Artigo original

IN SEARCH OF AN EFFECTIVE TRANSLATOR AND INTERPRETER TRAINING MODEL IN MOZAMBIQUE

Armando Adriano Magaia

Faculdade de Letras e Ciências Sociais, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane (UEM), Mozambique

ABSTRACT: Eduardo Mondlane University (UEM) is the only higher education institution offering BA Honours level translator and interpreter training in Mozambique. However, it still lacks an effective model for the development of translation and interpreting competence in students. To address this problem, this study seeks to find a practical model for designing a BA Honours curriculum that is conducive to an effective training of Mozambican professional translators and interpreters. The study has been designed as action-research because this design enables better understanding and improvement of training processes (CRAVO and NEVES, 2007). Three data collection tools were used to generate both qualitative and quantitative data from 123 participants, namely: (i) a survey, (ii) an English translation test and (iii) a sample of 18 archived Portuguese translations produced by former students. The survey findings suggest the need to reform the current curriculum in order to make it more conducive to translation and interpreting competence development. Furthermore, the results of macro- and micro-textual analysis show that, although UEM students are capable of producing acceptable English into Portuguese translations, their Portuguese into English translations are, overall, poor. The proposed solution would be the adoption of a new integrated translation and interpreting competence development model with the following four pillars: communicative competence, general knowledge, strategic competence and service provision. This model would lead to the design of a curriculum enabling students to be trained as translators and interpreters under the same programme, where English into Portuguese and vice-versa translation practice is mandatory.

Keywords: Curriculum design, integrated translation and interpreting competence development model, translation and interpreting studies, translator and interpreter training.

EM BUSCA DE UM MODELO EFICAZ PARA A FORMAÇÃO DE TRADUTORES E INTÉRPRETES EM MOÇAMBIQUE

RESUMO: A Universidade Eduardo Mondlane (UEM) é a única instituição do ensino superior que forma licenciados em tradução e interpretação em Moçambique. Contudo, carece de um modelo eficaz para o desenvolvimento da competência tradutória e interpretativa. Portanto, este estudo investiga um modelo prático para o desenho de um currículo de licenciatura, conducente a uma formação eficaz de tradutores e intérpretes moçambicanos. O estudo seguiu a metodologia de pesquisa-acção visto permitir uma melhor compreensão e melhoria dos processos de formação (CRAVO e NEVES, 2007). Foram usadas três ferramentas de recolha de dados para gerar dados qualitativos e quantitativos de 123 participantes, nomeadamente: (i) um inquérito, (ii) um teste de tradução para o inglês e (iii) uma amostra de 18 traduções arquivadas de antigos estudantes produzidas em português. Os resultados do inquérito sugerem que é preciso reformar o currículo actual para torná-lo mais conducente ao desenvolvimento da competência tradutória e interpretativa. Outrossim, os resultados da análise macrotextual e microtextual mostram que, embora os estudantes da UEM produzam traduções aceitáveis do inglês para o português, a qualidade da sua tradução inversa, em geral, é fraca. A solução que se propõe seria um novo modelo integrado de desenvolvimento da competência tradutória e interpretativa assente em quatro pilares, nomeadamente: competência comunicativa, cultura geral, competência estratégica e prestação de serviços. Este modelo orientaria o desenho de um currículo que permita que os estudantes sejam formados como tradutores e intérpretes num único programa, onde a prática de tradução do inglês para o português e vice-versa é obrigatória.

Palavras-chave: Desenho curricular, modelo integrado de desenvolvimento da competência tradutória e interpretativa, estudos de tradução e interpretação, formação de tradutores e intérpretes.

Correspondência para: (correspondence to:) armando.a.magaia@uem.ac.mz

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

1

INTRODUCTION

Eduardo Mondlane University (UEM) is the only higher education institution offering BA Honours level translator and interpreter training in Mozambique. However, the university still lacks an effective model for the training of professional translators and interpreters. This is due to the fact that there is currently no specific translation competence development model in place at UEM, which has resulted in a flawed curriculum design approach that, by and large, reflects a one-size-fits-all mind-set. For example, UEM currently has a compulsory core curriculum comprising many subjects whose applicability to translation or interpreting is questionable. This perception is corroborated by the fact that, during practical translation classes, most students often question the relevance of some of the compulsory subjects they are required to attend, as they fail to see their connection with translation and interpreting competence development. On the other hand, most of the so-called optional subjects now on offer at UEM contribute little or nothing to developing translation competence, let alone interpreting competence. Again, students often regret wasting time attending optional subjects that in one way or another end up being compulsory, when indeed they should be investing their time and effort developing translation and interpreting competences. Therefore, this study investigates a possible practical model – and, hopefully, an effective curriculum – for the training of professional translators and interpreters at BA Honours level at UEM.

Rationale

A major reason for conducting this research is the fact that an effective training model could guide efforts aimed at producing an adequate curriculum for educating Mozambican translators and interpreters. For the past few years, UEM has been trying, in vain, to review its curriculum. The university even reached a point at which it saw the need to phase out the Interpreting component from its curriculum in to order to adjust to the Bologna process that was being implemented. It may be argued that one fundamental reason for failing to improve this curriculum is the lack of a clear guiding model outlining the main competences that a translator or an interpreter should have. Indeed, the inherited curriculum in place at UEM seems to reflect the general view that translation and interpreting are just some of the competences that can be developed within the major disciplines of Linguistics and Literature.

Hence, the researcher's awareness of his role in curriculum development at UEM has thus motivated him to embark on this study. Being a UEM alumnus and having been a lecturer in that university for over 10 years has enabled him to get fully acquainted with the Translation and Interpreting course programme. Therefore, the researcher could not shrug off his responsibility as a curriculum evaluator, since "teachers have the responsibility of evaluating both the curriculum and instruction" (OLIVA, 2001, p. 56).

In addition, a teacher's role is not limited to simply observing and evaluating the curriculum in the classroom because he/she is also "a curriculum worker who engages in curriculum planning in varying degrees, on different occasions" (OLIVA, 2001, p. 16). This view is shared by McKernan (1996, p. 53), who observes that "research by teachers can provide a curriculum knowledge in the same way that research by mathematicians and sociologists provides a basis for teaching those disciplines". He adds that such teacher-driven research "will yield up new curriculum knowledge and contribute to the construction of new understandings and more sophisticated theories of curricularizing" (MCKERNAN, 1996, p. 53). Therefore, this study can be viewed as the researcher's own modest attempt to contribute to the ongoing curriculum reform process at UEM.

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

2

Aims of the Study

The overriding goal of this study is to propose a new integrated translation and interpreting competence development model for the training of Mozambican professional translators and interpreters at BA Honours level, which can provide the foundation for building an improved translator and interpreter training curriculum at UEM, with the potential to enhance graduate employability.

Specifically, this study pursues the following objectives:

a) To assess the effectiveness of the current UEM translation curriculum in leading to the development of translation and interpreting competence as perceived by stakeholders (students, lecturers, professional translators/interpreters and potential clients); and

b) To propose an integrated translation and interpreting competence development model that can provide a framework for designing conducive translator and interpreter training curricula.

Theoretical Framework

Translating and Interpreting – Similar Yet Different Professions

Despite the strong relationship between the concepts of translating and interpreting, it is compelling to study their similarities and dissimilarities in detail. In this regard, even though De Groot (1997, p. 26) acknowledges that translating and interpreting share many general features, he argues that "the use of a single term to refer to both may veil the – fundamental – differences between them". He goes further when he says: "The differences, especially in terms of the processes involved, are in fact so substantial that the two may require a different set of skills to be performed optimally" (DE GROOT, 1997, p. 26). Neubert (1997, p. 14-15) agrees when he states that "there are striking differences in

the way translators and interpreters act out their responsibility as managers of the subtle problems arising in the two modes of *translation*" (his emphasis). Consistent with this proposition, Gile (1998, p. 41) also argues that, although most scholars view translating and interpreting as essentially fulfilling the same function, "many – especially interpreters – consider that the two are very different, even incompatible professions". To justify this view, Gile (1998, p. 41) suggests that in terms of actual translation and interpreting practice, the most obvious of the differences stem "from the fact that translators deal with written language and have time to polish their work, while interpreters deal with oral language and have no time to refine their output".

