

A Study of Translation Proficiency with Special Reference to Title Translations

Milind Solanki

Assistant Professor,

Dept. of English, KSKV Kachchh University, Bhuj

Abstract:

Writing and translation process studies have a lot of similarities, from the research questions to the tools employed to investigate them. It is not uncommon for translation studies to take into account the workplace and cognitive processes as well as the impact they have on product quality, similar to how writing research has done so lately. Translators' perspectives of their obligations as text creators, as well as their approach to the title translation problem, may be examined using methodologies from both domains, as we demonstrate in this paper. As part of an extensive investigation on the relationship between translation competence and the process, a large corpus of data was collected. Our multi-method approach includes keystroke logging, screenshot recording, eye tracking, retrospectives, and interviews. In a non-intrusive and regulated manner, it allows us to monitor translators at work. Additionally, it provides a plethora of data from which I may draw conclusions about how translators of varying levels of skill approach their work and how they approach language.

Keywords: Self-concept, titles, translation competence, retrospection, multi-method

1. Introduction

As has been stated and well-documented elsewhere, recent technology breakthroughs have drastically changed text creation processes in practically all areas of human endeavour (e.g. Bazerman 2007). Writing a few lines or "pencilling in an appointment" may soon be as obscure to future generations as the simile "as fine as vellum" is to most present readers. Inkpots and quills are as antiquated as the notion of translators toiling over manuscripts in the company of reference books. A vast variety of digital materials have made computer workstations crucial in both fields. In today's world, not only do the majority of texts get written on computers, but they're also delivered online and printed only when someone requests them. When it comes to translation, most translators prefer working with computer-generated translations, and they'll even charge extra if they're forced to deal with paper-based translations.

Scholars interested in the writing and translation processes might benefit from the computerization of both professions, which is another similarity between the two. Non-invasive methods such as keystroke monitoring make it possible to reproduce and analyse texts and translations at every step of their development (see Van Waes&Leijten 2006 on the use of InputLog in writing research and Jakobsen 2006 on the use of TransLog in translation research). If you're a writer or translator who has to keep track of micro-alterations and pauses, keystroke logs are a great tool. However, they don't give much information about what occurs while you're not writing. However, the use of eye-tracking and continuous screen recording in writing and translation studies has successfully overcome this limitation (see for example Asadi&Séguinot 2005; Degenhardt 2006; Dragsted 2010). By keeping an eye on both the changes on the computer screen and any shifts in visual attention, such as when someone switches screens to consult a resource or look up a phrase in an online thesaurus, the process may be better understood.

Another prominent source of data in writing and translation research is self-report by writers and translators, either in the form of current or retrospective verbalizations. A century after they were first used in psychology and language studies, contemporaneous reports have been critiqued for interfering with the process being examined (Camps 2003). Jakobsen showed

that thinking aloud reduces translation pace and causes translators to analyse material in smaller pieces when they think aloud (Jääskeläinen 1999: 151-158)

Retrospection, which occurs after a job has been finished, is a useful alternative to verbalising the task at the time of its completion. Writing and talking are not required at the same time; the talking does not affect the writing or translation process because it comes subsequently. Other approaches, like as keystroke logging or screen recordings, are commonly used in combination with it (see, for instance, Alves 2005 and Kujamäki 2010). For cue-based retrospective data, a recording of the operation is replayed and the writer or translator is allowed to remark (cf. Hansen 2006; see Göpferich 2009 or Jääskeläinen 2011 for potential drawbacks of retrospection).

Because many methodologies may be used, researchers can look at the writing and translation processes from a number of perspectives to better understand the talents and resources that writers and translators employ in their work. For the study of journalists' writing processes, Perrin (2001, 2002, 2003, 2006a) created Progression Analysis. Observation, interviewing, computer recording, and cue-based retrospection are just a few of the methods used in this study. Examining the writing processes of students in schools has also proven to be effective (e.g. Gnach et al. 2007). Screen recording and eye-tracking have lately been applied to studies of translation processes in controlled contexts (e.g. Ehrensberger-Dow & Künzli 2010; Massey & Ehrensberger-Dow 2010; Ehrensberger-Dow & Perrin 2013).

Data from various forms of computer recording and retrospective notes can be used to derive conclusions about reading processes, revision, research, consultation, problem-solving, and other behaviours during translation. Because each computer activity can be reconstructed from the recordings, it allows for a more comprehensive investigation of how specific problems are handled than is possible with other products.

Data from screen recordings and cue-based retrospection are used in the current study to investigate whether indicators of translators' self-concepts are linked to how they deal with the issues raised by title translation, as measured by a focus on various aspects of the translation process (such as as part of a social system or as a cognitive act). Many psycholinguistic and cognitive models, such as Kiraly 1995 and Göpferich 2009, directly or implicitly (e.g. PACTE 2003, 2005, 2011) consider self-concept to be a key aspect of

translation competence, hence we choose to explore it. PACTE According to Nord (1993), translation is both a sociological event and an act or set of observable practises that can be triggered in the translator's mind when they are translated. The focus on titles is motivated by the fact that they provide essential source texts that when translated generically represent both of these aspects of the translation process (cf. Nord 1993: 286).

2. Translation competence and translator self-concept

Practically speaking, it's a given that the way you go about your translation work has an impact on your ability to do it effectively. There are six interconnected sub-competences or components in the holistic model proposed by the PACTE group (2003, 2005, 2011). There are three factors that appear to be universal in the development of multilingual texts: bilingualism, the ability to communicate in many languages, and a psycho-physiological component (e.g. attention). It is considered that the other three sub-competences (instrumental, strategic, and translation-specific knowledge) are unique to translation, whereas the first two are assumed to be universal. Knowledge of translation principles and the profession can be tested through interviews and questionnaires in this sub-competence. Translation-knowledge The research, information literacy, and information technology abilities that translators use may be seen in the instrumental sub-competency. The strategic sub-competence must be accessible indirectly, maybe when translators reflect on their actions and judgements, in order to have overall control over the translation process. Translators' understandings of their roles and obligations as language mediators and text creators, as articulated by Kiraly (1995: 100), might be gleaned through this kind of thinking.

