

ÇANAKKALE ONSEKİZ MART UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

COLLABORATIVE LEARNING IN TRANSLATION
COURSES AT E.L.T DEPARTMENTS

M.A THESIS

by

Hayati ATMACA

Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Dinçay KÖKSAL

ÇANAKKALE

2007

T.C
ÇANAKKALE ONSEKİZ MART ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

“*Collaborative Learning in Translation courses at E.L.T Departments*” adlı çalışma jürimiz tarafından İngilizcenin Öğretimi Anabilim dalında Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Başkan:.....

Prof.Dr.Dinçay KÖKSAL(Danışman)

Üye:.....

Doç.Dr.Salih UŞUN

Üye:.....

Yrd.Doç.Dr.İsmail Hakkı ERTEN

Üye:.....

Yrd.Doç.Dr.Cevdet YILMAZ

Üye:.....

Yrd.Doç.Dr.Aysun YAVUZ

**COLLABORATIVE LEARNING IN TRANSLATION
COURSES AT E.L.T DEPARTMENTS**

CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	I
ÖZET (Turkish).....	V
ABSTRACT.....	VII
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	IX

CHAPTER I

1.0. INTRODUCTION	X
1.1. The Aim of the Thesis	X
1.2. Background to the Study.....	XI
1.3. Scope of the Study.....	XI
1.4. Limitations to the Study.....	XIII

CHAPTER II

2.0. THEORETICAL BASES OF THE STUDY.....	2
2.1. Review of Literature on Collaborative Learning	2
2.2. The Application of Collaborative Learning in a Translation Course.....	3
2.3. The Various Techniques in Collaborative Learning.....	5
2.4. Collaborative Learning and Second Language Acquisition.....	7

2.5 The Application of a Traditional Teacher-fronted	
Translation Course.....	9
2.6. Team Formation on Collaborative Learning.....	10
3.0. Criteria that were taken into account for	
the formation of the team.....	11
3.1. Gender Distribution.....	11
3.2. Language Proficiency.....	11
3.3. Individual Factors in Collaborative learning.....	12
3.3.1. Proportion of Time Spent in Collaborative	
Learning Activities.....	13
3.3.2 Physical Set-up of the Classroom.....	13
3.3.3. Preliminary Explanations.....	13
3.3.4. Other Considerations in Translation Courses.....	15
3.3.5. A Typical Class in Collaborative Work.....	16
3.3.6. Group Assignments Done Collaboratively.....	19
3.3.7. The Diary Kept in a Translation Course.....	20
3.3.8. The Role of the Instructor in Collaborative Learning.....	21
3.3.9. Evaluation of the Collaborative Method	
as Applied to Translation.....	21
4.0. Tools for Evaluating Cooperative Learning	23
4.1. Cooperative Learning as an Instructional Method.....	25
4.2. Cognitive Processes in a Social Context.....	27
4.3. Diversity Issues in Cooperative Group Work.....	28
4.4. Factors of Cooperative Teaching and Learning.....	29
4.5. Cooperative Language Learning	32

CHAPTER III

5.0. THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY.....	35
5.1. The Research Questions.....	35
5.2. Methodology.....	36
5.3. Translation Methodology: A Cooperative Work Procedure...	37
5.3.1. Profile of the Student.....	42
5.3.2. Profile of the Educator.....	43
5.3.3. The Infrastructure.....	44

CHAPTER IV

6.0. THE FINDINGS TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY.....	45
6.1. The First Research Question and Findings.....	45
6.2. The Second Research Question and Findings.....	51
6.3. The Third Research Question and Findings.....	57
6.4. The Fourth Research Question and Findings.....	58

CHAPTER V

7.0. THE RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS OF THE STUDY.....	59
7.1. The Results of the Study.....	59

7.2. The Suggestions..... 60

REFERENCES..... 63

APPENDIX

**A Topic Familiarity Questionnaire for the Lecturers and Students
Through a six-point Likert Rating Scale 75**

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı “İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümlerinde Çeviri Derslerinde İşbirliğine Dayalı Öğrenmenin” öğrencinin başarısına etkisi konusunda öğrenci ve öğretim elemanlarının görüşlerini belirlemektir. Araştırmada kız ve erkek öğrencilerinin yanı sıra, öğrenci ve öğretim elemanlarının görüşleri arasında da anlamlı bir farklılık olup olmadığı belirlenmek istenmiştir.

Araştırma alan tarama (Survey) modeli kullanılarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çalışma evreni olarak Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi seçilmiş ve Eğitim Fakültesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümünde görevli öğretim elemanları, üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrencileri de örneklem oluşturmuştur.

Araştırma verilerinin toplanmasında yüz maddelik bir konu bilgisi anketinden ve davranışları, tercihleri, subjektif tepkileri ölçmek için altı tutumdan oluşan bir Likert ölçekleme tipinden yararlanılmıştır. Bu anket onbir öğretim elemanı ve elli altı öğrenciye rastgele (random) metodla uygulanmış ve bu konudaki yaklaşımlarını öğrenmek için sonuçları tablolastırılıp değerlendirilmiştir.

Araştırma verilerinin analizinde frekans, yüzde ve “T” testi gibi istatistiksel teknikler kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümünde ki öğrenci ve öğretim elemanlarının çeviri derslerinde işbirliğine dayalı öğrenmenin etkisine yönelik olumlu görüşlere sahip olduklarını göstermiştir.

Uygulanan “T” testi sonucunda kız ve erkek öğrencilerin anket sorularına vermiş oldukları cevapların cinsiyet dağılımına göre, kızlar lehinde anlamlı bir farklılık gösterdiği saptanmıştır. Öte yandan, öğretim elemanları ve öğrencilerin vermiş oldukları cevaplar kıyaslandığında, öğrenciler kaynak bir çeviri metnin daha geniş kapsamlı bir şekilde anlaşılmasına yönelik işbirliğine dayalı öğrenmeden

daha duyarlı, paylaşımcı ve müştereken yararlanma eğilimi göstermişlerdir. Böylece işbirlikçi öğrenme tekniğinin çeviri derslerinde öğrencilerin çeviri becerilerini yükselttiği ve öğrenme motivasyonlarını arttırdığı ve ayrıca başarılarının yanısıra öğrenme idraklerini geliştirdiğini ortaya koymuştur. Bu anlamda, ankete katılan öğrencilerin lehinde dikkate değer bir farklılık saptanmıştır.

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study is to determine the students' and lecturers' points of view towards the effect of collaborative learning to the successes of students in translation courses at E.L.T departments. In the study, it has been aimed at determining that whether a significant difference among the points of view of the male and female students and also, of the students and lecturers exists or not.

The study has been carried out by using the survey model. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University has been chosen as the population of the study, and the third and fourth-year Turkish university students who have been majoring English at advanced level to be teachers of English at secondary schools in Turkey and the lecturers teaching at E.L.T department of the Faculty of Education have been the subjects and samples of this study.

A Likert-Scale Measurement that consists of six attitudes and a Topic Familiarity Questionnaire including a hundred of question items have been made use of gathering the research data, and this questionnaire has been administered to the eleven lecturers and fifty-six students at random, and their answers were tabulated and assessed.

The numerical data such as frequency and percentage have been analyzed by using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) and T-test has been run to analyze the research data. The findings have shown that the students majoring and the lecturers teaching at E.L.T department at the Faculty of Education of C.O.M.U have positive points of view towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses.

According to the gender distribution of the responses given to the questionnaire by the male and female students at the end of the T-test carried out, it has been determined that a significant difference has been observed in favor of the female students, and on the other hand, in comparison with the responses given by the students and the lecturers, the students have arrived at a more in-depth understanding of the source texts collectively and could achieve a greater degree of grammatical correctness, accuracy and faithfulness in the translation through discussion and negotiation. So, collaborative learning technique has certainly enhanced the students' translation skills, increased their motivation to learn and improved learning comprehension as well as achievement of ESL students. In this context, it has been determined that a significant difference has been seen in favor of the students participating in the questionnaire.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis called “Collaborative Learning in Translation Courses at E.L.T Departments” has been carried out under the supervision and direction of Prof. Dr. Dinçay KÖKSAL, Head of the E.L.T Department and Dean of Faculty of Education of Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. It was commenced in 2006 and completed in 2007 for the partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master Degree.

I would like to thank my mentor and supervisor, Prof. Dr. Dinçay KÖKSAL, for his help in the preparation of this thesis and I am also grateful for the guidance and encouragement provided by all my colleagues in the English Teacher Training Department, especially Assist. Prof. Dr. İsmail HAKKI ERTEN, for his assistance and guidance.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Salih Uşun for his help, support and intellectual guidance during the S.P.S.S assessment and the findings of the thesis.

I am also grateful for the participation and encouragement provided by all my colleagues in the English Language Training Department.

1.0.INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Aim of the Thesis

The main aim of the thesis is to determine the effect of collaborative learning on the students' successes in translation courses at E.L.T departments.

The Subaims of The Thesis

1. What are the points of view of the students majoring at E.L.T departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses?
2. What are the points of view of the lecturers and instructors of English teaching at E.L.T departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses?
3. Are there any distinctive and remarkable differences among the points of view of the students majoring and lecturers teaching at E.L.T departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses?
4. According to the gender variations, are there any distinctive and remarkable differences between male and female students majoring at E.L.T departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses?

1.2. Background to the Study

I have been teaching translation courses at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University for about eight years now and although satisfied in some ways, there was a general feeling that there were areas related to this subject where further information would be useful. This was what prompted me to carry out this study.

Although much has been written on research of collaborative learning in translation courses, no scientific or statistical evaluation of the method has been conducted. There has been therefore, obviously a need such a study which would fill a gap in E.L.T departments.

Assessment of existing articles and books about the effects of a cooperative classroom structure on student behaviour and attitudes and a cooperative small-group methodology in the language classroom would provide an idea about how to deal with the concepts in question.

Building positive attitudes by using collaborative learning groups and interindividual differences in preferences for cooperation in respect of the theoretical background and practical consequences should be taken into consideration.

1.3. Scope of the Study

For the research element of this study, a topic familiarity questionnaire on collaborative learning was administered both to the instructors of English and the lectures in the English Language Teaching Department of Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University (see Appendix) and to the students currently studying in the same department in November and December 2006 at the Faculty of Education of C.O.M.U during the fall semester. The numerical data such as frequency and percentage were

analyzed by using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) and samples t-tests were run to analyze the research data.

Chapter I gives general information about the introduction, aims and subaims of the study. It also mentions about background and scope of the study as well as limitations to the study.

Chapter II covers the theoretical bases of the study. It deals with the review of literature and describes and analyses what has already been done that is related to this study. It provides some information on the application of collaborative learning in a translation course, the various techniques in collaborative learning, the application of a traditional teacher-fronted translation course, and team formation on collaborative learning.

It also outlines the criteria that were taken into account for the information of the teams on collaborative learning in translation courses. It describes the tools for evaluating cooperative learning. It deals with cooperative learning as an instructional method, cognitive processes in a social context, diversity issues in cooperative group work, and factors of cooperative language teaching and learning.

Chapter III combines the research questions and deals with its methodology. It consists of a translation methodology through a step by step cooperative work procedure. It gives information about the profile of the student and educator and the infrastructure in collaborative learning.

Chapter IV deals with the findings and research questions of the study. It consists of the tables for the lecturers and students.

Chapter V includes the results, suggestions and references of the study.

Appendix includes A Topic Familiarity Questionnaire on Collaborative Group Learning for the Lecturers and Students Through a six-point Likert Rating Scale.

1.4. Limitations to the Study

- This study has the limitations below:
- This study is limited to the advanced the level fourth grade students of English, lecturers and instructors at English Language Teaching Department at the Faculty of Education at Ç.O.M.U / Turkey
- Equal gender distribution of the students in cooperative translation courses is desirable.
- The students' linguistic background in the cooperative group work should be taken into consideration. Forming heterogeneous and well-balanced groups should be preferable.
- Each student's personal characteristics have to be taken into account and evaluated carefully; argumentative students should not be placed in the same group.
- Proportion of time spent in collaborative learning activities should be well measured. About three 50 – minute classes are to be spent preparing students for collaborative work both intellectually and socially.
- Physical set-up of the classroom should be well assigned for group discussions. Students should be able to face each other, preferably forming circles where they can clearly see each other.
- Each group ought to choose a chairperson and a recorder/spokesperson.
- The difficulties of the texts to be translated must be carefully graded, starting with easier ones. At the beginning of the

course, texts can include magazine articles dealing with current events or topics of general interest.