It should, however, be noted that although the interpreting activity is marked by a great deal of pressure associated with its spontaneity (absent in the translating activity), this does not mean that the translator's profession is always easy. One of the reasons for arriving at this conclusion is because "adequate translation cannot be explained by lexical matching alone" (NEUBERT, 1997, p. 11-12). Neubert (1997, p. 12) goes on saying that there are numerous factors that condition a translator's choices such as "systemic-linguistic, some under the semantic influence of the global text meaning, some under pressure of stylistic demands of the target culture, and others under the control of the pragmatics of the translation context".

Despite the difficulties inherent in the task of translating, it appears that a translator may find himself or herself in a less demanding situation than that of an interpreter. Danks and Griffin (1997, p. 164) corroborate this perception when they identify the immediate temporal constraints as a fundamental difference between readers and listeners as well as between translators and interpreters. Thus according to these scholars, "Just as readers typically have as much time as they need to

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

3

understand a text, so do translators have plenty of time to comprehend and translate the text" (DANKS and GRIFFIN, 1997, p. 164). They go further when they state that, indeed, "translators may well have more time than readers because readers are under the pressure of implicit social norms about how long it takes to read a text", which may not apply to translators (DANKS and GRIFFIN, 1997, p. 164).

These authors are quick to admit that such norms may indeed exist, but they assert that "at least implicitly, within the community of translators, the pressure to produce a good, accurate translation is often more important than how long it takes" (DANKS and GRIFFIN, 1997, p. 164). At the same time, these scholars acknowledge that "translators are faced with the demands of the commission and its associated deadlines, but the time constraints of deadlines are usually measured in days and not minutes and seconds as they are in listening and interpreting" (DANKS and GRIFFIN, 1997, p. 164). In contrast, the time pressure on interpreters is heightened by the fact that, as these authors go on to say, "the listeners for the interpreted text are waiting for the speech in the target language and the speaker may (in the consecutive case) or may not (in the simultaneous case) be waiting for the interpreter to finish the interpretation" (DANKS and GRIFFIN, 1997, p. 164-165). Likewise, GILE (1998, p. 41) suggests that, in contrast to translation, "interpreting requires attention sharing and involves severe time constraints". What comes to the surface is that the context, process and product of translating and interpreting are different, even though the two tasks share some features. Thus, a translator may not necessarily be an interpreter and, by the same token, an interpreter may not necessarily be a translator, unless he/she receives sound training in both professions.

Translation Competence

Typically, the translation competence models that have greatly influenced the design of translator training curricula around the globe are multi-componential. Such models usually include components such as source- and target language proficiency, cultural competence, cognitive qualities, domain/subject specific competence, transfer competence, research competence, interpersonal competence, technological competence and so forth (GILE, 1995; MASON, 1998; NEUBERT, 2000; PRESAS, 2000, SCHÄFFNER, 2000; KELLY, 2005; PACTE GROUP, 2005; GÖPFERICH, 2009; and CHODKIEWICZ, 2012).

However, some scholars disagree with multi-componential models. For example, Shreve (1997, p. 120) defines translation competence as "a specialized form of communicative competence" and argues that it "is both knowing about translation and about knowing how to do translation". From this definition one can glean that translation competence requires more than having theoretical knowledge of translation or even the ability to describe the translation process. As Shreve (1997, p. 121) puts it, translation competence "is about producing translations that are well formed, referentially accurate with respect to source texts, and socially appropriate in their cultural contexts". Therefore, translation competence is not some vague concept or knowledge that can be demonstrated intellectually – it requires the production of some tangible products, i.e., acceptable translations. It is quite significant that Shreve (1997, p. 121) suggests that translation competence requires a good amount of practice when he says: "Not everyone can translate; those that learn how to translate do so by acquiring a history of translation experience". Again, one can glean from this remark that a curriculum might fail to develop translation competence in students if it does not provide enough time for practising translation.

Similarly, Pym (2003, p. 487) criticizes multi-componential models, claiming that

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

4

these "are heavy with assumptions not just about what translation is and how it should be taught, but more especially about the level at which specific teaching is needed, and for how many years". He postulates that "there is no neat definition of all the things that translators need to know and will be called upon to do" (PYM, 2003, p. 488). Furthermore, Pym (2013, p. 489) claims that multi-componential models of translation competence "bring together various areas in which a good translator is supposed to have skills and knowledge (*know how* and *know that*), as well as certain personal qualities, which remain poorly categorized". Nevertheless, although Pym (2013, p. 489) disagrees with multi-componential models of translation competence, he admits that there is "nothing particularly wrong with such models". As he puts it, "they can be neither right nor wrong, since they are simply lists of training objectives, with no particular criteria for success or failure" (PYM, 2013, p. 489). Furthermore, referring specifically to the European Master's in Translation (EMT) model, he suggests that this "configuration is nevertheless important precisely because it is the result of significant consensus, agreed to by a set of European experts and now providing the ideological backbone for some 54 university-level training programs in Europe, for better or worse" (PYM, 2013, 489).

Interpreting Competence

As is the case with translation competence, interpreting competence is hard to define and it lacks an agreed upon universal model. Therefore, some models have features that others omit, reflecting different foci when investigating interpreting competence. For example, Gile (1997, p. 197-8) proposes the simultaneous interpretation effort model, consisting of three efforts: (1) The listening and analysis effort; (2) The production effort; and (3) The memory effort. However, Al-Salman and Al-Khanji (2002, p. 607-608) believe that an interpreter

should meet the following requirements: (1) Mastery of the active language; (2) Solid background of general knowledge; (3) Personal qualities: e.g. faculty of analysis and synthesis, ability to intuit meaning, capacity to adapt immediately to change in subject matter and different speakers and situations; (4) Other qualities: having good short and long term memory, ability to concentrate, a gift for public speaking, and physical endurance and good nerves.

Meanwhile, Fraihat and Mahadi (2013, p. 184) suggest that professional consecutive and simultaneous interpreters share five competences, namely: (1) Linguistic Competence in the working languages (SL and TL) including grammar, lexical & discourse analysis, (2) Transfer Competence (Efficiency), (3) Cultural and Societal Competence, (4) Strategic Competence (Communication & interaction) and (5) Extra Linguistic Knowledge in specialized areas (academic, political, legal, business, etc.). They further identify some distinctive cognitive competences between consecutive and simultaneous interpreters as well as some shared physical and personal traits and skills. In the same vein, another model can be found in a report prepared by the ALTA Language Services, Inc. for the Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts in 2007. Although it focuses specifically on court interpreters, its model of interpreting competence can be elucidative. The model consists of the following skill areas: (1) Linguistic Skills; (2) Speaking Skills; (3) Listening Comprehension Skills; (4) Reading Comprehension Skills; (5) Interpreting Skills; and (6) Behavioural Skills (ALTA, 2007, p. 2).

What it all boils down to is the fact that there is a set of competencies or skills, knowledge, attitudes or qualities that interpreters should have. This can help isolate the most critical areas of knowledge and abilities an interpreter training programme should focus on. By way of

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

5

criticism, however, most of the translation or interpreting competence models available in translation studies comprise features that are somehow redundant. This can make it difficult to craft an appropriate curriculum under a specific model. This also denotes a gap and a trap in translation and interpreting studies, as shown below.

