some reasons as mentioned by the instructors. Though contending that technology can be of much help for translation training, nearly all of the instructors referred to the fact that access to technology is limited in their translation classrooms.

*Yes, technology can be a part of translator training program, as computers become more feasible, but the university should equip the classrooms with computers. (Instructor 1)*

*Definitely advanced technologies can facilitate such trainings. However, these technologies are usually expensive and cost a lot of money. I hope that the universities provide the classroom with technologies which facilitate the teaching of translation (Instructor 6)*

On the other hand, some of the instructors were skeptical of the use of technology in language translation classrooms. The skeptical instructors referred to the idea that technology cannot cover all the aspects of the translation process.

*Technology helps trainees but it does not make perfect translators as there are a lot of other things to be a good translator. (Instructor 8)*

*Technology can only play a side role in training learners in translation. (Instructor 3)*

These skeptical aside, most of the instructors believed that technology can be used for good in translation classrooms but there are some limitations which are mostly practical in nature.

#### G. Translation Theories and Principles

This was one area that the results of the study were clear as the observation of the classrooms indicated that all of the translation instructors paid ample attention to the presentation of translation theories and principles in their classrooms. This teaching strategy has been already suggested by researchers in the field (e.g., Gerding-Salas, 2000; Göpferich, 2009). Moreover, the finding was to be expected. As the present investigation was carried out in an academic context (Islamic Azad University-South), it was not surprising that the instructors practiced and reported the use of translation theories and principles in the teaching of English translation, especially when we consider the fact that the instructors were university professors who had long years of experience in teaching translation theories.

*Translation theories are very helpful to clarify the mind of translator and become them familiar with the new ideas and developments in the field of translation (Instructor 1)*

*Theories are not separate from actual translation. Theories can teach students improve their translation output. (Instructor 7)*

Some other instructors stated more radical beliefs, contending that getting familiar with translation theories and theoretical principles is basic to becoming a good translator. For example, one instructor wrote that

*I put emphasis on translation theories in my own classrooms. Knowledge of different theories of English translation is the first step for learners to take in order that they learn translation techniques and strategies more deeply. Translation theories have much to offer to translation practitioners. (Instructor 4)*

## VI. CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

First, from the findings of the study, it is clear that there are some shortcomings in the teaching of English translation techniques and principles in the Iranian context. Especially, even though the instructors expressed positive attitudes towards the use of technology in teaching translation, they did not seem to make enough use of technological advancements in their classrooms. So, it is necessary that institutions are responsible for the teaching of translation techniques and principles provide the trainers and trainees with technological equipments. Moreover, the trainers and trainees should be prepared to work with these equipments (Pym, Perekrstenko, & Starink, 2006). Second, both the instructors emphasized the importance of translation competence models, and other translation theories and principles, and, therefore, translation instructors should try to become familiar with the modern and the most recent translation models. Third, there seemed to be some inconsistencies between the instructors' criteria and their real-world practices for teaching translation skills. According to some researchers, such inconsistencies between theory and practice are not surprising, given the fact that practical and institutional limitations constrain a bridge between translation theory and practice (e.g., Robinson, 2004; Bassnett & Trivedi, 2012).

