The Impact of Technology in Professionalising Translation Graduates

E-Learning Experiences in the MA in Translation

TAMARA DE INÉS ANTÓN

Abstract

Due to recent changes in the translation industry, our understanding of translator competence (Kiraly 2000) has evolved to feature more prominently the translator's ability to effectively use new technologies. Against this background and from the early 2000s, scholarship in the teaching of translation (Samson 2013; Gouadec 2003; Kiraly 2000) has highlighted the need to include information and communication technologies (ICT) and computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools as part of translation curricula.

At our institution, a decision was made to move the two foundational courses in the MA in Translation (French/Spanish) to online delivery, starting September 2019. This paper describes how course content and assessment were restructured to account for recent developments in the pedagogy of the discipline as well as the new virtual environment, and to highlight the training potential of CAT and online tools. Moreover, it assesses the researcher's e-teaching experiences with regard to the impact that emphasising translation technologies in a virtual environment had in the programme.

Keywords: translation technologies, online teaching, translation pedagogy, collaborative learning

Introduction to Translation Technologies

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN ONLINE TECHNOLOGIES HAVE NOT ONLY internationalised the translation industry, permitting stakeholders to operate from anywhere in the world, but also changed the practical conditions of translators' work in several ways. At its most basic, the internet itself has revolutionised translator-client communication by allowing professionals from all over the world to be in regular contact, and work to be sent and received electronically across national and cultural borders (Biau Gil and Pym 2006, 6). Moreover, electronic communication has made easier the coordination of various intermediaries (translators, terminologists, revisers) working simultaneously in one single large translation project. It has also enhanced communication and networking between language professionals, particularly through the use of specialised internet forums.

But electronic communication is far from the only way in which technology has changed the face of translation. Computer-assisted translation (CAT) tools such as translation memories (TM), electronic corpora and terminology databases have also become an essential part of the translation process in any professional setting. Translation memories are programmes that create databases of source-text and target-text segments in such a way that these paired segments can be reused (Biau Gil and Pym 2006, 9). This means that when using a TM, translators are not beginning the translation project from scratch but working from the information stored in the TM databases. The use of a TM can save time, increase productivity and minimise inconsistencies (particularly in larger or collective projects); and even though these programmes are user-friendly, one still needs to learn how to use them, which is why it is extremely important for TMs to be part of the academic curriculum in translation programmes.

Electronic corpora are "systematic, planned and structured collections of texts stored in an electronic database, and specifically compiled for linguistic analysis" (Neshkovska 2019, 63). Bernardini, Stewart, and Zanettin (2003) distinguish several types of corpora used for the purposes of translation, such as parallel corpora[1], comparable corpora[2] and translational corpora[3]. Parallel corpora in particular can resemble a TM, as the latter is also based on a database of source and target segments. When compared to printed texts, electronic corpora are easy to access and save translators a lot of time.

Like TM systems and electronic corpora, terminology databases and glossaries are also an important tool for professional translators and translation

students. These databases[4] can be prepared by terminologists or translators before or after they finalise the translation, and they must be "regularly updated and reviewed by a team of translators with the contribution of terminology experts to minimise erroneous translations" (Odacioglu and Kokturk 2015, 1092). And this is precisely why all these CAT tools have been extensively adopted by the translation industry – because they save translators time, increase productivity and ensure consistency.

In a study of North American job advertisements in translation and related language services, Bowker (2004) established that whilst knowledge of translation-specific technologies was only required in approximately 20 per cent of the ads, basic computer literacy was a key skill required by employers, appearing in 60.5 per cent of the ads. Moreover, Bowker (2004, 970) also noted the sharp increase in this percentage during the three-year timeline encompassing her study, which could lead us to argue that these percentages are likely to be much higher today, over a decade later.

Still, computer literacy and translation technologies have not always been given the necessary curricular space in translation education. According to Marshman and Bowker (2012), financial and time restrictions often make the teaching of translation technologies very difficult. This has led to some clear gaps in education and a certain dissatisfaction among employers of recent graduates of translator education programmes (Samson 2005, 104). And even though this is a problem that has been identified and explored at an international level, financial and resource constraints are perhaps even more difficult to overcome in a Caribbean academic context, making students' access to certain CAT tools almost impossible and its inclusion in our courses a challenge.

Technology and Translation Education

In the last two decades, translation pedagogy has evolved significantly with the development of the widely recognised "social constructivist approach" (Kiraly 2000). Kiraly's constructivist approach to translation education clearly distinguishes between translation and translator competence. Translation competence focuses mainly on the linguistic skills needed to produce an "adequate target text" (Kiraly 2000, 10), whilst translator competence encompasses a much wider set of skills, including the ability to understand and meet client expectations, and the ability to use various technologies efficiently (11). By focusing on the impor-

tance of translator competence, Kiraly encourages teachers to assign realistic and situated projects or tasks in which students become active learners by working and building knowledge together, instead of remaining passive recipients of a kind of knowledge seemingly divorced from real-world needs and applications.