Translation self-concept involves a comprehension of the translation's objective, a recognition of its information requirements, an appraisal of one's competence to execute the work, and an associated capacity for monitoring and evaluating translation results for appropriateness and adequacy. We will use Toury's (1995) fundamental difference between the cognitive translation act and the contextual communicative, socio-cultural event in which that act is embedded to describe the translator self-concept for the purposes of this research. Self-concept in this sense is a recognition that translators face a wide range of duties and obligations in the course of translating and in the aftermath of translating.

The translator's self-concept is central to a psycholinguistic model of the translator's mental space established by Kiraly (1995: 101). The concept is based on research into students' and interpreters' simultaneous verbalizations (i.e. think-aloud techniques). Translator's personal self-concept is also included in Göpferich's model of translation competence (2008: 155; 2009: 22). According to Risku (2009; see also Risku 2009), it has been linked to the translator's education, as well as to aspects of social obligation and function. TransComp participants were asked to complete questionnaires about their own self-concept as translators at three different points in the study: at the beginning, after three semesters, and at the end (see Göpferich 2009 for more information; see also Göpferich et al. 2011), in order to test Göpferich's model. According to their comments, the hypothesis that one's self-concept is linked to one's ability to translate may be supported.

Others, including Gross (2003: 91), have made the same assumption. First, boosting the awareness of the link between journalistic work and translation should have a positive influence on translators' self-concepts. Parallels between translation and writing are also shown by Tirkkonen-Condit and Laukkanen (1996: 45-46). Because she sees herself as a "equivalents" translator, the translator works hard to find words that convey the same meaning as what she is translating. When she sees herself as a writer who conveys to her audience the important aspects of the original message, she is fully responsible for producing the target text in a way that makes sense to her audience member. "copier" and "maker" are two different things, according to Katan (2009: 135), in his report on a global survey of professional translators' empowerment and self-image. When it comes to translation, "the double bind present in all translation: [...] a need to simultaneously reach towards the target text readers ("readability") while remaining faithful to the source text." is what Koskinen (2008: 103) revealed in her ethnographic research of Finnish EU translators. With this basic dichotomy, Kiraly (2008) proposes a more complex approach to translation studies, which reflects the long-standing controversies in translation studies surrounding "literal" "true" and "free" translations (see Munday 2008). (1997:152). A continuum exists "stretching from the simple retrieval of spontaneous connections at the word level to a complicated, multistaged problem-solving process in which extra-linguistic elements are taken into account." he claims. When translating, a translator who has a well-developed self-concept may be able to go back and forth between words and readers as needed.

According to the translator's degree of experience, there are various emphasis points along the continuum stretching from literal word-level translation to intricate reader-oriented transfer discussed in section one of this paper. For this purpose, we analysed translators' retrospective comments in order to learn more about their own self-concepts and the translation process itself, in accordance with the practise of enabling translators to express themselves.

3. Data collection and creation of a corpus

As part of our ongoing research, Capturing Translation Processes, we've enlisted the help of translators of all ability levels to complete translations in a lab setting. We can compare the performance of students at various stages of their careers, such as at the beginning and end of their degree programme and two years after graduation, using our database of data. We can also compare the performance of professionals and students in various degree programmes, such as BA and MA, and compare translations into different languages, such as German-English or English-German (L1 or L2). MA translation students tested in the first semester of their graduate programme, and professionals with more than two years of experience working as staff translators tested at the end of their first translation course. Students with a bachelor's degree in translation were tested before their first translation class began. The group sizes are spread as evenly as feasible within the constraints of the corpus's size. A summary of the situation is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Groups, experience, direction, and source texts

Group (n)	Level of experience	Version	Source text(s) translated
BAG (9)	BA beginners	into German (L1)	<i>whales</i>
BAE (9)	BA beginners	into English (L2)	<i>Wale</i>
MA (8)	MA students	into English (L2)	<i>Wale</i>
		into German (L1)	<i>whales</i>
ProG (8)	Professionals	into German (L1)	<i>whales</i>
ProE (7)	Professionals	into English (L1)	<i>Wale</i>

The data collecting method and environment differ slightly amongst the groups due to logistical constraints. Two subgroups of a large cohort of individuals were randomly selected and tested at the beginning of the longitudinal research to form the BA starter groups. They

were allocated to translate into their first language (German) or their second language (English) after completing an interview in which they answered questions about their educational and professional backgrounds (English). All of the tools and resources that they were previously familiar with from other computers were available at a customised computer workstation in the departmental library, which had a similar user experience to other computers in the department. A keystroke logging programme (InputLog 2.0) recorded the participants' keyboard and mouse activities, and another programme (Camtasia Studio) recorded all changes to the source text, which included switching between windows, editing the emerging translation, and looking up information in libraries and on the internet. 1 For those new to BA, the project manager promised them that they would not be penalised if they didn't meet their deadline (approximately 20 minutes). Once in the silent room, they were given the screen recording of their procedure and asked to comment on what they saw themselves doing in the language of their choice in the language of their choice (cue-based retrospection).

