



Exploratory-Cumulative Discourse Markers in Translation Classes: Covertly- vs. Overtly-Translated Texts

Samaneh Yazdani¹, Hossein Heidari Tabrizi^{2*}, Azizeh Chalak³

¹ Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English, Isfahan (Khorasgan Branch), Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

^{2*} Associate Professor, Department of English, Isfahan (Khorasgan Branch), Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Department of English, Isfahan (Khorasgan Branch), Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

Received: June 17, 2021

Accepted: February 08, 2022

Abstract

The methodological-conceptual approach towards exploratory-cumulative talk was the main motivation to set the present study to check whether there is any significant difference between the frequencies of the discursal markers which show exploratory-cumulative features in the covertly- and overtly-translated texts. To this purpose, sixty three linguistically-homogeneous undergraduate students majoring in English translation at the Islamic Azad University of Shahreza, Iran, participated in this study. Two classes of Translation of Literary Texts and Translation of Political Texts, were exposed to exploratory-cumulative talk as an effective approach to make the learners more efficient and independent cognitively, pedagogically, linguistically, and psychologically. Exploratory-cumulative talk discursal markers, thereof, were identified by using a number of pre-defined indicators by Wegerif and Mercer, based on four ground rules that led to capture the nature of the types of the talks and their frequency in classroom recorded conversations. The results of the data analysis showed that although the mean of the occurrences of exploratory-cumulative discourse markers for the course Translation of Political Texts was higher than that for the course Translation of Literary Texts, the difference was not significant. The implication of the findings of this study is that teachers should facilitate more frequent exploratory-cumulative dialogues, especially in the early stages of translation courses, where students are creating and merging different concepts in both languages.

Keywords: Exploratory-Cumulative talk; Discourse markers; Translation classes; Translation of Literary Texts; Translation of Political Texts

INTRODUCTION

According to Mercer (1995) and Mercer & Dawes (2014), in connection with the traditional classroom opportunities, to have a real argument about what the learners are learning is scarce. Kumaravadivelu (2012, p. 41) said, "The reiteration of learner needs and learner

rights has the power to facilitate higher participation of the learner in classroom tasks and thereby the increase in the learner's motivation." learning Additionally, by learning to use exploratory-cumulative speech, learners expand language skills lain in such conversations (Mercer, 1995), as well as other noted, tested, and demonstrated effects. In keeping

*Corresponding Author's Email:
stu.berenji@iaut.ac.ir

with most exploratory-cumulative dialogue interventional studies, the same protocol is shared: teachers and learners are instructed how to talk in an exploratory-cumulative manner through the use of (intervention) ground rules. On the one hand, the results of pre-and post-tests and, on the other hand, in-depth analysis of exploratory-cumulative interactions are exploited to articulate the effects. Based on the literature, these influences can be considered in four main categories: linguistic, cognitive, psychological, and pedagogical.

An effective way of using language to think collectively is presented through exploratory-cumulative dialogue. As noted above, however, this type of talking development was rarely given priority or attention in classrooms (Wegerif, et al., 1998). The IRF pattern did not make the students learn through interaction, as the interaction between teacher and teacher is required. student but an IDRF-pattern did (Mercer & Dawes, 2014), where D stands for 'discussion'. There should also be a place for discussion between students within the class time or cooperative work. Consequently, as described by Bullen, et al. (2002) the classroom offers an agenda for the attainment of information as well as the growth of social collaboration with others through collective aids implanted in a socio-cultural setting. The fundamentals will be at hand to be learned both in school as well as in adult life. This will increase the intrinsic motivation of the students, helping them to learn better and become more creative. Students will benefit from practicing and can learn to translate more adequately and accurately. Students will develop new insights and purposeful expertise in practice (Cheung & Rudowicz, 2003).

Nord (2000) emphasized that translation teaching should be similar to the actual practice of translation. She proposes 'functional theory' that includes criteria for selecting texts to be translated in the classroom, how to classify translation problems and processes, how to monitor students' progress, and how to evaluate translations. Then, as a complement, Gile (2009) states that translation teaching should be based on basic translational concepts (about message fidelity,

quality, communication, and finally comprehension, and knowledge acquisition) rather than the analysis of translation errors. Classroom discussion should be focused on the use of different sources of information.

Yazdani, et al. (2020) claim that improving technical and literary translation is an important undertaking, taking into account student language style, expressive power as well as content, and similar work to translate into the target language.