- The grading system for the group assignments is to be the same as for individual ones, spelling mistakes, clumsy renderings, grammatical errors, misunderstandings of the source text, incoherence are to be counted negatively.
- Students should require to keep a diary in which they will record what they learn during each group discussion regarding vocabulary, grammar, translation problems, and so on
- The teacher in collaborative learning process should act as an organizer, a facilitator, and to various degrees, a resource person.

CHAPTER II

2.0. THEORETICAL BASES OF THE STUDY

2.1. Review of Literature on Collaborative learning

What is collaborative learning? According to Slavin (1983) “Many studies have shown that two or more individuals can solve problems of different kinds of better when they work in groups than when they work independently” (p.9) Collaborative learning is a special group-work approach which offers a useful alternative to traditional teacher-fronted techniques, both in the schools, where it is usually called “Cooperative Learning” and at the post-secondary level. It differs from other types of group work done by students in at least two respects: its underlying philosophy as well as the structure it follows. The philosophy on which collaborative learning is based is that knowledge is essentially social in nature: it is a give-and-take process that depends on interaction with other individuals. One has to accept the fact that knowledge is simply imparted to the students by the instructor but that students learn from each other through communication and cooperative efforts, while the teacher acts as an organizer, a facilitator, and, to various degrees, a resource person (Sheridan, Byrne and Quina, 1989;Wiener,1986)

Collaborative learning is also a democratic process in which all the participants are equal and are treated as such; playing a role that is valued by all of

them. The groups themselves are teams rather than mere collections of individuals brought together by chance. They share a common goal and are prepared to perform certain tasks to reach that goal (Aronson, Bridgeman and Geffner, 1978).

All the guiding principles as well as the techniques used should be explained to the students by instructors wishing to use collaborative learning in high school and college, not only because they will then know what to expect but also because some students who have had negative experiences with group work may be prejudiced against it, and the method will only work if participants have a positive attitude (Sills, 1988).

2.2. The Application of Collaborative Learning in a Translation Course

Collaborative learning, based on small group discussions conducted according to specific rules, provides an alternative to traditional classroom structure which has been shown to be useful in second language acquisition. A more in-depth understanding of the source text is arrived at collectively, and a greater degree of grammatical correctness, accuracy and faithfulness can be achieved in the translation through discussion and negotiation as participants are required to justify their solutions. Social support is important as participants share their difficulties. They gain in self-confidence and self-esteem; they also become more tolerant of different opinions and appreciate the non-threatening atmosphere of working in small groups.

A valuable technique to promote interdependence is to assign each member a role to perform within the group. A group leader is appointed to organize, manage and direct activities. A recorder takes accurate notes and records data for group activities. A checker assures that each member understands the tasks or concepts. An encourager is appointed to make sure that each member has ample opportunity to contribute to the group. Finally, part of the final grade is derived from the group's performance on the task. Thus, if one member of the group does not understand the concepts to be learnt, the assessment scores of the other group members will suffer.

Members may have different responsibilities (chairperson, recorder, spokesperson) within the group as advocated by Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson, & Skon (1984), but no member should be judged to be superior to the others, and the functions may be convinced that their contributions as well as those of their fellow group members are essential to the success of their team's work (Johnson & Johnson 1985). Once this has been explained to them, peer pressure is usually strong enough to shame potential free-riders into doing their share and participating fully. Through discussion and negotiation, the team reaches a consensus, which means that group members have to compromise and accept that their solution is not necessarily the best one.

2.3. The Various Techniques in Collaborative Learning

Many different types of cooperative or collaborative learning methods have been perfected over the years. Interested readers will find useful reviews by Knight and Bohlmeyer (1990) and Slavin (1990). The technique described below, which was used in a translation course, is essentially an adaptation of the Co-op co-op method (Kagan, 1985), originally used to increase “the involvement of university students in traditional psychology courses by allowing them to explore in-depth topics in which they were particularly interested (p.437). As Kagan states, the method is both ‘simple and flexible’ (p.440); it normally contains ten successive steps which can be used in the format best suited to the needs of the course.

In her book *Second Language Learning through Cooperative Learning*, Julie High (1993) reports her discovery that effective language learning depends on the structuring social interaction to maximize the need to communicate in the target language.

Co-op co-op. The emphasis in this structure is on bringing out and nourishing the natural intelligence, creativeness and expressiveness of students. In Co-op Co-op, the structure indicates that we value the interests and abilities of the students. This cooperative language learning structure has ten steps.

- 1-** Student-centered class discussion. This discussion leads to an understanding among the teacher and the class about what the students want to learn and experience in relation to the topic or unit to be covered.

- 2- Selection of student learning teams
- 3- Teambuilding and cooperative skill development. This is an important phase in which the members of each team feel they are a “we” and have developed trust and communication skills.
- 4- Team topic selection. The team members settle on the topic of most interest to themselves as a group.
- 5- Mini-topic selection. The team members divide the topic of the team into mini-topics for each member to work on.
- 6- Mini-topic preparation. Individual students work on their own topics.
- 7- Mini-topic presentations. Individual students present their own topics to their teammates.
- 8- Preparation of team presentations. The team discusses and integrates the material presented in the previous step in order to prepare their team presentations.
- 9- Team presentations.
- 10- Reflection and evaluation. Students reflect on their work and their achievements. The whole class evaluates team presentations. Individual presentations are evaluated by teammates.

Research on teaching has shown that whole-class discussion, individual seatwork and lecture prevail as the favorite organizational structures in the traditional classroom. In relation to participation structures which promote meaningful interaction, Spencer Kagan maintains that by participating in planned formats “students become responsible for learning and sharing what they have

learnt. The structure prepares students for participation in a democratic society” (Kagan 1992). And he goes on, “How we structure a classroom is an important, perhaps the most important, form of communication we make to students. If we structure the classroom so that goal of learning is a good team score, we communicate that the most important value is a competitive victory. If we structure so that the teacher is in full control of what and how students study, we communicate that students are empty or that their intelligence and curiosity are not valued. If we choose an autocratic authority structure, we communicate a lack of faith in the potential of students to choose positive directions for development. By taking full responsibility for students’ learning, we leave them none. We do not leave students room to come out and become fully engaged in the learning process”. Thus, planning participation structures at the micro-level of language teaching is seen as an aspect of “precision teaching.”

2.4. Collaborative Learning and Second Language Acquisition

For variety an attempt was made to adapt the jigsaw method (Aranson et al, 1978), which is described below, but its use was found to be rather complicated in the context of translation.

Taking into consideration the hypothesis accepted by the proponents of collaborative learning that knowledge is essentially social in nature and since the use of language itself is also a social phenomenon, it would seem only logical to apply the method to language classes. However, as pointed out by Ford (1991),

there have been very few scientific studies on the effects of the method on L2 learning. Nevertheless she mentions a number of advantages indicated by studies on the effects of group work in language classes , such a greater opportunities for students to interact and to express themselves (McGroarty, 1988), to produce comprehensible out (Swain, 1985), to alter their output so as to make it more comprehensible (long & Porter, 1985 ; McGroarty, 1988) and to communicate in a more natural environment by using longer utterances in normal exchanges between speakers (McGroarty, 1988). Doughty and Pica (1988) concluded from their experiments that the use of small groups and dyads of non-native speakers in the classroom increases the amount of negotiation for meaning. This important finding led Allwright and Bailey to suggest that perhaps we should be doing more group work and fewer teacher-fronted lessons in second language classes (1991, p.148). The relaxed atmosphere associated with group work is also more conducive to a favorable attitude which in turn increases participation and learning (long & Porter, 1985). The cooperative or collaborative method produces similar benefits as shown by McGroarty (1993) in her summary of the recent theory and research related to group work in second language learning in order to provide a foundation for understanding the advantages and limitations of cooperative work in fostering second language acquisition in school settings (p.19).

2.5 The Application of a Traditional Teacher-fronted Translation Course

The decision to use collaborative learning arose primarily from a desire to innovate and to increase student participation. In a traditional teacher-fronted translation course, the students are usually given the text to translate a few days in advance and are required to prepare the translation for a due date. Each individual is responsible for the explanation of the text and any terminological research, as well as the actual translation into the target language. The translation is then corrected in class: one of the common methods is for the instructor to ask a student to propose his/her translation, sentence by sentence or paragraph by paragraph. Other students may be invited to provide comments and/or alternative solutions before the teacher offers a final version, which is generally taken as a model by the class. In essence the teacher is the supreme judge of the quality of the translation: knowledge is imparted to the students in the traditional way by virtue of the instructor's qualifications, experience and status, and his/her authority is rarely challenged. This leaves little room for discussion and only the bravest students are prepared to offer alternatives. In large classes anonymity is often the rule: the teacher hardly knows the students who do not know each other. In sum students only learn through their own individual efforts, which can produce limited and sometimes erroneous results, and through impersonal contact with a teacher with whom they have little interaction. Such a traditional approach can leave both instructor and students with a feeling of frustration. The

collaborative learning method fulfilled this search and an account of how this method was adapted to a translation course.

2.6. Team Formation on Collaborative Learning

According to the literature on cooperative learning (for instance, Johnson et al, 1984), teams function best when they are comprised of between four and seven members. For the present study groups of four or five were used, with the latter number being preferable because the students were exposed to a larger variety of opinions during the discussion. Also, with groups of four, students occasionally complained that if one or two persons were absent, the discussion was neither as interesting nor as fruitful.

Since the goal was to produce the best translation possible and not to group together students sharing an interest in particular topic, heterogeneous teams were preferable so that students would learn as much as possible from each other. In order to assign students to groups which would be as heterogeneous as possible and yet of comparable overall strength, it was necessary for the instructor to get to know them, which meant that groups could only be formed about two to three weeks after the beginning of the course. By then the instructor had been able to observe students in class and to return at least one assignment and one test.

3.0. Criteria that were taken into account for the formation of the teams.

3.1. Gender Distribution

The vast majority of students in university language courses, including translation, are female, constituting about %90 of classes. Although Webb concludes that equal gender distribution is desirable in a school setting because “Girls in majority-female groups and in majority-male groups learn less than boys” (1985, p36), this cannot be achieved at the university level. On the other hand, language instructors’ experience confirmed the findings of Gass and Varonis (1986) that in non-native speakers’ interactions men usually tend to be more assertive and to lead the discussion. In some cases, however, the lone male student in each group may feel overwhelmed and even intimidated by the predominance of women. The situation, therefore, has to be closely monitored.

3.2. Language Proficiency

Taking into consideration the variety of the students’ linguistic background in the course that was taught, it was easy to form heterogeneous, well balanced groups with preferably not more than one allophone student whose dominant language was neither the source nor the target language and who might have felt unsure about his/her English skills. On the other hand, it was found helpful to

include in each group, if possible, one participant with native or near native skills in the second language, since this person could generally better assess the quality of translations done into that language. A mix of linguistic abilities was also desirable to maximize exchanges within groups and to ensure that all teams were of equivalent strength.

3.3. Individual Factors in Collaborative Learning

For groups to function harmoniously personality traits of each member had to be taken into account, which meant that during the first two or three weeks of the course, instructor had to evaluate each student's personal characteristics. For instance, argumentative students were not placed in the same group, and the odd unfriendly or disgruntled individual who can sometimes be found in a class was assigned to a team where the other participants were particularly tolerant and would know how to deal with such a person. The placement of students is a matter of judgment, and personality problems can usually be overcome.

Other factors were also taken into account, such as expertise in academic subjects and work experience, so that each participant could bring particular knowledge and skills and so that the overall composition of the groups would maximize the amount that members could learn from each other.

It was felt useful to leave the teams in place for one semester so that members felt comfortable working with each other.

3.3.1. Proportion of Time Spent in Collaborative Learning Activities

For the sake of variety, the method was used only once a week, that is, for one 50-minute class, with more traditional methods being applied during the other two classes of the week.

3.3.2. Physical Set-up of the Classroom

Cooperative learning can be successful only if it occurs in a classroom that lends itself to group discussions. Students should be able to face each other, preferably forming circles where they can clearly see each other (Morton, 1988). Instructors who intend to use the method would be well advised to inspect the classroom assigned to them so as to be able to request to change, if necessary.

3.3.3. Preliminary Explanations

As indicated by Cohen (1994, p.39), 'the first step in introducing group work to the classroom is to prepare students for cooperative work situations. It is a great mistake to assume that children (or adults) know how to work with each other in a constructive collegial fashion'. At the university level, the present writer found it vital, before starting to use the collaborative learning method, to familiarize advantages. This preliminary coaching is necessary not only so that the

students know what to expect and how to proceed, but also in order to foster a positive attitude among group members. Participants must be convinced that the exercise will lead to worthwhile results (individual, academic and social advantages must be stressed), and that the group's result will be commensurate with the sum total of its members' efforts. Each member must also understand that each individual is responsible for the team's success.