A single study like this one cannot provide us with conclusive answers to the research questions posed and therefore more investigations need to be conducted to be able to draw more dependable conclusions. Thus, it is recommended that this line of research be followed in several directions by other researchers. First, the translation instructors were sampled from only one translation-teaching context (i.e., Islamic Azad University-South, Tehran) and so it is not possible to generalize the findings of the study so far. So, it is necessary to carry out more studies of the same type to see whether the findings obtained can be applicable to other contexts in which translation is taught as an academic major. Second, it is recommended that the study be replicated in non-academic contexts as well, considering the fact that teaching English translation is flourishing in Iranian non-academic contexts. In recent years in Iran, there has been an interest in translation theories and techniques among individuals who are not following English translation as an academic major. Third, the current study had a descriptive nature in that it only investigated what techniques and criteria instructors used to train their students in translation. However, the question of whether the techniques used by the instructors had any positive effects on the students' translation abilities and skills remains unanswered. So, it is suggested that the future study include a follow-up interventional phase the aim of which is to determine whether the techniques and criteria used to teach English translation would have any positive effects on prospective translators' skills.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Anderman, G., & Rogers, M. (2000). Translator training between academia and profession: A European perspective. *Benjamins Translation Library*, 38, 63-76.
- [2] Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [3] Bassnett, S., & Trivedi, H. (Eds.). (2012). *Postcolonial translation: Theory and practice*. London; Routledge.
- [4] Bell, R.T. (1991). *Translation and Translating. Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- [5] Dancy, C. P., & Reidy, J. (2007). *Statistics without Maths for Psychology*. London: Pearson Education.
- [6] Day, R. R. (1990). Teacher observation in second language teacher education. In J. C. Richards and D. Nunan (eds.) *Second language teacher education* (pp. 43-61). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Fraser, J. (2004). Translation research and interpreting research: Pure, applied, action or pedagogic? In C. Schäffner (Ed.), *Translation research and interpreting research: Traditions, gaps and synergies* (pp. 57-61). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [8] Gerding-Salas, C. (2000). Teaching translation. *Translation Journal*, 4(3), 50-62.
- [9] Göpferich, S. (2009). Towards A Model of Translation Competence and Its Acquisition: The Longitudinal Study Transcomp. In S. Göpferich (Ed.), *Behind the Mind: Methods, Models and Results in Translation Process Research* (pp. 1-37): Arnt Jakobsen and Inger Mees Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.
- [10] Hatim, B. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Translation*. New York: Routledge.
- [11] Hatim, B. (2014). *Teaching and Researching Translation*. New York: Routledge.
- [12] Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. London: Longman.
- [13] Heping, L. (2008). Rethinking the Construction of a Pedagogical System for Translation Teaching. *Chinese Translators Journal*, 3, 011.
- [14] Jettmarov á Z. (2004). A way to methodology: The institutional role in TS research, training, and development. In C. Schäffner (Ed.), *Translation research and interpreting research: Traditions, gaps and synergies* (pp. 77-87). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [15] Kelly, D. (2005). *A Handbook for Translator Trainers. A Guide to Reflective Practice*. St. Jerome Publishing: Manchester.
- [16] Kiraly, D. (2000). *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education. Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome.



- [17] Lesznyák, M. (2003). A Ford íási Kompetencia Értékelése: Helyzetkép És Kutatási Feladatok [The translation competency assessment: Survey and research tasks]. *Ford íástudomány*, 5.1, 60-80.
- [18] Li, D. (2000a). Tailoring Translation Programs to Social Needs: A Survey of Professional Translators. *Target*, 12(1), 127-149.
- [19] Li, D. (2000b). Needs Assessment In Translation Teaching: Making Translator Training More Responsive To Social Needs. *Babel*, 46(4), 289-299.
- [20] McDonough, J., & McDonough, S. (2014). *Research Methods for English Language Teachers*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [21] Olohan, M. (2011). Translators and Translation Technology: The Dance of Agency. *Translation Studies*, 4(3), 342-357.
- [22] Pym, A. (2006). A Reply to Federica Scarpa's Reply. Tarragona, Spain: Intercultural Studies Group.
- [23] Pym, A., Perekrstenko, A., & Starink, B. (2006). *Translation Technology and Its Teaching*. Tarragona, Spain: Intercultural Studies Group.
- [24] Razmjou, L. (2002). Developing Guidelines for a New Curriculum for the English Translation BA Program in Iranian Universities. *Online Translation Journal*, 6(2), retrieved from <http://accurapid.comejournal/20edu1.htm> on August, 2014.
- [25] Robinson, D. (2004). *Becoming a translator: An introduction to the theory and practice of translation*. London: Routledge.
- [26] Sch äffner, C. (2004). *Translation Research and Interpreting Research: Traditions, Gaps, and Synergies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [27] Snell-Hornby, M. (1984). Dimension and perspective in literary translation. In E. Wilss, & G. Thorne (Eds.) *Translation theory and its implementation in the teaching of translating and interpreting* (pp. 105-113). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- [28] Vienne, J. (2000). Which competences should we teach to future translators and how? In C. Schaffner & B. Adab (Eds), *Developing translation competence* (pp. 91-100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [29] Wilss, W. (1989). *Topical Issues in Translator Training At Universities*. Binghamton: State University of New York at Binghamton.
- [30] Wilss, W. (1992). *Übersetzungsfertigkeit. Annäherungen an Einen Komplexen Übersetzungs-Praktischen Begriff* [Translation Skills. Approaches to a Complex Translation of Practical Term]. Tübingen: Narr.
- [31] Wilss, W. (1994). A Framework for Decision-Making in Translation. *Target*, 6, 131-50.
- [32] Zdanys, J. (1987). Teaching translation: Some notes toward a course structure. *Translation Review*, 23(1), 9-11.

**Elham Heidari** holds an M.A. in Translation Studies at Islamic Azad University South Tehran Branch. She is interested in teaching courses such as Translation, and Teaching Methodology.

**Bahram Mowlaie** is assistant professor of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch. His main areas of interest are reading and writing. He has published in journals related to teaching and learning English as a foreign language.