



ISSN: 1999-5601 (Print) 2663-5836 (online)

Lark Journal

Available online at: <https://lark.uowasit.edu.iq>



*Corresponding author:

Prof. Dr. Alya Mohammed Hussein

University: University of Duhok

College: College of languages

Email: mhalya1963@uod.ac

Keywords:

building translation competence, translation competence sub-competences, communicative competence of writing, designing a writing course, rubric for the assessment of writing

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 20 Apr 2023
Accepted 8 May 2023
Available online 1 Jul 2023

Building translation competence of translation students through supporting courses: A suggested writing course at the university level

A B S T R U C T

Building translation competence is an issue of key concern to translation programmes at university level. To achieve this objective, a host of factors should be considered. This study aims at suggesting a writing course which is supposed to be a supporting course to the major ones on practical translation at the Department of Translation, College of Languages, University of Duhok in Kurdistan Region of Iraq. The study dealt with the problem of teaching the writing course among other courses with no relevance to the building of translation competence. To design a relevant writing course, the study posed two questions which are related to the reason behind teaching writing in the department in the first place and how this course should be taught. The researcher defined her writing course objective through examining the department's mission, vision, and objectives, as well as institutional and non-linguistic constraints. The approach decided on is Task-Based Language Learning together with its theory of language and theory of learning. The study also tackled the instructional design in terms of syllabus, types of learning, and teaching activities. Finally, the procedure explained how the theoretical issues can be put into actual practice in the classroom. The study questions were answered. Writing is taken to be a supporting course that aims at building the student's bilingual sub-competence and extralinguistic sub-competence with the ultimate objective of building translation competence with the help of the other major courses on translation.

© 2023 LARK, College of Art, Wasit University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31185/>

بناء كفاءة الترجمة لدى طلاب الترجمة من خلال الدورات المساندة: دورة كتابة مقترحة على المستوى الجامعي

أ.د. علياء محمد حسين أحمد الربيعي /قسم الترجمة/كلية اللغات/ جامعة دهوك
الخلاصة:

يعد بناء كفاءة الترجمة مسألة ذات أهمية رئيسية لبرامج الترجمة على المستوى الجامعي. ولتحقيق هذا الهدف، ينبغي مراعاة مجموعة من العوامل. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى اقتراح دورة كتابة من المفترض أن

وقائع المؤتمر العلمي السابع تحت شعار (العلوم الانسانية بين التحديات الراهنة والافاق المستقبلية) الذي اقامته كلية الآداب في جامعة

واسط بتاريخ 2023/7/1

تكون دورة مساندة لدورات التخصص في الترجمة العملية في قسم الترجمة بكلية اللغات جامعة دهوك في إقليم كردستان العراق. تناولت الدراسة مشكلة تدريس دورة الكتابة ضمن دورات أخرى لا علاقة لها ببناء كفاءة الترجمة. لتصميم دورة كتابة ذات صلة، طرحت الدراسة سؤالين يتعلقان بالسبب وراء تدريس الكتابة في القسم في المقام الأول وكيف يجب تدريس هذه الدورة. حددت الباحثة هدف دورة الكتابة من خلال دراسة رسالة القسم ورؤيته وأهدافه، بالإضافة إلى القيود المؤسسية وغير اللغوية. النهج الذي تم تحديده هو تعلم اللغة القائم على المهام جنبا إلى جنب مع نظرية اللغة ونظرية التعلم المصاحبة للنهج. كما تناولت الدراسة التصميم التعليمي من حيث المنهج الدراسي وأنواع التعلم والأنشطة التعليمية. أخيرا، أوضح الإجراء كيف يمكن وضع القضايا النظرية موضع التنفيذ الفعلي في الفصل الدراسي. تمت الإجابة على أسئلة الدراسة. تعتبر دورة الكتابة دورة داعمة تهدف إلى بناء الكفاءة الفرعية ثنائية اللغة للطالب والكفاءة الفرعية خارج اللغة بهدف بناء كفاءة الترجمة بمساعدة الدورات الرئيسية الأخرى في الترجمة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: بناء كفاءة الترجمة، الكفاءات الفرعية لكفاءة الترجمة، الكفاءة التواصلية للكتابة، تصميم دورة الكتابة، نموذج تقييم الكتابة

I. INTRODUCTION

Translation competence (TC) was considered a mode of bilingualism in the early years of the 1970s and even prior to that (Palumbo, 2009, p. 21). Nevertheless, this view was radically altered since the 1980s because of the various changes in the social, political, and historical fields. These changes reached a climax at the beginning of 1990 and consequently led to decisive changes in market demands. Since then, the term "translation competence" has come to refer to a multifaceted collection of linguistic, cultural, and technological skills (Esfandiari et al., 2015, p. 45). As a result, most models for TC suggested by academics (for example, Bell, 1991; Kiraly, 1995; Hatim and Mason, 1997; Nord, 2005) emphasize the definition of

the constituent parts of TC. However, the most apparent determination of the definition of the term is the effort undertaken by the PACTE Group which, through empirical-experimental research using the mixed-method approach, defined the concept as “the underlying system of knowledge and skills needed to be able to translate”(PACTE Group, 2017, p. 36). The team also introduced the most comprehensive description of TC sub-competences. These sub-competences are: Bilingual, Extralinguistic, Knowledge of Translation, Instrumental, Strategic, and Psycho- Physiological (PACTE Group, 2017, pp. 39-40).

