Journal of Language and Translation
Volume 8, Number 1, March 2018, (pp. 65 -83)

The Impact of Teaching Methods Applied in Translation Courses on the Translation Proficiency Development of Student Majoring in English Language

Mohammad Iman Askari[1*], Jahanbakhsh Nikoopour[2]
[1]Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English Language Teaching, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
[2] Assistant Professor, Department of English Language Teaching, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Received: 13January, 2018 Accepted: 14April, 2018

Abstract
The study was aimed at investigating the effectiveness of methods of teaching Translation Courses (TCs) used by Iranian instructors on English-major students' translation proficiency development. To this end, 156 homogeneous students were selected as the participants to undergo quantitative and qualitative data collection simultaneously through a convergent parallel mixed methods design. The data were collected using a sample language proficiency test (PET), a translation pre- & posttest, the Waddington TQA Rubric, and an interview as the instruments of the study. The quantitative data were analyzed using ANCOVA while the qualitative data were extracted through the procedure of content analysis by pinpointing and condensing meaning units as well as codifying and sorting the commonalities out of the comments extracted from the responses to the interviews. Finally, the two data banks were reported via SPSS software. It was concluded that the modern methods of teaching TCs had a significant effect on students' translation proficiency, the results of which were confirmed by the qualitative data analysis of the responses in the interview. The research findings contribute to translation studies via providing guidelines and solutions for the instructors to apply appropriate methods and deal with the challenging aspects of teaching TCs.

Keywords: Methods of teaching translation, Translation courses, Translation proficiency development

INTRODUCTION

In a world and era where ever changing needs prevail in higher education, the increasing demand for the adaptation of educational programs' curriculum to the novel needs and the related evaluation processes, various courses, and methodologies applied in different programs of study come into attention (Tiropanis, Davis, Millard, Weal, White & Wills, 2009). Currently, one of the academic resources of study which has a crucial role in paving the grounds for other resources and equips the learners with an updated knowledge of several different fields is translation courses (TCs) for English-major students.

*Corresponding Author's Email: askari@intl.iau.ir

Accordingly, by limiting the focus of the present study to the teaching methods applied in TCs, it was possible to investigate more about the effectiveness of higher education since the methods were quite influential in shaping competitiveness among curriculum designers, instructors, and learners.

During the past decade, translation has gradually become one of the dominant factors in English language teaching. In spite of the fact that TCs have been provided in the objectives of the field, up to this time, there are a limited number of studies which have given at least a partial record of the trends regarding the teaching methods in TCs for the advancement of English-major students. Generally, the specific courses focusing on translation have not been much concerned with the debates and issues emerging in recent years in the field of language teaching (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998). Even the published reports in specific fields of language learning were limited and organized for specific objectives, although the exceptions such as the study of interlanguage use in relation to discourse domains existed (Selinker & Douglas, 1985). By considering other methods, Gerding-Salas (2000) proposed a cooperative translation work procedure for training the translators at undergraduate levels. In this method, the educator was a facilitator in the translation task and students may accomplish via collective, individual and further discussions and efforts.

Accordingly, conducting researches to provide guidelines for the instructors in teaching translation might be significant since their results provide them with the solutions to the challenging aspects of teaching TCs. In this respect, the present study was carried out among the English-major students, studying at the Islamic Azad University-IAU College of Foreign Languages to find out more about the phenomenon.

Obviously, TCs are significant materials for both first and second language learning. What has been shown by the experienced instructors of languages was to put emphasis on the role of translation abilities in developing languages among the learners. The evidence to the issue is the use of Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), which dominated language learning for a long time. Another issue intertwined with the importance of TCs is the teaching methods used by instructors to teach translation to learners. Therefore, due to the essential role of TCs in educational contexts, it was valuable to examine the current methods of teaching TCs proposed by Alekseeva (2000), including traditional, complex and modern methods.

The traditional methods consisted of four sub-branches. The first branch, as the most popular one, was training translation in a specific field such as technical and legal translations. The teaching process began with studying the terms of the field and consequently, giving the related equivalents in the language of translation. Through this, students proceeded with complex grammatical structures of specific written texts. The method mostly focused on the learning of technical vocabularies which can be investigated in different kinds of texts and fields. However, learners were unaware of stylistic peculiarities and may fail to translate the texts appropriately.

The second reputable branch for teaching translation was text analysis and translation. Text analysis has been considered as one of the most crucial features of training languages and translation at higher education institutions. The method resulted in identifying peculiarities and general principles of the text types under training. However, through the method, the translators were not able to pick out the features suggested for a text and should be distinguished from those that can be ignored. As a result, the method assumed intuitive choices in a translation strategy and characterizes a conventional practice of text analysis focusing on problematic elements of a translation such as grammatical structures, set-expressions, realities and other elements of a text. Thus, text analysis did not give sufficient consideration to the features of the text as a complete substance including the type of the text, sphere of application and recip-

ients suggested in a discourse method of making text analysis and considering text as an integral communicative message. The method might have certain shortages, but text analysis took a vital position in the translation process.

The third branch consisted of finding all existing translation equivalents. As the popular method in contemporary Western education systems, it was rooted in the belief that form-content relations did not have only one equivalent in which, students were needed to find as many equivalents for a word as possible within a text.