A Gap and a Trap in Translation and Interpreting Studies

A major challenge in translation and interpreting studies is the dearth of research aimed at finding adequate models for the training of professional translators and interpreters in higher education. This perception is corroborated by Yan et al. (2015, p. 264), who contend that "despite the importance of T&I [translation and interpreting] training and the exponentially increasing number of studies dedicated to this sub-field, there remain very few reviews of this applied branch of T&I research". In a similar vein, Albir (2007, p. 163) argues that the formal training of translators and interpreters "lacks the curriculum research tradition of other disciplines with a longer academic standing". In fact, Kiraly (2016, p. 130) criticizes today's Bologna-influenced translation-studies curricula in place in Europe when he observes that, in such curricula, "skills and knowledge to be acquired are commonly represented with geometrical shapes or containers that are labelled with learning outcomes to represent the achievement of predefined educational outcomes and objectives – which may or may not be aligned with the demands of the market". In addition, referring to the curricular framework of the MA in Translation programme at his university, the author further observes that the panoply of subjects that students choose from in a given semester are "little more than a patchwork quilt of content to be accumulated in a sequence that is based more on the chance of getting into classes one wants to take and fitting them into one's schedule than anything else" (KIRALY,

2016, p. 131). Clearly, one does not solve the challenge of finding adequate translator and interpreter training models by simply adopting or adapting available European models. There is need to acknowledge the gap and fill it according to local circumstances.

At the same time, a literature review exposes a "trap" in translation and interpreting studies, as briefly explained below. Without due care, designing a translator and interpreter training curriculum can be treacherous. Hatim and Mason (1997, p. 7) point out that "it should not be assumed that because translating in the written and in the oral mode are known by different terms – translating and interpreting – they have little in common". In fact, these scholars criticize the fact that translating and interpreting are usually separated on translator/interpreter training programmes, although they are marked by commonalities in using communication strategies (HATIM and MASON, 1997). Along these lines, Asensio (2007, p. 87) observes that there has been an overlap between translating and interpreting as professional activities, which "can give rise to repetition (or omission) in the curriculum between Translation and Interpreting courses". Therefore, an effective curriculum design should avoid either repeating or omitting essential aspects inherent in each of these two professions.

Following the presentation of the theoretical underpinnings of this study, a brief definition of the term "model" is provided below, followed by that of "competence-based curriculum", as used in this study.

Defining a Model

Since any training programme is based on a model, it is important to have a clear definition of this concept. According to Henson (1995, p. 113), "a model is not a reality", but rather, "a visual or written description of someone's perception of reality". Furthermore, "models are

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

6

imperfect" (HENSON, 1995, p. 113), which calls for ongoing research towards improving them. In this study, the term "model", used in conjunction with the term "training", is defined as an idealization of guiding principles, transformed into a visualizable schematization of key interrelated components of a training philosophy that can provide a framework for designing specific training curricula. In other words, a training model clearly articulates the main competencies constituting an envisaged profession but need not be inflated by detailing every single sub-competence, skill, knowledge area or attitude that might contribute towards developing such professional competence. A training model may be likened to a skeleton. Furthermore, to be practical, a model must allow its users to draw principles to guide training processes and ensure that these stay focused on the ultimate goal of equipping a student for work. This is closely related to the concept of competence-based curriculum, briefly touched on below.

Competence-based Curriculum

Albir (2007, p. 164) identifies "adapting teaching to new pedagogical models" as a major challenge facing today's education, including translator and interpreter training. He highlights the need for "training that develops the necessary competences to perform well in the job market; and training that guarantees autonomous, multi-purpose and continuous or lifelong learning which can be adapted to a constantly changing world" (ALBIR, 2007, p. 164-165). According to this author, an emerging pedagogical response is what has been called "competence-based training", which comprises specific and general competences (ALBIR, 2007, p. 165-168). Furthermore, he sees advantages in this model, such as "greater transparency of professional profile in study programmes, greater emphasis on the outcome of learning, more flexibility and a greater integration of all aspects of a curriculum"

(ALBIR, 2007, p. 167-168). Thus, the term "competence-based curriculum" in this study means a curriculum designed according to the broader professional profile and specific sub-competences, knowledge areas, skills and attitudes that a course intends to develop in students.

METHODOLOGY

Design and Method

Scholars like Snell-Hornby et al. (1994), Hansen (2006) and Sun (2014) have argued that Translation Studies is an *interdiscipline*. Odacıoğlu and Köktürk (2015, p. 18) go further when they observe that "Translation Studies is currently thought to show a transition process from inter-disciplinarity to transdisciplinarity". It can, then, be concluded that, even though translation studies today is widely accepted as a discipline, its interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary nature can allow several approaches to researching this field. With regard to methodological implications of considering translation studies as an interdiscipline, Hansen (2006, p. 6) writes: "Disciplines and research patterns from psychology, phenomenology, natural sciences and social sciences provide empirical translation research with useful tools, methods and techniques". Sun (2014, p. 176), in turn, says: "If we view TS [translation studies] as an interdiscipline, then almost all research methods in its feeder disciplines can be used in our research field". This shows that research in translation and interpreting studies should not be restricted to a particular method. A translation and interpreting studies researcher may thus choose any methodological approach he/she finds most suitable for the object of his/her study (CRAVO and NEVES, 2007).

This study has been designed as action research. Action research design in translation studies is recommended by scholars such as Cravo and Neves (2007, p. 96), because it allows researchers to "be involved with people and particularly with

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

7

the people who will, in the end, benefit from their research: the translators themselves, the students of translation and translators-to-be, the teachers of translation, and, above all, the 'consumers' of the end product". Similarly, Saldanha and O'Brien (2013, p. 16) suggest that action research is appropriate in translation studies because it is "collaborative: it seeks to empower the stakeholders and moves away from the concepts of the 'researcher' and the 'researched'".

Research Instruments and Analytical Framework

In action research, data can be gathered from multiple sources, including field notes, audiotapes, videotapes, photos, pupil diaries, interviews, questionnaires, sociometry, documentary evidence, case studies, matrices, artefacts and tests (See MILLS, 2003; HOPKINS, 2002 and COHEN *et al.*, 2002). Thus, in this study, data was collected by means of:

1) a *survey questionnaire,* consisting mainly of Likert-type items divided into four sections, which gathered quantitative data. However, open-ended questions were included in order to capture qualitative data with the very same instrument. This was possible because even though participants were mostly asked to tick applicable answers among five options, they were equally encouraged to share their deep thoughts by providing *reasons* for their answers in each of the questions;

2) a *translation test,* where former students were asked to translate a short text from Portuguese into English. The sample text consisted of 135 words, having been extracted from a document about mother and child mortality, published by the Mozambican Ministry of Health. The content of the selected source text is, by and large, simple except where specialized medical language is used; and

3) a *sample of students' final Portuguese translations* archived in the English section, containing 100-135 words in the source text selected. In total, six different source texts were used for the samples analysed in this study, given the fact that participating students had submitted their final translation projects in different years. The first text was extracted from a report on the Zimbabwean electoral process in 2008; the second sample was extracted from an ODI (Overseas Development Institute) paper on poverty; the third text analysed was extracted from an economic report published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF); the fourth text was taken from a report on maternal and child health published by the Zimbabwean Ministry of Health; the fifth text was extracted from a paper on the African Peer Review Mechanism; and the sixth and last text was taken from an IMF study on gender and economy. All of these texts contained a reasonable amount of specialized terminology in their respective domains.

