International Peer Reviewed E Journal of English Language & Literature Studies
ISSN: 2583-5963
www.ell.iaar.co Page No. 11 To 27

2

Processes of Translation and Writing: An Analytical Study

Dr. Paresh Jotangiya

Assistant Professor,

English Department, Surendranagar University

Dr. Arjun Dave

Vedant Educational Services, Rajkot

Abstract

The study of writing and the study of translation are typically pursued as different pursuits in college. Many similarities have been found between the two groups, as evidenced by studies undertaken on both groups that usually employ the same study approach. A focus on writing and translation as methods of text production is encouraged in this introduction. Examples of study subjects at the interface of writing and translation are sketched out. Following this introduction, we'll take a closer look at competency and profiles, two of these aspects.

Keywords: translation studies, writing competence, text production

ISSN: 2583-5963

1. Introduction

There has always been a divide between written communication and translation. Both subjects have been studied extensively, and it is evident that they are quite similar in many ways. Here we claim that writing and translation share a common foundation, and that the many different kinds study done by both areas should benefit from each other's discoveries. In the broadest sense conceivable, they are both forms of human activity. Due to human activity's ability to be described at several levels of abstraction, it is difficult to pin down the exact link between the two fields (Steiner 1988: 145).

Writing and translation will be treated as part of a larger category of text creation in this introduction, which includes adaptation as a third party. A procedure that culminates in the generation of a text is what we mean when we talk about "text production." For our purposes, we shall argue that the three categories share a similar foundation, but each one is unique in its own way, and that they may be grouped as members of a group known as "text production," There is no one-size-fits-all answer to the question of what constitutes "text production." Because of the diverse ways these three forms of text generation relate to pre-existing texts, we'll make the case that each one behaves differently in terms of process features. This assumption is proved here by using the dimensions of phases and strategies, as well as contextual features, creativity, competence, and profiles (the latter two being central issues of the contributions of this special section).

2. The type of textual production that is being discussed.

There are various processes involved in defining a person's category membership. The classical Aristotelian perspective is that a group's membership is defined by whether or not it meets a set of sufficient and necessary criteria. Not all occurrences, however, can simply be divided into a number of different categories in light of a set of pre-established, common features. Many people know Wittgenstein's argument for comparing and contrasting different types of games. Wittgenstein (1953, 1958, section 66) argues that the difficulty in classifying games stems from the fact that no one quality can be defined as being shared by all types of games. Thus the idea of "family resemblance" was born, in which individuals of a group are linked by overlapping similarity but do not share a single trait. In Zethsen (2009), translation is characterised as a tertium comparationis (third-order comparison) rather than a non-finite

discipline that relies on either necessary or sufficient criteria (Zethsen 2009: 800). Intralingual translation1 may now be included in translation research as a result of this notion. A notable example of this kind of explanation is found in Goel and Pirolli's definition of design (1992: 401-402). The prototype theory2 is used to define design as a category with Rosch prototype effects (1978). They provide a set of 12 criteria that they hope will serve as a model for identifying commonalities among people. As a result, the definition and delivery of the artefact are separated by a significant amount of time. As a result, they create a template of characteristics that may be used to identify archetypal individuals. In contrast to more peripheral members, prototypical people (also known as core members) have all of the traits of the template (Goel &Pirolli 1992: 402).

Here, we'll lay up a comprehensive definition of text production that takes into account the commonalities that exist across all of its members. Because we think it's feasible to specify a collection of sufficient and required criteria for category membership, our definition should not be interpreted in the same manner as a template in the classic meaning of prototyping With this in mind, it's helpful to think of the qualities of the definition as a basic substrate to which many characteristics may be applied depending on whether the text creation is seen horizontally or vertically. Text creation may be summed up as follows:

An individual or group of individuals work together to create an organised, well-crafted written piece for an intended audience. There must be interaction between the writer's state of mind and his or her environment in order for literature to be generated successfully. Even at the most abstract level of abstraction, it may be categorised as a design activity