The last branch of traditional methods was comprised of the translation training, implemented by an experienced and talented translator which can be used alone or along with the first and the second branches to meet the necessary requirements in a translation. Through the method, an experienced translator trained other translators by selecting varieties of texts. The trainer rarely gave the grounds to students and the assessments were provided by the trainers' own variants of translation. The trainer relied on his/her own knowledge, by which the branch of teaching can be called the "authoritarian-creative" method (Alekseeva, 2000). Thus, the method was dependable on sharing the trainers' common experiences and competences, gained through long-term practice in the field.

Besides traditional methods, Alekseeva (2000) also proposed complex methods of teaching TCs, in which the training process passed through preparatory, basic, and training stages. The preparatory stage consisted of examining different types of texts by investigating issues such as critical reading, text analysis, and writing practices to cover the objectives of the stage by the practices provided for analysis and synthesis of texts' type in the native language via finding similar types of texts in the language of translation, detecting their features and writing the texts at the same time. Thanks to the methods, students can familiarize themselves with the types and skills for reproducing different peculiarities of texts.

Finally, the last methods of teaching TCs applied to the translation of specialized texts, called modern methods, were proposed by Alekseeva (2010). In her opinion, methods were the specific branch of translation studies challenging previous methods of teaching in which the text was treated as an objective phenomenon and translation was defined as dealing with signs of an original text. In these methods, translation techniques were selected based on the following statements by which translation was considered as the modeling and the consequent transmission of complex-structured meanings: (a) the methods were based on handling with the text and the use; (b) the choice of texts for translation depended on translators; (c) the translator may add his/her comprehension to the translation; (d) translation techniques were determined by the text integrity.

Most recent studies on teaching translation methods have focused on mere teaching methods, neglecting translation learning techniques. By considering this fact, Garant (2010) discussed Nord's model of translation-oriented text analyses, the process-oriented and the competence and skill-led approaches to teach translation, for which Alekseeva (2000) also referred to the necessity of separation in training interpretations and written translations. In teaching written translation, she gave an overview of traditional methodologies and suggested complex methodologies that incorporated traditional perspectives. Alekseeva (2010) critiqued traditional methods through raising the issue of inadequacy in such methods. She proposed the modern methods based on the idea that translation included the modeling of the original texts' meanings by the translator and emphasizing the role of translation within educational contexts which were defined by Vermes (2010), as the pedagogical or instrumental translations.

Methods of teaching translation were also considered as the sub-branch of second language acquisition by pointing out input based systems for the assessment of students' translation practices or output based systems to focus

on the feedback provided for the learners including Krashen's (1982) Monitor Model and Swain's (1985) Comprehensible Output Hypothesis. Thus the commonalities which existed in all methods of teaching TCs made it necessary to find out more about their effectiveness by applying different perspectives in educational researches and designs. In this view, according to O'Donoghue and Punch (2003), the data could be checked and verified from multiple sources of data collection via qualitative and quantitative procedures to reach the intended regularities in the research data, the results of which might be valuable to apply better teaching practices in classes.

TCs were also influenced by the linguistic types of research in translation, such as what had been proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) and Catford (1965), that linguistics did not incorporate sociocultural and pragmatic factors, nor did they emphasize the role of translation as a communicative act sufficiently. The continued application of linguistics-based models had demonstrated their obvious and in-built link with translation such as the models used in generative grammar, functional linguistics and pragmatics. All these issues might be challenging to the instructors and learners since they are expected to ensure effective interlanguage communication and to provide adapted teaching ideas to different learning environments (Davis, 2004).

Based on the aforementioned problems, the present research attempted to answer the following questions:

Q_1: Is there a significant difference among the effect of modern methods of teaching TCs on the translation proficiency development of Iranian English-major students?

Q_2: Is there a significant difference among the effect of traditional methods of teaching TCs on the translation proficiency development of Iranian English-major students?

Q_3: Is there a significant difference among the effect of complex methods of teaching TCs on the translation proficiency development of Iranian English-major students?

Q_4: What are the most appropriate and common methods of teaching TCs according to Iranian English English-major students' viewpoints?

To answer the quantitative questions of the study, the following null hypotheses were proposed:

H_{01}: There is no significant difference among the effect of modern methods of teaching TCs on the translation proficiency development of Iranian English-major students.

H_{02}: There is no significant difference among the effect of traditional methods of teaching TCs on the translation proficiency development of Iranian English-major students.

H_{03}: There is no significant difference among the effect of complex methods of teaching TCs on the translation proficiency development of Iranian English-major students.

METHODS

Participants

From among 200 sophomore English–major students, 156 homogenous participants were selected and assigned randomly to three experimental and three control groups (26 students in each group). The participants were selected from Islamic Azad University-IAU North and South branches. In addition, to justify and confirm the results gathered in the quantitative procedure, the participants at the experimental groups in each class were also used for the qualitative data collection at the same time. The descriptive statistics of the participants in three classes are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1.
Descriptive statistics for the homogenous participants at three methods

Method	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Traditional	52	15.20	16.86	16.18	.31
Complex	52	15.66	16.84	16.18	.33
Modern	52	15.66	16.84	16.18	.33

Table 2.
Characteristics of the participants of the study

Total Number of participants	Gender	Proficiency level	L1
156	Male & Female	Intermediate	Persian

Instruments

Various instruments were utilized in this study according to the quantitative and qualitative data collection requirements.