Source texts (STs) were selected for this study because of their believed to be basic enough for novices to grasp but being demanding for specialists. According to the project's specifications, the texts were taken from pieces that appeared in local daily newspapers (the publication name and date of publication were provided) and were intended for publishing in a similar magazine in the target culture. For all that they were almost identical in terms of word count, they came from publications with similar readerships, they provided around the same amount of potential translation challenges, and they seemed to be on the same theme. [TRANSLATION] (whales or Wale in German; see Table 1). They differed in terms of the length and intricacy of their titles as well as the content of the body of the text (see Appendix A).

However, unlike the beginners, who were randomly allocated to a certain translation version, the MA students and pros were not given the identical STs to translate. MA students conducted two translations in eight weeks: one into English (their second language) and one into German (their native language) (their L1). 2 Given that these translations were done after three semesters of translation instruction, it was anticipated that there would be no significant influence on students' self-perceptions or translation abilities due to the small time gap

between data collection and student performance. They all translated into their own tongue, which is the direction they are most familiar with. An additional data collection method used to distinguish MA students and professionals from BA novices was an eye-tracking monitor and software³, in addition to keyboard logging and screen recording programmes. The MA students and professionals were tested in the usability lab. As soon as the eye-tracker was calibrated, they were given an Internet search activity to get them used to the layout of the translation environment, such as where their browser was positioned. To get an answer to something as simple as "How big is the Pacific Ocean?" they had to turn to the internet. According to our audience's preference, we wanted to translate the words "whales" and "Wale ST" into German and English, respectively. A recording of roughly 20 minutes was set up for the MA students, who were advised to work as normal and at their own pace, with the awareness that they would be recorded for that length of time. When eye tracking gaze plots were transformed into.avi files, the MA students and professionals completed a cue-based self-reflection in the language of their choice by commenting on eye tracking gaze plots that were overlaid on the screen recordings (see videoclip ProG sample.avi for an example | available at WritingPro.eu for more information)

4. Results and conclusions: categories of self-perception

Because of their quantity of information, the recordings of the translation procedures provided as high-quality triggers for the retrospective observations. Following Göpferich (2008: 72-81)'s advice, the commentary was transcribed using TEI 2008 conventions, and the screen events were coded using XML tags built expressly for the Capturing Translation Processes project (see Appendix B). Identifying the statements that revealed a meta-linguistic comprehension of what participants were doing and why was done iteratively by isolating and categorising those that were not solely reports of screen events or study activities. It was then separated into five categories, ranging from the micro level of words and phrases to a knowledge of the readership's wants and expectations, resulting in a total of thirteen codes (see Table 2, with example utterances from participants from the three levels of experience given for each code and category).

This was done by using percentages to figure out the number of students in each of the self-concept groups who had provided comments. Each ST has its own set of results. As an indicator of the translator's major focus of attention, any overt comments made on certain areas of the translation were taken to indicate that the translator was aware of that particular area.

Table 2. Continuum of self-concept categories derived from the retrospective commentaries

Categories	Codes	Examples (participant code_version)
Words & phrases	literal	<i>I more or less translated it word for word</i> (BAE1_GE)
	word-for-word	<i>I sort of stayed stuck to the source text</i> (MA1_EG) <i>I tend to write a literal translation</i> (ProE5_GE)
Sentence structures	moving	<i>I also moved things around with respect to sentence</i>
	changing	<i>structures</i> (BAE2_GE)
	word order	<i>and then I had to adapt the sentence construction to English</i> (MA3_GE) <i>divide this up into two sentences in German</i> (ProG2_EG)
Text quality	esthetics	<i>find something else instead of using the same word twice</i>
	naturalness	(BAG8_EG)
	style	<i>whether it flows well</i> (MA6_GE) <i>how I could reword it to make it sound a bit nicer</i> (ProE5_GE)
Loyalty to ST	loyalty to text completeness	(none of the BA beginners referred to this) <i>you don't necessarily have to say 'Meer' [sea]</i> (MA6_EG) <i>check again to see whether everything's there</i> (ProG8_EG)
Readership	audience	<i>I tried to make it a bit easier to understand</i> (BAE7_GE)
	readability	<i>it is still readable and understandable</i> (MA1_EG)
	function	<i>it's for a newspaper it's not for a scientific journal</i> (ProE4_GE)

When translating from English into their L1, German, the percentage of translators who make remarks about their own self-concept is seen in Table 3. For example, BA freshmen (BAG) are separated from MA undergrads and professionals from both groups (MA) (ProG).

Table 3. Percentages of translators in each E-G group making comments in each category (*whales* ST)

Group	Experience level	Direction	Words & phrases	Sentence structures	Text quality	Loyalty to ST	Readership
BAG	BA beginners	L2-L1	44	33	33	0	78
MA	MA students	L2-L1	50	25	25	50	63
ProG	Professionals	L2-L1	25	75	88	50	88

Inexperienced English-German speakers seem to have a very narrow focus of attention, with most commenting on the readership and few commenting on the other categories. Student attention to audience may be an indicator of their self-concepts as writers and text analysts because they completed coursework in both the source and target languages the previous semester in text creation and analysis. More careful reading reveals that they're referring to the ST's readership rather than their intended audience (TT). On the other hand, half of the MA students emphasised the importance of conveying the ST's message, while the other half preferred to focus on the target text readership. Higher than half of MA students say that their focus is focused on the level of words and phrases, far more than the group of professionals. According to their remarks, professionals tend to be better at multitasking and have the attention resources to deal with a wide range of worries than the general public. In a survey of professional translators, these and other issues were raised by those who were asked to self-report, and the results showed that translators were dividing their time between ST, TT, and the end-user (Katan 2009).