Advice should also be given on how to conduct the discussion. At the beginning of each session each group chooses a chairperson and a recorder/spokesperson. The chairperson is responsible for ensuring that the discussion proceeds in an orderly and smooth fashion, that all members participate in turns without anyone monopolizing the floor and that even the shyest students are encouraged to express an opinion.

He/she has a responsibility to keep the discussion on focus as it is sometimes easy and tempting for the participants to digress, and they may have to be reminded to stick to the discussion of the text to be translated. The recorder/spokesperson writes down the results of the discussion, i.e., the translation produced by the team, and presents it on behalf of the group during the plenary class discussion at the end of the period.

Members have to be reminded that they must be polite, considerate, and tolerant of their fellow group members' views. They must learn to critique tactfully without hurting the other students' feelings. In other words part of the preliminary session is a lesson in social skills which will then have to be applied.

Sometime must be devoted to the introduction of group members to one another so that they can become acquainted. In general terms, students are invited to talk about their background such as family, ethnic origin, education, personal tastes and interests, strengths and weaknesses, life objectives, and so forth. The goal is not only to create an atmosphere where members of each team can feel comfortable with one another but also to enable them to draw on their different areas of specialization.

About three 50-minute classes were spent preparing students for collaborative work both intellectually and socially: two were necessary to explain the method and how it differed from other group work that the students had taken part in, and one for them to get acquainted and exchange views about language learning and translation.

3.3.4. Other Considerations in Translation Courses

As in a traditional translation course, the difficulties of the texts to translate must be carefully graded, starting with easier ones. At the beginning of the course, texts can include magazine articles dealing with current events or topics of general interest. At the end of the academic year, students should be able to tackle texts of a semi-technical nature and also literary ones, which are by far the most difficult. Because of the necessity to advance from simpler texts to more complex ones, it is not advisable to let the students choose the texts to be translated. However, so as to increase their motivation, to take advantage of their fields of expertise, and thus

to improve the quality of translations, the instructor may ask the students for input on the type of texts and topics they would like to have included in the course. Students are especially pleased when the teacher tries to accommodate their wishes when choosing texts.

3.3.5. A typical Class in Collaborative Work

The classes in the course described here were 50 minutes long, although the instructor believes that for collaborative work longer periods would have been preferable, allowing for longer passages to be translated during the same class. Students were given the text to translate a week in advance and were required to prepare the translation, including the necessary documentary and terminological research before coming to class. This is of the utmost importance since lack of preparation slows down the proceedings considerably and wastes the team members' time. Punctuality in arriving in class should also be stressed as the discussion should not be disrupted once it has started.

As outlined above, the first task is to choose a chairperson and a recorder/spokesperson. These functions should be rotated weekly to provide equal opportunities for all students.

In a collaborative learning session time is of the essence. Groups have to be told at the beginning of the period how many minutes are allotted to the discussion of the translation of a specific passage in order to leave enough time for the plenary discussion. The length of the passage is determined by the

instructor according to the degree of difficulty of the chosen text, but generally the excerpt has to be just a few lines long to allow for in-depth discussion. If a longer text is chosen, the rest can be discussed during subsequent classes. The importance of the time factor cannot be underestimated and students will have to be reminded not to stray from the topic they are discussing.

By the time students are ready to start collaborative sessions they know what kind of translation is expected from them. They are aware that the first step is to understand the original meaning of the source text, that is to say the message intended by the author, and then to transpose it into the target language so that it sound most natural to native speakers, without adding to or subtracting from it and keeping the same register.

The chairperson, therefore, asks each team member for his or her translation of each translation unit. An orderly discussion takes place at the level of lexis or terminology, syntax and word order, with participants being required to justify their interpretation of the source text and their translation. The chairperson then summarizes discussion and reads out the translation on which a consensus has been reached and which aims at being as faithful and accurate as possible and at soundly natural the target language.

During the period set aside for the plenary discussion, at least two different models can be used. The instructor may act as a moderator, inviting the spokespersons for each team to present the translation on which their group has decided. A general discussion chaired by the instructor ensues, at the end of which a consensus is reached by all the groups. An alternative is to have the

spokesperson of one of the teams act as the moderator, first presenting his/her group's version and leading the discussion. As the discussion progresses, the quality of the proposed translation improve: from the first level of individual translations to the ones arrived at by the various teams and finally the one on which the whole class has agreed.

For variety, an attempt was made to adapt the jigsaw method (Aronson, 1978; Slavin, 1980): the source text (see Appendix A) was divided into segments (usually translation units) that were discussed and translated by representatives from each group. These students then reported back to their original teams on the segments that had been discussed. During the next class the translated segments were pieced together by the groups so as to form cohesive and coherent translation. The experiment was only partly successful for a number of reasons. First, it proved difficult to divide the source text into adequate segments that could be evenly distributed among the groups. Second, when the students returned to their original teams the process of assembling the translations of the various segments proved to be very time consuming, as sometimes the discussion would start all over again on how to translate a particular segment. There were also organizational problems, particularly because some students were absent for either the first or second classes where the jigsaw method was introduced. Finally, some groups were made up of fewer students than others, and those groups could not be represented for the discussion of particular segments. In spite of those difficulties, some of which may be resolved in future attempts, most of the students commented that they found the experiment both enjoyable and worthwhile as it

presented a challenge and afforded them with the opportunity of working with members of other teams.

3.3.6. Group Assignments Done Collaboratively

One assignment per semester out of three was done collaboratively, and each student received the same grade as his/her team members. Some dissatisfaction was expressed at first because students were concerned that their grade would be lower than if they had worked on their own or that someone else would get the benefit of their work. This problem can be alleviated if students handing in their group translation have to specify their role in its elaboration and if a percentage of the grade is assigned by the team members themselves as suggested by Conway, Kember, Swan, and Wu (1993). Some students also found it difficult to meet with their group outside class time and because of this, they requested that one class be devoted to the discussion by the groups of the translation that was to be done collectively. In the end, however most of them realized the advantages of working together on an assignment and indeed, in a class of 29 students, all but one obtained higher grades on their group translations than on all other papers prepared individually. Two students during the first semester and only one during the second chose not to participate in group in discussions for the assignments and were allowed to hand in their own translations.

The grading system for the group assignments was the same as for individual ones: while spelling mistakes, clumsy renderings, grammatical errors, misunderstandings of the source text, incoherence, and so forth, were counted negatively, good translations of particular portions of the text would be rewarded and cause negative points to be cancelled accordingly.

3.3.7. The Diary Kept During Group Discussions in a Translation Course

As part of the course work students were also required to keep a diary in which they would record what they had learned during each group discussion regarding vocabulary, grammar, translation problems, and so on. They were also expected to comment on the discussion itself, as well as the contributions and attitudes of the participants, including their own. One student found this exercises boring, but most of the others found it beneficial. On the one hand, they were forced to take more accurate and comprehensive notes; on the other, there were metacognitive benefits to be reaped from having to review their notes and to reflect on particular points as well as to assimilate new elements.

Suggestions were also made for improving future discussions. For the instructor who read and graded the diary, it provided useful feedback regarding students' opinions of the method, both in positive and negative terms that led to feelings of satisfaction and at the same time to a search for possible remedies where necessary.

3.3.8. The Role of the Instructor in Collaborative Learning

The main role of the instructor in this student-centred approach is that of organizer and facilitator. Some instructors teaching subjects other than languages even find their students prefer them not to interfere at all in their collaborative learning efforts: Huber (1991) felt that the method had been a lesson in humility for him because he had discovered that he could be dispensed with. However, the present writer was asked by her students to circulate from group to group and take part in their discussions. Because some students might have found the presence of the teacher intimidating, great care was taken to give advice as tactfully as possible, and in keeping with the philosophy of collaborative learning, not to behave as if the teacher was only source of knowledge.

3.3.9. Evaluation of the Collaborative Method as Applied to Translation

Although no scientific or statistical evaluation of the method was conducted, comments made by students in their diaries speak for themselves. A summary of their comments is given below, and it is interesting to note that their awareness of the benefits to be reaped from the used of the method coincides with research findings reported in the literature (for instance, Bejarano, 1987; Gunderson & Johnson, 1980; Long & Porter, 1985; McGroarty, 1983).

On a personal level, students expressed satisfaction with being able to share their difficulties with others. They saw that if their team-mates could overcome translation problems and produce successful translations, there was no reason why they themselves should not be able to. This in turn helped their self-esteem, their self-confidence, and their morale. They also found it less stressful to present their tentative translations to a small group they felt comfortable with rather than to the whole class.

This applied particularly to shy individuals who could really achieve their potential after a few sessions in what they termed “a non-threatening atmosphere.” Participants were also better able to accept criticism of their translation if it came from fellow students because they knew that they themselves had the right to criticize others.

On a social level, collaborative learning raised the level of tolerance and acceptance of other people’s viewpoints. It forced students to compromise, a skill routinely required in real life situations. It increased their sense of responsibility as they realized that the final product depended on each group member’s efforts. It also enabled participants to make friends. Many of them stressed that university life can be very solitary, and this course, thanks to the collaborative-learning method, alleviated their feeling of isolation.

On an academic level, there were gains in achievement in conformity with Johnson and Johnson’s findings of ‘considerable evidence that cooperative learning experiences promote higher achievement than do competitive and individualistic experiences’ (1985, p. 104). The method certainly enhanced the

students' translation skills. The collaborative learning method greatly helped comprehension of the source text, as students were able to explain to each other the meaning of any elements which was not clear in a way that would not have been possible had they worked individually. They also had to go into finer details of meaning, nuances and subtleties which they might have missed by themselves. In the same way, it improved the rendering of the source text into the target language as group members were able to pool their resources and draw upon each participant's individual strengths.

The students found this method of translation , where the meaning of the text was first elucidated collectively and then all team members joined forces in order to produce the best target-language text possible, much more interesting than just looking words up in the dictionary and stringing the equivalent terms together. This was an interactive method (Kramsch, 1987; Rivers, 1987), in which everybody participated, that really worked. Translation, which can be a rather dry process and, just like university life itself, a solitary one, came alive with the use of the collaborative learning method.

4.0. Tools for Evaluating Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning encourages cooperation across racial lines, equal-status roles for students of different races, and the communication of teacher support for interracial contact. Allport (1954), in a recently proposed instructional model for diverse populations, the authors claimed that the lecture-dominated format of traditional college classrooms could be interpreted as a form of discrimination against populations who

maintain cooperative social values (Obler, Arnold, Sigala, & Umbdenstock, 1991). In the Obler et al. study, minority students were seen to learn more effectively from the group-oriented focus as compared with the traditional individual-achievement orientation. In addition, when working in a diverse group, students have the potential to gain cross-ethnic friendships. This could have very positive social implications for future academic and professional group skills, which applies to ethnic diversity as well as other types of student diversity (age, religion, background, etc.). Therefore, it is very important that instructors make their best effort to include a diversity of students in each group to maximize the potential for these cross-ethnic relationships to occur.

In the best cooperative learning situation, the members of a learning group should benefit in several ways. Typically, an instructor who chooses to use this method may not only have a learning goal that is domain-specific for the course, but also hopes that in the process of trying to attain this goal, the students will acquire new strategies and knowledge. By dividing the class into groups, a new social context is created whereby students have the opportunity to share individual cognitions with their peers and come to a conclusion based on the sum of these cognitions. A group that contains diverse members has the benefit of exposure to different ideas and the challenge of incorporating these ideas into the cognitive process of the group. One can think of the source of benefits for cooperative learning in two ways: benefits related to the instructional method, and benefits associated with the instructor-guided learning process.

4.1. Cooperative Learning as an Instructional Method

Cooperative learning is most likely to be used in courses where there is a focus on problem solving or in which the topic lends itself to discussion or active learning. The key variable for effective group work, among others, is that students must work together to reach a common goal in order to increase the likelihood of success. Variables that describe important characteristics of a successful group include: the goals of the group, individual accountability of each group member, and the formation of the group (Lindauer and Petrie, 1997). Although the instructor develops an overarching objective for the group, the group itself should still develop its own "team goals." The team goals should be agreed upon by all members of the group and each individual member must contribute his or her own successes to the success of the group in order to maximize the learning potential of the entire group (Cooper, Robinson, & McKinney, 1994). This is where individual accountability becomes key; if students are motivated themselves and are invested in the success of the group, they will be more likely to encourage success and motivation among other members of the group. This can be encouraged with effective monitoring by the instructor, who ensures that students are engaged in the group process by contributing their individual opinions and ideas (Courtney, Courtney, Nicholson, 1994).