With regard to the survey questionnaire, it should be noted that this instrument contained a section with a proposal developed by the researcher following a pilot study conducted in 2016. This proposal featured an integrated translation and interpreting competence development model laid upon four pillars, namely: 1) Communicative competence, 2) General knowledge, 3) Strategic competence, and 4) Service provision. The proposal also included the following description:

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

8

In the proposed model, **translation/interpreting competence** consists of communicative competence, general knowledge, strategic competence and service provision. **Communicative competence** encompasses linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competences in both the source-language and the target-language (English-Portuguese). **General knowledge** means acquaintance with any field/subject of the translator's/interpreter's interest, including linguistics or translation/interpreting. **Strategic competence** includes declarative knowledge and application of translation methods/procedures, or interpreting modes/techniques, problem identification and solving strategies (i.e. lexical, structural, idiomatic, pragmatic, cultural, register and style problems), including correct use of tools/resources (e.g., physical/electronic dictionaries, parallel texts, terminology databases), subject/thematic research, logical/critical reasoning, proofreading/revision skills, etc. **Service provision** includes interpersonal skills, entrepreneurial skills, self-marketing, negotiation skills, project/time/stress management, knowledge of and compliance with ethical/deontological norms, etc. Under this model, students practise translating and interpreting from and into English on an equal footing with Portuguese.

In addition, three new curriculum proposals were attached, each reflecting an ideal curriculum under three different scenarios:

Scenario 1: A joint BA Honours in translation and interpreting;

Scenario 2: Two Separate BA Honours programmes (one in translation and the other in interpreting); and

Scenario 3: A BA Honours in Language Sciences (which would include translation and interpreting competences among linguistics, literature, secretarial skills, text revision and editing, etc.)

The quantitative data was mainly entered into a Microsoft Excel workbook and analysed with the aid of this statistical tool. Likewise, the qualitative data from translations was analysed following the macro- and micro-textual analytical framework developed by Magaia (2014). According to Magaia (2016, p. 59), a translation error is defined as "an instance of underperformance during a translation act, observed through the lack of translation message accuracy and target text effectiveness". In this translation assessment method, a source-language-originated error (SLOE) is defined as "any error being caused by flawed interpretation of the source-language text, in part or in whole" (MAGAIA, 2016, p. 59). Under the broader category of SLOEs, the following micro-level translations errors are found: wrong meaning (WM), wrong lexical choice (WLC), omission (O) and nonsense (NS). Likewise, a target-language-originated error (TLOE) is "any mistake or error exposing a translator's poor mastery of the target language/culture norms and conventions, but which is not necessarily identifiable through source-text vs. target-text comparison" (MAGAIA, 2014, p. 84). Thus, under the umbrella category of TLOEs, the following micro-level errors are distinguished: target language norm deviation (ND), misspelling (MS), poor punctuation (PP) and unnaturalness (UN).

It should be further pointed out that the qualitative data included in this study was critical to understanding the reasons behind the quantitative data yielded. Therefore, this data was transcribed according to the

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

9

questions it was answering. At the same time, the answers were analysed paying attention to recurrent themes in the likeness of the analytical framework used in the researcher's previous case study (MAGAIA, 2014, p. 64-66), building on Rowley's (2002) strategy for analysing case study data. In this strategy, "a framework of sections reflecting the themes in the case study are developed and evidence is gathered within relevant themes, and analysed and compared in these categories" (ROWLEY, 2002, p. 24).

Against this background, the next section describes the marking scheme used in analysing the students' translations.

Marking Scheme

The marking scheme used in this study is based on a 0-20 mark range, which is customarily followed at UEM, and it stipulates that the total number of words in a source text be divided by 20 to know the number of words affected by each error. Then 20 is divided by the quotient of the first operation. The quotient of the second operation is divided by 2 to know the weight of the SLOE penalty. Finally, the quotient of the third operation is divided by 2 to know the weight of the TLOE penalty. In other words, the weight of a TLOE penalty is always 50% of that of a SLOE. Here is an example:

If the source text has 100 words, then:

1. Step 1: $100 \div 20 = 5$;
2. Step 2: $20 \div 5 = 4$;
3. Step 3: divide the quotient of operation in step 2 by 2 (in this case, 4 divided by 2 equals 2, which means the penalty for each SLOE is 2 marks);
4. Step 4: divide the quotient of operation in step 3 by 2 (in this case, 2 divided by 2 equals 1, which means the penalty for each TLOE is 1 mark);

Procedures and Ethical Considerations

All participants were contacted either personally or by email and invited to participate voluntarily in the study. To this end, subjects were provided with an informed consent form, which they signed after receiving background information on the aim of the study and confidentiality aspects. Then the subjects were asked to complete a survey questionnaire and return it at their earliest convenience. In addition to returning the questionnaire, former students also submitted a sample of English translations for macro- and micro-textual analysis. Furthermore, former students had a sub-section within the survey with some specific questions to learn about their rates of employment and professional experience. This step was followed by a collection of a corpus of former students' final Portuguese translation projects for macro- and micro-textual analysis too. Data collection took place from mid-April to July 2017 upon obtaining permission to conduct research at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (to reach current students) and at the Language Institute of Maputo (to reach potential students), and after ethical clearance was granted by the University of South Africa (the institution providing academic supervision for this research).

RESULTS

Presented below are the findings of the study, starting with those of the survey questionnaire.

Survey Data Results

Respondent Profile

A total of 123 respondents participated in the study. Students (former, current and potential) make up the vast majority of those participants, with a total of 90 respondents, equivalent to 73%. Lecturers, professional translators/interpreters and potential translation and interpreting service users together make up 27% of the participants (33), with each category having 11 participants.

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

10

Effectiveness of the UEM Curriculum

The survey data shows that 46% of the respondents find the present curriculum effective. Reasons for approving of the current curriculum include the fact that "it allows you to get to know multiple processes of translation and how to deal with many of the issues during the translation process" and that "the course has modules which make sense to translation studies". Nonetheless, 26% are "not sure", 19% rate it "ineffective", and 2% consider "very ineffective", while 7% have no answer to this question. Some respondents pointed the following as reasons for their negative response: "We're only learning translation. What about interpreting? If we are to be translators and interpreters, we should learn both, not only one"; "Most translation students are more likely to develop skills in literature, history of ideas and linguistics rather than in translation as such"; "The major bottleneck of the current curriculum is that it leaves the best part for the end (where most of the students are already busy looking for job opportunities and are no longer full-time students)"; and "By looking at the grid, one can see that certain modules are a bit out of context in terms of what we imagine when we hear or look at the definition of the course."

Recommendability of UEM Curriculum

Collectively, 57% of the respondents said they would recommend the current curriculum compared to 20% who would do so hesitantly and 5% who would not do it at all; 9% were not sure and 9% did not answer this question. The majority of those recommending the current curriculum gave the following reasons: "It is a very interesting course with highly qualified trainers with long years of experience"; "This course is eligible for those candidates who love languages and would like to engage in a professional linguistic career"; "I still believe UEM is the best university in Mozambique in terms of lecturers' qualifications"; "It is the only BA degree course in translation offered in the country

at the moment"; and: "Despite its shortcomings, the curriculum does have the potential to train future translators". The few who would not recommend the current curriculum pointed out, inter alia, that: "There are no medical students who would like to enrol to study medicine and end up studying law. That's what is happening in our curriculum. We're not focused on translating and interpreting"; "At the beginning, in the first years of the course, one doesn't feel like a translator because you start late with modules directly related to translation"; and: "The curriculum doesn't comprise relevant modules for a translation course."

Irrelevant Subjects

According to the survey data, *History of Ideas* was found to be the most irrelevant subject, with a negative rating by 47 participants (38%). Negatively rated by 36 respondents (29%), *Mozambican Literature and Culture* comes second, followed by *Introduction to Literary Studies II* and *Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology*, each considered irrelevant by 31 participants (25%). *Introduction to Literary Studies I* and *Optional Subjects* as a whole are viewed as irrelevant by 27 (22%) and 25 (20%) participants, respectively. Equally rejected, although by fewer, are *Introduction to Linguistics II* (12%), *Portuguese Descriptive Linguistics III* (11%) and *English Descriptive Linguistics II* (10%) and *English Descriptive Linguistics III* (9%).