It is necessary for any text to be formally and semantically consistent in order to qualify as a text. The author's state of mind and the environment in which the text is written both have an impact on the process of generating coherence. The latter is made up of a variety of factors. As a rule of thumb, every writing is meant to accomplish a specified task in respect to the intended audience. Some people refer to this as the skopos3 (Schjoldager 2010: 153-154). The commencement of the text-creation process is related with the skopos of the target text. The bulk of professional text production projects begin with an external instruction, known as a 'brief' in translation studies. The writer's social and physical circumstances, as well as the resources and tools at their disposal, all have an impact on the process of creating written

ISSN: 2583-5963

work. Digital tools are increasingly being used in the development of most types of texts, as Ehrensberger-Dow and Massey (this book) point out. This has a significant effect on how text producers go about their work. Writing and translation take happen in a variety of different contexts, and this idea is universal.

If you look at our description above, you will see that we describe how a text comes to be as a result of a person's mental state and the context in which they are writing it. The writer of a piece is in charge of directing the writing process by weighing a flurry of options and making several decisions. To establish the kind of these, elements such as the writer's level of ability and recall are taken into consideration.

As defined by this concept, the action of creating text is a design process. According to Goel and Pirolli, design activities are distinct from non-design activities. The two components that separate design activities from non-design activities are logical and creative, according to Goel and Pirolli (Alexander 1964; Archer 1969, quoted by Goel &Pirolli 1991: 397). Logical writing and translation, according to our theory, is a process in which a writer or translator employs the rules of linguistic composition, using language in a logical way to create the text. Problem-solving skills that rely on divergent thinking (as defined by Guilford, 1971) might be classified as a person's creative side. Writers and translators both need good language skills to handle the logical aspects of text development. It is possible that a writer or a translator would encounter difficulties that look insurmountable if they only use their logic. Such issues demand the employment of imagination in order to be overcome, according to Pommer (2008). For handling allegedly intranslatable issues that crop up during the translation process, "Imagination is the most important attribute in resolving seemingly intranslatable problems that arise throughout the translation process" is a critical attribute (Pommer 2008: 364). While architecture and engineering are considered paradigmatic instances of design activities, Goel and Pirolli (1991: 401) argue that the lack of separation between the definition of the design object and its delivery makes writing an insignificant part (Goel &Pirolli 1991: 403). The writer or translator may opt to sketch out a strategy or a framework for the text-production activity before beginning to generate the real output, and while we feel this is typically accurate, we state that this is not always the case.

As a result of the preceding, we believe that the inclusion of extra qualities that make each of the three forms of text production—writing, adaptation, and translation—partially separate from one another can distinguish them. For the most part, each of these approaches has a unique relationship to previously published works of literature. A source text is required for translation, whereas writing relies on pre-existing texts and other sources in a more indirect way. There are some similarities between the processes of adaptation and translation in that both rely on a source text (or more than one) and change the text's style by rewriting or summarising the original material (Jakobsen 2005: 176) 4. As a result, the authoring, adaptation, and translation processes have a wide range of ramifications because of this wide divergence between the three forms of text production. It affects, for example, how the author of the text interacts with the context in which the work is produced and the kind of activities the author does in that setting. This is illustrated in the next part by sketching how writing and translation interact with different components of the writing and translation process.

Process Dimensions (No. 3)

In order to explain how the nature of text creation changes depending on the kind of content, several features of text production might be described. Phases, strategies, context, creativity, competency, and profiles are among the subjects covered in this part, as are other issues that have garnered a lot of attention in the literature for both professions.