The instructor's role in encouraging the success of the long-term group goes beyond establishing the group's overarching goal, assembling the groups, and assessing group performance. The instructor must use certain strategies to implement the type of group, such as long-term or short-term groups, and the group technique (Cooper, Robinson, & McKinney, 1994). Typically, groups formed for clear, short-term goals do

not need as much structure as those formed for semester-long projects or long-term goals determined by the instructor. It is in the instructor's best interest to form small, heterogeneous groups based on ability, motivation, sex, age, and race for long-term projects (which are what we were most interested in) (Slavin, 1995). A variety of group-work application techniques currently exist in the cooperative learning literature, including STAD (student teams achievement division), jigsaw, constructive controversy, and group investigation. Once the instructor has established the method of group work, the method of assessment should reflect the achievement of the group and its individual members. It is also important to explain to the groups why this method was chosen. For example, a teacher may emphasize that the group grade will be criterion-referenced as opposed to norm-referenced to discourage competition between groups.

One of the main reasons an instructor would choose group work as an instructional method is that group work provides a positive opportunity for students during the course and may have long-term academic effects for those students in their future classes. For instance, research demonstrates that if a group is effective in meeting its goals, there is a range of benefits to be had by the students who participate, including increased feelings of support, motivation, self-efficacy, sense of social cohesiveness, and reduction in anxiety (Courtney, Courtney, & Nicholson, 1994). Nelson (1994) concurs that group work is important for encouraging motivation and a sense of support, but most importantly he believes that group work can be used as a tool to foster what he calls, "real learning." He claims it is not enough that students work together, but they must develop their ideas collectively with preparation, cognitive structuring, and role structuring. It is critical that the instructor facilitates this process, because if it does not occur, the purpose of establishing the group in the first place is lost.

4.2. Cognitive Processes in a Social Context

According to Ickes, Bissonnette, Garcia, and Stinson (1990), coordinated cognitive activity depends on inter-subjectivity: a shared understanding among group members of what is being worked on. In the case of cooperative teaming, the instructor is responsible for setting up a problem so that inter-subjectivity can be reached even before the process of problem solving begins. Once initial understanding of the problem has been reached, what the instructor inherently hopes will come out of the problem solving process are socially shared cognitions.

Traditionally, individual cognitions have been the subject of educational and psychological research. Some progress has been made in the recent development of social perspective theorists, who have accepted the role of social and cultural contexts on individual cognition (Reynolds, Sinatra, & Jetton, 1996). These theories can be traced back to Vygotsky (1978) who was the first to postulate that social experience can shape the cognitive processes of individuals in a learning situation. However, even social perspective theories are focused on cognitive processes of individuals within a context and not necessarily on the cognitive process of group interaction. Levine and Resnick (1993) challenge the idea that cognition is exclusively an individual act, as psychologists have assumed, but rather that cognitive and social aspects of working in a group are somehow fused together. Resnick (1991), who agrees with other social perspective theorists that learning occurs through the mediation of social interaction, takes it a step further by assuming that the product of interaction cannot be associated with the cognition of just one member, but with

the shared cognitions constructed from all group members. Therefore, diverse groups in cooperative learning situations seem very relevant to the idea of socially shared cognitions, since members of a diverse group can be both challenged and benefit from exposure to differing viewpoints.

4.3. Diversity Issues in Cooperative Group Work

Slavin (1995) states that "Cooperative-learning methods explicitly use the strength of the desegregated school to enhance inter-group relations and other outcomes" because it satisfies the role of equality originally advocated by Allport (1954). Cooperative learning can provide cooperation across racial lines, equal-status roles for students of different races, contact across racial lines, and the communication of teacher support for interracial contact. In a recently proposed instructional model for diverse populations, cooperative learning was listed as a way to empower students of all backgrounds and to reinforce learning skills and concepts (Obler, Arnold, Sigala, & Umbdenstock, 1991). Minority students saw additional benefits from participating in groups because group work improved learning. This result seemed most likely because this setting is less individual-achievement oriented and more group –goal oriented.

4.4. Factors of Cooperative Teaching and Learning

A number of factors or essential elements of cooperative teaching and learning, according to Donna Johnson and her colleagues at the University of Arizona. Tucson (1991), who have conducted extensive research concerning effect group management, are necessary to make cooperative learning successful.

The first factor, *positive interdependence*, means that each group member depends upon every other group member to achieve a goal. If other members have little or nothing to contribute then there is no reason for the group to exist.

One way to structure an assignment to foster a positive interdependent relationship is to give the students more work to do than any single individual could complete within the time limits allotted. Another way to encourage interdependence is to provide specific information to two of the group members and different information to other two members. This, two of the members will depend upon the information possessed by the other two members.

The second factor needed to make cooperative learning successful is *face-to-face promotive interaction*. Promotive interaction occurs as student encourage each other, reward one another, provide assistance to help each other learn, exchange information ideas and challenge ideas of other group members. This may be accomplished through trusting and caring relationship formed within each group as students interact. If one student attempts to impress other students with his or her knowledge to increase his or her self-esteem positive interaction does not occur.

Individual students must learn that they are responsible for understanding the course content. This is the third factor, referred to as *individual accountability*. The teacher may call at random upon individual students to answer questions. Also, individual tests are given periodically to evaluate students' achievement. Inevitably, some students exploit the group structure to avoid working and let the others do the bulk of the work. This behavior is called "social loafing". Group members can monitor individual accountability by constructing quizzes of each group member's contribution during a cooperative learning assignment. The important point is that there must be a system to continually assess each student's knowledge and contribution to insure that learning is occurring.

Building social *collaborative skills* is the fourth salient factor. We cannot assume that each student possesses well developed interpersonal and group communication skills. A large proportion of students have not had the experience of working with other students in small group activities. Some students distrust others: some feel uncomfortable working with minority students. Others, to avoid verbal interaction with peers, prefer to listen rather than participate, especially when they are among aggressive peers.

The cooperative learning environment, if well organized, provides an opportunity for students to grow socially and learn effective group communication skills. The importance of mastering these skills is undeniable. If one of the most important missions of the school is to help students develop wisdom, then certainly helping them to acquire effective interactive social skills is an important activity. Teachers should encourage students to develop these skills by

identifying, explaining and rewarding students for engaging in effective social interaction activities. Skills such as active listening, turn-taking, offering constructive and encouraging criticism, showing concern for the feelings of others and actively participating in group discussions are but a few important skills students must learn by participating in a promotive interactive framework.

David Johnson and Roger Johnson (1989) report research findings showing that the combination of positive interdependence and the use of effective social skills promote highest achievement among students within a cooperative learning environment

The last factor, *group processing*, describes the group's self-evaluation of each member's contribution. Individual contributions either help or hinder achievement of the desired goals. Group processing also includes an analysis of improvements that could be made to help the group function more effectively in the future. A combination of teacher and student processing results in significant improvement and success within a cooperative learning format. Student interactive evaluations provide a way to maintain good working relationships among group members and ensure that individual members receive feedback about the quality of their participation. Group processing also occurs when the instructor provides feedback to the class based on observations of individual student contributions. This processing serves as a model for students who are learning how to critique peers effectively. Positive feedback for work well done creates a feeling of enthusiasm, of being successful and of increased self-esteem among students.

It is not possible to incorporate all these factors within each group encounter but the greater the number of features used, the greater the learning. Cooperative learning fosters growth in many areas: learning to use interpersonal skills effectively, understanding and applying the course content to life situations, developing self-structured small group cooperative activities. However they are sufficient to distinguish positively the cooperative learning paradigm from the traditional individualistic and competitive “lecture only” teaching. Johnson and Johnson (1989) report that in almost every study conducted during this century that compares the effectiveness of cooperative and competitive learning formats, the cooperative model results in higher achievement and greater productivity, more caring committed interpersonal relationships, greater psychological health and social competence.

4.5. Cooperative Language Learning

In her book *Second Language Learning through Cooperative Learning*, Julie High (1993) reports her discovery that effective language learning depends on structuring social interaction in the target language. We have always believed that memorizing conjugations, grammar structures and vocabulary produces at best some knowledge about a language. Knowledge about a language, however, is very different from acquiring the language.

Julie High describes a number of classroom activities, which structure social interaction in the classroom. They are based on a simple formula:

Structure + Content = Activity

In fact, Julie High adapts Spencer Kagan's original ideas about cooperative learning structures which he calls "co-op structures" in his book, *Cooperative Learning* (1992) published by his Californian company, Kagan Cooperative Learning Co. Several such participation structures, we have been using in our language classes. Our students love them, confiding that achievement should not be divorced from enjoyment (Julie High).

4-S Brainstorming. This structure is based on speed, synergy, silliness and support. The class is divided into teams of four students. Each team's number has a special role to facilitate the creative potential of brainstorming and has a phrase to say in the target language that encourages her or his partners:

- Speed: "Let's hurry!"
- Synergy: "Let's build on that!"
- Silly: "Let's get crazy!"
- Support: "All ideas help!"

Students brainstorm an idea for a while and then all teams' pair up and interview each other.

Pairs Check. Teams break into two sets of pairs each of which works on worksheet. One student is the problem solver and the other one is the coach. The coach helps and checks his or her partner's work. After a while, the team disagrees, they ask the teacher to help them. If the team agrees on the answer,

they do a team handshake. Pairs Check is a particularly good structure for practicing new skills.

Numbered Heads Together. This is a four-step cooperative structure, which can be used with any language teaching content and at various places in a lesson:

1. Students number off,
2. Teacher asks a question,
3. Heads together,
4. Teacher calls a number,

Each student on a team has a different number. He or she will answer to that number when it is called. The teacher formulates a question as a directive, e.g. “Make sure everyone on your team can...” The students put their heads together and discuss the question until everyone knows the answer. After a while, the teacher will call a number at random and the students with that number raise their hands to be called upon, as in the traditional classroom.

CHAPTER III

5.0. THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

5.1. The Research Questions

5. What are the perceptions of the students majoring at E.L.T departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses?
6. What are the perceptions of the lecturers and instructors of English teaching at E.L.T departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses?
7. Are there any distinctive and remarkable differences among the perceptions of the students majoring and lecturers teaching at E.L.T departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses?
8. According to the gender variations, are there any distinctive and remarkable differences between male and female students majoring at E.L.T departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses?

5.2. Methodology

Model

The study has been carried out by using the survey model.

The Population and Sample

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University has been chosen as the population of the study and the third and fourth-year Turkish university students and the lecturers teaching at E.L.T department of the Faculty of Education have been the subjects and samples of this study.

English language courses offered at COMU emphasize reading and writing skills, and include a strong grammatical component vocabulary enrichment being stressed mostly in the third and fourth years of the program. As the students have previously had no systematic training in translation and some have had no exposure to translation at all, the senior students who have been majoring English at advanced level to be teachers of English at secondary school in Turkey have been chosen as the samples of the this study.

Gathering The Research Data

A Likert-Scale Measurement that consists of six attitudes and a Topic Familiarity Questionnaire including a hundred of question items have been made

use of gathering the research data, and this questionnaire has been administered to the eleven lecturers and fifty-six students at random.

The Analysis and Comment of the Data

The numerical data such as frequency and percentage have been analyzed by using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) and T-test has been run to analyze the research data. The frequency, percentage and arithmetic average have been used towards the first and second sub-aims and the “T” test has been used towards the third and fourth sub-aims. The research data have been made table and analyzed. The computer SPSS (Statistical Packet for Social Sciences) program has been made useful in data analysis.

5.3. A Translation Methodology: A Cooperative Work Procedure

(By Prof. Constanza Gerding- Salas)

My experience in the field of translation training has given me some useful hints on how to elaborate a translation methodology with undergraduate students who want to become translators. This approach attempts to develop some workshop activities for the translation process- as a cooperative activity with the students- through a graded and sequential procedure. We must assume that students have sound linguistic knowledge, both theoretical and practical, and a wide cultural bilingual background, achieved during their first years in college.

This methodology, consisting of a step-by-step procedure workshop, (stages may sometimes be sequential and successive, sometimes, alternated) has proven quite successful in my classes in terms of students' motivation, productivity and the quality of their work. However, I do think that this methodology can be improved.

1. The teacher makes a selection of the material to translated. Text must be chosen according to previously defined objectives for translation practice, taking into account the degree of difficulty of the texts (semantic, cultural, stylistic, etc.), the topic or the specific knowledge area (science and technology; social, institutional, economic and/ or political topics; and literary or philosophical works), the translation problems to be solved, and so on.
2. After browsing through the text (scan reading and/or skim reading), the students, assisted by their teacher, should identify the source, the norm. It is a kind of game of the imagination in which the text is real but the client and her/his needs are imaginary.
3. The students should read the whole text at least twice: The fist reading will be comprehensive and general, to become acquainted with the topic and to understand to original, always bearing in mind that meaning is context-determined.