This emphasis on active and collaborative learning resonates well with the tenets of translation technology education, as promoted by scholars such as Biau Gil (2006), Gouadec (2003) and Doherty (2016). Scholars such as Samson (2013) foreground a series of strategies for including technologies and optimising their use in the translation classroom. According to Marshman and Bowker (2012), they all recommend introducing basic technological tools early in the programme of studies, encouraging students to view these tools as an inherent part of their future professional life.

Beeby, Rodríguez Inéz, and Sanchez Guijón (2009), Biau Gil and Pym (2006) and Marshman and Bowker (2012) argue that these technological tools may be taught most effectively within courses with a clear focus on the translation task itself, so that learning to use them can be naturalised as part of the student's understanding of how to translate rather than becoming a separate task. If one agrees with the above, it becomes clear that the use and evaluation of these online technologies should not be limited to a single technology-focused course, as it is common practice in many universities, but embedded within the overall programme of studies.

It is here where one should take a moment to contextualise the literature presented above and note that most of these scholars work in translator training institutions with a two-cycle format (i.e. where degrees in translation are being offered at the undergraduate and graduate level). This is very common in the European context, where students in translation receive approximately five years of training. In such a scenario, a more comprehensive and in-depth teaching of translation technologies is expected, and as such these scholars focus not so much on whether or not to teach translation technologies, "but on the right sequencing of course contents and the overall teaching methodologies, proposing a number of project-based situated approaches that emphasise teamwork and an under-standing of production processes in the translation industry" (Austermuehl 2013, 329). According to Austermuehl (2013) things do get much more complicated when working in an environment where a one-year or two-year postgraduate degree is the default setting for translator training, meaning that any teaching of technological tools to enhance the professionalisation of your graduates needs

to be balanced with laying a theoretical foundation for translational actions, and sometimes even language teaching. This is a situation found, for example, in a number of English-speaking countries, including Australia, New Zealand, or the United States (Austermuehl 2013, 329).

Technology in Our MA in Translation (Spanish/French)

This is also the situation in our university, where the MA in Translation (French/Spanish) is a part-time postgraduate programme lasting two years, and consisting of eight courses[5], the last one a research course in which students are asked to produce a 20,000 word research paper, in this case an extended translation (5,000 words translation and 15,000 commentary).

Since our MA in Translation (French/Spanish) does not include a single technology-focused course, I considered the need for creating a course on "Translation Technologies", when I was assigned the coordination of the programme in August 2018. A number of reasons led us to decide against this. First of all, the very time constraints imposed by a two-year part-time programme already made us question the extent to which the teaching of these tools and their impact on the translation process could be effective if delivered in a single course more or less divorced from the other translation practice and theory components of the programme. Second, the varying degrees of linguistic and translational competence of our students made us wonder whether such a tool/technology-oriented approach was the best use of our students' time. Our programme, as many other translator educator courses according to Marshman and Bowker (2012), is already densely packed, as it involves several specialised translation courses and three working languages (Spanish, French and English).

Third, the varying degrees of technological competence of our students was carefully considered. Biau Gil (2006) states that even students in European schools, born in a digital era and having grown up surrounded by computers, often arrive in translation degrees with very different attitudes and comfort levels with computers. I would argue that this is even more evident in our MA in Translation (French/Spanish) for two main reasons: (1) since this is a postgraduate degree the age of our students vary greatly, and generally older students report a lower level of comfort when it comes to computers; (2) the lack of consistent internet access and technological resources traditionally imposed by a Caribbean context can also mean our students might express a lower comfort with computers or

might not have the means to access and experience certain technological tools.

Finally, it is not only the students' but the institution's financial constraints and lack of resources that can make the teaching of translation technologies challenging. For example, buying the licenses for a translation management system such as SDL TRADOS Studio, which would open the door for students to use TMs among many other things and work collaboratively in a single project, is quite costly, even after the generous discount the company offers to educational entities. As such, we are still working to ensure funding to buy these licenses, a situation that was only complicated by the COVID-19 pandemic and that will hopefully be solved within the academic year 2020/2021.

With all the aforementioned constraints in mind, the best choice seemed to be to avoid creating a single technology-focused course (which would have required a stronger financial investment on the part of the institution and time investment on the part of the students) and instead modify for online delivery the two foundational courses in the MA in Translation (French/Spanish), courses which act as prerequisites for all the other courses. On the one hand, this was an administrative decision made to enable these two courses (Principles and Practices of Translation and General Translation) to be taught every year, and consequently students to apply to the programme without having to wait for the previous cohort to complete it, i.e. two years, as was the case up to September 2019. On the other hand, and most importantly to this paper, this was a pedagogical decision aimed to introduce our students to basic computer literacy and to ensure their familiarity with a virtual and technological environment from the earliest stages of their training in translation.