Talking about literary translation, the real challenge arises because it has to be done in a manner in which an expressive balance of emotion and an artistic aesthetic of context is created in such a way that linguistic play, formal-aesthetic traits, and personal style in the text are preserved. Then, the greater complexity of the content, both semantics and syntax, ambiguous and inconsistent structures, textual deficiencies in terms of linguistic mistakes, and even faulty punctuation, can be amended through detailed scrutiny of the text in a group discussion.

According to the findings of Yazdani (2020), exploratory-cumulative dialogue may answer the need to improve the translation quality of both overtly- and covertly-translated texts. This strongly suggests that students benefit from learning exploratory-cumulative interactions, making translations more adequate and accurate linguistically, as well as becoming more cognitively and academically independent.

Characteristics of Exploratory-Cumulative Discourse: Long Utterances

Findings from several researchers suggest that the length of utterances formed from learners' segment chains increased in post-intervention conversations when exploratory-cumulative dialogue was mastered (Mercer, 2002; Wegerief, et al., 2005) They suggested a random breakpoint of 100 characters. Longer periods can be an indicator of an increase in the quality of communication and the construction of meaning. However, this can be reduced to 70 to get enough material for analysis.

Rojas-Drummond & Mercer (2003) discovered that students who learned to use exploratory-cumulative interaction not only made more overt discussion, but their discussions were also of higher quality. From this, it can

be concluded that exploratory-cumulative speech will have a markedly positive effect on speech function and reasoning skills at the word level.

Sociocultural Discourse Analysis

As noted by Heydri Tabrizi and Pezheshki (2015), translation has a foremost role in the spread of science and certainly, this wide-reaching role for the transfer of knowledge cannot be disregarded. The concern of linguistic discourse analysis in translation studies is the organizational structure of the language, the focus of socio-cultural discourse analysis is on the function, the content of the language, and ways of developing shared understanding in the social context over time. The qualitative aspect will be nothing more than the interpretation of portions of the transcriptomes and the next step will be the integration of this analysis with the quantitative approach. For example, the why-question reveals some aspects of qualitative analysis as an indicator of critical thinking during collaborative activities.

To detect the nature of the types of interactions in the class Wegerif et al. (1998) suggested four levels of analysis: Level 1 was about the time when students begin to build knowledge and are towards each other. In this fundamental way the question would be, what social thinking do students use: controversial or exploratory-cumulative? Level 2 focuses on the rules governing the construction of proper statements which are the ground rules. The following practical basis rules for exploratory-cumulative dialogue from this combination of sources are provisionally proposed (Mercer, 2002): (a) all relevant information is shared; (b) the group attempts to reach agreement; (c) takes responsibility for group decisions; (d) reasons to be expected; (e) challenges are acceptable; (f) the alternatives are discussed before a decision is taken; and (g) everyone in the group is encouraged to speak by the other members of the group. At level 3, the group takes responsibility for decisions, and reasons are expected; at level 4, challenges are acceptable and alternatives are discussed before making a decision.

Researchers need coding methods to correlate the results with the characteristics of the

observed events. These methods are insufficient to explain any progression by which such correlations may rise (Wegerif et al., 1998). Taking into account a socio-cultural approach to data collection, qualitative methods and analysis can be applied as designated above, but methods of descriptive linguistics may need to be added, such as prosodic elements and lexical objects. In the analysis of grammatical constructions, quantitative methods are also needed, as large amounts of data are often collected and analyzed.

According to House (2015), to decide whether a translation should be 'manifest' or 'secret' depends on how much a foreign text is dependent on its culture for legibility. Accordingly, indirect translation the addressees of the translation text are quite overtly but not directly addressed. Thus, the open translation should clearly be a translation and not be considered as a second original. A cryptic translation, on the other hand, has the status of the original source text in the target culture. Subsequently, it becomes a text that is created in itself that, accordingly, is not specifically addressed to a particular target cultural audience. The similarity between the source text and target text should be sought at the level of individual text function and style, while language/text and register can be modified by applying cultural filters including cultural elements.