Language Proficiency Test: For the quantitative data collection, the Preliminary English Test-PET, provided by Cambridge English Language Assessment for selecting homogenous participants was used.

Translation Pre & Posttest: Two different authentic one-paragraph texts (about 200 words) to be translated as the pre-test and post-test in experimental and control groups were used. The two one-paragraph texts were almost at the same length and readability, which had been checked by instructors of TCs and translators with at least five years of experience.

Waddington Model for Translation Quality Assessment-TQA: To analyze the quality of the translations in pre and post test, the following rubric (Table 3) developed by Waddington (1999) was used as the criterion:

Table3.
Waddington model for translation quality assessment

Level	Accuracy of transfer of ST content	Quality of expression in TL	Degree of task completion	Mark
5	Complete transfer of ST information; only minor revision needed to reach professional standard.	Almost all the translation reads like a piece originally written in English. There may be minor lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Successful	9,10
4	Almost complete transfer; there may be one or two insignificant inaccuracies; requires certain amount of revision to reach professional standard.	Large sections read like a piece originally written in English. There are a number of lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Almost completely successful	7,8
3	Transfer of the general idea(s) but with a number of lapses in accuracy; needs considerable revision to reach professional standard.	Certain parts read like a piece originally written in English, but others read like a translation. There are a considerable number of lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Adequate	5,6
2	Transfer undermined by serious inaccuracies; thorough revision required to reach professional standard.	Almost the entire text reads like a translation; there are continual lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Inadequate	3,4
1	Totally inadequate transfer of ST content; the translation is not worth revising.	The candidate reveals a total lack of ability to express himself adequately in English.	Totally inadequate	1,2

Interview: For the qualitative data collection, a structured interview consisted of the three following questions developed based on the definitions of methods of teaching TCs proposed by Alekseeva (2010) was carried out:

1. What are the students' evaluations about the methods of teaching TCs?
2. What are the students' opinions about advantages and disadvantages of the methods in terms of fidelity, transparency and other features of a good translation?
3. Are the methods effective in the Iranian context by considering the linguistic abilities and communicating meanings and concepts in source and target languages?

Design

A convergent parallel mixed methods design was adopted to accomplish the purpose of the study through the qualitative and quantitative data collection procedures.The reason for choosing the mixed methods design was to compare the different results and perspectives drawn from quantitative and qualitative data and merging the databases to show how the data converged or diverged in studying the methods of teaching, and their impact on the students' translation proficiency development. According to Creswell (2013), the required steps in a convergent design were as follows:

1. Collecting and analyzing the quantitative and qualitative data separately;
2. Merging or bringing together the two databases. This can be done in several ways. After the results have been compiled, the interpretation of inferences drawn from the two databases can be brought together in a discussion where they are arrayed side by side;
3. Examining the extent to which the quantitative results will be confirmed by the qualitative results;

Procedure

The quantitative and qualitative phases of the study were conducted at the same time, by which an interview was carried out among the three groups while the three phases of the quantitative experiment namely, pretest, treatment, and the posttest were run for each method of teaching TCs.

Pretest phase

For the three methods of teaching TCs, 52 intermediate English-major students in both experimental and control groups attended the pretest. The translations scored by two raters, which was checked via the inter-rater reliability. The data were analyzed through using SPSS software and reported.

Treatment phase

For the three methods of teaching TCs, the participants at the experimental group received the treatment phase for eight sessions within four weeks during their academic semester. They were provided with the main objectives and principles of the methods of teaching TCs.

Regarding the *traditional* methods, the participants have been trained by each sub branch separately. Also, during the treatment, the students were trained in a specific field by studying the vocabularies and equivalents of the field, besides getting acquainted with complicated grammatical structures of the texts in the same field by characterizing a conventional practice of text analysis including grammatical structures, set-expressions, realities, form-content relations, emotionally colored, literal or neutral words, polysemanticity, cooperative learning as well as the basics of text analysis.

For the *complex* methods of teaching TCs, the participants had been represented with a more comprehensive view on translation in whichthe treatment focused on the stages of acquisition to study different types of texts by concerning the preparatory, basic and training stages for critical reading, text analysis or writing training, analyti-

cal search of translation variants, analysis of translated texts and ideal translations.

Regarding the *modern* methods of teaching TCs, the translation of specialized texts was focused by relying on the following statements: (a) the technique is based not on the use, but on handling with the text; (b) the original text as an object for translation totally depends on translators; (c) translator adds comprehension of meaning to translation; (d) translation techniques are determined by the text integrity.

The participants were provided with translation training by modeling and consequent transmission of a complex-structured meaning, building space for translation, compression of special knowledge, interpretation of meaning and identifying theme and rheme of the text. The treatment was finalized by practicing the written translation of specialized texts which were completely differing from earlier practices. Thus, the cognitive functions, extraction of the meanings, and modeling in the language of translation were emphasized by which the texts were considered as integral units.

Posttest phase

Following four weeks of instruction in eight sessions, the posttest of translation, an authentic one-paragraph text about 200 words, was administered to the participants in the three experimental groups. The translations of the participants were collected and scored by the two raters. The data were then analyzed by using SPSS software and reported.