Table 4. Percentages of translators in each G-E group making comments in each category (*Wale* ST)

Group	Experience level	Direction	Words & phrases	Sentence structures	Text quality	Loyalty to ST	Readership
BAE*	BA beginners	L1-L2	50	75	75	0	38
MA*	MA students	L1-L2	38	50	63	25	38
ProE	Professionals	L2-L1	29	71	100	86	86

* translation into L2

Table 4 displays the percentages of German to English translators who commented on their own self-concept in each of the categories.

Textual level characteristics and TT quality are more important to novices and MA students compared to faithfulness to source text as a whole and what the ST author may have intended, according to studies. It appears that the MA students' dedication to the ST and their awareness of the audience is lacking when they comment on their translation procedures into their second language (L2). Students' emphasis reveals that they may perceive translation into their second language as a practise activity for improving their proficiency in the target language. There might also be a reason for the translations' lack of faithfulness or commitment to the source text, despite the fact that all of the retrospective commentary were written in the translators' native language. Due to German-English translators showing the same spread of attention as English-German translators, it appears that the differences in patterns seen between BAG and BAE beginners and among the same MA students translating E-G or G-E appear to be influenced by translation direction. (i.e. translation into the L2). Follow-up studies should include professionals who routinely translate into both their first and second languages to see if their self-concept is stable enough to be independent of translation direction.

Interpreters' views on their work appear to be affected by training, experience and translation direction according to our research of comments.. Translators who work only in their mother tongue tend to be more conscientious of their obligations to the languages they work in, the texts they translate, the authors they work with, and the audiences they serve. They say that there is less homogeneity, with emphasis given to lexical, syntactic and textual categories that are less uniformly distributed than in the past. Among BA novices, this is even more apparent, as they exhibit a substantial focus on reading the source material but little knowledge of other categories and the translator's work difficulty. BA groups show no reference to source text loyalty in either the L2-L1 direction or when translating into their second language. It appears that they are primarily concerned with the linguistic aspect of translation into L2, a pattern that may also be found among MA students, albeit to a lesser extent. Putting these insights into practise in real-world translation is the next step. Using the

same sets of BA newbies, MA students and professionals we can see how they deal with title translation issues.

5. Titles translation

According to Nord (2004a: 908), a lot of emphasis has been paid to the study of titles in general, but the translation of titles has gotten very less attention. 193 (Viezzi 2011). Prior to the cultural turn in translation studies, the equivalence-oriented dichotomy between literal and free translation was examined in greater detail, with the latter being seen as the most important example (Doyle 1989) or even paradigm of intercultural communication and functional translation (Nord 1991, 1993). (Nord 2004a). "culturally re-contextualized semantic transfer." is the prism through which Doyle examines a corpus of newly translated Spanish and Spanish-American literature titles. "Traits of fidelity" along a "spectrum of the translation process from literal to near-literal to liberal or free translation" (1989: 46) are substituted for the simple faithful/unfaithful dichotomy (1989: 41), which is similar to Kiraly's continuum of "literal to near-literal to liberal or free translation" (1997). According to Nord (1993: 286), title translation is a multifaceted skopos-driven act with many allegiances to the players in the translation event (the commissioner/client, the author of the original material, and the intended recipient). Since all translations aim to be faithful to the original partners' intentions while also being useful in a new communication context, this is a common objective for all translations that goes well beyond the simplistic opposition of "faithful" and "free" translation. Result: (Nord 1993: 291). Nord has used a method quite similar to this in more recent studies (e.g. Nord 2008). Title translations can be analysed along an implicit continuum that ranges from linguistic equivalence to Rabadàn (1991)'s notion of translemic equivalence: "the unique relationship characterising any pair of source and target texts above the mere 'linguistic' level" (Viezzi 2011: 192). In the functionalist paradigm adopted in translation studies over the past twenty years, translators are the only participants in translation events capable of weighing the demands of adequacy and loyalty, which emphasises the importance of translators' responsibilities and has significant implications for their status and self-image (cf. Nord 1993: 293).

In light of this, we contrasted our research participants' findings on title translation self-concept with those previously stated. Until far, all of the translation assessments have been based on product-oriented evaluations. With this approach and process data analysis integrated, our investigation goes one step further. Title translation process-oriented analyses have only been published by Johnsen (2011).

5. Titles for analysis and findings

The corpus utilised for the self-concept analysis (previous section) was also used to collect data for the title translation research. The recordings of screen events and eye-tracking paths were reviewed in addition to the final versions of the titles in the target texts to ascertain the kind and timing of every modification and instance of resource consumption associated to translating the titles. All title-related statements in the retrospective verbal protocols (RVPs) were also gathered and evaluated. The titles indicated a broad range of German translations of the highly difficult English ST title: none of the 23 TT titles were precisely the same (see Appendix C) (see Appendix C). However, as indicated in Table 5, the linguistic patterns may be characterised by four broad forms (Nord 2004b) (Nord 2004b). A verb transmitted the second piece of information in the ST in the most typical way, while the placements of the other two information units were inverted. This form was utilised by the same amount of BA beginners (BAG) and professionals (ProG), however none of the MA students did. A non-finite variant of the first pattern, with the verb as a passive participle rather than in the present tense, was developed by members of all three groups. German grammatical restrictions govern the change in component order from English.

The other two most prevalent patterns are elaborate noun phrases with post-modifying preposition phrases, analogous to the English ST pattern. The organisation of information in the more usually generated pattern (made by two BA and two MA students) follows that of the English ST, while the less frequently produced pattern has the reverse order.