According to Skidmore and Murakami (2016), research into teacher-student dialogue is in its infancy, and more empirical studies are needed to ascertain how this important phenomenon of pedagogical speech functions in the classroom. Discourse markers are mostly indicative of coherent interaction production and these particles in the translation field are often checked for the meaningful and stroking presence of a parallel image. Translators must then understand their practical meaning as they are expected to produce the same effect on the intended audience of the text. Certain essential discourse markers for the logical structure of common interactions based on cooperative principles will lead to an understanding of the relationship between ideas and units of interaction. A crucial feature of group work that has not hitherto been the focus of

attention in translation studies is the language, the quality of group talk.

In this type of talk, learners learn to ask each other questions about the task, make propositions and give explanations for the decisions they make. Collaboration seems fine: they confirm each other's statements and validate them, either explicitly or indirectly by the repetition of them. They are not only building their lesson together but also building a shared understanding of what the lesson should be like (Littleton & Mercer, 2014).

Harasim (2015) identified a developing character for computer-mediated collaboration as designated by Brown (2016) as a cognitive transfer system to associate with exploiting it as a tool for the upcoming change from looking at exploratory-cumulative interactions to support conversations. Why understand? Therefore, it seems that collaborative dialogue is a kind of powerful, novel form of collaborative effort.

They ultimately emphasize that students become more cognitively independent through the use of exploratory-cumulative dialogue in translation classes. Therefore, translators may seek to advance the interests of the power network of translation because translation as a social phenomenon is by its nature a site of ideological conflict, especially in certain social and political contexts. Furthermore, the movement of texts from the context of the other to the context of the self is an undeniable change of ideological position in group discussions.

Overall, in order to follow the objective of the study and to find out in which types of translation tasks, the incidence of exploratory-cumulative dialogue features was higher, the following research question was posed:

RQ.: Is there a significant difference between the number of occurrences of discussion markers showing exploratory-cumulative characteristics in the two types of translated texts under the study?

METHOD

Design

To attain the proposed purposes of the current study and depending on the nature of the question addressed, a qualitative-

quantitative experimental design was exploited in the current study was done in a foreign language learning context at the English Department of Islamic Azad University (IAU), Shahreza Branch, where one of the researchers worked as a translation teacher. The study was run for 12 sessions of ninety minutes.

Participants

They were senior students, both male and female, aged 21 to 24 years, studying English translation at the Islamic Azad University of Shahreza. They were selected through a non-probability sampling procedure (convenience/opportunity sampling). They declared to have a similar educational background. knew Persian as their first language and knew only English as their foreign language, without any special knowledge in translating or teaching English. They were assigned to two groups consisting of 63 intermediate-level university students.

Table1
Characteristics of the Students

1. Sex	Male: 10	Female: 53
2. Age	Range: 21-24	
3. Translation or Teaching Experience	No	
4. Educational Background	Senior students	

Materials and Instruments

Literary Text Translation textbook by Khazaee Far (2017) and *Political Text Translation* by Birjandi, Gorjian, and Molonia (2009) for students majoring in English Translation were the instructional materials. In order to control the language proficiency factor Oxford Quick Placement Test was used. Finally, to check the transcriptions and coding of the recorded conversations of student's discussions based on (Mercer, Hennessy, & Warwick, 2019) CDE-scheme and to check the type and the frequency of the numbers of occurrences of exploratory-cumulative discourse markers, (T'Sas, 2018) conversation analysis checklist was used. The conversation analysis checklist can be found in the index part.

Procedures

Data Collection

According to Mercer (2002), within the variety of methods used in exploratory-cumulative talk studies, sociocultural discourse analysis is proved the most appropriate to evaluate classroom talk as exploratory-cumulative. Exploratory-cumulative talk is the kind of talk in which partners participate critically and positively against each other's thoughts.

Through thorough conversation analysis, a number of pointers for exploratory-cumulative talk may be attained. Using a number of pre-defined pointers by (Wegerif et al., 1998) based on four ground rules, to detect the nature of types of talk and their frequency in classroom conversations. Table 2, in a very detailed categorized fashion, summarizes the indicators of the exploratory-cumulative talk (T'Sas, 2018), followed by the researchers.