At the same time, the qualitative data were also gathered from the same participants through the interview. The interview was recorded and transcribed in order to probe into the students' opinions on each method. The qualitative content analysis was utilized to investigate each method's evaluation, features and effectiveness based on the students' perspectives. The qualitative data were extracted through the procedure of content analysis by pinpointing and condensing meaning units as well as codifying and sorting the commonalities, out of the comments extracted from the interview's responses. The results were reported via SPSS to be used for the confirmation of the quantitative data.

RESULTS

Quantitative Data Analysis

Inter-Rater Reliability Indices

To ensure the existence of reliability between the raters' scores in both pre-test and post-test results for each method, as shown in Table 4,Cronbach alpha was calculated. The results indicated the existence of a high consistency between the two raters in their scoring systems in traditional, complex and modern methods since α was .912, .833 and .931, respectively; which were all greater than>.70.

According to Table 4, both pretest and posttest results from the two raters showed correlation with each other in the three methods.

Besides, there existed a high degree of interrater reliability between the two raters at both pre and posttest results, since the results for intraclass correlation for average measures were .908, .818 and .917 for traditional, complex and modern methods, respectively.

Table 4.

Inter-item correlation matrix-reliability statistics for three methods

Method	Cronbach's Alpha		Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	
Traditional	.912		.913	
	Pretest Score Rater 1	Pretest Score Rater 2	Posttest Score Rater 1	Posttest Score Rater 2
Pretest Score Rater 1	1.000	.675	.770	.726
Pretest Score Rater 2	.675	1.000	.753	.644
Posttest Score Rater 1	.770	.753	1.000	.778
Posttest Score Rater 2	.726	.644	.778	1.000
Method	Cronbach's Alpha		Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	
Complex	.833		.838	
	Pretest Score Rater 1	Pretest Score Rater 2	Posttest Score Rater 1	Posttest Score Rater 2
Pretest Score Rater 1	1.000	.795	.521	.525
Pretest Score Rater 2	.795	1.000	.394	.554
Posttest Score Rater 1	.521	.394	1.000	.593
Posttest Score Rater 2	.525	.554	.593	1.000
Method	Cronbach's Alpha		Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	
Modern	.931		.932	
	Pretest Score Rater 1	Pretest Score Rater 2	Posttest Score Rater 1	Posttest Score Rater 2
Pretest Score Rater 1	1.000	.718	.729	.824
Pretest Score Rater 2	.718	1.000	.788	.806
Posttest Score Rater 1	.729	.788	1.000	.775
Posttest Score Rater 2	.824	.806	.775	1.000

Analysis of Covariance -ANCOVA:

ANCOVA was used since the researchers aimed at controlling the potential effect of covariate, which was the pretest scores of participants by taking into account the preexisting difference between the experimental and control groups and its potential effect on the dependent variable of the study which was the participants' posttest scores. The results of ANCOVA test are shown in the following tables by identifying the two levels of the between-subjects factors-experimental and control groups-for the three methods. As shown in Table 5, 6 and 7, the *p* values of .414, .928 and .924 are all greater than 0.5 and they represent the fact that the interaction between the covariate (pretest) and independent (group) variable groups were not statistically significant for the traditional, complex and modern methods of teaching TCs. Thus, the researchers had not violated the assumption of homogeneity

of regressions that revealed the similarities of the groups with respect to their slopes and trends in all the methods. In other words, the factors (pretests) and covariates (experimental and control groups) did not interact, so the assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes had been met.

Table 5.
Tests of between-subjects effects for traditional methods

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Group	.079	1	.079	1.08	.303
PRETEST	91.87	1	91.87	1255.34	.000
Group * PRETEST	.050	1	.050	.678	**.414**
Error	3.51	48	.073		
Total	431.00	52			
Corrected Total	95.923	51			

Table 6.
Tests of between-subjects effects for complex methods

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Group	.000	1	.00	.00	.990
PRETEST	20.87	1	20.87	25.20	.000
Group * PRETEST	.007	1	.007	.008	**.928**
Error	39.74	48	.828		
Total	520.25	52			
Corrected Total	61.20	51			

Table 7.

Tests of between-subjects effects for modern methods

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Group	.87	1	.87	3.41	.071
PRETEST	78.01	1	78.01	305.89	.000
Group * PRETEST	.002	1	.002	.009	**.924**
Error	12.24	48	.255		
Total	666.75	52			
Corrected Total	107.70	51			

The actual analysis of ANCOVA also provided the researcher to look for the effect of treatment group on the outcome, thus after investigating the peculiarities of the unadjusted group's means and standard deviations, Levene's test of homogeneity of variance (Table 8) were calculated for the three methods prior to the implementation of ANCOVA test to ensure the assumptions of equality between groups, by which the *p* values were .107, .421 and .347 which were greater than .05, respectively.

Table 8.
Levene's test of equality of error variances[a] for the three methods

Method	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Traditional	2.699	1	50	.107
Complex	.658	1	50	.421
Modern	.902	1	50	.347

To complete the quantitative analysis of the study, the test of the main hypotheses were carried out through the tests of between-subjects effects, the results of which are presented in Tables 9, 10 and 11 for the traditional, complex and modern methods, respectively.