Table 5. Forms and examples of titles for each group (E-G)

Form of ST title	English ST title			
Whales ₁ -at N ₂ -in NP ₃	Whales at risk in sonar sea exercises			
Form of German titles	Examples of German titles [English gloss]	BAG	MA	ProG
NP ₃ -V ₂ -Wale ₁	Sonarübungen im Meer gefährden Wale [Sonar exercises in sea endanger whales]	4	-	4
Wale ₁ -durch NP ₃ -V ₂	Wale durch Schalltests gefährdet [Whales by sound tests endangered]	2	1	1
Wale ₁ -in N ₂ -X ₃	Wale in Gefahr aufgrund von Sonartests im Meer [Whales in danger because of sonar tests in sea]	2	2	-
NP ₃ -als N ₂ -für Wale ₁	Marine Sonartests als Gefahr für Wale [Marine sonar tests as danger for whales]	-	1	1
	(other variants)	1	2	2
	(no title)	-	2	-

Note. The unit with information content matching that of the source text has been numbered in subscript for ease of comparison

Product analysis shows that BA novices and experts perform equally, but MA students perform significantly differently, in contrast to the pattern seen for the self-concept category categories, according to the findings of the study. As an alternative, it is possible to gain a better understanding of the similarities and contrasts between the two groups by examining processes in both languages. We were able to get a wide range of information on the translation process through screen recordings of the translation procedures and from the RVPs. The book's title was translated in less than ten minutes by nearly all of the participants! In contrast to the two experts (ProG) who didn't start translating the German TT until after they finished the first draught of the English title, two MA students never started translating the English title. Not all students could finish a first draught due to time restrictions, despite the small variances in data collection methods outlined in the preceding section. This resulted in just a 10-minute evaluation period of the translation process.

A breakdown of data gathered from analysing the titles translated from English to German in the first ten minutes of the research is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Process data for title translation analyses of whales ST (E-G): means per group

Process measure	BAG	MA	ProG
Time in process of 1st version of title (hh:mm:ss)	00:03:10	00:01:32	00:01:20
Consulted dictionary for title translation	89%	25%	50%
Consulted other resources for title translation	11%	38%	75%
Number of revisions to title during first 10 min.	3.8	4.0	4.8
Percentage of translators commented title in RVP	56%	50%	100%

Title analysis began with determining how long it took for the translator to type in a translation's initial rendition of a title after they pressed the space bar to access source material. When compared to the more experienced teams, the BA newbies (BAG) took considerably longer to come up with their first draught of the title ($p=0.05$; unequal variance groups one-tailed t-tests). An overwhelming 91% of BA newcomers looked up the title in dictionaries, compared to just 8% of students or professionals from other disciplines who used additional sources like online encyclopaedias or parallel literature (11 percent). The significant majority of members of the professional group (ProG) cited the latter kind of resources.

For title modifications, specialists appear to have the ability to make five alterations in ten minutes, whereas the other two groups only manage to make four in the same period of time. The average number of changes made to the title by the majority of experts ($av=6.9$ in this case) was computed throughout the entire process because of this. Professionals varied in their approach, with some making many changes to the title throughout the drafting process while others concentrated entirely on the revision. A total of 8.8 alterations were made to the title by the five pros who finished their first version of their target text before making two or more changes to the title. A total of 3.3 modifications were made by three specialists who put off working on a new title until the last stage of development (i.e., those who made only one or no revisions throughout the drafting process). After the drafting stage, they found it to be a successful strategy to put off finishing a difficult title.

There are just 56 percent of BA newbies who reacted on the title in Appendix D. (see below for the comments). Only a fourth of the BA novices (e.g., "and then I just started to translate

right with the title") made detailed comments about the title in the retrospective verbal protocols (RVP) (e.g., "and then I just started to translate right with the title"). On the title, hardly half of the MA students had anything to say (one of whom realized, when watching the process, that she had forgotten to translate it, and two of whom said that they did not know why they had translated it at the beginning because they normally wait until the end). In contrast to the general public, the German translation specialists (ProG) provided extensive commentary on the title and their method to translating it. The three-word German ST title, despite the fact that BA novices and MA students were translating into their second language, appeared to provide less of a challenge (English). Since at least two translators came up with at least four primary patterns, the nine alternative versions (out of 23 translated titles; see Appendix C) may be summarised in four main patterns (for example, the pattern "Ven-Ns" in Table 7 covers both Beached whales and Staggered whaling vessels).

Table 7. Forms and examples of titles for each group (G-E)

Form of ST title	German ST title [English gloss]			
Vungen ₁ -von Ns ₂	Strandungen von Walen [Strandings of whales]			
Form of English titles	Examples of English TT titles	BAE*	MA*	ProE
Ven ₁ -Ns ₂	Beached whales	4	-	4
Ving ₁ -of-Ns ₂	Beaching of whales	3	2	1
N ₂ -Vings ₁	Whale beachings	1	1	2
N ₂ -Ving ₁	Whale stranding	-	3	-
	(other variants)	1	2	-

* translation into L2

Note. the unit with information content matching that of the source text has been numbered in subscript for ease of comparison

By reversing the emphasis and reverting to a pre-modified noun phrase, this was the most commonly used approach for keeping the information in the correct sequence while also moving the focus (see Figure 1). It was discovered that the second most commonly observed pattern, which had the same informational order and grammatical structure as the German ST, was more similar to the German. While the ST's plural noun form was used by three MA

students, no other translators generated it, the last common version (used by all of the other translators but three MA students) was the identical form in the singular.