Writers and translators go through several stages throughout the development of a work, according to several research (for example, Flower & Hayes 1980; Göpferich 2002; Jakobsen 2003; Englund Dimitrova 2005; Hayes 2012). Even while phase models and descriptions can vary slightly in their level of detail, the following steps are always included in all of them: planning, drafting, and revision, which are not always linear but can also occur in recursive cycles. Writing and translating may both be achieved through these stages, but what sets them apart are the phases that comprise each step, the tactics used throughout each stage, and the writing or translation styles applied (as explained in Carl &Dragsted: this volume).

It is common practise for both authors and translators to use strategies—a series of actions—to help them overcome obstacles and achieve their goals. The term "strategy" is used in writing and translating literature, although its meanings vary depending on the context, and it is frequently used without a clear explanation in many situations. To add insult to injury, it's

ISSN: 2583-5963

in direct competition with terms such as "skill," "tactical" and "method" (Gambier 2010: 412). Throughout this introduction, when we discuss strategy, we mean the actions made when creating a document in order to achieve a certain goal (a similar definition can be found in Jääskeläinen (2009)). The strategies used to write a book might alter based on the author's personal and professional circumstances. Tactics are influenced by a person's degree of mental capacity and knowledge, as well as their sentiments, memories, and other mental states. External conditions, such as the length, complexity, and type of information to be written, all influence the strategies used. A variety of tactics are applied at different points throughout the process. Both writing and translation begin with the creation of ideas and the evaluation of previously published works. When translating from one language to another, a translator first analyses the source text's meaning and then looks for translations that convey that meaning in the target language (with a view to the skopos). In order to understand the subject matter and background information, thoughts and linguistic inspiration of a piece of writing, a text producer analyses 'other' texts and/or other kinds of external (resources). In professional text production, the demands of the end user are a different information source than in translation5. These findings can be correlated with the study of skopos in translating Preparation in writing is more confusing and difficult than in translating since there are so many sources from which the writer might draw. Authors may be more concerned with producing new ideas than translators, because the source material specifies how to portray the book's subject matter. As an example, text producers can use strategies such as (a) rereading previously written material to evaluate its correctness or as a kind of visual stimulus to plan and produce new text, (b) noting a tentative solution, and (c) consulting external sources, where the text producer consults dictionaries, reference books, or the Internet (Van Waes, Leijten, and Quinlan 2009). This is a strategy that can be employed by both writers and translators; nevertheless, it can be presumed that the translator's searches are more concentrated and limited in terms of collocations and phrases, for example. Once the final product has been completed, the author rereads it to ensure that it is free of grammatical and semantic errors. The revision stage is where you're at right now. The translator evaluates the quality of the translation both in isolation and in contrast to the source material. The author's circumstances is assumed to be different from this.

At the textual level, both writers and translators use functional strategies. To express the message of a piece of literature from one language to another, translators employ a wide range of words, phrases and sentences (Schjoldager 2010: 89). Though they may not be directly related to linguistic phrases in the original text, functional approaches can be used by writers to communicate their intended message. Adaptation tactics are used in proportion to how similar the source and target texts are; it's "a question of degree and motivation rather than of kind," when it comes to adaptation, according to Zethsen (2009: 809). If the skopos are chosen wisely, very little traces of the original text may be detected in the modified copy, making the process of applying strategies akin to the act of writing. Translation strategies are used when adaptation is more tightly tied to the original text or texts, and it is reasonable to assume that the translation micro-strategy of simplification7 is often applied (Zethsen 2009: 808).

When it comes to writing and translation studies, process sociology has emerged as a new topic of study since the 1990s. A writer's ability to generate text depends on more than just his or her own thoughts; it is influenced by their physical and social surroundings as well (Bayerman 2007; Risku 2010; Schubert 2007). This work is carried out in a variety of settings, including the physical environment, networks of cooperation and technology tools that have had a considerable influence on the workplace since their inception. Translators' working conditions in the translation sector are heavily influenced by technological instruments such as machine translation software, machine-assisted translation, and translation memory systems (Dragsted 2004, 2006; O'Brien 2010; Christensen &Schjoldager 2010, 2011). Google searches, dictionaries, electronic documents, and so on are all necessary tools for writing but are not always available for translation. In contrast, translation frequently uses translation memory aids or machine-translation systems, which are not always available in writing, but they can be used for translation. Aids and tools, such as those described above, have an effect on the aforementioned stages and procedures, as well the author's originality.