Move to Online Delivery and Consequent Modification of Content and Assessment

The introduction of computer literacy into the teaching and learning process has conferred special importance on virtual environments, but in many ways research in translation pedagogy has not sufficiently explored the possibilities of these virtual and technological tools. First of all, when considering the modification of any course for online delivery, one should always avoid a common pitfall, i.e. including technology into the classroom environment but not making its use a key part of the lecturer's methodology. According to Varela Salinas in 2007 the

"novelty" of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) "often led to its erroneous use" (Varela Salinas 2007, 2), for example, by simply offering traditional learning materials online, so that only the medium of delivery changes. I would argue that this is still a common error among many educators, even though online learning or the implementation of ICTs in the classroom may no longer be considered such a novelty. Consequently, a lot of effort went into the modification of the two courses discussed here, to allow for their online delivery in September of 2019, and to adapt all the material to its new environment in order to fully optimise the use of technologies and exploit all the potential advantages.

For example, in online teaching "users enjoy the benefits of being connected within an evolving and networked community" whilst at the same time being allowed to satisfy their own individualistic needs (Boisselle 2014, 2). In fact, online learning increases the opportunity to meet the needs of a variety of students, including returning and working students – as is the case of most of the students registered in the MA in Translation (French/Spanish) – who benefit from its time and place flexibility (Boisselle 2014, 2). In this context, learners become responsible for when and to a certain extent what they learn, as it is easier for them to control the learning process and produce results and data that are better tailored to their interests, i.e. they turn into active constructors of knowledge (Varela Salinas 2007, 2).

In its most basic form, learning to translate would mean acquiring the knowledge, skills, techniques and strategies that allow translators to effectively render a text in another language, but translation scholars are yet to agree on the exact catalogue of sub-competences or skills that should make up the toolkit of the professional translator. Still, one could argue that at the very least "knowledge about correct decoding of the source text and idiomatic encoding into the target text, comprehension of cultural features, research skills, but also the correct use of the tools for terminology management and computer-assisted translation, are necessary to guarantee quality in the final product" (Varela Salinas 2007, 3).

Within the context of this paper, a modification in the content and assessment of our two foundational courses to fit the new online mode of delivery was intended not only to introduce students to the core technological tools any professional translator should ideally master, but more importantly to the core skills they would need in dealing with translation in general and translation technology in particular. This paper endorses Austermuehl in that two such skills must be: (1) revision skills in the target language, (2) documentation and research skills

(Austermuehl 2013, 330); but it also adds two more: (3) communication skills, and (4) collaborative skills.

The case of "Principles and Practices of Translation"

Principles and Practices of Translation (TRAN6101) is, as described by its course outline, the first of two foundational courses in our MA in Translation (French/Spanish) and provides students with the knowledge and technological tools needed to interrogate the complexities of translation as a professional and academic practice. One should note here how the importance of technological tools is already highlighted in the rationale of the course. Moreover, and even though this is the most theory-focused course in the programme, as it requires students to examine traditional and contemporary translation theories, its description also establishes that students will gain practical experience in text analysis and translation research methods.

Furthermore, the content of the course is divided in four main units:

1. What is Translation Studies?
2. Main translation theories;
3. Text analysis and translation commentary; and
4. Translation in the 21st century.

Even though the very methodology of the course is designed to incorporate digital technologies and their importance throughout the semester, Unit 4 is perhaps the one that touches upon translation technologies most explicitly by covering issues such as machine translation, computer-assisted translation, audiovisual translation, and localisation.

When it comes to its online mode of delivery, the course presents itself in a mixture of asynchronous and synchronous teaching (*see* Appendix A). Synchronous learning environments provide real time interaction, which can be collaborative in nature. This is important since collaboration and teamwork have been established within this paper as key skills in the training of future translators. Still, in the context of our MA in Translation (French/Spanish), I argue that a heavy reliance on synchronous teaching would in fact act as detriment to the learning experience of our average student. Synchronous experiences call for the interactive presence of both lecturer and student, and in this course synchronous

work was mostly reserved to biweekly seminars and/or workshops in the form of videoconferencing sessions via Zoom.

Synchronous interaction requires a strong and stable internet connection that is not always readily available for everybody. Moreover, the average student in our programme is a working student, in many cases with a full-time job. For this type of student, the flexibility offered by asynchronous learning is ideal, since it means that they can manage their own time. The flexibility of asynchronous learning as understood in this course needs to be qualified, because the course is still scheduled to last 13 weeks and all assessments need to be submitted by a particular deadline and within a more or less limited timeframe. In brief, since the course is designed to combine asynchronous and synchronous teaching, students are expected to follow the overall course schedule and cover a certain amount of material within any particular week, or in the words of Pym, the course offers a form of "controlled asynchrony" (Pym 2011, 4).

To summarise, the course has been designed to combine a week of asynchronous work, where students are presented with a number of readings, videos and podcasts with a week of more synchronous teaching. Pedagogically speaking there are two things of note when it comes to the asynchronous materials[6]. On the one hand, the lecturer categorises materials as prescribed, highly recommended or recommended presenting students with what Pym terms as "variable workloads" (2011, 5). Since our students are very different, they will want to work at different paces, and the best solution here would seem to allow for a relatively high proportion of optional readings and tasks, especially those that involve web searches, with the minimal requirement that a certain number of them be done – those identified as prescribed materials or activities by the lecturer. This allows students to manage their own time, and to some extent tailor their learning experience to their own interests by exploring further those areas that are of particular interest to them, highlighting once again autonomy among student learners as one of the main advantages brought by online teaching (Boisselle 2014, 7). On the other, students are given the opportunity to learn from multimedia materials (written, audio, audiovisual, etc.). This permits users to not only manage their own reading order and/or learning sequences, but to "switch between different texts and materials that represent diverse information" and engage the student's cognitive process in different manners (Varela Salinas 2007, 3).