4. The second reading must be a “deep” reading, placing emphasis on items where translation problems may appear. In other words, this is what I have called “reading with translation intention,” i.e. doing pre-editing and assessing the quality of the writing (Reminder: Not all texts are well written). In my opinion, when translating into the TL, if the translator detects mistakes (usually due to misprints) in the original text, s/he should be entitled to amend them in her/his version if too obvious or else consult the client or an expert in case of doubt. When doing this “reading with translation intention,” students should first underline unknown terms and then they should mentally confront potential translation difficulties in the text with suitable translation procedures.

5. The teacher then divides the text into as many segments as students in the group. Depending on the degree of difficulty and the length of the text, these segments may be paragraphs, columns, pages or even whole chapters. Then, each student is assigned a fair portion of the text.

6. If the topic is already quite familiar to the students, they do a preliminary translation. As this is the first approach to the text, it will probably lack naturalness, since students tend to transfer SL units of translation to TL units of translation (“one-to-one translation,” Newmark, 1995a). This first approach can often be made orally and suggested annotations may be written in the margins.

7. If the topic is completely unknown to the students, they should consult complementary literature. In other words, before beginning the transfer process, they should resort to various documentation sources, especially parallel texts (those which are similar in nature and style) in the language of the original. This allows them to achieve a deeper understanding of the topic under study.
8. Once the “one-to-one” version is accomplished, the students do a second version of their own translation – this time a written draft – handling the most suitable translation strategies and procedures and being faithful in the transfer of ideas.
9. With the original text in front of her/him and being careful to follow the same correlative order of the SL text, each student reads out her/his own version of the translated text, making the necessary pauses between sentences.
10. The students and the teacher follow the reading of each text attentively.
11. During this procedure, the students and the teacher need to set up all necessary conventions with regard to the homogeneity of the terms and the coherence and cohesion of the final version.
12. As Newmark states, “translation is for discussion” (Newmark, 1995b). Students should then be encouraged to take notes and discuss the (in) convenience of the

contributions and comments arising from this analytical reading of each one of the different versions proposed.

13.As a metacognitive activity, the students, assisted by the teacher, analyze the translation strategies and procedures used, and discuss the reasons taken into account in the choice of each analyzed criterion: “The ability to discuss translation in an objective way is central to a translator’s competence”, (Kusssmaul, 1995).

14.The students hand in the final version of their revised and post-edited segments, which have already been amended in the light of the whole text. The work must be typed, double-spaced and paged according to the original.

15.The teacher makes a final revision (second post-edit), gives formative evaluation and makes “happy” solutions and creative acts, on the one hand, and analyzes failures and weaknesses in the process, on the other.

5.3.1. Profile of the Students

The teacher is understood as a facilitator of the translation task, since the lion's share of the transfer process is accomplished by the students, mainly collectively, but also individually. I therefore consider it valid for students to consult all possible information sources, including the traditional written forms, the "live" sources or informants, e.g. Their own teacher (the "client," in the case), experts in the topic, native speakers, translation software, term data bases to be efficiently carried out, the following minimum conditions should be met:

- Sound linguistic training in the SL and the TL
- Knowledge covering a wide cultural spectrum
- High reading comprehension competence and permanent interest in reading
- Adequate use of translation procedures and strategies
- Adequate management of documentation sources
- Improvement capacity and constant interest in learning
- Initiative, creativity, honesty and perseverance
- Accuracy, truthfulness, patience and dedication
- Capacity for analysis and self-criticism
- Ability to maintain constructive interpersonal relationships

- Capacity to develop team work
- Efficient data processing training at user's level
- Acquaintance with translation software for MT and MT edition

In sum, translators must understand the original text, for which they must have wide general knowledge, handle the vocabulary of the topic in the SL as well as in the TL and, last but not least, write their own language well (Orellana, 1994).

5.3.2. Profile of the Educator

The following minimum conditions should be met:

- Sound knowledge of the SL and the TL, translation theory, transfer procedures, cognition and methodology
- Comprehension of what translation is and how it occurs (Bell, 1994)
- Permanent interest in reading various kinds of texts
- Ability to communicate ideas clearly, empathically and openly
- Ability to work out synthesis and interrelationship of ideas
- Capacity to create, foster and maintain a warm work environment, "an atmosphere of sympathetic encouragement" (Kussmaul, 1995)
- Capacity to foster search and research critical and analytical capacity
- Clear assessment criteria

5.3.3. The Infrastructure

- Terminological resources (tools to save time and to make translation more profitable): Monolingual and bilingual dictionaries, specialized dictionaries, encyclopedias, glossaries, various texts on translation theory and practice, access to international data processing nets, informants, expert and other sources.
- International collaboration via congresses, symposia, seminars, conferences, inquires through international nets, etc.
- PCs, translation software, printers and printing material, term data bases.
- Appropriate environment: The right place and enough time for reflection: Ideally, a translation laboratory.

CHAPTER IV

6.0. THE FINDINGS TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In this chapter, the findings have been dealt with the results of the questionnaire as parallel to the research questions of the study.

6.1. The First Research Question and Findings

What are the viewpoints of the lecturers teaching at E.L.T departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses?

The viewpoints of the lecturers teaching at English Language Teaching (E.L.T) departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses have been graded under the six attitudes according to the Likert Rating Scale (1= strongly disagree, 2= moderately disagree, 3= slightly disagree, 4= slightly agree, 5= moderately agree, 6= strongly agree). The analyses of the frequency (f) and percentage (%) of the responses that the lecturers have given within the framework of each response choice have been shown at Table 1.

Table 1: The views of the lecturers teaching at English Language Teaching (E.L.T) departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses.

	6		5		4		3		2		1	
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	3	27,3	3	27,3	1	9,1	0	0,0	2	18,2	2	18,2
2	2	18,2	4	36,4	2	18,2	1	9,1	2	18,2	0	0,0
3	1	9,1	3	27,3	2	18,2	4	36,4	0	0,0	1	9,1
4	3	27,3	3	27,3	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0
5	4	36,4	4	36,4	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
6	1	9,1	5	45,5	1	9,1	2	18,2	2	18,2	0	0,0
7	3	27,3	4	36,4	2	18,2	1	9,1	1	9,1	0	0,0
8	3	27,3	2	18,2	2	18,2	0	0,0	2	18,2	2	18,2
9	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1	2	18,2	3	27,3	1	9,1
10	2	18,2	1	9,1	4	36,4	2	18,2	2	18,2	0	0,0
11	5	45,5	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0	0	0,0	3	27,3
12	4	36,4	4	36,4	0	0,0	1	9,1	2	18,2	0	0,0
13	3	27,3	4	36,4	2	18,2	2	18,2	0	0,0	0	0,0
14	0	0,0	2	18,2	6	54,5	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0
15	3	27,3	1	9,1	0	0,0	5	45,5	2	18,2	0	0,0
16	3	27,3	3	27,3	1	9,1	2	18,2	2	18,2	0	0,0
17	1	9,1	3	27,3	4	36,4	1	9,1	2	18,2	0	0,0
18	3	27,3	1	9,1	0	0,0	3	27,3	3	27,3	1	9,1
19	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1	2	18,2	3	27,3	1	9,1
20	2	20	2	18,2	1	18,2	4	9,1	1	36,4	1	9,1
21	0	0,0	4	36,4	3	27,3	2	18,2	0	0,0	0	0,0
22	2	18,2	2	18,2	0	0,0	5	45,5	0	0,0	0	0,0
23	1	9,1	3	27,3	2	18,2	1	9,1	2	18,2	0	0,0
24	1	9,1	1	9,1	2	18,2	1	9,1	2	18,2	2	18,2
25	2	18,2	0	0,0	2	18,2	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1
26	0	0,0	0	0,0	3	27,3	3	27,3	3	27,3	0	0,0
27	1	9,1	0	0,0	2	18,2	2	18,2	2	18,2	2	18,2
28	2	18,2	0	0,0	3	27,3	1	9,1	1	9,1	2	18,2
29	3	27,3	0	0,0	3	27,3	1	9,1	0	0,0	2	18,2
30	3	27,3	2	18,2	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	18,2	2	18,2
31	1	9,1	2	18,2	1	9,1	1	9,1	2	18,2	2	18,2
32	3	27,3	2	18,2	0	0,0	0	0,0	4	36,4	0	0,0
33	1	9,1	4	36,4	1	9,1	1	9,1	2	18,2	0	0,0
34	2	18,2	1	9,1	4	36,4	2	18,2	0	0,0	0	0,0
35	1	9,1	2	18,2	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1	1	9,1
36	2	18,2	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1	2	18,2	0	0,0
37	1	9,1	5	45,5	1	9,1	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	18,2

38	2	18,2	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1	2	18,2	0	0,0
39	3	27,3	1	9,1	2	18,2	1	9,1	2	18,2	0	0,0
40	3	27,3	3	27,3	0	0,0	3	27,3	1	9,1	0	0,0
41	3	27,3	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0	3	27,3	0	0,0
42	2	18,2	3	27,3	3	27,3	1	9,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
43	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1	4	36,4	0	0,0	0	0,0
44	3	27,3	2	18,2	0	0,0	3	27,3	1	9,1	0	0,0
45	2	18,2	3	27,3	0	0,0	2	18,2	2	18,2	0	0,0
46	3	27,3	1	9,1	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0
47	2	18,2	3	27,3	1	9,1	3	27,3	0	0,0	0	0,0
48	1	9,1	3	27,3	2	18,2	3	27,3	0	0,0	0	0,0
49	0	0,0	6	54,5	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
50	2	18,2	3	27,3	2	18,2	1	9,1	1	9,1	0	0,0
51	1	9,1	4	36,4	2	18,2	0	0,0	2	18,2	0	0,0
52	2	18,2	0	0,0	4	36,4	1	9,1	2	18,2	0	0,0
53	1	9,1	1	9,1	3	27,3	1	9,1	3	27,3	0	0,0
54	0	0,0	3	27,3	2	18,2	2	18,2	2	18,2	0	0,0
55	1	9,1	3	27,3	4	36,4	1	9,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
56	3	27,3	0	0,0	2	18,2	4	36,4	0	0,0	0	0,0
57	2	18,2	2	18,2	2	18,2	0	0,0	2	18,2	1	9,1
58	2	18,2	2	18,2	0	0,0	5	45,5	0	0,0	0	0,0
59	1	9,1	2	18,2	1	9,1	4	36,4	0	0,0	1	9,1
60	1	9,1	3	27,3	0	0,0	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1
61	1	9,1	0	0,0	2	18,2	3	27,3	2	18,2	1	9,1
62	1	9,1	3	27,3	0	0,0	3	27,3	1	9,1	1	9,1
63	4	36,4	0	0,0	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0
64	3	27,3	1	9,1	2	18,2	3	27,3	0	0,0	0	0,0
65	4	36,4	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0	1	9,1	1	9,1
66	2	18,2	1	9,1	3	27,3	1	9,1	1	9,1	1	9,1
67	0	0,0	1	9,1	4	36,4	4	36,4	0	0,0	0	0,0
68	1	9,1	2	18,2	1	9,1	2	18,2	3	27,3	0	0,0
69	2	18,2	0	0,0	1	9,1	4	36,4	2	18,2	0	0,0
70	2	18,2	3	27,3	0	0,0	2	18,2	1	9,1	1	9,1
71	4	36,4	0	0,0	2	18,2	1	9,1	1	9,1	1	9,1
72	2	18,2	2	18,2	3	27,3	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	18,2
73	2	18,2	3	27,3	1	9,1	1	9,1	0	0,0	2	18,2
74	2	18,2	3	27,3	2	18,2	0	0,0	0	0,0	2	18,2
75	1	9,1	2	18,2	3	27,3	0	0,0	3	27,3	0	0,0
76	3	27,3	0	0,0	3	27,3	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0

77	2	18,2	3	27,3	1	9,1	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0
78	2	18,2	3	27,3	1	9,1	3	27,3	0	0,0	0	0,0
79	2	18,2	3	27,3	0	0,0	3	27,3	1	9,1	0	0,0
80	1	9,1	2	18,2	2	18,2	2	18,2	2	18,2	0	0,0
81	1	9,1	2	18,2	3	27,3	3	27,3	0	0,0	0	0,0
82	2	18,2	3	27,3	0	0,0	2	18,2	2	18,2	0	0,0
83	1	9,1	4	36,4	1	9,1	3	27,3	0	0,0	0	0,0
84	2	18,2	1	9,1	1	9,1	3	27,3	2	18,2	0	0,0
85	3	27,3	2	18,2	1	9,1	3	27,3	0	0,0	0	0,0
86	3	27,3	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1	1	9,1	0	0,0
87	2	18,2	3	27,3	1	9,1	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0
88	4	36,4	1	9,1	1	9,1	3	27,3	0	0,0	0	0,0
89	2	18,2	3	27,3	2	18,2	1	9,1	1	9,1	0	0,0
90	3	27,3	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0	2	18,2	3	27,3
91	4	36,4	0	0,0	1	9,1	3	27,3	1	9,1	0	0,0
92	2	18,2	2	18,2	1	9,1	3	27,3	1	9,1	0	0,0
93	3	27,3	4	36,4	1	9,1	1	9,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
94	2	18,2	3	27,3	3	27,3	1	9,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
95	4	36,4	2	18,2	1	9,1	2	18,2	0	0,0	0	0,0
96	3	27,3	2	18,2	1	9,1	2	18,2	1	9,1	0	0,0
97	4	36,4	1	9,1	0	0,0	4	36,4	0	0,0	0	0,0
98	4	36,4	1	9,1	0	0,0	1	9,1	3	27,3	0	0,0
99	3	27,3	4	36,4	1	9,1	1	9,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
100	3	27,3	2	18,2	1	9,1	3	27,3	0	0,0	0	0,0

According to the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items assessing the views of the lecturers teaching at English Language Teaching (E.L.T) departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses, the lecturers have marked the numbers of 5,65,71,88,91,95,97,98 as a response item for mostly “strongly agree”. The frequency (f) and percentage given to these question items are respectively (f) 4 and 36.4%.