When logical abilities alone aren't enough to finish a text creation task, the text producer must turn to creativity. Writing requires a higher level of originality than translating since it has a more indirect link to pre-existing materials. This is due to the fact that while writing,

ISSN: 2583-5963

the text creator has more latitude than when translating. It is impossible for a translator to be innovative when translating since the source material restricts their options. However, it is important to remember that the level of originality needed of the text author, in both writing and translation, differs depending on the type of content. In technical writing, for example, the writer's independence is diminished because of the text's close connection to other entities. This is a problem. When it comes to public relations texts, text creators need to know how to utilise language effectively to persuade the audience that will be reading it.

Writing and translation contain two more facets: the writer's or translator's competence(s) and their profile(s). These two facets are inextricably linked. Writing studies have focused on how a writer's capacity to write as a skill develops with time and experience, according to Bereiter (1980) and Kellogg (2008). This relationship has always been established between the development of writing and its subsequent output (Becker Mrotzeck 1997; Pospiech 2005).

Translation studies (following Holz-(1986) Männttäri's professionalisation method) have been interested in describing what constitutes a competent professional translator and how competencies connect to the self-concept of translators; writing study has focused on skill acquisition and growth (Kiraly 2000). Numerous competency models have been established in translation studies as a result of this tendency (Risku 1998, Göpferich 2008; PACTE 2000, 2005, 2009). As a result, competence is a well-defined concept in translation studies. Using the idea that the level of competence determines how text producers operate, Göpferich and Jääskeläinen (2009), for example, discriminate between specialists and less experienced text producers.

4. Textual creation research and development

As previously noted, both professions have been investigating the dimensions listed in the preceding section for many years on their own. Studies of both internal cognitive processes and external processes help disciplines understand how writers and translators function throughout the writing or translating process, from receiving a job to producing the final written result. However, little effort has been made to date in order to compare the results in order to narrow the present gap between the two disciplines.

ISSN: 2583-5963

To better understand how the three forms of text creation interact, it is vital to compare and contrast the dimensions and methods used in each of the three domains of text production (for example). The following section summarises a few study viewpoints at the intersection of the three forms of text production:

4.1 Models of text production phases and techniques in terms of text production

Many approaches to text production research exist, depending on the stages and strategies that are being studied. There are several phases and techniques for both writing and translation research, which are outlined in the following sections. It is possible that comparing and contrasting these models conceptually might be an important direction for future study. An emerging question would be whether or not the writing and translation models apply to adaptation and whether or not the notion of adaptation may serve as a beneficial bridge between the two areas. Because there are no models for adaptation to our knowledge. Comparable empirical research in three areas might generate good findings if deductive testing of models is applied to them. Cognitive qualities such as competence and memory may have an impact on how text producers organise their process, which in turn might be studied empirically (see Section 2).

4.2 The influence of context on the development of text

It was not until the 1980s that process study began to focus on the writing and translation process as a whole. This has changed in recent years as the focus has turned to add context. From the perspective of text production, several comparable studies of the interaction of the text producer with context can be carried out, including studies of the interaction of the text producer with technical tools, the interaction of the text producer with people, and the interaction of the text producer with the physical environment.