Among the reasons for finding such subjects irrelevant are: "Their focus is not on what we, translators, need; these modules embarrass and confuse us"; "These modules do not meet our specific needs. The content of these modules is useful for other courses except for translation/interpreting"; "They don't help much in solving translation problems"; "Some don't have anything to do with the course; others are repetitive"; "There's no added value, most of these modules are taught in Portuguese"; "Translation

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

11

students do not have to spend two semesters learning Linguistics and Literature and a semester learning History of Ideas"; "They are not useful when you have to deal with a translation assignment. Apart from that, I think that there are too many optional modules, and it would be much better to make use of that time for translation/interpretation-related subjects"; "I don't see the need to study History of Ideas and Mozambican Literature and Culture in the context of translation"; and: "Optional modules are vague! Learners may choose something which is far detached from translation".

Former Students' Confidence to Provide Translation and Interpreting Services

The vast majority of respondents (90%) said they were confident in their own capacity to provide *translation* services from English into Portuguese and vice versa. Some of the reasons for these feelings are: "I am confident that I have almost all the tools and techniques needed to translate any text"; "I learned enough to work with any kind of text"; and "I have undergone this training programme. I have had some theoretical and practical lectures that helped me build self-confidence, but mostly practice". In contrast, only 43% said they trusted their own capacity to provide *interpreting* services from English into Portuguese and vice versa. Some of the reasons why the majority felt inadequate are the following: "I keep running away from interpreting because it is difficult"; "I feel more like a fish in the water translating than interpreting because I didn't have interpreting lessons"; and: "I don't feel quite confident about interpreting because I had no training in interpreting; I don't feel I have the methodologies and procedures required for interpreting services, as interpreting was not part of the translation curriculum I took".

Graduate Employability and Course Relevance

In terms of graduate employability, the current UEM translation course seems to be able to boost the students' chances of getting a job not very long after graduation. In this regard, 82% of former translation students said they had a job at the time of data collection. Of these, 67% said they had a full-time job while 33% were working freelance. At least 10 of the graduates having either a full-time or a freelance job took less than 1 year to get their first job. Nevertheless, it appears that the translation training that former students had at UEM does not have any direct relationship with their current job, since only 6 of the students who reported having a job describe their task as being related to translation and/or interpreting, compared to 6 whose job involves neither translation nor interpreting and another 5 who do other tasks plus a little translation and interpreting.

Reactions to the Proposal to Train Translators and Interpreters Under One Single Programme, Or Under Two Separate Courses, Or Under an Umbrella Language Science Course

Most respondents (80%) are in favour of a model where translators and interpreters are trained simultaneously under one single programme, against 10% who disagree and 6% who are "Not sure", and 4% who have no response. In justifying their choice, some of the respondents said: "A single course would empower the students and those modules that are 'useless' would be replaced by interpreting lessons"; "By designing a single course, perhaps it would be easier to focus on a single curriculum and provide the main training needed"; "I don't think graduates from this course will ever work solely in one of the two streams, that is, either only as a translator or only as an interpreter – they co-occur"; "The skills required are almost the same and at the end of the day graduates end up doing one or the other in the real market"; "When people hear that you are a translator, they automatically think that you are also an interpreter, so if you say that you are unable to do one thing or the other, they think that

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

12

you are incompetent"; "By the time the student graduates, he will be complete and ready to carry out the two activities, which would greatly improve his performance"; "Many translators end up interpreting without the requisite competencies. It's far better to endow the students with everything they need"; and: "If they can do both, it will help them seek for the market. It will also reduce the cost for the users."

Reasons for disagreeing with this proposal include: "This would be too much for the students because it would add more modules and workload than the current one, which is also too much as the focus is also given to non-translation related subjects"; "Anecdotal evidence shows that few in this training would be able to develop satisfactory competences in the interpreting area"; "The competences acquired in translation and interpreting are different, hence the need to specify the study of each area/branch"; and "There are students with difficulties in assimilating both areas simultaneously."

Findings Regarding a Mandatory Bidirectional Translation / Interpreting Practice Policy

With regard to the suggestion to introduce a policy according to which it would be mandatory to have practical translation and/or interpreting classes from Portuguese into English instead of just practising it from English into Portuguese, 83% are in favour, while 6% disagree and 11% did not share their opinion. Some of the reasons for supporting this policy are: "The translator and/or interpreter never knows what he will be translating and must be versatile and able to handle either language"; "The translator needs to be fluent in both languages to be successful in his career"; "It would provide solid understanding of both languages for translators and interpreters"; "Since we are studying both Portuguese and English, the students should master both languages"; "Most companies prefer hiring those who work in both directions"; "A truly skilled translator is the one who is comfortable

translating either way"; "Although we live in a Portuguese speaking country, it does not mean that as Translators we should only translate into Portuguese (i.e., only from English). The reality has proven that the other way round will always be needed"; "I strongly agree because that is the reality in the Mozambican translation market. Even if the translator does not feel they can provide high quality services in translating from Portuguese into English, they will end up doing that, otherwise they can lose a client"; and: "If the interpreter can't do it in both languages he or she is not ready to work on it, for he or she must have a good command of both languages."

The few who disagree provided the following reasons: "It would be a huge challenge, as we need to have such a great command of the English language;" "This is in fact the ideal scenario, although the reality might show that few acquire equivalent competences in both directions"; and: "I believe that there's need for the student to have more target language command".

Feedback on the Researcher's Model Proposed as a Framework for Guiding the Training of Mozambican Translators/Interpreters

According to the survey data, 84% of the respondents approve of the proposed model, with 42% finding it "very practical" and 42% judging it "practical", against 4% considering it just "a little practical", 5% being uncertain and 7% preferring not to answer the question. Here are some of the reasons for supporting the researcher's proposal: "Mostly because of the service provision part. It teaches us how to behave in the employment market"; "It is realistic, well compounded and brings the most relevant aspects in respect of translation/interpreting competence development"; "It's clear that the model covers and provides a wide range of skills and competences that the students will have acquired by the end of their training"; "This model has a holistic and strategic view

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

13

which essentially aims at training translators"; "First, it teaches you languages; then it gives you the chance to choose what you like; then it teaches you how to deal with people; it prepares you to deal with the real world/life situations"; "The first focus is communicative competence because this stage will give a picture of who is linguistically mature/prepared to face the demands of the course"; "It truly encompasses the dimensions that empower the translator/interpreter; I think it covers the various existential areas of a competent translator/interpreter"; and "It comprises all the tools that a translation/interpreting student needs, from translation/interpreting competence to service provision competence. One of the most difficulties faced by former students is related to finding a job. So, this model gives important tools, such as entrepreneurial skills, self-marketing, etc., which enable former students to opt for self-employment".

The few finding it "a little practical", or hesitating, justified their choice as follows: "A translator or an interpreter will no longer have competences in linguistics, pragmatics and other fields at all"; "We lack some materials that would improve the curriculum such as audio-visual materials"; "I think communicative competence should cover more space than general knowledge; and "With regard to communicative competence, semantic competence, lexical competence and syntactic competence are missing".

Feedback on Three Curriculum Proposals to Replace the Current UEM Curriculum

The survey asked participants to rank the best, second best and worst curriculum proposal among three proposals made by the researcher based on his proposed translation/interpreting competence model. Thus, proposal 1 (which features translation and interpreting subjects being taught under one single course) was ranked first by 64

out of 123 participants, i.e. more than half of the respondents. Proposals two (which teaches translation and interpreting in two separate courses) and three (teaching translation and interpreting under an umbrella language science course) were rated second best and worst, respectively.