The tables show whether our groups in the study were significantly different in terms of their scores on the outcome variable, which was the posttest score based on the effect of independent variable through the test of between subjects effects. In order to interpret the results, the "sig." column shows the statistical significance value (i.e., p-value) of whether there are statistically significant differences in post-test scores (i.e., the dependent variable) between the groups (i.e., the independent variable) when adjusted for pretest scores (i.e., the covariate). In this respect, it is possible to see whether there is a statistically significant difference between adjusted means ($p<.05$).

Table 9.
Tests of between-subjects effects for traditional methods' test of null hypothesis

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power[b]
PRETEST	92.28	1	92.28	1269.23	.000	.963	1269.23	1.00
Group	.03	1	.03	.43	**.513**	.009	.43	.099
Error	3.56	49	.07					
Total	431.00	52						
Corrected Total	95.92	51						

As shown in Table 9, the main effect of traditional methods of teaching TCs was not significant on the English-major students' translation proficiency development, controlling for the effect of pretest since *p* (.513)>(.05) and thus the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Also the effect size was .009 and indicated that the strength of independent variable was considered as small as a numerical value for indicating the efficacy of treatment as the methods of teaching. In addition, the observed power of test was .099 which did not enable the researcher to reject the null hypothesis.

The actual influence of the covariate is also shown in the Table 9, for which the significant level associated with it, was .000<.05 indicating that the covariate had a significant effect on the outcome that might negatively treat the effect of treatment. Also, about 96% of the variance in the posttest was explained by pretest and not by the group behavior.

Table 10.
Tests of between-subjects effects for complex methods' test of null hypothesis

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power[b]
PRETEST	20.86	1	20.86	25.72	.000	.344	25.72	.999
Group	.04	1	.04	.05	**.823**	.001	.05	.056
Error	39.75	9	.81					
Total	520.25	2						
Corrected Total	61.20	1						

As shown in Table 10, the main effect of the complex methods of teaching TCs was not significant on the English-major students' translation proficiency development, controlling for the effect of pretest since *p* (.823) > (.05) and thus the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Also the effect size of .001 indicated the strength of independent variable which was considered as small as a numerical value for indicating the efficacy of treatment as the methods of teaching. In addition, the observed power of test was .056 which did not enable the researcher to reject the null hypothesis.

The actual influence of the covariate is also shown in Table 10, for which the significant level associated with it, was .000<.05 indicating that the covariate had a significant effect on the outcome and might negatively treat the effect of treatment. Also, about 34% of the variance in the posttest was explained by pretest and not by the group behavior.

Table 11.
Tests of between-subjects effects for modern methods' test of null hypothesis

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power[b]
PRETEST	85.72	1	85.72	343.07	.000	.875	343.07	1.000
Group	6.14	1	6.14	24.60	.000	.334	24.60	.998
Error	12.24	49	.25					
Total	666.75	52						
Corrected Total	107.70	51						

But finally, as shown in Table 11, the modern methods of teaching TCs' main effect was significant on the English-major students' translation proficiency development [p (.000)< (.05)] controlling for the effect of pretest and the null hypothesis was rejected.

In other words, one way ANCOVA was conducted to determine a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores on the English-major students' translation proficiency controlling for the potential effect of pretest scores of participants by experimental and control groups through which *p*=.000<.05 resulted in rejecting the null hypothesis.

According to Table 11, the significant value of .000 which is smaller than 0.05 indicated the fact that our groups were significantly different from one another. Also the effect size of .334 revealed the strength of independent variable as an appropriate numerical value for indicating the efficacy of the treatment- modern methods of teaching. In addition, the observed power of test was .998 which enabled the researcher to reject the null hypothesis strongly.

The actual influence of the covariate is also shown in Table 11, for which the significant level associated with it, was .000<.05 indicating the covariate had a significant effect on the outcome

and therefore might negatively treat the effect of treatment and our ability to observe the effect of treatment. Also about 87% of the variance in the posttest was explained by pretest and not by the group behavior. All these revealed the importance of taking into account the role of co variate variable in the study.

Post hoc tests were also run to figure out which groups were significantly differed from the others. In doing so, Tables 12, 13 and 14 show the adjusted means of the groups based upon the influence of covariate in three methods.

Table 12.
Estimated marginal means in the two groups of traditional methods

Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experimental	2.514[a]	.053	2.407	2.620
Control	2.563[a]	.053	2.457	2.669
Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values			PRETEST_AVG_Waddington Model = 2.4712.	

Table 13.
Estimated marginal means in the two groups of modern methods

Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experimental	3.000[a]	.177	2.643	3.356
Control	2.943[a]	.177	2.586	3.299
Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values			PRETEST_AVG_Waddington Model = 2.7788	

Table 14.
Estimated marginal means in the two groups of modern methods

Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experimental	3.623[a]	.098	3.426	3.821
Control	2.934[a]	.098	2.737	3.131
			PRETEST_AVG_Waddington Model = 2.7788	

Based on the quantitative analysis of the study shown in the Tables 15 and 16, the researchers could compare the outcomes from experimental and control groups on the three methods of teaching. In this respect, both experimental and control groups were not significantly different from each other through multiple measurements of *p* values in both traditional and complex methods since *p* were .513 and .823 which were greater than .05, representing how different groups vary in the two methods.