The lecturers have marked the number of 49 as a response item for mostly “moderately agree”. The frequency (f) and percentage given to this question item is respectively (f) 6 and 54.5%.

The lecturers have marked the number of 14 as a response item for mostly “slightly agree”. The frequency (f) and percentage given to this question item is respectively (f) 6 and 54.5%.

The lecturers have marked the numbers of 15, 22, 58 as a response item for mostly “slightly disagree”. The frequency (f) and percentage given to this question item is respectively (f) 5 and 45.5%.

The lecturers have marked the number of 32 as a response item for mostly “moderately disagree”. The frequency (f) and percentage given to this question item is respectively (f) 4 and 36.4%.

The lecturers have marked the numbers of 11, 90 as a response item for mostly “strongly disagree”. The frequency (f) and percentage given to these questions items are respectively (f) 3 and 27.3%.

When the arithmetic averages and percentages of each six attitudes scale are compared, a decrease from strongly agree to strongly disagree are seen.

The arithmetic and percentage for the option of “strongly agree” in the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items are respectively 2.14 and 19.47%.

The arithmetic and percentage for the option of “moderately agree” in the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items are respectively 2.17 and 19.74%.

The arithmetic and percentage for the option of “slightly agree” in the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items are respectively 1.61 and 14.65%.

The arithmetic and percentage for the option of “slightly disagree” in the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items are respectively 1.87 and 17.01%.

The arithmetic and percentage for the option of “moderately disagree” in the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items are respectively 1.18 and 10.74%.

The arithmetic and percentage for the option of “strongly disagree” in the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items are respectively 0.46 and 4.18%.

Based on these findings, the lecturers teaching at English Language Teaching (E.L.T) departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses have positive views and additional benefits for useful and improving skills.

6.2. The Second Research Question and Findings

What are the viewpoints of the students majoring at English Language teaching at E.L.T departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses?

The views of the students mastering at English Language Teaching (E.L.T) departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses have been graded under the six attitudes according to the Likert Rating Scale (1= strongly disagree, 2= moderately disagree, 3= slightly disagree, 4= slightly agree, 5= moderately agree, 6= strongly agree). The analyses of the frequency (f) and percentage (%) of the responses that the students have given within the framework of each response choice have been shown at table 2.

Table 2: The views of the students majoring at English Language Teaching (E.L.T) departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses.

	6		5		4		3		2		1	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	16	28,6	31	55,4	7	12,4	1	1,8	1	1,8	0	0,0
2	10	17,9	29	51,8	15	26,8	2	3,6	0	0,0	0	0,0
3	10	17,9	16	28,6	21	37,5	5	8,9	4	7,1	0	0,0
4	26	46,4	18	32,1	9	16,1	2	3,6	0	0,0	0	0,0
5	25	44,6	25	44,6	5	8,9	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	1,8
6	27	48,2	19	33,9	7	12,5	1	1,8	2	3,6	0	0,0
7	21	37,5	27	48,2	6	10,7	2	3,6	0	0,0	0	0,0
8	4	7,1	12	23,2	23	41,1	12	21,4	4	7,1	0	0,0
9	9	16,1	23	41,1	15	26,8	7	12,5	1	1,8	1	1,8
10	17	30,4	21	37,5	14	25,0	2	3,6	1	1,8	1	1,8
11	36	64,3	13	23,2	5	8,9	0	0,0	1	1,8	1	1,8

12	30	53,6	19	33,9	6	10,7	1	1,8	0	0,0	0	0,0
13	20	35,7	25	44,6	9	16,1	1	1,8	1	1,8	0	0,0
14	5	8,9	25	44,6	21	37,5	1	1,8	2	3,6	0	0,0
15	12	21,4	22	39,3	12	21,4	6	10,7	2	3,6	0	0,0
16	21	37,5	15	26,8	12	21,4	7	12,5	0	0,0	1	1,8
17	15	26,8	27	48,2	7	12,5	6	10,7	0	0,0	1	1,8
18	25	44,6	22	39,3	4	7,1	4	7,1	1	1,8	0	0,0
19	20	35,7	22	39,3	8	14,3	5	8,9	1	1,8	0	0,0
20	19	33,9	17	30,4	12	21,4	8	14,3	0	0,0	0	0,0
21	9	16,1	25	44,6	14	25,0	5	8,9	1	1,8	0	0,0
22	12	21,4	26	46,4	15	26,8	3	5,4	0	0,0	0	0,0
23	15	26,8	26	46,4	12	21,4	2	3,6	1	1,8	0	0,0
24	13	23,2	14	25,0	13	23,2	12	21,4	3	5,4	1	1,8
25	2	3,6	4	7,1	12	21,4	14	25,0	13	23,2	11	19,6
26	10	17,9	24	42,9	9	16,1	6	10,7	3	5,4	3	5,4
27	2	3,6	3	5,4	6	10,7	13	23,2	21	37,5	11	19,6
28	4	7,1	1	1,8	4	7,1	10	17,9	14	25,0	23	41,1
29	12	21,4	13	23,2	17	30,4	7	12,5	6	10,7	1	1,8
30	21	37,5	20	35,7	14	25,0	1	1,8	0	0,0	0	0,0
31	22	39,3	16	28,6	12	21,4	3	5,4	1	1,8	2	3,6
32	13	23,2	16	28,6	14	25,0	6	10,7	5	8,9	2	3,6
33	13	23,2	22	39,3	14	25,0	6	10,7	0	0,0	1	1,8
34	12	21,4	20	35,7	16	28,6	6	10,7	2	23,6	0	0,0
35	15	26,8	18	32,1	17	30,4	3	5,4	3	5,4	0	0,0
36	12	21,4	25	44,6	11	19,6	5	8,9	3	5,4	0	0,0
37	25	44,6	22	39,3	7	12,5	2	3,6	0	0,0	0	0,0
38	19	33,9	24	42,9	8	14,3	3	5,4	2	3,6	0	0,0
39	16	28,6	13	23,2	14	25,0	9	16,1	2	3,6	1	1,8
40	13	23,2	22	39,3	17	30,4	4	7,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
41	14	25,0	27	48,2	11	19,6	4	7,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
42	23	41,1	23	41,1	8	14,3	1	1,8	1	1,8	0	0,0
43	17	30,4	28	50,0	9	16,1	1	1,8	1	1,8	0	0,0
44	36	64,3	11	19,6	5	8,9	4	7,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
45	24	42,9	18	32,1	9	16,1	3	5,4	0	0,0	2	3,6
46	16	28,6	18	32,1	16	28,6	4	7,1	2	3,6	0	0,0
47	19	33,9	21	37,5	11	19,6	3	5,4	2	3,6	0	0,0
48	25	44,6	20	35,7	7	12,5	4	7,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
49	8	14,3	34	60,7	11	19,6	3	5,4	0	0,0	0	0,0
50	35	62,5	14	25,0	7	12,5	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
51	10	17,9	32	57,1	10	17,9	2	3,6	1	1,8	0	0,0

52	19	33,9	21	37,5	12	21,4	3	5,4	1	1,8	0	0,0
53	17	30,4	22	39,3	11	19,6	3	5,4	3	5,4	0	0,0
54	13	23,2	64	60,7	6	10,7	3	5,4	0	0,0	0	0,0
55	21	37,5	22	39,3	9	16,1	4	7,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
56	20	35,7	22	39,3	8	14,3	6	10,7	0	0,0	0	0,0
57	18	32,1	24	42,9	11	19,6	2	3,6	1	1,8	0	0,0
58	13	23,2	20	35,7	15	26,8	6	10,7	1	1,8	0	0,0
59	10	17,9	9	16,1	12	21,4	7	12,5	12	21,4	6	10,7
60	15	26,8	20	35,7	9	16,1	7	12,5	5	8,9	0	0,0
61	14	25,0	16	28,6	13	23,2	6	10,7	3	5,4	4	7,1
62	32	57,1	18	32,1	4	7,1	1	1,8	1	1,8	0	0,0
63	45	80,4	7	12,5	2	3,6	1	1,8	0	0,0	1	1,8
64	42	75,0	12	21,4	1	1,8	1	1,8	0	0,0	0	0,0
65	41	73,2	11	19,6	2	3,6	2	3,6	0	0,0	0	0,0
66	13	23,2	13	23,2	13	23,2	10	17,9	4	7,1	3	5,4
67	12	21,4	25	44,6	15	26,8	3	5,4	0	0,0	0	0,0
68	29	51,8	19	33,9	7	12,5	0	0,0	1	1,8	0	0,0
69	17	30,4	15	26,8	10	17,9	6	10,7	6	10,7	2	3,6
70	14	25,0	20	35,7	13	25,2	5	8,9	3	5,4	0	0,0
71	22	39,3	25	44,6	5	8,9	3	5,4	1	1,8	0	0,0
72	16	28,6	22	39,3	15	26,8	3	5,4	0	0,0	0	0,0
73	19	33,9	25	44,6	6	10,7	5	8,9	1	1,8	0	0,0
74	22	39,3	19	33,9	9	16,1	5	8,9	0	0,0	1	1,8
75	39	69,6	14	25,0	2	3,6	0	0,0	1	1,8	0	0,0
76	15	26,8	19	33,9	14	25,0	6	10,7	2	3,6	0	0,0
77	22	39,3	18	32,1	8	14,3	3	5,4	4	7,1	1	1,8
78	36	64,3	16	28,6	2	3,6	1	1,8	0	0,0	1	1,8
79	31	55,4	20	35,7	4	7,1	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	1,8
80	29	51,8	23	41,1	3	5,4	0	0,0	1	1,8	0	0,0
81	14	25,0	23	41,1	15	26,8	3	5,4	0	0,0	1	1,8
82	28	50,0	18	32,1	6	10,7	3	5,4	1	1,8	0	0,0
83	18	32,1	25	44,6	10	17,9	3	5,4	0	0,0	0	0,0
84	28	50,0	19	33,9	6	10,7	3	5,4	0	0,0	0	0,0
85	15	26,8	25	44,6	11	19,8	4	7,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
86	20	35,7	19	33,9	12	21,4	4	7,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
87	22	39,3	20	35,7	11	19,6	1	1,8	0	0,0	0	0,0
88	26	46,4	19	33,9	8	14,3	2	3,6	0	0,0	0	0,0
89	20	35,7	24	42,9	6	10,7	4	7,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
90	34	60,7	12	21,4	7	12,5	2	3,6	0	0,0	0	0,0
91	29	51,8	22	39,3	4	7,1	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0

92	23	41,1	27	48,2	3	5,4	1	1,8	1	1,8	0	0,0
93	4	7,1	14	25,0	24	42,9	7	12,5	1	1,8	1	1,8
94	23	41,1	26	46,4	3	5,4	2	3,6	0	0,0	0	0,0
95	28	50,0	18	32,1	8	14,3	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
96	40	71,4	11	19,6	3	5,4	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
97	38	67,9	14	25,0	1	1,8	1	1,8	0	0,0	0	0,0
98	39	69,6	9	16,1	5	8,9	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
99	35	62,5	13	23,2	4	7,1	2	3,6	0	0,0	0	0,0
100	44	78,6	7	12,5	2	3,6	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0

According to the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items assessing the views of the students mastering at English Language Teaching (E.L.T) departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses.