Some of the reasons why proposal 1 was prized by the majority were: "Joining translation and interpreting will help students improve their competences and give them more employment options when they finish the course"; "It is very practical, and it doesn't only train a translation student but a professional"; "The proposal is inclusive: it gathers both courses and offers enough number of optional modules"; "It allows the candidates/students greater freedom of choice according to their interest"; "The competences are taught simultaneously and the student is given the chance to specialize either in translation or interpreting and to freely choose any other field to study a different field which may become useful when providing translation/interpreting, since a good translator has to be well versed in different areas"; "It essentially focuses on the training of translators/interpreters and is based on specific skills which the student chooses at the end of his training"; "It's encompassing and consistent with the translation and interpreter training philosophy"; "It's dynamic and straightforward. Right at the beginning students get the feeling of their future job. The modules are pragmatic"; "It enables the individual to deal with the two most common ways of using two languages simultaneously without prioritizing neither; and "Although the student only specializes in one of the two areas, he or she has sufficient basic notions in the other area".

Assessing Graduates' Translation Quality

Findings on Former Students' Output Speed

On average, each of the 18 former UEM

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

14

students who returned the requested translations spent nearly 40 minutes to accomplish the translation task, which included reading, text analysis (exegesis), terminology research, transfer, evaluation, revision, editing, etc. The fastest translator reported 17 minutes, and the slowest 60 minutes, to finish the assignment.

Findings on Overall Graduate Performance Analysis

The macro- and micro-textual analysis yielded the following results:

Portuguese into English Translation:

Of all the translations analysed, 72% failed the test and 28% passed it. Two students stood out: one with 15.6 marks and the other with 14.08 marks. Four students got zero mark, one got 0.76 marks, two got 1.5 marks and one got 2.98 marks. As observed from the examined sample, macro-level analysis shows that when it comes to translating texts from Portuguese into English, UEM translation graduates seem to have more problems in producing acceptable texts in English, although they also reveal quite a significant number of problems in handling the source language text. As such, even though the percentage difference between source-language originated errors (SLOEs) and target-language originated errors (TLOEs) is relatively small, the quality of these students' translations is heavily penalized for lacking accuracy in conveying the intended source-language text message. It should be borne in mind that, according to Magaia (2016, 60), a SLOE penalty is given more weight than that of a TLOE.

Furthermore, at micro level, **wrong lexical choice errors** (WLC) are the most important type of SLOEs (with 18%), denoting poor handling of source-language texts. It seems that students either have difficulty determining the correct meaning of the lexical items in Portuguese or they fail to choose the most (contextually) adequate equivalents in English. As a result, their lexical choices compromise the quality of the translation both in terminology and register. In addition, **wrong meaning** (WM) and **omission** (O) also compete in reducing the quality of former students' translations (with 13% and 12%, respectively). By analysing these translations, one can notice that students are unaware of how grammar affects the meaning of a text. Furthermore, the fact that omission is frequent in students' translations may reveal lack of correct strategy for ensuring conveyance of Portuguese messages into English. Realizing that their rendering might be incorrect, students may simply "capitulate", to paraphrase Campbell (1998, 154) in front of huge translation problems by resorting to omission. Finally, **nonsense errors** (NS) are quite negligible (with 5%). This is quite positive because it shows that students are at least aware of the need to make texts able to communicate some understandable message. Were it not for their poor lexical choice and their distortion of messages, they would be on a path to developing translation competence.

With regard to TLOEs affecting the quality of former UEM students' translations, micro-textual analysis shows that **unnaturalness** (UN) is by far the most important type of translation errors (with 27%), followed by **target language norm deviation** (ND), with 11%. Unnaturalness in most cases is due to excessive use of the definite article "the" in English – or lack of it – because of Portuguese language interference. In addition, there is a significant number of cases of **poor punctuation** (PP), with 9%. Finally, the least relevant TLOE occurrence is marked by **spelling mistakes** (MS), with 5%. As a consequence of translation errors found in the above Portuguese into English translation samples, nearly two thirds of graduates failed the translation.

English into Portuguese Translation:

The analysis of archived translations produced by former students as their final work showed that 83% passed the test and

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

15

17% failed it. Ten students got 14 marks or above, the best of which was 17 marks, followed by two students who obtained 15.52 marks. The worst mark was 0.88 followed by 3.9 marks.

In terms of micro level analysis, **wrong meaning** (WM) errors and **wrong lexical choice** (WLC) errors are by far the most important types contributing to SLOEs, with 24% and 22%, respectively. This denotes poor handling of source-language texts. On a positive note, there are very few cases of **nonsense** (NS) and **omission** (O) errors, which correspond to 4% and 3%, respectively. With regard to TLOEs affecting the quality of former students' final translation projects, micro-textual analysis shows that **target language norm deviation** (ND) is prevalent, with 20%, followed by **unnaturalness** (UN) and **poor punctuation** (PP), each contributing with 10%, and **spelling mistakes** (MS), with 7%.

So far, the performance of former UEM students has been analysed and discussed separately. The next section looks at the students' overall performance in both English and Portuguese translation tests.

Overall English into Portuguese and Vice Versa Translation Performance:

When the average of English-Portuguese-English translation samples was calculated, 67% of the graduates were found to have failed, with a pass rate of 33%. A major factor contributing to this finding is significant poor performance while translating from Portuguese into English. At micro-level, the occurrence of **unnaturalness** (UN), with 22%, is most frequent in graduates' aggregated English and Portuguese translation analysis, followed by **wrong lexical choice** (WLC), with 19%, and **wrong meaning** (WM), with 16%. **Norm deviation** (ND) errors come fourth, with 13%, following by **omission** (O) errors, with 10%, **poor punctuation** (PP) with 9%, **misspelling** (MS) with 6% and **nonsense** (NS) errors, with 5%. Again, when we bear in mind that SLOEs are given

more penalty weight, it is a matter of concern that wrong lexical choice, wrong meaning, omission and nonsense errors contribute to 50% of translation error occurrences found in the analysed aggregated samples.

DISCUSSION

Although 46% of the respondents find the current UEM curriculum effective in developing translation and interpreting competence, it cannot be asserted that stakeholders approve of the present translator and interpreter training curriculum. Almost the same number are unsure or negative about the efficacy of the present curriculum at UEM. Thus, it is fair to conclude that although the current curriculum enjoys a measure of acceptability, it needs improvement in order to convincingly justify its existence.

Meanwhile, the survey data showed that most stakeholders would recommend the UEM translation course. However, the fact that in their comments some attached more importance to the profession of translators and interpreters, to the prestige of UEM as a higher education institution, and to the quality of UEM lecturers, rather than commend specific attributes of the current curriculum, may provide reason for concluding that recommending the course in its current fashion is not tantamount to praising it for its quality. The chief reason for recommending the UEM translation course is because it offers most language practitioners an alternative course to language teaching at BA honours level, especially when there is more hope of real-life applicability than more traditional linguistics and literature courses, which tend to be more theoretical.

Related to the effectiveness of the current UEM translator/interpreter training curriculum is the issue of perceived relevance of its subjects, or modules. The survey data analysis has led to the conclusion that *History of Ideas*, *Mozambican Literature and Culture*,

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

16

Introduction to Literary Studies I, Introduction to Literary Studies II and *Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology* are perceived as the most irrelevant subjects for effective development of translation or interpreting competence. Likewise, Optional Subjects are seen as a hindrance because, though termed "optional", they end up being "compulsory", offering students little opportunity to choose those subjects that would add more value to their training. This suggests that the choice of subjects taught in any translation and/interpreting course should make sense to the students. In other words, students should clearly see how such subjects contribute to enhancing their translation and interpreting competences.