Table 2

Operationalized Four Level Indicators of Exploratory-Cumulative Talk, (T'Sas, 2018)

Level of analyses	1	2	3	4a	4b
Social mode of thinking	Main characteristics	Ground rules	Specific speech/ communicative acts, exchanges	Language used: key words in context	Turn taking, length of utterances, quantity and quality of arguments
1	active joint engagement with each other's ideas	1. all relevant information is shared	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assertion of knowledge • confirmation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • actually (to justify/clarify) • agree 	
2	alternative hypotheses offered	2. the group seeks to reach agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • critique • disagreement + explanation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • also • because (in reasoning) 	
3	initiations challenged and counterchallenged	3. the group takes responsibility for decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explanation: procedural/conceptual • giving and asking for opinions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • but (constructive challenging or clarification) 	
4	justifications given and developed	4. reasons are expected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • goal identification / clarification • hypothetical question 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • could • for example 	
5	members try to collaborate and to understand each other's viewpoints	5. challenges are acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • joint elaboration • justification of ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how • I think/ reckon/ guess (introducing ideas) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more long utterances • more symmetrical turn-taking
6	progress to joint acceptance of suggestions	6. alternatives are discussed before a decision is taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proposals + agreed action • proposals as an offer + explanation, clarification or Elaboration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if (reason about problem) • let's (cooperative suggestion) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • higher quantity and quality of arguments
7	to be actively encouraged by their peers to speak and to put forward ideas	7. all in the group are encouraged to speak by other group members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • question seeking explanation, clarification or elaboration • reaching / stating a consensus • recounting another's idea • reformulating another's idea • selecting an option • self-regulation • utterances connect to the ones before 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> maybe (idem) might no (with justification or reasoning) what (idem) which/where (idem) why (task-related question) would you (in a question) 	

It was important to take into account the various aspects of applying exploratory-cumulative speech to decision making about a group of students. Therefore, the number of students in each group, were expected to engage in exploratory-cumulative conversations in their groups and achieve networks among each other, as well as plainly outline the role of the teacher. was defined by, and the way in, the interaction between the teacher and the groups. First, the researchers gave ethical approval from the head of the English language department. In a debriefing session with the subjects of the experimental group, the nature of the exploratory-cumulative dialogue, its value (to engage more actively and meaningfully in the teaching and learning processes), the way students will be placed in groups, and the teacher-researcher explained how to work in the classroom (what has been learned and why, developing synergy between himself and the teacher) during the semester.

After seeing the value of feedback and the opportunity to repeatedly examine themselves and peers, students were stimulated to vigorously deliver it in their groups as well as their teacher's feedback that supports their learning. The basic rules and basic notions of how to apply exploratory-cumulative dialogue were presented to students as the desired type of relationship was applying exploratory-cumulative dialogue as didactic strategies for negotiating effectively. That is, they were likely to do activities in the classroom such as peer-to-peer learning in small groups where they worked together on their translation tasks without teacher's help, sharing, challenging and resourcefully challenging ideas, Reach consensus on how to participate in decision-making by their group and in resolving and revising their translation problems, as well as evaluating their translation quality.

To begin the process, first, a variety of exploratory-cumulative speech is modeled by the teacher to negotiate the meaning of the ideas and their expectations of the way students talk together in their groups. clarified. In the next step, the teacher provided a set of cues that were visible to the students when they worked

in a group. Here is an example list of signals. Why don't we try to do the same? What do you think we should do? How about this structure? I have a different idea. What else could we do? So, do we all agree? Why do you think so? Then, the teacher introduced the use of signs for students as they worked in groups throughout the course. Since the main part of the exploratory-cumulative dialogue was reaching consensus, all students were expected to care about the progress of other members and the group as a whole as a unit of performance. Finally, asking a group to reproduce the use of exploratory-cumulative speech in their group task was more closely focused on signals or ground rules. Finally, the students were asked to consider the same process in all the following semesters.

The project involved a small-scale enquiry about the possible problems in translating the texts at home, reminding the subject, initiating the cooperation and start discussion by using exploratory-cumulative talk in groups. In each group, one of the members was responsible to record the group's discussion by cellphone and deliver it to the teacher at the end of every session. Considering the number of sessions and groups in each class, one of the group's delivered voices was transcribed each session by the researchers to check out the process of using exploratory-cumulative talk and the number of related discursal markers during the semester. Doing so, the chance of observing and checking of discussions of all groups was equal (three times in a semester).

That type of the data, collected on the process of using exploratory-cumulative talk in two groups, was qualitative in nature providing insight about the frequency and the quality of the used exploratory-cumulative talk discourse markers (that provide precious clues to ensure the researchers about the appropriateness of communication in every group regularly, and to make such group work more productive). That type of data, collected on the role of embedding the exploratory-cumulative talk in translation teaching courses was determined by the nature of the focus and included quantitative data.