Moreover, in the synchronous Zoom sessions or workshops, the lecturer presents the students with a number of activities or case-studies where they can

put into practice what they have been learning about translation theory the week before. In brief, preliminary readings have made the student aware of a problem or difficulty, whilst the actual synchronous session presents ways of solving the problem, and a series of tasks and research outlets that will invite the student to investigate even further. These activities can be completed individually or in groups by using break-out rooms. In any case, students' will be engaging here their collaborative skills, because even if an activity was first to be completed individually, there will be a collective discussion and revision of the student's choices afterwards. These sessions are designed to be highly participative and interactive, and ensure community-building within the classroom, in order to avoid any sense of isolation, perceived lack of interaction or decline in motivation on the part of the student, both common dangers of e-learning (Pym 2011, 5). The creation of a learning community is very important here not only for its pedagogical virtues, but also because it can help students to develop networking skills and prepare them to be active members of similar virtual communities of professional translators. This is also highlighted by one of our forms of assessment in the course, i.e. Forum Discussions.

As seen in table 1, when modifying the course for online delivery, not only its teaching methodology and mode of delivery changed, but also the structure and nature of its assessment.

Table 1. Previous and modified assessment for "Principles and Practices of Translation"

Previous Course Assessment (F2F)	Modified Course Assessment (Online)
40% Coursework	**100% Coursework**
– 3,000 words Research Paper (25%)	– Forum Discussions (15%)
– Translation-Editing Project (15%)	– Seminar Presentation: Critical review of an article (20%)
60% Final Exam	
– Essay Question (30%)	– 3,000 words Research Paper (25%)
– Translation Commentary (30%)	– Translation Journal (40%)

This revised assessment aims to promote in our students a deeper understanding of the way in which translation theories can inform translation practice in the professional world, and takes advantage of both the new online environment and translation technologies to do so. First of all, a decision was made to keep

the research paper, but eliminate the final exam, which was not only too heavily weighted – 60% of the final grade – but also could only assess our students on their knowledge of translation theories in a more traditional and arguably superficial manner. Instead, students are now required to produce a translation journal, where they will have the opportunity to try out their understanding of the studied theories in two 300–350 word source texts. The focus will not be so much on the final product, i.e. the finished translation, as on the process. This would allow students to reflect upon their own process, try out different strategies, manipulate the texts in as many ways as possible informed by their understanding of the different translation theories, and discuss their experience.

As such, they will take one or two 300–350-word source texts and manipulate them in different ways to produce five different experiments. Each experiment/translation would be based on a particular question or theoretical framework, such as: What are the limits of domestication and foreignisation? Is translation a colonising tool or a way for the postcolonial subject to write back? How does one translate race? What does it mean to hijack a text from a feminist perspective? Can you queer a translation? How can you define equivalence within Skopos theory? What are the limits of machine translation, etc.? Each of their experiments/translations should be accompanied by its own translation brief and commentary.

Translation briefs or specification sheets are (or at least should be) a common feature in the work of professional translators. Translation commentaries contribute to the mastery of the art of translation by raising the student's awareness of the factors which affect translation, and even though they are not likely to produce translation commentaries in their professional life, this task is designed to hone the students' ability to articulate their choices. This is a skill that according to Sewell (2002) is highly valued among professional translators, since they are often called upon to defend their choices to reviewers or clients. In brief, the translation journal is an innovative form of assessment that this paper highly recommends to other educators in translation, as it encourages critical thinking as well as creativity on the part of our students (Johnston and Losensky 2017, 45).

Unlike translation journals, the use of online discussion forums has become a prevalent part of online teaching, facilitated by the increased use by educational institutions of virtual learning environments, in our case OurVLE (Mazzolini and Maddison 2007). Forum discussions are particularly useful to promote interaction and community-building without the constraints of synchronous videoconferencing sessions. In our course, each Forum Discussion remains open for two

weeks. First, students are asked a theory-based, ideally controversial question within Translation Studies. These questions change every year, except the one in Forum Discussion 1. Since most of the students starting our programme are very much new to translation theory, I like to begin the course and our forum by discussing the widely acknowledged divide between translation theory and practice within the discipline. In Forum Discussion 1, students are advised that with the emergence of Translation Studies as an independent field of studies, the number of training and academic programmes in Translation has increased, as well as the amount of scholarly work/theoretical writings underpinning the practice of translation. Still, maybe because this is an ancient activity but a fairly recent area of studies, a lot of professional translators have not received any specific academic training or simply do not see how the theoretical writings being produced by the "Ivory Tower" can help them in their everyday practice. Thus, the proposed question in Forum Discussion 1 is: "Many translators complain that much theoretical writing on translation is of no practical use to them. Is this a valid criticism, and if so, does it matter?" In order to answer the question, students are invited to read an excerpt from the book entitled *Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue between the Ivory Tower and the Wordface* (Chesterman and Wagner 2014), a book written as a form of dialogue between professional translator Emma Wagner and translation scholar Prof. Andrew Chesterman.