With regard to graduates' confidence in their own capacity to provide translation and interpreting services from English into Portuguese and vice-versa, a stark contrast was observed. The data analysis showed that most graduates feel confident about their ability to translate from and into English, whereas fewer can offer interpreting services in both directions. This finding suggests that the decision taken in 2009 to phase out the interpreting component is negatively impacting on the students' prospects of becoming effective translation and interpreting service providers.

Furthermore, the fact that 80% claim that they can confidently translate from and into English was not supported by evidence. In effect, only 28% of the former translation students who submitted an English translation passed the test. This figure is in contrast to 83% of approved Portuguese translation samples produced by the same students prior to their graduation. This finding raises justifiable concerns because it is expected that, with the passage of time, graduates should gain more and more experience and thus produce better translations than when they are about to conclude their course, bearing in mind that Shreve (1997, p. 121) suggests a correlation

between translation competence and "acquiring a history of translation experience." At the same time, this finding lays bare that the current practice at UEM of translating from English into Portuguese, and not vice versa, is greatly hampering the students' potential to develop their competences during and after the training. It is also related to the other finding according to which 83% are in favour of introducing a mandatory two-way translation and interpreting practice policy.

On a positive note, the survey data showed that the level of employability of UEM translation students is very high (82%). These results are encouraging, since they provide evidence of the usefulness of the translation course to the labour market. Significantly, the findings on the number of graduates working freelance suggest that, even though there is more perceived security in having a full-time job, preparing students for self-employment is a strategy that might bring added value to the translation course.

In terms of an ideal translator/interpreting training model, it became clear from data analysis that most stakeholders would favour a model which promotes simultaneous translation and interpreting competence development. The vast majority of the study participants (80%) are in favour of designing a single two-pronged course. This provides enough evidence to conclude that the best way to train Mozambican translators and interpreters at BA honours level is to offer them a programme that caters for the two interrelated fields simultaneously.

CONCLUSION

The problem identified for this study was the absence of an effective model for the training of professional translators and interpreters at UEM. Consequently, it was hoped that, through this study, an effective model could be found for the training of Mozambican professional translators and interpreters at the first level of university

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

17

education (referred to as *licenciatura* in Mozambican universities), which could simultaneously provide the framework for designing or choosing appropriate subjects and boost graduate employability. As has been pointed out, this study was designed as action research. Action research usually points towards some evidence-based action. Accordingly, following the findings of this study, the action suggested to improve translator and interpreter training at UEM is the proposal of a new integrated translation and interpreting competence development model. The proposed model is expected to make it possible to simultaneously train professional translators and interpreters in four years under one single programme. Furthermore, under this model, students will be practising translating and interpreting from and into the foreign-language (i.e. English) on an equal footing with their mother tongue or first language of formal instruction (i.e. Portuguese).

Recommendations

In order to guide its ongoing curriculum reform/review process, UEM is recommended to adopt the proposed new integrated translation and interpreting development model, consisting of four pillars, namely communicative competence, general knowledge, strategic competence and service provision. Details are provided below to facilitate the translation of the model into a curriculum.

Pillar 1: Communicative Competence

The general objective of this pillar is to develop balanced SL and TL linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competences. The new curriculum should include the following to generate knowledge, competences/skills and attitudes that contribute to translation and interpreting competence development: Lexical, grammatical, semantic, phonological, orthographic, orthoepic, discourse, and functional competences; Text design competence; Specific skills: receptive (listening and reading) and productive skills

(speaking and writing); Mixed competences: linguistic markers of social relations; politeness conventions; expressions of folk wisdom; register differences; dialect and accent, and so forth. A set of compulsory core subjects that contribute to the development of these competences and skills should be carefully selected. Examples include English B1 to C2; Portuguese B1 to C2; Reading; Speaking; Writing; Listening; Oral and Written Communication; Linguistic Revision/Editing; Intercultural Studies, and the like.

Pillar 2: General Knowledge

The goal of this pillar is to acquaint students with any scientific field/subject of their interest. General knowledge here means acquaintance with any scientific field/subject of the translator's/interpreter's interest, including linguistics or translation/interpreting studies. Thus, the new curriculum should allow (and encourage) students to freely choose and explore subjects or modules from other fields such as medicine, law, economics, sociology, education, engineering, physics, chemistry, biology, or literature, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, comparative linguistics, and so forth. Such choices should be framed within a range of restricted elective subjects or free elective subjects.

Pillar 3: Strategic Competence

The goal of pillar 3 is to develop the student's declarative knowledge and application of translation and interpreting theories. This pillar advocates for a more practical approach to translator and interpreter training, where experience is prized over theorization. Therefore, the new curriculum should include these expected knowledge, competences/skills and attitudes: Principles/methods/procedures in translation/interpreting; types of translation; types/modes of interpreting; technology in translation and interpreting; ethics and deontology; problem

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

18

identification and solving strategies (i.e., lexical, structural, idiomatic, pragmatic, cultural, register and style problems); use of tools/ resources (e.g., physical/electronic dictionaries, parallel texts, terminology databases); subject/thematic research; logical/critical reasoning; proofreading/ revision skills, and so forth. Here, too, a set of compulsory core subjects should be defined, such as Introduction to Translation and Interpreting Studies; Terminology Research and Management; Translation and Interpreting Technology; Translation Practice; Interpreting Practice; and so forth.

Pillar 4: Service Provision

The general objective of this pillar is to develop the student's ability to provide translation and/or interpreting services. Service provision competence is the ability to deliver translation and/or interpreting services. This is the ultimate goal of the training to which students are subjected. The new curriculum at UEM should include the following expected knowledge, competences/skills and attitudes: Interpersonal skills; self-marketing; entrepreneurial skills; negotiation skills; project/time/stress management; knowledge of and compliance with ethical/deontological norms, and the like. To achieve this, subjects such as Translation Practice; Interpreting Practice; Entrepreneurship and Language Consultancy; Service Provision; Skills Lab; and Work Placement, should be made mandatory.

Alongside these recommendations, there are other implications for UEM such as the need to provide adequate infrastructure and technology. This means that the university should have at least:

a) One language lab, equipped with audio-visual technology for developing communicative competence;

b) One translation lab, equipped with computers and reliable internet connectivity for practising

translation, including developing documentation/terminological research skills, and providing translation services; and

c) One interpreting lab, equipped with a booth and simultaneous interpreting equipment (consoles, microphones and headphones) for practising interpreting and providing interpreting services.

At the same time, such infrastructure could be enriched by providing some basic reference materials such as dictionaries, thesauri, grammars and basic literature on Translation and Interpreting Studies. Likewise, the university should invest in modern machine translation tools or software. This would allow students to develop critical skills as they contrast machine translation products with their own products. In addition to providing a translation lab, ensuring reliable, free internet connectivity on campus could help students to access multilingual translation websites which provide some examples of human translations such as linguee or reverso, and online term banks such as IATE or ETB-EuroTermBank.

REFERENCES

ALBIR, A. H. Competence-based Curriculum Design for Training Translators. **The Interpreter and Translator Trainer**. v. 1, n.2, p. 163-195, 2007. Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.10 80/1750399X.2007. Accessed on 29 February 2016.

AL-SALMAN, S. and AL-KHANJI, R. The Native Language Factor in Simultaneous Interpretation in an Arabic/English Context. **Meta: Translators' Journal**. v. 47, n.4, p. 607-626, 2002. Available at: <DOI: 10.7202/008040ar>. Accessed on 28 December 2016.

ALTA LANGUAGE SERVICES. **Study of California's Court Interpreter Certification and Registration Testing**.

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

19

San Francisco: ALTA Language Services, 2007.

ASENSIO, R. M. For a New Approach to Translator Training. **The Interpreter and Translator Trainer**. v. 1, n.1, p. 79-95, 2007. Available at: <DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2007.10798751>. Accessed on 29 February 2016.