Accordingly, the traditional and complex methods of teaching TCs did not make statistically significant difference in the proficiency of English-major students while controlling for the effect of the pretest.

The case is different for the modern methods since the adjusted means of the groups based upon the influence of covariate of the methods made the researchers to observe the statistical significance of .000 that by conducting a post hoc test the researchers could figure out which groups significantly differed from the others. Further to this, the researchers could compare the outcomes from experimental and control groups on the modern methods of teaching.

It was concluded that in contrast to the previous methods, within modern methods, both

groups were significantly different from each other through multiple measurements of *p* value in both groups since *p*=.000 and is smaller than .05 that showed how different groups vary.

Accordingly, the modern methods of teaching TCs made a statistically significant difference in the proficiency of English-major students while controlling for the effect of the pretest.

Table 15.
Pairwise comparisons for the three methods' groups

Traditional Methods						
(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.[a]	95% Confidence Interval for Difference[a]	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experimental	Control	-.049	.075	.513	-.200	.101
Control	Experimental	.049	.075	.513	-.101	.200
Complex Methods						
(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.[a]	95% Confidence Interval for Difference[a]	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experimental	Control	.057	.252	.823	-.449	.563
Control	Experimental	-.057	.252	.823	-.563	.449
Modern Methods						
(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.[b]	95% Confidence Interval for Difference[b]	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experimental	Control	.689*	.139	.000	.410	.969
Control	Experimental	-.689*	.139	.000	-.969	-.410

Table 16.
Univariate tests for the three methods' groups

Traditional Methods								
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power[a]
Contrast	.032	1	.032	.434	.513	.009	.434	.099
Error	3.563	49	.073					
Complex Methods								
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power[a]
Contrast	.041	1	.041	.051	.823	.001	.051	.056
Error	39.756	49	.811					
Modern Methods								
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power[a]
Contrast	6.148	1	6.148	24.603	.000	.334	24.603	.998
Error	12.244	49	.250					

Qualitative Data Analysis

In order to provide answer to the qualitative research question, an interview consisting of three questions were carried out among the participants who took part in each experimental method separately. Actually, they became aware of the methods' features during the treatment phases. Besides, a handout of a brief description of each

method was also provided to assure their deep understanding of each method. The responses to the interview's questions were provided as the answer to the qualitative question of the study. The results of the qualitative data analysis are shown in the following Tables 17, 18, 19, and 20.

Table 17.
Summary of the participants' responses to the interview's questions

	Q1: Students' viewpoints on evaluation of the methods			
Traditional Methods	Identified Categories			
	Beginners Practice	Requirements	Incapabilities	
	Frequencies of Comment Texts			
	8	20	27	
	Percent of Comment Texts			
	14.5	36.4	49.1	
	Q2: Students' viewpoints about the advantages and disadvantages of the methods			
	Categories			
	Advantages		Disadvantages	
	Frequencies of Comment Texts			
	25		34	
	Percent of Comment Texts			
	42.4		57.6	
	Q3: Students viewpoints on the effectiveness of the methods			
	Categories			
	Yes-Meanings and Concepts	No-Meanings and Concepts	Yes-Linguistic Abilities	No-Linguistic Abilities
	Frequencies of Comment Texts			
	10	17	8	11
	Percent of Comment Texts			
	21.7	37	17.4	23.9
	Q1: Students' viewpoints on evaluation of the methods			
Complex Methods	Identified Categories			
	Stages Effect	Suitability of Methods	Equivalents Independency	
	Frequencies of Comment Text			
	16	24	21	
	Percent of Comment Texts			
	26.2	39.3	34.4	
	Q2: Students' viewpoints about the advantages and disadvantages of the methods			
	Categories			
	Advantages		Disadvantages	
	Frequencies of Comment Texts			
	39		57	
	Percent of Comment Texts			
	40.6		59.4	
	Q3: Students viewpoints on the effectiveness of the methods			
	Categories			
	Yes-Meanings and Concepts	No-Meanings and Concepts	Yes-Linguistic Abilities	No-Linguistic Abilities
	Frequencies of Comment Texts			

	10	17	11	14
	Percent of Comment Texts			
	19.2	32.7	21.2	26.9
	Q1: Students' viewpoints on evaluation of the methods			
	Identified Categories			
	Usefulness of the Methods	Translator's Role	Complementary Nature	
	Frequencies of Comment Text			
	23	9	26	
	Percent of Comment Texts			
	39.7	15.5	44.8	
	Q2: Students' viewpoints about the advantages and disadvantages of the methods			
	Categories			
Modern Methods	Advantages		Disadvantages	
	Frequencies of Comment Texts			
	76		25	
	Percent of Comment Texts			
	75.2		24.8	
	Q3: Students viewpoints on the effectiveness of the methods			
	Categories			
	Yes-Meanings and Concepts	No-Meanings and Concepts	Yes-Linguistic Abilities	No-Linguistic Abilities
	Frequencies of Comment Texts			
	38	5	25	6
	Percent of Comment Texts			
	51.4	6.8	33.8	8.1

The qualitative data of each method were summarized in Table 17. The summaries are also provided for the three methods of teaching TCs based on questions' classification. The first question summary data on the participants' view points for the evaluation of the methods is shown in Table 18.