Translations into German yielded some intriguing and maybe surprising outcomes in terms of product results, but one notable finding was that the patterns of BA novices and professionals were more comparable than the patterns of MA students. On the basis of the items accessible, it is impossible to come up with a convincing explanation for this apparent oddity. The process data was also assessed, and the means for each group were obtained within the first ten minutes of the translation process, as in the case of English-German translations. The study's results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Process data for title translation analyses of Wale ST (G-E): means per group

Process measure	BAE*	MA*	ProE
Time in process of 1st version of title (hh:mm:ss)	00:02:30	00:02:07	00:01:37
Consulted dictionary for title translation	78%	75%	29%
Consulted other resources for title translation	22%	63%	29%
Number of revisions to title during first 10 min.	2.2	1.0	2.1
Percentage of translators commented title in RVP	78%	38%	43%

* translation into L2

Expert translators were marginally faster than novices and MA students at drafting the first draught of a title, but the differences were not statistically significant. Only a third of the professionals looked up definitions in dictionaries, while the majority of BA beginners (BAEs) and MA students did, which is probably because they were translating into their second language (second language). There were more MA students who requested supplementary resources than BA starters, which may suggest a better grasp of the need of meeting target-culture customs, particularly when translating into a second language. In the same way, specialists who were translating into their native language were less likely to require additional resources, maybe because to their greater familiarity with title norms and forms in the target culture and language.

Table 8 shows results that differ from those reported in the preceding section, which were derived using data on the German translation process (Table 6). This may be because of the

more complex semantic and syntactic structure of the English ST title as compared to the German source text title, which may explain why 75 percent of ProG consulted other resources but only 29 percent of ProE did so (i.e. Whales at risk in sonar sea exercises vs. Strandungen von Walen). Two MA students and two specialists were not involved in translating the title at this step of the translation process.

As can be seen in Table 1, only a very small percentage of German MA students performed any type of research for the more advanced ST title, which is in English. This group's increased problem awareness and caution while translating into their second language appears to be the most plausible reason in this case. Even more MA students than BA newcomers or veterans made less changes to their titles during the German ST title consultations, suggesting that the process may have helped them identify solutions in which they had faith.

The two-tailed t-test for groups with unequal variance found that the German title was revised significantly more frequently in the first 10 minutes than the English title was (4.2 versus 1.8, respectively; $p < 0.05$). After 10 minutes, the German translators generated considerably less TT than English translators did in the same time period because of the title's complexity (59.0 and 85.9 words, respectively). Within the first ten minutes of the trial, the more experienced groups generated TT at a rate that was much quicker than that of the less experienced groups ($p < 0.05$; one-tailed t-test for groups with unequal variance; $p < 0.05$ for groups with equal variance). although BA and MA students did not significantly differ in their translation speeds between the two versions (37.9 and 43.8 words respectively produced in the first 10 minutes for translation into German and English), it is possible that the complex title of the English source text slowed them down at L1 practise

According to RVPs, the English source material's title was more difficult to translate than the German source text's title: a higher percentage of the groups remarked on the title overall (E-G 68 percent vs. G-E 54 percent ; see Appendix D). ProG scored 100%, but ProE scored 43%, which may be attributed to the amount of mental effort required to come up with a workable solution for the challenges. While there was a small percentage of students in the MA programme who fit this pattern (50 percent E-G vs. 38 percent G-E), the converse was true for the two groups of BA students who started with E-G. (BAG 56 percent vs. BAE 78

percent). It was apparent that the BAE group was unsure about one of the terms in question when they made a number of comments concerning its title. When translating from one language to another, beginners often focus on the smallest details (see Table 4).

Based on the statistics provided above, it appears that there are considerable differences between the groups of translators in terms of problem awareness and (strategic) problem-solving strategies. In the following paragraphs, we explore these findings in connection to those pertaining to the translator's self-concept and propose some implications for how the new insights may help us better understand how translation ability develops.

6. General debate and deliberation

Translating titles appears to be an activity that can be done by anyone, regardless of their experience level—which is even more surprising given that the translation of any type of text is characterised by the same quintessential features. This finding is even more surprising given that the title translation event is seen to have the quintessential characteristics of translation (cf. Nord 1991, 1993). When it came to formal resemblance and conformance to German target-language norms, Nord's corpus analysis revealed that nearly the same number and proportions of BA beginners and professionals produced titles in German that were nearly identical to one another in terms of formal resemblance (NP3-V2-Wale1, Wale1-through NP3-V2) (1993: 59-60). "title experience," as Nord (1993: 62) refers to it, is evident in both rookie and seasoned BAs. In view of the professionals' clearly greater competence and, most all, the outcomes attained by the MA students this is a valid argument, it is far from sufficient. Their translation results were shown to be less compatible with target language norms, even though they were expected to have greater competence than their younger colleagues.

In order to determine what is generating the apparent anomaly, we may make use of the process data collected. All of the experts who worked on that version may have commented on their title translations in some depth due to the challenges provided by the English ST title, suggesting a general appreciation of the difficulties posed by the ST title in the original language. Several factors point to the fact that the translation of the complicated English ST title into German required considerable thought and deliberation on the part of the translator, including the large number of title variations produced by the MA group and professionals,

its omission by two MA members, and its translation by two professionals after the first draught of the target text was completed. Many students were unable to give a really comprehensive response, with only around 50 percent of BA freshman and 50 percent of MA students providing any meaningful feedback. As a result, the BA and MA students are likely to have used a less introspective approach than the professionals in the study. Using linguistic resources heavily suggests an attempt to compensate for deficits in bilingual competence, and the BA beginners appear to be less knowledgeable about pragmatic issues and functional aspects of the translation event than their products might initially indicate — and less confident in their solutions.

BA beginners tend to focus on translation's micro-level qualities rather than its pragmatic and functional aspects, according to a number of process data, including those on their self-concepts and translations of the German ST title. After a thorough investigation of data pertaining to self-concept it is clear that when translators acquire expertise, their focus will shift from the micro level of words and phrases to messages in source material (including author's goal) and the TT audience, rather than vice versa. Experts speculate that this shift in emphasis is the result of their growing awareness of the many responsibilities and allegiances they have to the translation event in which they are taking part. Higher-level activities and reflection may have more cognitive resources available since lower-level tasks have become more commonplace and habitual. An example of "translation activation competence," as defined by Göpferich (2009: 19), may be the straightforward translation of the German source text's title into English. There were less criticisms on the title from MA students and professionals who translated it into English than there were from BA novices since their translation methods and research activities have become more routinely over time..