CAMPBELL, S. **Translation into the Second Language**. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd., 1998.

CHODKIEWICZ, M. The EMT Framework of Reference for Competences Applied to Translation: Perceptions by Professional and Student Translators. **JoSTrans The Journal of Specialized Translation.** v. 1, n.17: p. 37-54, 2012. Available at: *http://www.jostrans.org/issue17/art_chodk iewicz.pdf*. Accessed 31 March 2013,

COHEN, L.; MANION, L. and MORRISON, K. **Research Methods in Education**, 5th ed. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2000.

CRAVO, A. and NEVES, J. Action Research in Translation Studies. **The Journal of Specialised Translation.** v. 7, p. 92-107, 2007. Available at: http://www.jostrans.org/issue07/art_cravo. php. Accessed on 1 May 2013.

DANKS, J. H. and GRIFFIN, J. Reading and Translation: A Psycholinguistic Perspective. In: DANKS, J. H.; SHREVE, G. M.; FOUNTAIN, S. B. and MCBEATH, M. K. (ed.). **Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting**. London: Sage Publications, 1997. p. 120-136.

DE GROOT, A. M. B. The Cognitive Study of Translation and Interpretation: Three Approaches. In: DANKS, J. H.; SHREVE, G. M.; FOUNTAIN, S. B. and MCBEATH, M. K. (ed.). **Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting**. London: Sage Publications, 1997. p. 25-56.

FRAIHAT, O. A. and MAHADI, T. S. B. T. Professional Consecutive vs. Simultaneous Interpreters' Required Competence

Catalogue. **Arab World English Journal**. v. 4, n.1, p. 175-188, 2013. Available at: www.awej.org. Accessed on 10 April 2016.

GILE, D. **Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995.

GILE, D. Conference Interpreting as a Cognitive Management Problem. In: DANKS, J. H.; SHREVE, G. M.; FOUNTAIN, S. B. and MCBEATH, M. K. (ed.). **Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting**. London: Sage Publications, 1997. p. 196-214.

GILE, D. Conference and simultaneous interpreting. In: BAKER. M. (ed.). **Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies**. London: Routledge, 1998. p. 40-46.

GÖPFERICH, S. Towards a Model of Translation Competence and Its Acquisition: the Longitudinal Study *TransComp*. In: GÖPFERICH, S.; JAKOBSEN, A. L. and MEES, I. M. (ed.). **Behind the Mind: Methods, Models and Results in Translation Process Research**. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur, 2009. p. 11-37.

HANSEN, G. Retrospection methods in translator training and translation research. **Journal of Specialised Translation.** v. 5, p. 2-41, 2006. Available at: http://www.jostrans.org/issue05/art_hansen .pdf. Accessed on 5 May 2014,

HATIM, B. and MASON, I. **The Translator as Communicator**. Oxon: Routledge, 1997.

HENSON, K. T. **Curriculum Development for Education Reform**. New York: Longman, 1995.

HOPKINS, D. **A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research**, 3rd ed. Berkshire: Open University Press, 2002.

KELLY, D. 2005. **A Handbook for Translator Trainers.** Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

20

KIRALY, D. Beyond the Static Competence Impasse in Translator Education. In: THELEN, M.; EGDOM, G. V.; VERBEECK, D; BOGUCKI, L. and LEWANDOWSKA-TOMASZCZYK, B. (ed.). **Translation and Meaning**. Frankfurt: Peter Lang GmbH, 2016. p. 129-142.

MAGAIA, A. A. Assessing Translation Competence at Eduardo Mondlane University. In: THELEN, M.; EGDOM, G. V.; VERBEECK, D; BOGUCKI, L. and LEWANDOWSKA-TOMASZCZYK, B. (ed.). **Translation and Meaning**. Frankfurt: Peter Lang GmbH, 2016. p. 55-68.

MAGAIA, A. A. Investigating Translation Competence: A Case Study of Undergraduates at Eduardo Mondlane University. 2014. 167 p. Dissertation (Master of Arts in Linguistics), University of South Africa.

MASON, I. Communicative/functional approaches. In: BAKER, M. (ed.). **Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies**. London: Routledge, 1998. p. 29-33.

MCKERNAN, J. Curriculum Action Research: **A Handbook of Methods and Resources for the Reflective Practitioner**. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 1996.

MILLS, G. E. **Action Research: A guide for the Teacher Researcher**, 2nd ed. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc, 2003.

NEUBERT, A. Postulates for a Theory of *Translatio*. In: DANKS, J. H.; SHREVE, G. M.; FOUNTAIN, S. B. and MCBEATH, M. K. (ed.). **Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting**. London: Sage Publications, 1997. p. 1-24.

NEUBERT, A. Competence in Language, in Languages and in Translation. In: SCHÄFFNER, C. and ADAB, B. (ed.). **Developing Translation Competence**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000. p. 1-18.

ODACIOĞLU, M. C. and KÖKTÜRK, Ş.

From Interdisciplinarity to Transdisciplinarity in Translation Studies in the Context of Technological Tools & Localization Industry. **International Journal of Comparative Literature & Translation Studies**. v. 3, n3, p. 14-19, 2015. Available at: <DOI:10.7575/aiac.ijclts.v.3n.3p.14>. Accessed 5 February 2017.

OLIVA, P. F. **Developing the Curriculum**, 5th ed. New York: Longman, 2001.

PACTE GROUP. Investigating Translation Competence: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. **Meta: Translators' Journal.** v. 50, n.2, p. 609-619, 2005. Available at: http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/011004ar. Accessed on: 5 April 2013.

PRESAS, M. Bilingual Competence and Translation Competence. In: SCHÄFFNER, C. and ADAB, B. (ed.). **Developing Translation Competence**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000. p. 19-31.

PYM, A. Redefining Translation Competence in an Electronic Age. In Defence of a Minimalist Approach. **Meta: Translators' Journal**. v. 48, n.4, p. 481-497, 2003. Available at: http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/008533ar. Accessed on: 31 March 2013.

PYM, A. Translation Skill-Sets in a Machine-Translation Age. **Meta**. v. 58, n.3, p. 486-503, 2013. Available at: https://www.researchgate. Accessed on 29 February 2016.

ROWLEY, J. Using Case Studies in Research. **Management Research News**, v. 25, n.1, p. 16–27, 2002. Available at: https://www.arf-asia.org/resources/using_case_study_in_re search.pdf. Accessed 8 May 2013.

SALDANHA, G. and O'BRIEN, S. **Research Methodologies in Translation Studies**. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2013.

SCHÄFFNER, C. Running before

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

21

Walking? Designing a Translation Programme at Undergraduate Level. In: SCHÄFFNER, C. and ADAB, B. (ed.). **Developing Translation Competence**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000. p. 143-156.

SHREVE, G. M. Cognition and the Evolution of Translation Competence. In: DANKS, J. H.; SHREVE, G. M.; FOUNTAIN, S. B. and MCBEATH, M. K. (ed.). **Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting**. London: Sage Publications, 1997, p. 120-136.

SNELL-HORNBY, M., PÖCHHACKER, F. and KAINDL, K. (ed.). **Translation Studies: An interdiscipline**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1994.

SUN, S. Rethinking translation studies. **Translation Spaces**. v. 3, p. 167–191, 2014. Available at: <doi 10.1075/ts.3.08sun issn>. Accessed on 9 June 2017.

YAN, J. X., PAN, J. and WANG, H. Studies on Translator and Interpreter Training: a Data-driven Review of Journal Articles 2000–12. **The Interpreter and Translator Trainer**. v. 9, n.3, p. 263-286, 2015. Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.10 80/1750399X.2015.1100397. Accessed on 29 February 2016.

Rev. cient. UEM: Sér. ciênc. soc.. Vol. 2, No 2, pp 1-22, 2021

22