Students are required first to give their own answer to the question by not only sharing their opinion but supporting it with references to other scholarly sources and/or specific examples. Once their answer has been posted, they should then engage with other students. Their interaction should look like a conversation/debate. There is no limit to the number of posts, but a minimum of three posts and 750 words are required in each forum for the student's participation to be assessed.

In another example of controlled asynchrony, students have two weeks to participate in each of the five online Forum Discussions that will open throughout the semester. They are strongly advised by their lecturers to post at least once within the first week in order to give themselves the space and time to engage with others in week 2. This engagement is an important part of the assessment criteria underpinning Forum Discussions, and students are aware that a set of marks will be deducted if all or most of their posts are made at the end (within a 72-hour period of the deadline), because this kind of participation does not allow for their classmates' interaction with their work.

The questions to the Forum Discussions are specifically designed so there are no right or wrong answers, and students are left in charge of doing their own research and building knowledge as a community. Lecturers do post in these Forum Discussions to encourage participation by highlighting interesting aspects of a student's answer or asking follow-up questions, i.e. their role is rather that of a moderator (Mazzolini and Maddison 2007). Students receive their individual mark and feedback once the Forum Discussion has closed. Within an online environment, timely feedback is seen as a key element to ensure a successful teaching and learning experience, since the intention is to keep students' motivation from waning, and for students to build in competence and knowledge and apply this feedback in the next task.

The use of Forum Discussions as a form of assessment is meant to, on the one hand, ensure students read the materials provided to them in a timely manner; and most importantly on the other, to hone their communication, research, and collaborative skills. First of all, students have to engage in their own research to build their responses to the Forum Discussion, but they also work collaboratively in constructing knowledge and giving an overall response to the proposed question. Finally, as mentioned before, professional forum discussions for translators are one of the many ways in which technology has changed the face of the translation industry, and this kind of classroom discussions are meant as an early introduction of our students into that world.

To conclude, and perhaps of less interest to this particular paper is the students' critical review of an article. Students are expected to choose an area of research within the field of Translation Studies and a key scholarly article within that area. Students will present a critical review of that article in front of the classroom, in this case in a synchronous Zoom session. This form of assessment is particularly effective because it encourages students to work on their research and presentation skills, but also to collectively build knowledge within their learning community. Each student is given 20–25 minutes to present and five minutes for follow-up questions from their classmates. This assessment is designed to work in tandem with the research paper.

The idea is that this presentation will take place in week 7, and it will allow students to explore a particular area of study, receive feedback on their contribution, and come up with a clear research question, which they will then answer in the final Research Paper due in week 13. Although students are free to choose a topic for the critical review and research paper, this lecturer has seen a growing

interest in technologies and digital media within them. As such, last semester approximately 40 per cent of our students worked on areas of translation directly enhanced by digital technologies, such as audiovisual translation, news translation in an increasingly digital world, or the translation of memes.

The case of "General Translation"

General Translation (TRAN6102) is, as described by its course outline, the second of two foundational courses in the MA in Translation (French/Spanish). The course focuses on the translation of texts related to the fields of journalism, environment, sports, tourism, and literature. Students are required to become familiar with terminological research, and they are guided to develop a sensitivity to genre, register and the expectations of their target reader/client. Moreover, within the context of this paper, it seems important to highlight that the following can be found among the learning outcomes of this course:

1. Effectively post-edit or revise a target text;
2. Conduct advanced terminological research; and
3. Manage and create glossaries based on the material translated in each subject area.

Similar to TRAN6101, teaching methodology, content, and assessment were all modified for online delivery. Even though TRAN6102 also presents itself in a mixture of asynchronous and synchronous teaching (*see* Appendix B*)*, there was a heavier reliance on asynchronous teaching, and so our lecturers fostered interaction by ensuring frequent and timely feedback for each of the week's activities.

TRAN6102 consists of six units:

1. The Translation Process;
2. Environmental Texts in Translation;
3. Journalistic Translation;
4. The Translation of Tourism;
5. Sports Translation;
6. Introduction to Literary Translation.

Each unit lasts approximately two weeks, and as such from a pedagogical perspective, it is important to note that students will always complete formative activities in the first week and receive feedback before they have to submit their

assignment in the second week. In addition, even though translating in different topic areas, it is expected that students will apply what they have learnt about analysing a ST, complying with client's expectations and terminological research in previous assignments when completing the next one. In fact, we have clearly seen this happening with our students producing translations of increasing quality throughout the semester.

The structure and nature of the assessment in this course was modified as shown in table 2.