The translator's self-concept is examined and defined in greater detail in the second half of this article, and it appears to be closely tied to translation quality. Translation professionals must be able to distribute cognitive resources to customers, clients, and readers in accordance with the event or scenario so that they may meet the demands of the work at hand. Teachers that teach translators should try to widen their students' self-concept by focusing less on particular words, phrases, and sentences and more on the translators' duties and obligations that go beyond the text's surface qualities. The current study used process research

approaches to acquire information about translators' self-concepts and practises. To help authors better understand the relevance of their unique writing style, such tactics have been used in coaching sessions (cf. Perrin 2006b). Massey and Ehrensberger-Dow (2011) and Dam-Jensen and Heine (2012) both found that these treatments improved students' self-awareness (2009). Teaching through case studies can be an effective way to improve students' self-perceptions of their abilities as translators.

References

- Alves, F. (2005). Bridging the gap between declarative and procedural knowledge in the training of translators: meta-reflection under scrutiny. *Meta*, 50(4). Retrieved from <http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2005/v50/n4/019861ar.pdf> doi: 10.7202/019861ar
- Asadi, P., & Séguinot, C. (2005). Shortcuts, strategies and general patterns in a process study of nine professionals. *Meta*, 50(2), 522-547. doi: 10.7202/010998ar
- Bazerman, C. (Ed.). (2007). *Handbook of research on writing. History, society, school, individual, text.* New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Camps, J. (2003). Concurrent and retrospective verbal reports as tools to better understand the role of attention in second language tasks. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13/2, 201- 221. doi: 10.1111/1473-4192.00044
- Dam-Jensen, H., & Heine, C. (2009). Process research methods and their application in the didactics of text production and translation. Shedding light on the use of research methods in the university classroom. *trans-kom Journal of Translation and Technical Communication Research*, 2(1), 1-25.
- Degenhardt, M. (2006). CAMTASIA and CATMOVIE: Two digital tools for observing, documenting and analysing writing processes of university students. In L. Van Waes, M. Leijten & D. Neuwirth (Eds.), *Writing and Digital Media*, (pp. 180-186). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Doyle, M. S. (1989). Contemporary Spanish and Spanish American fiction in English: tropes of fidelity in the translation of titles. *Translation Review*, 30, 41-46. doi: 10.1080/07374836.1989.10523464
- Dragsted, B. (2010). Coordination of reading and writing processes in translation: An eye on uncharted territory. In G. M. Shreve & E. Angelone (Eds.), *Translation and Cognition*, (pp. 41-61) Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/ata.xv.04dra
- Ehrensberger-Dow, M., & Künzli A. (2010). Methods of accessing metalinguistic awareness: a question of quality? In S. Göpferich, F. Alves & I. M. Mees (Eds.), *New Approaches in Translation Process Research (Copenhagen Studies in Language 39)* (pp. 113-132). Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.

- Ehrensberger-Dow, M., & Perrin, D. (2013). Applying newswriting process research to translation. *Target*, 25(1), 79-94. doi: 10.1075/target.25.1.07ehr
- Gnach, A., Wiesner, E., Bertschi-Kaufmann, A., & Perrin, D. (2007). Children's writing processes when using computers. Insights based on combining analyses of product and process. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 2(1), 13-28. doi: 10.2304/rcie.2007.2.1.13
- Göpferich, S. (2008). *Translationsprozessforschung. Stand - Methoden - Perspektiven*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Göpferich, S. (2009). Towards a model of translation competence and its acquisition: the longitudinal study TransComp. In S. Göpferich, A. L. Jakobsen & I. M. Mees (Eds.), *Behind the Mind: Methods, Models and Results in Translation Process Research (Copenhagen Studies in Language 37)* (pp. 12-37). Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.
- Göpferich, S., Bayer-Hohenwarter, G., Prassl, F., & Stadlober J. (2011). Exploring translation competence acquisition: Criteria of analysis put to the test. In S. O'Brien (Ed.), *Cognitive explorations of translation (Continuum studies in translation)* (pp. 57-85). London: Continuum.
- Gross, A. (2003). Teaching translation as a form of writing. Improving translator self-concept. In B. Baer & G. Koby (Eds.), *Beyond the Ivory Tower. Rethinking translation pedagogy* (pp. 83-93). Amsterdam: Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/ata.xii.06gro
- Hansen, G. (2006). Retrospection methods in translator training and translation research. *Journal of Specialised Translation*, 5, 2-41.
- Jääskeläinen, R. (1999). *Tapping the Process: An Explorative Study of the Cognitive and Affective Factors Involved in Translating (Publications in the Humanities 22)*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.
- Jääskeläinen, R. (2011). Back to basics: Designing a study to determine the validity and the reliability of verbal report data on translation processes. In S. O'Brien (Ed.), *Cognitive explorations of translation* (pp. 15-29). London: Continuum.