The students have marked the number of 63 as a response item for mostly “strongly agree”. The frequency (f) and percentage given to this question item are respectively 45 and 80.4%. The lowest levels are the questions 27 and 28. The frequency and percentage given to these questions items are respectively (f) 2 and 3.6%. Average level of the responses given for the choice of “strongly agree” has been determined in the questions 42 and 92. Its frequency is 23 and percentage 41.1%.

The students have marked the number of 54 as a response item for mostly “moderately agree”. The frequency (f) and percentage given to this question item are respectively 64 and 60.7%. The lowest levels are the question 28. The frequency and percentage given to these questions items are respectively (f) 1 and 31.8%. Average level of the responses given for the choice of “moderately agree”

has been determined in the question 51. Its frequency is 32 and percentage 57.1%.

The students have marked the number of 3 as a response item for mostly “slightly agree”. The frequency (f) and percentage given to this question item are respectively 24 and 42.9%. The lowest levels are the questions 64 and 97. The frequency and percentage given to these questions items are respectively (f) 1 and 1.8%. Average level of the responses given for the choice of “strongly agree” has been determined in the questions 15,16,20,25,31,52,59 and 86. Its frequency is 12 and percentage 21.4%.

The students have marked the number of 25 as a response item for mostly “slightly disagree”. The frequency (f) and percentage given to this question item are respectively 14 and 25.0%. As a lowest level, the questions, the frequency and percentage of which are 0.0 have been assessed as a level. These questions have not been assessed under these choices by the students. Average level of the responses given for the choice of “slightly disagree” has been determined in the questions 9, 16,29,59,60 and 93. Its frequency is 7 and percentage 15.5%.

The students have marked the number of 27 as a response item for mostly “moderately disagree”. The frequency (f) and percentage given to this question item are respectively 21 and 37.5%. As a lowest level, the questions, the frequency and percentage of which are 0.0 have been assessed as a level. These questions have not been assessed under these choices by the students. Average level of the responses given for the choice of “moderately disagree” has been determined in the question 59. Its frequency is 12 and percentage 21.4%.

The students have marked the number of 28 as a response item for mostly “strongly disagree”. The frequency (f) and percentage given to this question item are respectively 23 and 41.1%. As a lowest level, the questions, the frequency and percentage of which are 0.0 have been assessed as a level. These questions have not been assessed under these choices by the students.

When the arithmetic averages and percentages of each six attitudes scale are compared, a decrease from strongly agree to strongly disagree are seen.

The arithmetic and percentage for the option of “strongly agree” in the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items are respectively 20.39 and 36.70%.

The arithmetic and percentage for the option of “moderately agree” in the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items are respectively 19.76 and 35.57%.

The arithmetic and percentage for the option of “slightly agree” in the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items are respectively 9.67 and 17.41%.

The arithmetic and percentage for the option of “slightly disagree” in the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items are respectively 3.66 and 6.59%.

The arithmetic and percentage for the option of “moderately disagree” in the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items are respectively 1.60 and 2.88%.

The arithmetic and percentage for the option of “strongly disagree” in the response choices given to the hundred questionnaire items are respectively 0.86 and 1.55%.

Based on these findings, the students mastering at English Language Teaching (E.L.T) departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses have positive thoughts so as to develop their cognitive ideas collectively and improve translation skills.

6.3. The Third Research Question and Findings

Are there any distinctive and remarkable differences among the viewpoints of the students majoring and lecturers teaching at E.L.T departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses?

As seen at table 3, the responses given to the questionnaire by the individuals show a distinctive difference according to the institutional roles [$t_{(56)}=5.09, p < .05$]. The averages of the responses given by the teaching staff ($\bar{X}=3.56$) are more negative than the averages of the responses given by the university students. According to these findings, it can be said that the difference is observed in favor of the students.

Table 3. The table of the “T” test according to the institutional roles.

Sex	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Teachers	11	3,56	1.72	65	-5.09	.000*
Students	56	4.88	.43			

* Significant at P<.05

6.4. The Fourth Research Question and Findings

According to the gender variations, are there any distinctive and remarkable differences between male and female students majoring at E.L.T departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses?

As seen at table 4, the responses given to the questionnaire by the individuals show a distinctive difference according to their sexes [$t_{(56)} = 5.09$, $p < .05$]. The averages of the responses given by the male university students ($\bar{X} = 4.03$), are more negative than the averages of the responses given by the female university students ($\bar{X} = 4.82$). According to these findings, it can be said that the difference is observed in favor of the female university students.

Sex	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Males	12	4.03	1.59	65	-2.90	.005*
Females	44	4.82	.60			

*Significant P<.05

CHAPTER V

7.0. THE RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS OF THE STUDY

7.1. The Results and Discussion of the Study

The basic results which have been obtained based on the findings of the study are as follows;

- 1- Based on these findings, the lecturers teaching at English Language Teaching (E.L.T) departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses have remarkable positive point of views; therefore, it can be strongly recommended for translation teachers who are invited to experiment with the basic principles and develop their own variations on the technique.
- 2- Based on these findings, the students majoring at English Language Teaching (E.L.T) departments towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses have positive opinions to a great degree and have regarded it as useful technique in improving and enhancing their translation skills and getting a sound translation source text by the great majority of the students.
- 3- According to the institutional (students' and lecturers') roles of the response choices given the questionnaire items by the individuals, it has been determined that a significant difference has emerged between them.

- 4- According to the gender distribution of the response choices given the questionnaire items by the individuals, it has been concluded that a significant and distinctive difference has been determined.
- 5- The points of view of the students majoring at E.L.T (English Language Teaching) department towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses have more positive results than those of the lecturers’.

7.2. The Suggestions

The improved suggestions based on the findings and results of the study are as follows;

1. Some in-service training courses should be given to the lecturers teaching at E.L.T departments concerning the technique of collaborative learning.
2. At the end of the study, the students majoring at E.L.T departments should make use of this method of learning effectively since they have positive points of view towards the effect of collaborative learning in translation courses.
3. Students should enhance and improve their translation skills through collaborative learning.
4. The comprehension of the source translation texts and the quality of translation should be taken into consideration. Since the quality of translation depends on the quality of the translator, the participants in collaborative work

in translation courses should have the best and sound knowledge, skills, training, culture background expertise, and even mood.

5. The translation teacher in collaborative learning process should act as an organizer a facilitator, and to a various degree, a resource person.
6. Translation teachers should experiment with the basic principles and develop their own variations on the technique of collaborative work.
7. In collaborative group work, no member should be judged to be superior to the others and the functions should be rotated to ensure equal opportunities.
8. Participants should aim at the essence of the message and faithfulness to the meaning of the source language text being transferred to the target language text.
9. Each member should also understand that each individual is responsible for the team's success, and should be polite, considerate and tolerant of their fellow group members' views.
10. Group members should talk about their background such as family, ethnic origin, education, personal tastes and interests, strengths and weaknesses, life objectives and so forth.
11. Group members should be able to reach a consensus on the translation which aims at being as faithful and accurate as possible and at soundly natural the target language.
12. To make cooperative learning successful, students should encourage each other, reward one another, provide assistance to help each other

learn, exchange information and ideas and challenge ideas of other group members.

13. Teacher should encourage student to develop these skills by identifying, explaining and rewarding students for engaging in effective social interaction activities.

14. In a collaborative translation group work, students should first underline unknown terms and then they should mentally confront potential translation difficulties in the text with suitable translation procedures.

15. Students should have initiative, creativity, honesty and perseverance and accuracy, truthfulness, patience and dedication.

REFERENCES

Allport, G.

(1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley Bentler,

P. M, (1993). *EQS. Structural Equations Program Manual* Los Angeles:

BMDP Statistical Software.

Allwright, D., & Bailey, K.M.

(1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to*

classroom research for language teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Aronson, E., Bridgeman, D.L., & Geffner, R.

(1978). The effects of a cooperative classroom structure on student

behavior and attitudes. In D.Bar-Tal & L.Saxe (Eds.), *Social*

psychology of education: Theory and research (pp.257-272).

Washington: Wiley.

Bejarano, Y.

(1987). A cooperative small-group methodology in the language

classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 483-501.

Bell, Roger T.

(1994.). *Translation and Translating*. Longman Group UK.Ltd.

Bruffee, K.A.

(1984). Collaborative learning and the 'conversation of mankind.'
College English, 46,635-652.

Cohen, E.G.

(1994). *Designing group work: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom (2nd cd.)*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Conway, R.,Kember, D.,Swan, A., & Wu, M.

(1993). Peer assessment of an individual's contribution to a group project. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18, 45-56

Cooper, J. L., Robinson, P., & McKinney, M.

(1994). Cooperative learning in the classroom. In D.F. Halpern and Assoc. (Eds.), *Changing college classrooms* (pp.74-92). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Courtney, D. P., Courtney, M., & Nicholson, C.

(1994). The effect of cooperative learning as an instructional practice at the college level. *College Student Journal*, 28,411-411.

Doughty, C.,&Pica, T.

(1986). Information gap tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 305-325.

Ford, E.

(1991). Criteria for developing an observation scheme for cooperative language learning. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 48, 45-63.

Gass, S.M.,& Varonis, E.M.

(1986). Sex differences in nonnative speaker nonnative speaker interactions. In R.R.Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp.327-351). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gerding-Salas,

(July 200), *Translator Education*. Costanza

Gunderson, B., & Johnson, D.

(1980). Building positive attitudes by using cooperative learning groups. *Foreign Language Annals*, 13, 39-43.

Huber, G.L.

(1991, July). Inter-individual differences in preferences for cooperation: Theoretical background and practical consequences. Paper presented at the 2nd European Congress of Psychology, Budapest.

Ickes, W., Bissonnette, V., Garcia, S., & Stinson, L. L.

(1990). Implementing and using the dyadic interaction paradigm. In C. Hendrick and M. S. Smith (Eds.), *Research methods in personality and social psychology: Review of personality and social psychology* (pp. 16-44), Newbury Park, CA, USA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T.

(1985). The internal dynamics of cooperative learning groups. In R.E. Sharan, S. Sharan, S. Kagan, R. Hertz-Lazarowitz, C. Webb, & R.

Shmuck (Eds.), *Learning to cooperative, cooperating to learn* (pp.103-124). New York: Plenum.

Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., Holubec, E.J., & Roy, P.

(1984). *Circles of learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kagan, S,

(1995). Co-op co-op: A flexible cooperative learning technique. In R.E. Slavin, S. Sharan, S. Kagan, R. Hertz-Lazarowitz, C. Webb, & R. Schmuck (Eds.), *Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn* (pp.437-452). New York: Plenum

Knight, G.P., & Bohlmeyer, E.M.

(1990). Cooperative learning and achievement: Methods for assessing casual mechanism. In S. Sharan (Ed), *Cooperative learning, theory and research* (pp.1-22) New York: Praeger

Kramersch, C.J.

(1987). Interaction discourse in small and large groups. In W.M.Rivers (Ed), *Interactive language teaching* (pp.17-30). New York: Cambridge University Press

Kussmaul, Paul.

(1995). *Training the Translator*. John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Lee, R. M. & Robbins, S. B.

(1995). Measuring belongingness: The social connectedness and the social assurance scales. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42, 232-241.

Likert, R.

(1932) “ A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes” *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 155. *Six-Point Type Response Scales Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol 47, No 1, 27-35 (1987) & Sage Publications

Lindauer, P., Petrie, G.

(1997). A review of cooperative learning: An alternative to everyday instructional strategies. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 24, 183-187.

Long, M.H., & Porter, P.A.

(1985). Group work, inter-language talk and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-227.

McGroarty, M.

(1993). Cooperative learning and second language acquisition. In D.D.Holt (Ed.), *Cooperative learning: A response o linguistic and cultural diversity* (pp.19-46). McHenry, IL.Delta Systems.

McGroarty, M

(1998). Second language acquisition theory relevant to linguistic minority students: Cummins, Krashen and Schumann. In S. Mekat & S.C. Wong (Eds). *Language diversity: Problem or resource?* (pp.295-338). New York: Newbury House

Morton, T.

(1993). Fine cloth, cut carefully: Cooperative learning in British in British Columbia. In J.Golub (Ed.), Focus on collaborative learning (pp.35-11). Urbana, IL:National Council for Teachers of English.

Newmark, Peter.

(1995). *A Textbook of Translation*.Library of Congress Cataloging-in Publication Data.

Nida, E.y Taber Ch.

(1974), *The Theory and Practice of Translating* Brill,Leiden.

Obler, S., Arnold, V., Sigala, C, Umbdenstock, L.

(1991). Using cooperative learning and classroom research with culturally diverse students. *New Direction for Teaching and Learning*, 52, 9-19.

Slavin, R. E.

(1995). Cooperative learning and intergroup relations. In J.A. Banks (Ed,) *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 628-634). New York: Macmillan.