Table 3
Categorization of Indicators of Exploratory-Cumulative Talk Discourse Markers According to Functions

Functions	Example items	Mean of occurrence in political texts	Mean of occurrence in literary texts
Cognitive			
Denote thinking process	Well, I think	10	11
Reformulation / self-Correction	In other words, I mean	11	3
Elaboration / Hesitation	It's like / sort of, well	17	15
Assessment of the listener's knowledge about utterances	Right? Am I correct?	12	9
Structural			
Opening and closing of topics	Ok, right, well, now,	14	16
Sequencing topic shifts	Anyway, so, then, next	8	5
Summarizing options	And, so yeah	13	13
Continuation of or return to topics	Additionally, and so, and, plus	12	6
Referential			
Cause / Contrast	Because / But, although	11	4
Consequence / Digression	So / Anyway	9	11
Interpersonal			
Mark shared knowledge	You see, you know	16	13
Indicate speaker attitudes	Yes, of course, really, I agree	13	14
Show emotional response / interest and back channel	Great, sure, ok, yeah	12	11
Total		12.15	10.08

Data Analysis

In order to answer the research question of the current study, to determine in which groups, translation of political or literary texts, the number of the occurrences of discursal markers showing exploratory-cumulative features is higher and whether the difference is significant, the quantitative data, the mean, of both groups were computed and independent-samples t-test showed the significance between the two means. In the analyses of the transcribed data, a template approach was followed to enable the researchers identify the indicators of exploratory-cumulative talk discourse markers and ground rules used by the students during group work in their classrooms.

RESULTS

In order to answer the research question, to determine in which groups, literary (overtly needed translation text) or political (overtly needed translation text), the number of the occurrences of discursal markers showing exploratory-cumulative features is higher and

whether the difference is significant, the quantitative data, the mean of occurrences, of both experimental groups were computed and independent sample *t*-test was run. Lists of key words were used as in previous studies of exploratory-cumulative dialogue. All key words were analyzed in context: a key word was counted only if it was part of a speech-unit. After Mercer et al. (2019), key words used off-task, or in teacher-researcher conversations, or words in quotes, or used as repetitions or in incomplete pronunciations were excluded. The mean of events was calculated based on the number of events that occurred during the semester.

Two other observers coded and checked the variables in the first and last sessions of the semester, and they achieved an inter-observer agreement of 94%. As Table 2 shows, the overall mean of exploratory-cumulative discourse markers in political texts was 12.15 and 10.08 in literary texts. To test whether the difference between these two means was significant, an independent sample t-test was run. Table 4 presents inferential statistics.

Table 4
Independent Sample t-Test Comparison of the Mean of Occurrences of Exploratory-Cumulative Talk Discourse Markers in Political and Literary Texts

		Levene's test for equality of variances				t-test for equality of means				
		<i>F</i>	Sig.	<i>T</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed) <i>p</i>	Mean difference	Std. Error difference	95% Confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper	
Exploratory-cumulative talk discourse markers	Political texts	4.60	.07	1.49	32	.14	.10	2.34	10.9	13.4
	Literary texts			.17	29	.94	2.53	1.61	8.84	11.3

Although the mean of the occurrence frequencies of exploratory-cumulative discourse markers for Translation of Political Texts was greater (12.15) than those for the course Translation of Literary Texts (10.08), there was no significant difference between the two means as *t*-value was 1.49 and the *p*-value was .14 at $p < .05$, as Table 4 shows. Accordingly, there was no significant difference between the numbers of the occurrences of the discursal markers showing exploratory-cumulative features in these two types of translation texts.

DISCUSSION

Exploratory-cumulative speech provides an important means of working on simultaneous comprehension and thinking, with learners actively participating in group talks, feeling relatively comfortable, non-invasive, contradicting and expressing their own interpretations and shared knowledge. are free to do. Establishing a supportive context for learning during lessons is central to effective learning. It is only by talking about new ideas that learners easily move towards new ways of thinking and understanding. In fact, the support of a social group is essential for many learners. The term common sense (Edwards & Mercer, 2013) reminds us that the construction of knowledge is essentially a social process and that, in Mercer's words, the use of exploratory-cumulative dialogue makes reasoning visible in an educational setting.