Table 18.
Students' viewpoints on evaluation of methods (Q1)

Method	Analysis of the Responses			
	Comments (N)	Percent of the Comments on Categories		
Traditional	55	C1	C2	C3
		14.5	36.4	49.1
Complex	61	C1	C2	C3
		26.2	39.3	34.4
Modern	58	C1	C2	C3
		39.7	15.5	44.8

Further to Table 18, 14.5 percent of the students believed on the fact that the traditional methods of teaching TCs is considered as the methods for beginners' practice in language acquisition. Besides, 36.4 percent of them believed in the vast requirements of the methods before its

beneficial implementation in TCs classes by which 49.1 percent of them declared the incapabilities of the methods in their comments.

Regarding the complex methods of teaching TCs and the students' evaluation of the methods, it should be noted that 26.2 percent of them believed in the suitability of the methods resulted by the stages in training, comparing to the traditional methods. Besides, 39.3 percent of students declared their positive perspective about the suitability of the methods via the independency on equivalents finding, for which 34.4 percent of the participants made comments in supporting the issue.

However the students' responses to the modern methods of teaching TCs' evaluation were different. The reason for such a claim was confirmed by 39.7 percent of responses in supporting the usefulness of methods and 15.5 percent of the comments on the methods' emphasis on translators' role as well as 44.8 percent of the comments devoted for supporting the complementary nature of the methods.

The second question summary data about the participants' viewpoints on the advantages and disadvantages of each method are provided in Table 19.

Table 19.
Students' viewpoints on advantages and disadvantages of methods (Q2)

Method	Analysis of the Responses		
	Comments (N)	Percent of the Comments on Categories	
		Advantages	Disadvantages
Traditional	55	42.4	57.6
Complex	61	40.6	59.4
Modern	101	75.2	24.8

By investigating the overall responses of the participants to the second question of interview, it was revealed that, out of 55 extracted comments, 42.4 percent of them emphasizing on advantages and 57.6 percent of them declaring the disadvantages of the traditional methods to achieve fidelity and transparency in translations.

The situation was somehow the same for the complex methods of teaching TCs by 40.6 percent of the comments on the advantages and 59.4 percent for the disadvantages, out of 61 comments.

However, the case is totally different in the modern methods in which, out of 101 extracted comments from the responses, 75.2 percent of them confirmed the advantages and 24.8 percent of them declaring the disadvantages of the methods in preserving the fidelity and transparency in students' translations.

The summary data of the third question on the participants' viewpoints regarding the effectiveness of each method are provided in the following table:

Table 20.
Students' viewpoints on the effectiveness of methods (Q3)

Method	Analysis of the Responses				
	Comments (N)	Percent of the Comments on Categories			
		Yes-Meanings and Concepts	No-Meanings and Concepts	Yes-Linguistic Abilities	No-Linguistic Abilities
Traditional	46	21.7	37	17.4	23.9
Complex	52	19.2	32.7	21.2	26.9
Modern	74	51.4	6.8	33.8	8.1

By investigating the overall responses of the participants to the third question of interview, it was revealed that, out of the 46 extracted comments, 37 percent and 23.9 percent of them emphasized the inefficacy of the traditional methods in the Iranian context concerning the meanings and concepts as well as linguistic abilities, respectively. On the other hand, 21.7 percent and 17.4 percent of the comments indicated the effectiveness of the methods in the same context.

The situation was somehow the same for the complex methods of teaching TCs. That is, the 32.7 percent and 26.9 percent of the comments indicating the inefficacy of the methods whereas, 19.2 percent and 21.2 percent of the comments declaring the effectiveness of the methods in the Iranian context concerning the meanings and concepts as well as linguistic abilities based on the 52 comments extracted from the students' responses.

However, concerning the 74 comments extracted for the modern methods, the case was changed by putting just 6.8 percent and 8.1 percent of the comments on the inefficacy of the methods concerning meanings and concepts, and linguistic abilities; however, the comments indicated that 51.4 percent and 33.8 percent of responses confirmed the efficacy of the modern methods in the Iranian context on the same categories. The analysis of the results obtained through the participants' responses to the interview provided the answer to the research's qualitative question by which the most appropriate and common methods of teaching in TCs according to the Iranian English-major students' viewpoints are modern methods.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study, the methods of teaching TCs for translation proficiency development of English-major students were examined in an attempt to seek for the applicability of the methods in the Iranian context. Thus, the findings in the current research are of crucial importance to the instructors and learners due to the limited number of studies focusing on the teaching methods used in TCs.

Generally, the findings of the study emphasized that the methods of teaching TCs differently affect the translation proficiency development of Iranian English-major students since instructors had used different resources and activities via applying the methods.

In this respect, through applying different methods of teaching TCs, students might need further assistance to develop abilities to translate in various genres and contexts. Although the use of vocabularies and their equivalences along with complicated grammatical structures were the crucial components of teaching in TCs' classes, but stylistic peculiarities might be neglected, since the methods were limited to the particular examples of specific genres or contexts. Even if instructors adjusted the methods to analyze the text for identifying the peculiarities of different text genres, but the intuitive choices might not be found. Accordingly, it was not possible to take different features and specific needs of a text into account that might lead to the ignorance of communicative abilities in a message. The methods also put emphasis on the role of form-content relation as the necessary factor for the polysemantic nature of a translation task and a cooperative learning, through which no intuitive choices will be made. In this respect, the instructors are needed to be equipped with both translation principles and experts' knowledge of a field. Thus, the efficacy of training is highly depending on the combination of the strategies applied in all methods.