Table 2. Previous and modified assessment for "General Translation"

Previous Course Assessment (F2F)	Modified Course Assessment (Online)
40% Portfolio of Translations	**100% Coursework**
Translation of four (4) 500-word texts distributed at various stages in the semester, done in class and using paper dictionaries.	– Translation Portfolio (40%): The portfolio will consist of five translation assignments to be completed throughout the semester.
60% Final Exam	– Glossaries (20%)
Translation of two (2) passages on different topics and different languages (Spanish and French).	– Extended Translation Project (40%): The project will consist of approximately 1,250 words of literary translation and a 2,500-word commentary

As established in this paper, professional translators are currently expected to have a proficient use of CAT tools, databases, glossaries, virtual environments, etc. Unfortunately, this was not something students could demonstrate under exam conditions as prescribed by our university. As a lecturer of translation, the only things that I could assess under those conditions (i.e. access to paper dictionaries or no dictionaries at all) would be the students' understanding of their foreign languages (but advanced knowledge of Spanish and French is already a pre-requisite to our students' admission into the MA), very general translation skills, and perhaps most importantly, time-management. Time-management would still be assessed under the modified type of assessment, since some of the translations within the portfolio are timed, but other than that the decision was made to eliminate the final exam.

In addition to the elimination of the final exam, the structure of the translation

portfolio changed from a series of in-class tests to a series of virtual assignments. This is of particular interest to this paper because our students are now encouraged to access electronic dictionaries, databases, glossaries, translation forums, etc. in order to complete them, making these assignments feel like authentic translation projects. As established by Marshman and Bowker (2012), engaging students with both realistic translation tasks and technology in the classroom helps them to appreciate when and where these technological tools can be used.

That is why from Unit 1, students are invited to explore the different potential professional paths from which a graduate in translation could choose. For instance, and since recent developments of machine translation (MT) quality has led to growing use of the technology in many professional contexts, it is important for our students to know of this type of workflow, where a machine-translated text is used as a raw translation to be corrected or post-edited by a translator. As such, Assignment 1 is intended to hone our students' revision skills and test the limits of machine translation by completing a post-editing (PE) exercise. This paper argues that at least part of the skill set needed for post-editing is likely to be shared with more traditional human translation and the revision of human translated texts, such as source and target language proficiency, subject area knowledge, textual and linguistic skills, cultural and intercultural competence, as well as general documentation and research skills (Rico and Torrejón 2012; Austermuehl 2013). But also some specific PE skills will be needed such as a positive attitude toward MT and knowledge of pre-editing and controlled language (Koponen 2015, 3). In "General Translation", students were only introduced to the topic of PE and the aforementioned skills, and they will explore it further in other courses, particularly in our second-year course "Management of Translation Projects", where PE is again part of the assessment.

In Unit 2, we use the topic of the environment to introduce students to terminology management. "Terminology management is a generic term for the documentation, storage, manipulation and presentation of a specialized vocabulary" (Chen and Tian 2016, 2). Terminology management is crucial for professional translators, because it would be unrealistic to expect a translator to become an expert in every specialised field they translate and as such terminology mining or the search for the correct term can be very time consuming. With the aid of terminology management, the terminology of any specific discipline or translation project can be standardised to maintain translation accuracy and consistency, thereby improving translation quality and efficiency. A major advantage

of computer-aided translation and of translation management systems such as TRADOS is to maintain consistency in the project's terminology.

As established above, we are still awaiting the necessary funding to give our students access to such software, but we are still introducing them to terminology management, effective use of databases and electronic corpora, and teaching them how to create their own glossaries. Students are taught that in the creation of glossaries, the identification, selection and presentation of terms (i.e. alphabetical order, natural capitalisation) are key. In fact, glossaries are part of our assessment. Students are required to submit two multilingual glossaries (Spanish, French and English) of approximately twenty entries each. Students must use a source text in order to contextualise the glossary within an imagined translation project and are encouraged to also find a couple of parallel texts in order to optimise terminology mining.

Finally, the extended translation project is a highly interesting example of project-based learning, but due to the scope and space limitations of this paper will not be discussed here.

Conclusion

The need for greater computer and translation technology literacy among both professional translators and students of translation has been clearly established in this paper, as well as the financial, time, and resource constraints complicating the implementation of these technologies in the programme of studies of our MA in Translation (French/Spanish). Against this background, a move to online delivery of our foundational courses was seen as a valuable and strategic decision to streamline computer literacy and technological competences among our students from the earliest stages of their postgraduate learning process.

Since the move to online delivery has been quite recent, this paper only seeks to rationalise the changes made to the content and assessment of these courses as well as to present a very preliminary evaluation of their effectiveness in honing some core skills among our students. Those skills have been identified as revision, research and terminology skills, communicative and collaborative skills. This paper argues that familiarising our students with a virtual environment and encouraging their use of digital tools to optimise the translation process is successfully professionalising our graduates.

Of course, the courses described here cover only the first semester of our

programme, and all these translator competences are then to be progressively developed in the following semesters. Terminology management is key part of all our specialised translation courses (Technical Translation, Financial Translation, and Legal Translation) and the use of CAT tools to produce and revise texts, manage terminology, and optimise teamwork in larger translation projects is a key part of our courses on Institutional Translation and the Management of Translation Projects.