4.3 Methods of investigation

In order to bring together the research in both areas, it is important to discuss the research methods themselves. Research methodologies in writing and translation studies have always been the same. Methods include verbalizations, retrospective interviews, and observation, as well as technological instruments like keyboard logging, eye tracking, and screen recording.. Experimental research (usually on a limited scale) and field research (to a lesser extent) both

ISSN: 2583-5963

use these methodologies. Dam-Jensen & Heine (2009) and Heine & Koch (2009) argued and experimentally tested (Dam-Jensen & Heine 2012) that the use of text-production didactics in both subjects is helpful. Massey and Ehrensberger-Dow (2011) argue that the use of process tools in classroom education may stimulate student reflection and awareness, as well as give translator trainers with insights into both individual and collective translation behavior10, following the same line of thinking (see also Heine 2012 with a similar approach for writing). In the issue of keystroke logging, it is clear that each industry has built its own software. In Northern European translation research, Translog (Jakobsen 1999, 2003, 2007) is the most often used tool, while Inputlog and Scriptlog are widely utilised in writing (Van Waes and Leijten 2006; Van Waes, Leijten, Wengelin& Lindgren 2012; Van Waes, Leijten, Wengelin& Lindgren 2012). There is a lot of interest in looking at the tools' strengths and weaknesses, both in terms of their use in experiments as opposed to field studies, and in terms of their use in triangulation with other (electronic) research tools.

4.4 Textual production as a form of instruction

Dam- Jensen, Heine, and Schrijver (in preparation) are studying how authors might benefit from translation abilities and vice versa using a different and as of yet somewhat unexplored line of investigation into the didactics of text production. Training in writing could help the translator work more freely with the language without contaminating it with a source language, or (b) translation training could help writing students improve their handwriting because translators, unlike writers, work under direct constraints of a source text. These are just two examples of possible hypotheses to test.

It is important to note that the list of research questions outlined in this article is not an exhaustive one; rather, it is an attempt to stimulate interdisciplinary research, which is in keeping with the Journal of Writing Research's mission to promote cross-disciplinary research (JoWR).

5. A preview of this particular segment is provided.

In this special section, we've made a first pass at addressing some of the issues raised by the study described above. Competence and profiles of text production will be addressed in the studies that follow this introduction.

ISSN: 2583-5963

Ehrensberger-Dow and Massey submit their work "Indicators of translation competence: Translators' self-concepts and the translation of titles" in this special part of the journal Translation using a multi-method approach to translation and translation-process analysis. For this research, we used techniques that are common in academic writing such as keyboard logging and screen recording, as well as eye tracking and retrospection. It is possible to compare title translations done by newcomers, MA students, and seasoned professionals using this method-mix. Participants' self-concept data is analysed, and the results provide light on competence in general, as well as on how experience is obtained.

Authors have long been hypothesised to have one or more of the following categories of writers: broad planners, patchwork writers, or a combination of both. Researchers have found that translators use a variety of approaches to their work; nevertheless, no defined translation categories (such as the writers listed above) have yet to be uncovered in translation research. As an example, Carl and Dragsted's paper, “Towards an eye-tracking and keylogging data classification of translator profiles,” offers a first attempt to analyse translation profiles systematically using the similarity assumption. In order to establish translator characteristics, researchers Carl and Dragsted compared translations based on eye tracking and key logging data acquired from students and professionals. To test their assumptions, they establish groups with local and global profiles and compare them to known writing profiles to see whether there are any differences in translation styles regardless of the complexity of the translation work.