In this view, it seems clear that traditional methods of teaching have certain disadvantages. Therefore, a need for complex perspective of teaching TCs comes to the field to deal with the inefficacies of the methods by dividing the training process into separate stages. Finding equivalents is based on text analysis and helps the translators to delimit the scope of the analytical research both in finding equivalents and producing translations as the result of a mutual interaction between the teacher and student. However, what is at the stake here is to define the ideal translation which is affected by the roles assigned to the

teachers, translators and texts to provide the required integrity in a translation learning task. All these are achievable via building a space for translation and interpretations as well as identifying the themes and rhemes of the text. Although the factors could be considered as the guidance during the training processes, but they may deemphasize the cooperative learning procedure through neglecting the role of a teacher as the facilitator and feedback provider.

Despite the fact that traditional and complex methods could be applicable for the mentioned purposes, but still further justifications are required, part of which have been met by modern methods. Accordingly, the following conclusions could be made via applying the three methods of teaching TCs for collecting, analyzing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study to provide a better understanding of translation training. In concluding the results, both quantitative and qualitative analysis of data in the three methods confirmed each other. Within the modern methods, the confirmation was to the extent that the method had a statistically significant effect on the participants' translation proficiency which was emphasized by the participants' responses to the interview via mentioning the concepts such as the usefulness of methods, focusing on translator's role and complementary nature of the methods; besides, devoting more comments for the advantages and effectiveness of the methods in linguistic abilities and communicating meanings and concepts as the result of multiple measurements of the same concept. Accordingly, the modern methods of teaching TCs had a statistically significant effect on the proficiency of English-major students while controlling for the effect of the pretest by the quantitative results that converged and confirmed through the qualitative data and analysis. The findings of the study might provide some suggestions to encounter the difficulties caused by the ever-changing needs of higher education, teaching methodologies, translation studies and the related courses as the determining elements in shaping the interdisciplinary fields of study in teachings languages and translation.

References

Alekseeva, I. (2000). *Professional training for translators: A textbook on interpretation and written translation for teachers and translators.* Petersburg: Sankt.

Alekseeva, L. (2010). *Methodology for teaching written specialized text translation.* Vestnik: Perm University Press.

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics.* London: Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Research design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. London: SAGE Publications.

Davies, M. G. (2004). *Multiple voices in the translation classroom: Activities, tasks and projects.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dudley-Evans, A., & St. John, M.J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes* .Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garant, M. (2010). *Current trends in translation teaching and learning.* Helsinki :University of Helsinki Press.

Gerding-Salas, C. (2000). Teaching Translation: Problems and solutions. *Translation Journal*, 4(3), 328-334.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Inc.

Nord, C. (2005). *Text analysis in translation. Theory, methodology, and didactic application of a model for translation-oriented text analysis.* Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

O'Donoghue, T., & Punch, K. (2003). *Qualitative educational research in action: Doing and reflecting*. London: Routledge.

Selinker. L., & Douglas, D. (1985). Wrestling with 'context' in interlanguage Theory. *Applied Linguistics*, *6*(2), 190-204.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S., & Madden, C. (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. New York: Newbury House.

Tiropanis, T., Davis, H., Millard, D., Weal, M., White, S., & Wills, G. (2009). Linked Data as a Foundation for the Deployment of Semantic Applications in Higher Education. In: *SWEL'09: Ontologies and social semantic Web for intelligent educational systems*, 7 July 2009, AIED'09 Conference, Brighton, UK.

Vermes, A. (2010). Translation in Foreign Language Teaching: A Brief Overview of Pros and Cons. *Eger Journal of English Studies*, *10*(1), 83-93.

Vinay, J. P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *A comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Waddignton, C. (1999). Should translations be assessed holistically or through error analysis? *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics*, *26*(1), 15-37.

Biodata

Mohmmad Iman Askari is a Ph.D candidate in the field of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) at the Islamic Azad University-IAU, North Tehran Branch in Tehran, Iran. He holds a bachelor's and master's degrees in translation studies and has been lecturing at the IAU for about 5 years. He is the head of Translation & International Relations Bureau at the IAU's Central Organization and published a number of papers and a book about localization of translation and teaching methods applied in translation courses. His research interests include translation studies, teaching methodologies in the field of TEFL and the possible contributions of translation and methods to each other.
Email: askari@intl.iau.ir

Dr Jahanbakhsh Nikoopour is a faculty member and an assistant professor in the field of Applied Linguistics at the TEFL department of the Islamic Azad University-IAU, North Tehran Branch. He completed his PhD at the IAU, Science and Research Branch in Tehran, Iran in 2005. His dissertation entitled "The Wash back Effect of the UEE on EFL Education in Iran." He has presented and published several papers in domestic and international academic journals. He is a member of the Editorial Board of some national and international journals in the field of TESOL. His research interests include language assessment, language learning strategies, translation studies, teacher education, CALL, and learner variables.
Email: jahan.nikupur@gmail.com