APPENDIX A:
PROPOSED SCHEDULE "PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF TRANSLATION"

Monday 6–8pm & Tuesday 6–8 pm

Week 1 (14–18 September)	**UNIT 1** What is Translation Studies? (asynchronous)
Week 2 (21–25 September)	UNIT 1 Monday 6–7 (Q&A session) Tuesday 6–8 (Workshop Equivalence) Friday at midnight closes Forum Discussion 1
Week 3 (28 September–2 October)	**UNIT 2** Overview of Translation Theories (asynchronous)
Week 4 (5–9 October)	**UNIT 2** Monday 6–8 (Seminar on Creating a Translation Journal) Tuesday 6–8 (Workshop Functional Theories) Friday at midnight closes Forum Discussion 2
Week 5 (12–16 October)	**UNIT 2** Monday 6–7 (Seminar on preparing a Presentation) Tuesday 6–8 (Workshop Invisibility of the Translator) Research Topic to be chosen
Week 6 (19–23 October)	**UNIT 2** Tuesday 6–8 (Workshop Postcolonial/Feminist Translation) Friday at midnight closes Forum Discussion 3
Week 7 (26–30 October)	**UNIT 3** Text analysis and Translation Commentary (asynchronous) Presentation (20%) – Critical Review of an Article (TBA)
Week 8 (2–6 November)	**UNIT 3** Tuesday 6–8 (Workshop Paratexts in Translation/Translation of Paratexts) Submission of one example in the Translation Journal-Formative Feedback
Week 9 (9–3 November)	**UNIT 3** Monday 6–7 (Seminar on Writing a Research Paper) Tuesday 6–8 (Workshop Language Variety) Friday at midnight closes Forum Discussion 4
Week 10 (16–20 November)	**UNIT 3** Monday 6–7 (Q&A Session) Friday at midnight – Submission of Translation Journal (40%)
Week 11 (23–27 November)	**UNIT 4** New Technologies and Translation (asynchronous)
Week 12 (30 November–4 December)	**UNIT 4** Monday 6–7 (Q&A session) Tuesday 6–8 (Workshop Subtitling) Friday at midnight closes Forum Discussion 5
Week 13 (7–11 December)	Friday at midnight: Submission of Research Paper (25%)

APPENDIX B
PROPOSED SCHEDULE "GENERAL TRANSLATION"

Wednesday 6–8pm & Thursday 5–8 pm

Week 1 (14–18 September)	**UNIT 1** The Process of Translation (asynchronous)
Week 2 (21–25 September)	**UNIT 1** Wednesday 6–8 (Q&A session) Translation Portfolio Assignment 1
Week 3 (28 September–2 October)	**UNIT 2** Environment (asynchronous)
Week 4 5–9 October)	**UNIT 2** Wednesday 6–8 (Seminar on creating glossaries Translation Portfolio Assignment 2
Week 5 (12–16 October)	**UNIT 3** Journalism (asynchronous)
Week 6 (19–23 October)	**UNIT 3** Wednesday 6–8 (Seminar on writing a translation commentary) Translation Portfolio Assignment 3
Week 7 (26–30 October)	**UNIT 4** Tourism (asynchronous)
Week 8 (2–6 November)	**UNIT 4** Wednesday 6–8 (Q&A session) Translation Portfolio Assignment 4
Week 9 (9–13 November)	**UNIT 5** Sports (asynchronous) Friday at midnight: Submission of Glossaries (Two topics)
Week 10 (16–20 November)	**UNIT 5** Wednesday 6–8 (Q&A session) Assignment 5
Week 11 (23–27 November)	**UNIT 6** Literature (asynchronous) Extended Translation – ST assigned
Week 12 (30 November–4 December)	**UNIT 6** Wednesday 6–8 (Seminar on Translation Commentary II)
Week 13 (7–11 December)	**UNIT 6** Friday at midnight: Submission of Extended Translation

Notes

1. Parallel corpora consist of a collection of source texts (ST) in one language and their target texts (TT) in another language. ST and TT are aligned at a certain level. Depending on the number of languages involved in the corpus, these parallel corpora can be bilingual or multilingual in nature (Neshkovska 2019, 66–7).

2. Comparable corpora include texts that are comparable at different levels. A comparable corpus can be monolingual, bilingual and multilingual. A monolingual comparable corpus is composed of the non-translated texts and translated texts in the same language. Texts in the two corpora are similar with regard to registration, language variation, and time span, and the size of the two sub-corpora is roughly the same. A bilingual or multilingual comparable corpus contains texts in two or more languages which are comparable but not in translational relationship to one another. A corpus of this kind is primarily used in contrastive studies between languages (Neshkovska 2019, 67).

3. Translational corpora consist exclusively of texts translated from one or more languages into a certain language. Generally, a translational corpus is compiled for the investigation of features of translations, translational norms, translators' style, etc. However, it should be used hand in hand with a corpus which contains original texts (Neshkovska 2019, 67).