Slavin, R. E.

(1995). Enhancing intergroup relations in schools: Cooperative learning and other strategies. In W.D. Hawley & A.W. Wells, (Eds), *Toward a common destiny: Improving race and ethnic relations in America* (pp. 291-314). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rebuffot, J.

(1993). *Le point sur l'immersion au Canada*. Anjou, QC: Centre éducatif et culturel.

Resnick, L. B., Levine, J. M., & Teasley, S. D.

(1991). *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Reynolds, R. E., Sinatra, G. M., & Jetton, T.L.

(1996). Views of knowledge acquisition and representation: A continuum from experience centered to mind centered. *Educational Psychologist*, 31, 93-104.

Rivers, W.M.

(1987). Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication. In W.M.Rivers (Ed), *Interactive language teaching* (pp.3-16). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Romney, J.Claude,

(1997). The Canadian modern Language Review. Collaborative Learning in Translation Course.

Sheridan, J.Byrne, A.C., & Quina , K.

(1989). Collaborative learning: Notes from the field. *College Teaching*, 37 (2), 49-53.

Sills, C.K

(1998). Interactive learning in the composition classroom. In J.Golup (Ed), *Focus on collaborative learning* (pp.21-27). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Slavin, R.E.

(1980). *Using student team learning*. Baltimore, MD. Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University.

Slavin R.E.

(1985). Team-assisted individualization: Combining cooperative learning and individualized instruction in mathematics. In R.E. Slavin, S.Sharan, S.Kagan, R.Hertz- Lazarowitz, C.Webb, & R. Schmuck (Eds.), *Learning to cooperative, cooperating to learn* (pp.177-209). New York: Plenum.

Slavin, R.E.

(1990). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research and practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Slavin, R. E.

(1995). Cooperative learning and inter-group relations. In J.A. Banks (Ed,) *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 628-634). New York: Macmillan.

Slavin, R. E.

(1995). Enhancing inter-group relations in schools: Cooperative learning and other strategies. In W.D. Hawley & A.W. Wells, (Eds), *Toward a common destiny: Improving race and ethnic relations in America* (pp. 291-314). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Swain, M.

(1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp.235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Trottier, G., & Knox, G.

(1992). L'A.B.C.de l'apprentissage cooperatif en langue seconde. *Contact*, 11 (May), 15-18.

Vinay, J.P., & Darbelnet, J.

(1977). *Stylistique compare du français et e l'anglais*. Paris: Didier.

Vygotsky, L. S.

(1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Webb, N.M.

(1985). Verbal interaction in pear-directed groups. *Theory into Practice*, 24, 32-39.

Wiener, H.S.

(1986). Collaborative learning in the classroom. A guide to evaluation. *College English*, 48, 52-61.

APPENDIX

Rating Scale for Cooperative Group Learning

Student's or Lecturer's Name:

Age:

Sex:

Male:

Female:

Date or Time Period of Assessment:

Students and Lecturers were asked to respond to each item choosing from six-point Likert scale with the following response choices:

1= strongly disagree

2= moderately disagree

3= slightly disagree

4= slightly agree

5= moderately agree

6= strongly agree

Please, respond to each item into the boxes below choosing a six-point Likert scale with the response choices above

1. Cooperative learning encourages cooperation across , equal status roles for students of different races in translation courses.
2. Cooperative learning encourages the communication of teacher support for interpersonal contact in translation courses.
3. In cooperative learning in translation courses, minority students learn more effectively from the group-oriented focus as compared with the traditional individual-achievement orientation.
4. When working collaboratively in a diverse group, students have the potential to gain multi- cultural friendships.
5. The students acquire new strategies and knowledge in cooperative learning group.
6. Students have the opportunity to share individual cognitions with their peers and come to a conclusion based on the sum of these cognitions.
7. In cooperative learning, diverse group members have the benefit of exposure to different ideas and challenge of incorporating these ideas into the cognitive process of the group.
8. Cooperative learning is most likely to be used in translation courses where there is a focus on source text translating.
9. Students must work together to reach a common goal in order to increase the likelihood of success in translation courses.

10. The important characteristics of a successful cooperative learning group are the goals of the group, individual accountability of each group member, and the formation of the group.
11. Each individual member has to contribute his or her own successes to the success of the group in order to maximize the learning potential of entire group.
12. If students are motivated themselves and invested in the success of the group, they will be more likely encouraged with success and motivation among other members of the group.
13. In cooperation learning, students develop their ideas collectively with preparation, cognitive structuring, and role structuring.
14. Diverse groups in cooperative learning situations seem very relevant to the idea of socially shared cognitions.
15. Minority students in cooperative learning situations get additional benefits from participating in groups because group work improves learning.
16. In cooperative group learning, the student works with a wide range of peers, not just with close friends.
17. In cooperative group learning, the student willingly shares materials and ideas with others.
18. In group work, the student shows respect for others by listening and considering other points of view.

19. In cooperative group learning, the student follows group work rules as established for the activity.
20. In cooperative group learning, the student fulfills her/his work responsibility in the group.
21. In cooperative group learning, the student exhibits appropriate work behavior during the time set aside for groups.
22. In cooperative group learning, the student participates in discussions during the time set aside for group work.
23. In cooperative group learning, the student contributes ideas to the group efforts during the discussions in the time set aside for group work.
24. In cooperative group learning, there should be people in the group with whom I feel a close bond.
25. In cooperative group learning, I don't feel that I really belong around the people that I work.
26. In cooperative group learning, I feel that I can share personal concerns with other students.
27. In cooperative group learning, I feel so distant from the other students.
28. In cooperative group learning, I have no sense of togetherness and enthusiasm with my peers.
29. In cooperative group learning, the group members should make me feel enthusiastic.

30. In cooperative group learning, I should feel that I participate my knowledge with anyone or any group.
31. In cooperative group learning, I enjoy having discussions with people whose ideas and cognitive translation knowledge are different from my own.
32. In cooperative group learning, contact with group individuals whose background (e.g.,race, national origin, sex orientation) is different from my own is an essential part of my education.
33. In cooperative group learning, each of the group members contributes his or her fair share.
34. In cooperative group learning, group members have a clear understanding of the expectations for the group tasks.
35. In cooperative group learning, most group members share their own ideas and respond positively to peer questions during group work.
36. In cooperative group learning, group individuals try to be successful in translating the different source texts.
37. In cooperative group learning, each group member should be regarded as a resource for learning.
38. In cooperative group learning, as a result of group work, I improve my group-building and text translating skills.
39. Two or more individual can different kinds of translation texts better when they work in groups than when they work independently.

40. Students enhance their translation skills and arrive at the comprehension of the source text through collective learning.
41. Students achieve a greater degree of grammatical correctness, accuracy and faithfulness in the translation through discussion and negotiation collectively.
42. Students gain in self-confidence and self-esteem and also become more tolerant of different opinions and appreciate the non-threatening atmosphere of working in small groups.
43. In collaborative group work, all participants are convinced that their contributions as well as those of their fellow group members are essential to the success of their team's work.
44. In collaborative group work, no member should be judged to be superior to the others and the functions may be rotated to ensure equal opportunities.
45. Participants should aim at the essence of the message and faithfulness to the meaning of the source language text being transferred to the target language text.
46. Cooperative learning experiences promote higher achievement than do competitive and individualistic experiences.
47. In collaborative learning, the groups themselves are teams rather than mere collections of individuals brought together by chance.

48. In collaborative learning, members share a common goal, and prepared to perform certain tasks to reach a sound translation text.
49. In cooperative language learning structure, students want to learn and experience in relation to the topic or unit to be covered.
50. The members of each team feel they are a “we” and develop trust and communication skills.
51. The team members settle on the topic of most interest to themselves as a group.
52. The team members divide the topic of the team into mini-topics for each member to work on.
53. Individual students work on their own topics and present them to their teammates.
54. The team discusses and integrates the material presented in the previous step in order to prepare their team presentations.
55. Students reflect on their work and achievements, and the whole class evaluates team presentations and individual presentations are evaluated by teammates.
56. In collaborative learning process, each individual is responsible for the explanation of the text and any terminological research, as well as the actual translation into the target language.

- 57.** In a traditional teacher-fronted translation course, the students are usually given the text to translate a few days in advance and are required to prepare the translation for a due date
- 58.** In a traditional teacher-fronted translation course, knowledge is imparted to the students in the traditional way by virtue of the instructor's qualifications, experience and status, and his/her authority is rarely challenged.
- 59.** In collaborative learning group, equal gender distribution is desirable because girls in majority-female groups and in majority-male groups learn less than boys.
- 60.** In a collaborative group work, it is useful to include in each group, if possible, one participant with native or near native skills in the second language.
- 61.** In a collaborative group placement, the instructor has to evaluate each student's personal characteristics individually.
- 62.** The team goals in cooperative learning should be agreed upon by all members of the group.
- 63.** Each member should also understand that each individual is responsible for the team's success.
- 64.** Members should be polite, considerate and tolerant of their fellow group members' views.

- 65.** Members in cooperative learning group must learn to critique tactfully without hurting the other students' feelings.
- 66.** Group members should talk about their background such as family, education, personal tastes and interests, strengths and weaknesses, life objectives and so forth.
- 67.** An orderly discussion takes place at the level of lexis or terminology, syntax and word order, with participants being required to justify their interpretation of the source text and their translation.
- 68.** Group members should be able to reach a consensus on the translation which aims at being as faithful and accurate as possible and at soundly natural the target language.
- 69.** The grading system for the group assignments should be the same for individual ones.
- 70.** Students in cooperative work had better keep a diary in which they will record what they learn during each group discussion regarding vocabulary, grammar, translation problems, and so on.
- 71.** The main role of the instructor in collaborative student centered approach is an organizer and facilitator, not source of knowledge.
- 72.** In cooperative learning a recorder takes accurate notes and records data for group activities.
- 73.** In cooperative learning, a checker assures that each member understands the tasks or concepts.

74. In cooperative learning, an encourager is appointed to make sure that each member has vast opportunity to contribute to the group.
75. To make cooperative learning successful, students should encourage each other, reward one another, provide assistance to help each other learn, exchange information and ideas and challenge ideas of other group members.
76. If one student attempts to impress other students with his or knowledge to increase his other self-esteem positive interaction does not occur.
77. Each student should possess well developed interpersonal and group communication skills.
78. The cooperative learning environment, if well organized, provides an opportunity for students to grow socially and learn effective group communication skills.
79. Teacher should encourage student to develop these skills by identifying, explaining and rewarding students for engaging in effective social interaction activities.
80. A combination of teacher and student processing results in significant improvement and success within a cooperative learning format.
81. In a cooperative work procedure, students have sound linguistic knowledge, both theoretical and practical, and a wide cultural bilingual background.

- 82.** In a cooperative work procedure, the texts to translated must be chosen according to previously defined objectives for translation practice, taking into account the degree of difficulty of the texts (semantic, cultural, stylistic, etc.), the topic or the specific knowledge area (science and technology; social, institutional, economic and /or political topics; and literary or philosophical works).
- 83.** In a collaborative translation group work, students should first underline unknown terms and then they should mentally confront potential translation difficulties in the text with suitable translation procedures.
- 84.** The students hand in the final version of their revised and post-edited translation segments, the teacher makes a final revision, gives formative evaluation and makes “happy” solution and creative acts, and analyzes failures and weaknesses in the process.
- 85.** To deal with the profile of the students in collaborative learning procedure students should have sound linguistic training in the two languages and knowledge covering a wide cultural spectrum.
- 86.** Students should have high reading comprehension competence and permanent interest in reading.
- 87.** Students should have adequate use of translation procedures and strategies.

88. Students should have improvement capacity and constant interest in learning.
89. Students should have adequate management of documentation sources.
90. Students should have initiative, creativity, honesty and perseverance and accuracy, truthfulness, patience and dedication.
91. Students should have capacity for analysis and self-criticism.
92. Students should have capacity to develop team work and efficient data processing training at user's level.
93. Students should have acquaintance with translation software for MT and Mt edition.
94. Students should have ability to maintain constructive interpersonal relationship.
95. To deal with the profile of the educator in collaborative leaning procedure, educator should have ability to communicate ideas clearly, empathically and openly and work out synthesis and interrelationship of ideas.
96. Educator should have capacity to foster search and research critical and analytical capacity, clear assessment criteria.
97. Educator should have sound knowledge of the SL and TL, translation theory, transfer procedures, cognition and methodology.
98. Educators should have capacity to create, foster and maintain a warm work environment, "an atmosphere of sympathetic encouragement".

99. Educators should have permanent interest in reading various kinds of
texts.

100. Educators should have comprehension of what translation is and how it
occurs.