ISSN: 2583-5963

References

- Alexander, C. (1964). Notes on the synthesis of form. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Archer, L.B. (1969). The structure of the design process. In G. Broadbent & A. Ward (Eds.), Design methods of architecture. New York: Wittenborn.
- Bayerman, C. (Ed.) (2007). Handbook of research on writing. History, society, school, individual, text. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Becker-Mrotzek, M. (1997). Schreibentwicklung und Textproduktion [Writing development and text production]. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Bereiter, C. (1980). Development in Writing. In L.W. Gregg & E.R. Steinberg (Eds.), Cognitive Processes in Writing (pp. 73-93). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Boehm, D.C. (1993). Mozartians, Beethovians, and the teaching of writing. The Quarterly, 15(2), 15-18.
- Christensen, T.P., &Schjoldager, A. (2010). Translation-Memory (TM) Research: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It? Hermes, 44, 89-101. Retrieved from <http://download2. hermes.asb.dk/ archive> on 09.04.2012.
- Christensen, T.P., &Schjoldager A. (2011). The Impact of Translation Memory (TM) Technology on Cognitive Processes: Student-Translators' Retrospective Comments in an Online Questionnaire. In B. Sharp, M. Zock, M. Carl & A.L. Jakobsen (Eds.), Human-machine Interaction in Translation (Copenhagen Studies in Language 41, pp. 119-130). Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.
- Dam-Jensen, H. (2012). Decision-making in Translation -- A Pilot Study of Students' Translation Processes. Fachsprache, XXXIV(3-4), 146-164.
- 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-komZeitschriftfür Translation swissenschaft und Fachkommunikation, 2(1), 1-25.
- Dam-Jensen, H., Heine, C., & Schrijver, I. (in prep.). An interdisciplinary approach to text production: Talking about terms of the trade(s) first.

- Dragsted, B. (2004). Segmentation in Translation and Translation Memory Systems -- An Empirical Investigation of Cognitive Segmentation and Effects of Integrating a TM System into the Translation Process. PhD dissertation. (Copenhagen Working Papers in LSP). Copenhagen: Sam funds litteratur.
- Dragsted, B. (2006). Computer-aided Translation as a Distributed Cognitive Task. Pragmatics & Cognition, 14(2), 443-464. doi: 10.1075/pc.14.2.17dra
- Englund Dimitrova, B. (2005). Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/btl.64
- Flower, L. & Hayes, J.R. (1980). Identifying the Organization of Writing Processes. In L.W. Gregg & E.R. Steinberg (Eds.), Cognitive Processes in Writing (pp. 3-30). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Gambier, Y. (2010). Translation strategies and tactics. In Y. Gambier, & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), Handbook of Translation Studies (vol. 1). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 412-418. doi: 10.1075/hts.1.tra7
- Gile, D. (2004). Integrated Problem and Decision Reporting as a Translator Training Tool. The Journal of Specialised Translation 2, 2-20. Retrieved from http://www.jostrans.org on 23-02- 2009.
- Goel, V., &Pirolli, P. (1992). The Structure of Design Problem Spaces. Cognitive Science, 16, 395- 429. doi: 10.1207/s15516709cog1603_3
- Göpferich, S. (2002). TextproduktionimZeitalter der Globalisierung. EntwicklungeinerDidaktik des Wissenstransfers [Textproduction in the age of globalization. Development of a didactic of knowledge transfer]. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Göpferich, S. (2008). Translationsprozessforschung [Translation process research]. Tübingen: NarrFranckeAttempo.
- Göpferich, S., &Jääskeläinen, R. (2009). Process research into the development of translation competence: Where are we, and where do we need to go? Across Languages and Cultures, 10(2), 169-191. doi: 10.1556/Acr.10.2009.2.1
- Guilford, J.P. (1971). The Nature of Human Intelligence. London: McGraw-Hill.