4. Some important terminological databases available for students to access freely could be UNTERM (United Nations Multilingual Database), WTOTERM (World Trade Organization Terminology Database in three official languages) or the UNICRI (United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute) Thesaurus. In the MA in Translation (French/Spanish), these types of sources are extensively consulted by students when completing their "Institutional Translation" course.

5. The titles of the eight courses are: Principles and Practices of Translation, General Translation, Institutional Translation, Technical Translation, Financial Translation, Legal Translation, Management of Translation Projects and Research Paper.

6. The same argument can be made about asynchronous materials in General Translation, whose assessment is going to be discussed in the following section.

References

Austemuehl, F. 2013. "Future (and Not-So-Future) Trends in The Teaching of Translation Technology." *Revista Tradumática: Tecnologies de la traducció* 11: 326–37.

Beeby, A., P. Rodríguez Inéz, and P. Sanchez Guijón (eds.). 2009. *Corpus Use and Translating: Corpus Use for Learning to Translate and Learning Corpus Use to Translate*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bernardini, S., D. Stewart, and F. Zanettin. 2003. "Corpora in Translator Education: An Introduction." In *Corpora in Translator Education*, edited by S. Bernardini, D. Stewart and F. Zanettin, 11–14. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Biau Gil, J. 2006. "Teaching Electronic Tools for Translators Online." In *Translation Technology and Its Teaching*, edited by A. Pym, A. Perestenko and B. Satarink, 89–96. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, Universitat Rovira i Virgili.

Biau Gil J., and A. Pym. 2006. "Technology and Translation: A Pedagogical Overview." In *Translation Technology and Its Teaching*, edited by A. Pym, A. Perestenko and B. Satarink, 5–19. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, Universitat Rovira i Virgili.

Boisselle, L. 2014. "Online Learning and Its Utility to Higher Education in the Anglophone Caribbean." *Sage* 6 (1): 1–14.

Bowker, L. 2004. "What Does It Take to Work in Translation in the 21st Century?" *Meta* 49 (4): 960–72.

Chen, J., and C. Tian. 2016. "Terminology Management and Translation Teaching in Mainland China." *International Journal of Research and Review in Educa*tion 3: 1–12.

Chesterman, A. and E. Wagner. 2014. *Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue Between The Ivory Tower and The Wordface*. New York: Routldedge.

Doherty, S. 2016. "The Impact of Translation Technologies on the Process and Product of Translation." *International Journal of Communication* 10: 947–69.

Gouadec, D. 2003. "Position Paper: Notes on Translator Training." In *Innovation and E-Learning in Translator Training*, edited by A. Pym, C. Fallada, J. Biau and J. Orenstein, 11–19. Tarragona: Universitat Rovira i Virgili.

Johnston, B. and P. Losensky. 2017. "A Graduate Certificate in Translation Studies". In *Teaching Translation. Programs, Courses, Pedagogies*, edited by L. Venuti, 41–52. New York: Routledge.

Kiraly, D. 2000. *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education: Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Koponen, M. 2015. "How to Teach Machine Translation Post-editing? Experiences from A Post-editing Course". In *Proceedings of 4th Workshop on Post-Editing Technology and Practice*, edited by S. O'Brien and M. Simard, 2–15. Association for Machine Translation in the Americas.

Marshman, E. and L. Bowker. 2012. "Translation Technologies as Seen Through the Eyes of Educators and Students: Harmonizing Views with the Help of a Centralized Teaching and Learning Resource." In *Global Trends in Translator and Interpreter Training: Mediation and Culture*, edited by S. Hubscher-Davidson and M. Borodo, 69–95. London: Continuum.

Mazzolini, M. and S. Maddison. 2007. "When to Jump in: The Role of The Instructor in Online Discussion Forums." *Computers and Education* 49 (2): 193–213.

Neshkovska, S. 2019. "The Role of Electronic Corpora in Translation Training." *Studies in Linguistics Culture and Foreign Language Teaching* 6: 62–72.

Odacioglu, M. and S. Kokturk. 2015. "The Effects of Technology on Translation Students in Academic Translation Teaching." *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 197: 1085–1094.

Pym, A. 2011. "What Technology Does to Translating." *Translation and Interpreting* 3(1): 1–9.

Rico, C. and E. Torrejón. 2012. "Skills and Profile or the New Role of the Translator as MT Post-editor." *Revista Tradumática: Tecnologies de la traducció* 10: 166–78.

Samson, R. 2005. "Computer-assisted Translation." In *Training for The New Millennium: Pedagogies for Translation and Interpreting*, edited by M. Tennent, 101–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Samson, R. 2013. "El aprendizaje de las herramientas informáticas en la formación del traductor." *Revista Tradumática: Tecnologies de la traducció* 11: 247–56.

Sewell, P. 2002. *Translation Commentary: The Art Revisited.* Dublin: Philomel.

Varela Salinas, M. J. 2007. "How New Technologies Improve Translation Pedagogy." *The Translator Journal* 11(4): 1–14.