- Jakobsen, A. L. (2003). Effects of think aloud on translation speed, revision, and segmentation. In: F. Alves (Ed.), *Triangulating Translation* (pp. 69-95). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/btl.45.08jak
- Jakobsen, A. L. (2006). Research methods in translation -- Translog. In K. P. H. Sullivan & E. Lindgren (Eds.), *Computer Key-Stroke Logging and Writing: Methods and Applications* (pp. 95- 105). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Johnsen, Å. (2011). Revision in translation. Unpublished paper presented at the conference *Text- Process-Text: Questions in Process-Oriented Research on Translation and Interpreting*, November 17-19, Stockholm University.
- Katan, D. (2009). Translation theory and professional practice: a global survey of the great divide. *Hermes -- Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 42, 111-153.
- Kiraly, D. (1995). *Pathways to Translation: Pedagogy and Process*. Kent: Kent State University Press.
- Kiraly, D. (1997). Think-aloud protocols and the construction of a professional translator's self- concept. In J. H. Danks, G. M. Shreve, S. B. Fountain & M. K. McBeath (Eds.), *Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting (Applied Psychology: Individual, Social and Community Issues, vol. 3.)* (pp. 137-160). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Koskinen, K. (2008). *Translating Institutions. An Ethnographic Study of EU Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kujamäki, P. (2010). Auf der Suchenachtreffenden Worten. Bildschirmvideos als Mittel zur Analyse von studentischen Übersetzungsleistungen [Searching for the right words. Using screen videos to analysis student translation performance]. In L. Kolehmainen, H. Lenk & A. Liimatainen (Eds), *Infinite Kontrastive Hypothesen. Beiträge des Festsymposiums zum 60. Geburtstag von Irma Hyvärinen* (pp. 141-164). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Massey, G., & Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2010). Investigating demands on language professionals. *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée*, 2010(1), 127-141.

- Massey, G., & Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2011). Commenting on translation: implications for translator training. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 16, 26-41.
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Nord, C. (1991). Der Buchtitel in der interkulturellen Kommunikation: Ein Paradigma funktionaler Translation [The book title in intercultural communication: A paradigm of functional translation]. In S. Tirkonnen-Condit (Ed.), *Empirical Research in Translation and Intercultural Studies. Selected Papers of the TRANSIF Seminar, Savonlinna 1988* (pp. 121-130). Tübingen: Narr.
- Nord, C. (1993). *Einführung in das funktionale Übersetzen. Am Beispiel von Titeln und Überschriften* [Introduction to functional translation: The case of titles and headings]. Tübingen: Francke (UTB).
- Nord, C. (2004a). Die Übersetzung von Titeln, Kapiteln und Überschriften in literarischen Texten [The translation of titles, chapters and headings in literary texts]. In H. Kittel et al. (Eds.), *Übersetzung -- Translation -- Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung* (pp. 908-914). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Nord, C. (2004b). Die Übersetzung von Titeln und Überschriften aus sprachwissenschaftlicher Sicht [The translation of titles and headings from a linguistic perspective]. In H. Kittel et al. (Eds.), *Übersetzung -- Translation -- Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung* (pp. 573-579). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Nord, C. (2008). Ungetreuer oder kluger Verwalter? Überlegungen zu Form, Funktion und Übersetzung von Perikopentiteln [Unfaithful or clever custodian? Considerations of the form, function and translation of pericope titles]. In L. Schippel (Ed.), *Translationskultur -- ein innovatives und produktives Konzept* (pp. 211-236). Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- PACTE (2003). Building a translation competence model. In F. Alves (Ed.), *Triangulating Translation: Perspectives in Process-Oriented Research* (pp. 43-66). Amsterdam: Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/btl.45

- PACTE (2005). Investigating translation competence: conceptual and methodological issues. *Meta*, 50(2), 609-619. doi: 10.7202/011004ar
- PACTE (2011). Results of the validation of the PACTE translation competence model. Translation problems and translation competence. In C. Alvstad, A. Hild & E. Tiselius (Eds.), *Methods and Strategies of Process Research* (pp. 317-343). Amsterdam: Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/btl.94
- Perrin, D. (2001). *Wie Journalistenschreiben. Ergebnisse angewandter Schreibprozessforschung*. Konstanz: UVK.
- Perrin, D. (2002). Investigating writing strategies in the workplace. In C. M. Levy & T. Olive (Eds.), *Contemporary tools and techniques for studying writing* (pp. 105-117). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. doi: 10.1007/978-94-010-0468-8_6
- Perrin, D. (2003). Progression analysis (PA): Investigating writing strategies at the workplace. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(6), 907-921. doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00125-X
- Perrin, D. (2006a). Progression analysis: An ethnographic, computer-based multi-method approach to investigate natural writing processes. In L. Van Waes, M. Leijten & C. M. Neuwirth (Eds.), *Writing and digital media* (pp. 173-181). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Perrin, D. (2006b). *Schreibforschung im Kursalltag. Was die Progressionsanalyse praktisch nützt* [Writing research in training. The practical uses of Progression Analysis]. In O. Kruse, K. Berger & M. Ulmi (Eds.), *Prozessorientierte Schreibdidaktik* [Process-Oriented Writing Didactics] (pp. 279-294). Bern: Haupt.
- Risku, H. (2009). *Translationsmanagement. Interkulturelle Fachkommunikation im Informationszeitalter* [Translation management. Intercultural technical communication in the information age]. Tübingen: Narr.
- TEI (2008). TEI P5: Guidelines for Electronic Text Encoding and Interchange. Retrieved from <http://www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/html/>

- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. & Laukkanen, J. (1996). Evaluations a key towards understanding the affective dimension of translational decision. *Meta*, 41, 45-59. doi: 10.7202/002360ar
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Van Waes, L. & Leijten, M. (2006). Logging writing processes with Inputlog. In L. Van Waes, M. Leijten & C. Neuwirth (Eds.). *Writing and Digital Media* (pp. 158-165). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Viezzi, M. (2011). The translation of book titles: theoretical and practical aspects. In P. Kujamäki, L. Kolehmainen, E. Penttilä & H. Kemppanen (Eds.), *Beyond Borders -- Translations Moving Languages, Literatures and Cultures* (pp. 183-195). Berlin: Frank & Timme.