- Hayes, J.R. (2012). Modeling and Remodeling Writing. Written communication 29(3), 369-388. doi: 10.1177/0741088312451260
- Heine, C. (2012). Prozessansatzimtraditionellproduktorientierten "Academic Writing" Textproduktionsunterricht [Process approach in the traditionally product-oriented academic writing training]. In D. Knorr & A. Verhein-Jarren (Eds.), Schreibenunter den Bedingungen von Mehrsprachigkeit [Writing in a mulitlingual context] (pp. 99-116). Frankfurt a.M. u. a.: Lang, 99-116.
- Heine, C., & Koch, W. (2009). Prozess- und Produktoptimierungbei der Textproduktion. Translogalsdidaktisches Instrument? PilotstudiemitStudierenden der Wirtschaftsuniversität Aarhus, Dänemark. [Process and product optimization in text production. Translog as a didactic tool? Pilot study with students of the Aarhus School of Business, Denmark]. In F. Lenz (Ed.), SchlüsselqualifikationSprache: Anforderungen - Standards -- Vermittlung [Key qualification language. Requirements - Standards - Didactics]. (Forum AngewandteLinguistik 50, pp. 176- 204). Frankfurt am Main u. a.: Lang.
- Heine, C. & Schubert, K. (forthcoming). Modellierung in der Fachkommunikation. Fachsprache, Vol. XXXIVI [Modelling in specialized discourse communication. Fachsprache]. (n.p.n.).
- Holz-Mänttäri, J. (1986). TranslatorischesHandeln -- theoretischfundierteBerufsprofile [Translational action - theoretically based professional job profiles]. In M. Snell-Hornby (Ed.), Übersetzungswissenschaft -- Eine Neurorientierung. ZurIntegrierung von Theorie und Praxis [Translation studies - New perspectives. Integrating theory and praxis]. (UTB 1415, pp. 348- 374). Tübingen/Basel: Francke.
- Immonen, S. &Mäkisalo, J. (2010). Pauses reflecting the processing of syntactic units in monolingual text production and translation. Hermes -- Journal of Language and Communication Studies, 44, 45-61.
- Jääiskeläinen, R. (2009). Looking for a working definition of 'translation strategies'. In I.M. Mees, F. Alves & S. Göpferich (Eds.), Methodology, Technology and Innovation in Translation Process Research: A Tribute to ArntLykke Jakobsen (pp. 375-387). Copenhagen: Copenhagen Studies in Language.

- Jakobsen, A.L. (1999). Translog Documentation. In G. Hansen (Ed.), Probing the process in translation: methods and results (Copenhagen Studies in Language 24, pp. 149-184). Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.
- Jakobsen, A.L. (2003). Effects of Think Aloud on Translation Speed, Revision and Segmentation. In F. Alves (Ed.), Triangulating Translation (pp. 69-95). Amsterdam: Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/btl.45.08jak
- Jakobsen, A.L. (2005). Investigating expert translators -- processing knowledge. In H.V. Dam, J. Engberg & H. Gerzymisch-Arbogast (Eds.), Knowledge Systems and Translation (Text, Translation, Computational Processing, pp. 173-189). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jakobsen, A.L. (2006). Research Methods in Translation -- Translog. In E. Lindgren & K. Sullivan (Eds.), Computer Key Stroke Logging and Writing. Methods and Applications (Studies in Writing, pp. 95-105). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kiraly, D. (2000). A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education. Empowerment from Theory to Practice. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kellogg, R.T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. Journal of Writing Research, 1(1), 1-26.
- Kelly, D. (2005). A Handbook for Translator Trainers. A Guide to Reflective Practice. Manchester, UK & Northampton MA: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Massey, G., &Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2011). Commenting on translation: Implications for translator training. The Journal of Specialised Translation, 16, 26-41.
- Nord, C. (1997). Translating as a Purposeful Activity (Translation Theories Explained). Manchester: St Jerome.
- O'Brien, S. (2010). Eye tracking in translation process research: methodological challenges and solutions. In I. Mees, F. Alves, & S. Göpferich (eds.), Methodology, Technology and Innovation in Translation (Copenhagen Studies In Language 38, pp. 251-266). Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.
- Opdenacker, L., Stassen, I., Vaes, S., Van Waes, L., & Jacobs, L. (2009). Quadem: Manual for the Quality Assessment of Digital Educational Material. Antwerp: University of Antwerp. Retrieved 09-04-2013 from http://www.scribani.org/quadem/material_Q/handbook/Handbook.pdf.