Foreign language (L2) and mother tongue (L1) competencies as well as cultural competence are three aspects of translation competence and are a prerequisite for any type of translation. According to Nord (2000), the

challenges of translation may be due to the social functions of the language, the non-generalized characteristics of the text, and the challenges of practicality. They may also be due to the behavioral patterns of the source and target cultures, or the cross-linguistic challenges of the two languages, or the result of structural differences between the source and target texts, which must be negotiated. However, barriers to translation can be easily overcome by understanding the author's specific language style as well as their syntactic, linguistic, and expressive means. All these make it possible to reach a consensus for the purpose of the study, which is consistent with Yazdani and Driver (2016).

According to data analyzes study results, there was no significant difference between the number of occurrences of discourse markers showing exploratory-cumulative features in these two types of translation texts. Since literary translation is one of the most challenging areas of teaching and learning to enable students to translate into the target language by considering content, expressive power, language style, and preserve the same function of a literary text, it seems remarkable that students' Weaknesses (sometimes even in the source language) limit the utterance length of their exploratory-cumulative group discussion and cause consensus to be reached by shorter discussions. Having the ability to transfer non-linguistic and linguistic knowledge is of the highest demand for translators, requiring them to be able to converse about the mental images contained in text as well as words, grammatical and semantic aspects of language. Is. It is, according to the

findings of Brown (2016) and Harasim (2015), that stereotyped patterns, complex cognitive activity, and the assimilation of rules in all situations do not seem to have a proper purpose in academic translation teaching. In contrast, students of translation must establish different translation techniques and strategies in order to choose the optimal option for different text styles.

As Yazdani et al. (2020) noted, exploratory-cumulative dialogue may answer the need to improve translation quality of translation texts both overtly and covertly in which the widespread use of exploratory-cumulative dialogue discourse markers is a notable sign. The findings of the present study are in line with those of Higgins et al. (2019) also argued about opportunities for students to set their own ground rules, initiate questions, answer questions, and draw their own conclusions through group discussion. The benefits of this approach in translation classes can be explained when both types of translation lessons have equal opportunity to participate in exploratory-cumulative talk group discussions without significant differences.

CONCLUSION

In general, it is suggested that teachers facilitate more frequent exploratory-cumulative dialogue, especially in the early stages of translation courses, where students are creating and merging different concepts, in both languages. Enough to put the texts properly. From a pedagogical point of view, what is needed for effective and constructive learning can be put into practice by teachers, by exploratory-cumulative dialogue: prior knowledge and personal experiences (in the form of existing mental structures) to clear the way for new insights and knowledge. However, if it is going to be successful, the basic rules of exploratory-cumulative speech must be incorporated into the curriculum in a coherent manner. Accordingly, the basic rules of exploratory-cumulative speech must be taught as a vertical line of development during education.

Also, we should be aware of the fact that exploratory-cumulative talk is not only needed

for language classes, but is an essential didactic tool which improves learning in other domains. It is a systematic approach, although appropriate problem-solving work, along with reflection on the process of group talk, can facilitate knowledge transfer beyond the context in which the exploratory speech was learned. Since social constructivist teaching requires this higher learning skill to be put into practice, it focuses heavily on all aspects of constructivist education, including cognitive and pedagogical.

They have to be put into practice to develop the confidence to walk away from more traditional paths, to discover the value and relevance of learning principles, pedagogical principles, didactic approaches, etc. Therefore, it seems that teacher education needs to invest in a more repetitive as well as progressive curriculum to encourage synergy between theory, practice and thought. An integrated and inductive curriculum in which students and teachers begin to become apprentices, participate in group talks and engage in activities with practical assignments, helps them to change their perspective from controversial to exploratory-cumulative.

Furthermore, uncovering the different and complementary costs of working in more symmetrical contexts (group work), and heterogeneous contexts (teacher intervention in group work or whole-class discussion) is another application of this study. To inculcate the habit of asking questions in the minds of the learners and connect new ideas to their previous and passive knowledge in the social context of learning, empowering the learners by engaging them in inquiry, generating interest can take responsibility for finding new material as well as satisfaction in the quality of their own involvement, learning reflection, asking questions, reinterpreting experience, and exploring new techniques and solutions to the case at hand. There are all new ways of understanding what is relevant to. Application of the findings of the present study.

In exploratory-cumulative talk, teachers encourage learners to find alternative ways of looking at topics, to understand what evidence can be

used to support one or the other point of view, and to explore common approaches to the topic. Attempts may be made to complete the consent.

References

- Brown, A. C. (2016). Classroom community and discourse: How argumentation emerges during a Socratic circle. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, 4.
- Bullen, K., Moore, K., & Trollope, J. (2002). The influence of pupil-generated ground rules on collaborative learning in the classroom: A pilot study. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 16(4), 202-217.
- Cheung, C.-K., & Rudowicz, E. (2003). Academic outcomes of ability grouping among junior high school students in Hong Kong. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(4), 241-254.
- Gile, D. (2009). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training* (Vol. 8): John Benjamins Publishing.
- Harasim, H. (2015). The sociology of the classroom. In A. Hartnett (Ed.), *The Social Sciences In Educational Studies*, 33-45.
- Heidari Tabrizi, H., & Chalak, A. (2015). An investigation of final tests of translation as practiced in Iranian undergraduate English translation program. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic and Industrial Engineering*, 9(8), 2811-2816.
- Heidari Tabrizi, H., & Pezeshki, M. (2015). Strategies used in translation of scientific texts to cope with lexical gaps (Case of Biomass Gasification and Pyrolysis Book). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(6), 1173-1178.
- Higgins, J. P., Savović, J., Page, M. J., Elbers, R. G., & Sterne, J. A. (2019). Assessing risk of bias in a randomized trial. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*, 205-228.
- House, J. (2015). Global English, discourse and translation: Linking constructions in English and German popular science texts. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 27(3), 370-386.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). *Language teacher education for a global society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing*: Routledge.
- Littleton, K., & Mercer, N. (2014). *Interthinking: Putting talk to work*: Routledge.
- Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and learners*: Multilingual matters.
- Mercer, N. (2002). *Words and minds: How we use language to think together*: Routledge.
- Mercer, N., & Dawes, L. (2014). The study of talk between teachers and students, from the 1970s until the 2010s. *Oxford review of education*, 40(4), 430-445.
- Mercer, N., Hennessy, S., & Warwick, P. (2019). Dialogue, thinking together and digital technology in the classroom: Some educational implications of a continuing line of inquiry. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 97, 187-199.
- NeilMercer, D. & Mercer, N. (2013). *The Development of Understanding in the Classroom*. Routledge.
- Nord, C. (2000). Training functional translators. *Cadernos de traducaao*, 1(5), 27-46.
- Rojas-Drummond, S., & Mercer, N. (2003). Scaffolding the development of effective collaboration and learning. *International journal of educational research*, 39(1-2), 99-111.
- Skidmore, D., & Murakami, K. (2016). How prosody marks shifts in footing in classroom discourse. In D. Skidmore & K. Murakami (Eds.), *Dialogic Pedagogy* (pp. 186-202). London: Multilingual Matters.
- Wegerif, R., Linares, J. P., Rojas-Drummond, S., Mercer, N., & Velez, M. (2005). Thinking together in the

- UK and Mexico: Transfer of an educational innovation. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 40-48.
- Wegerif, R., Mercer, N., & Dawes, L. (1998). Software design to support discussion in the primary curriculum. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 14(3), 199-211.
- Yazdani, S., & Chalak, A. (2016). *Positive and Negative Presentation: The Manipulation of Ideology in Translation of Iranian Political News Titles*. Paper presented at the The 1st National Conference on Advances and Challenges in Science, Engineering and Technology Shiraz, Iran.
- Yazdani, S., Heidari Tabrizi, H., & Chalak, A. (2020). Exploratory-cumulative vs. Disputational Talk on Cognitive Dependency of Translation Studies: Intermediate level students in focus. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 8(33), 39-57.

Biodata

maneh Yazdani is a **Ph.D.** candidate of TEFL and lecturer at Department of English, Isfahan (Khorasgan Branch), Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Her research interests include Teaching Translation, Translation Quality Assessment, Critical Discourse Analysis, and English Literature.

Hossein Heidari Tabrizi is an associate professor of TEFL and currently the head of the English Department at Islamic Azad University, Isfahan Branch, Isfahan, Iran. He is the director-in-charge of Research in English Language Pedagogy (RELP). His research interests include language assessment, translation studies, and critical discourse analysis.

Email: heidaritabrizi@gmail.com

Azizeh Chalak is an associate professor of TEFL at the English Department, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran. She is the Editor-in-chief of Research in English language Pedagogy (RELP). Her research interests include Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics, Sociolinguistics, and Intercultural Communication.

Email: azichalak@gmail.com