- PACTE (2000). Acquiring translation competence: Hypotheses and methodological problems in a research project. In A. Beeby, D. Ensinger& M. Presas. Investigating Translation. Papers from the 4th International Congress on Translation, Barcelona, 1998, pp. 99-106. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- PACTE (2005). Investigating translation competence: Conceptual and methodological issues. Meta, Translators' Journal, 50(2), 609-619.
- PACTE (2009). Results of the validation of the PACTE translation competence model: acceptability and decision making. Across Languages and Cultures, 10(2), 207-230. doi: 10.1556/Acr.10.2009.2.3
- Pommer, S.E. (2008). No creativity in legal translation? Babel, 54(4), 355-368. doi: 10.1075/babel.54.4.04pom
- Pospiech, U. (2005). Schreibendschreibenlernen. Über die Schreibhandlungzum Text alsSprachwerk [Learning writing while writing. Reaching a crafted language text product via writing action] (Theorie und Vermittlung der Sprache 39) Frankfurt am Main u.a.: Lang.
- Reiss, K. & Vermeer, H.J. (1984). GrundlegungeinerallgemeinenTranslationstheorie [Setting the grounds for a general translation theory]. Tübingen: Niemeyer. doi: 10.1515/9783111351919
- Risku, H. (1998). TranslatorischeKompetenz: KognitiveGrundlagen des ÜbersetzensalsExpertentätigkeit [Translation competence: cognitive grounds of translation as an expert activity]. Tübingen: Narr.
- Risku, H. (2010). A cognitive scientific view on technical communication and translation: Do embodiment and situatedness really make a difference? Target, 22(1), 94-111. doi: 10.1075/target.22.1.06ris
- Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of Categorization. In E. Rosch, & B.B. Lloyd (Eds.), Cognition and Categorization. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Scheuermann U. (2012). Schreibdenken. SchreibenalsDenk- und Lernwerkezugnutzen und vermitteln [Think-writing. Using and teaching writing as a thinking and learning tool]. Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich.
- Schjoldager, A. (2010). Understanding Translation. Aarhus: Academica.

- Schubert, K. (2007). Wissen, Sprache, Medium, Arbeit. Ein integratives Modell der ein- und mehrsprachigenFachkommunikation [Knowledge, Language, Medium, Production. An integrative model of monolingual and multilingual specialized discourse communication] (Forum fürFachsprachenforschung 76). Tübingen: Narr.
- Steiner, E. (1988). Describing language as an activity: an application to child language. In P. Fawcett, & D. Young (Eds.), New developments in systemic linguistics. Vol. 2: Theory and application (pp. 144-173). London and New York: Pinter Publishers.
- Van Vaerenbergh, L. (2012): FunktionalistischeTranslationstheorie und technischeKommunikation. trans-kom, 5(2), 274-292.
- Van Waes, L. &Leijten, M. (2006). Logging Writing Processes with Inputlog. In L. Van Waes, M. Leijten& C.M. Neuwirth (Eds), Writing and Digital Media. (Studies in Writing 17, pp. 158- 165). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Van Waes, L., Leijten, M. & Quinlan, T. (2009). Reading during sentence composing and error correction: a multilevel analysis of the influence of task complexity. Reading and Writing. An Interdisciplinary Journal, 23(7), 803-834.
- Van Waes, L., Leijten, M., Wengelin, Å., & Lindgren, E. (2012). Logging tools to study digital writing processes. In V. W. Berninger (Ed.), Past, present, and future contributions of cognitive writing research to cognitive psychology (pp. 507-533). New York/Sussex: Taylor & Francis. doi: 10.1007/s11145-009-9190-x
- Vinay, J.-P., &Darbelnet, J. (1958). Stylistiquecomparée du français et de l'anglais [Comparative stylistics, from French to English]. Paris: Didier.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953/1958). Philosophical Investigations. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zethsen, K.K. (2006). The translator as cultural mediator. In I. Askehave, & B. Norlyk (Eds.), Meanings and Messages. Intercultural business communication (pp. 97-114). Aarhus: Academica.
- Zethsen, K.K. (2009). Intralingual Translation: An Attempt at Description. Meta, Translators' Journal, 54(4), 795-812.