1. Bilingual sub-competence involves pragmatic, sociolinguistic, textual, grammatical, and lexical knowledge in the source language (SL) and target language (TL).
2. Extralinguistic sub-competences include bicultural, encyclopedic, and subject knowledge.
3. Knowledge of translation covers knowledge about how translation functions in terms of such aspects as units, methods, strategies, problems encountered, and translation in the professional setting.
4. Instrumental sub-competence is using whatever resources available to accomplish a translation task, such as documentation sources, dictionaries, and communication and information technology.
5. Strategic sub-competence controls and interrelates all the other sub- competences to ensure that the translation process is performed effectively, and the problems are solved properly.
6. Psycho-physiological component is a mixture of cognitive and attitudinal components, and psychomotor mechanisms.

II. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS STUDIES

Building TC is a must in any translation programme at the university level. Often, this is done in translation courses (see, for example, Alenezi, 2020) rather than supporting ones. In some educational settings, this objective may be attained if the students' level of language proficiency makes them eligible for the translation course. Liang (2022), for example, designed a course for undergraduate students with the aim of building their TC in exhibition translation. But in other educational settings, it may not be so for two interrelated reasons. Firstly, the students' levels create an overlap between “translation teaching,” on the one hand,

and “language teaching,” on the other hand in the sense that students are taught in translation class how to be good language learners instead of how to be good translators (Alim, 2016, p. 21). Secondly, TC consists of several sub-competences the development of which would be a hard if not an impossible undertaking in view of the first reason. Though Alim (2016, p. 24) rightly observes that the development of TC is a gradual process that does not occur all at once but attained through the process of translation education and practice, he does not mention any supporting courses other than the translation courses ones. This may be probably because the educational setting he has in mind is that of eligible candidates who enroll in translation courses to be translators not language learners. To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, there are no previous studies on building TC of translation students through supporting courses, writing in the context of this study.

III. THE PROBLEM, AIM, AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

A. *Statement of the Problem*

The above-mentioned list of sub-competences is a very long one to be covered in an educational setting which is not actually designed to graduate professional translators but graduates with basic skills in translation as it is the case with the programme in the Department of Translation (DoT), College of Languages, University of Duhok (UoD). The curriculum of the DoT includes, in addition to practical courses on translation, other courses, such as Reading and Writing, Linguistics, English Grammar, and Translation Studies. The problem is that these courses are taught without relevance to the building of some of the sub-competences of TC. Writing, for example, which is the main interest of this study, is taught in a traditional way focusing on the concept of paragraph writing and/ or essay writing.

Research Aim

This study aims to suggest a writing course that is designed to be taught with the objective of building some of the sub-competences of TC.

B. *Research Questions*

The questions that this study addresses are:

1. Why is Writing taught in the DOT?
2. How Writing should be taught?

IV. THE SUGGESTED WRITING COURSE

The present researcher believes that it is still possible to build some of the TC sub-competences if the educational programme is designed to train the students to acquire them through their major courses in translation and other courses which can be seen as supporting ones. These supporting courses, such as Writing, Reading, English Grammar, Linguistics, and Translation Studies should be geared towards the aim of building TC. The programme thus becomes a collaborative one with a clearly set objective. This topic is too wide to be covered in one study. For this study, only the Writing course is considered. This study is undertaken to highlight the skill of writing that most students struggle to develop, as part of the TC building agenda. The following writing course is suggested on the basis of the researcher's experience in teaching writing in the DoT over a period of six years.

A. Communicative Competence and Writing

Writing is one of the four skills taught in English to first- and second-year students in the DoT. But why is it taught? The first question that any teacher should ask before choosing the appropriate teaching method is why this course is taught. To answer this question, the DoT's mission, vision, and objectives should be considered to see what the purpose behind its program is, what type of graduates are envisioned in terms of knowledge and ability, and what the curriculum is meant to offer.

The mission and vision run as follows (The Department of Translation, 2013):

Mission statement:

The DoT offers a program of study leading to be a BA degree in Translation (English into Kurdish/ Arabic and vice versa).

What is our purpose?

Our mission is to equip the students with the skills required for translation and interpreting to prepare them to pursue further training after graduation in a graduate program. They will also be enabled to put these basic skills into practice in the workplace.

Vision:

Whom do we serve?

Our graduates are supposed to be able to join a graduate program which will further provide them with the advanced practical skills necessary for career success in a world increasingly marked by the demands of language and mutual communication. In the long run, the programme serves the market of translation and interpreting.

Objectives:

How do we serve?

Our curriculum is meant to offer sound theoretical match in language, literature, linguistics and translation, and sound training in translation and interpreting.

The program is therefore meant to equip its graduates with basic skills in translation through some theoretical knowledge and training. But what is the role of writing in the skills required for translation? The translator is basically a mediator between two languages and cultures, transferring a text written in the SL and situated in its own sociocultural setting into an equivalent text written in the TL. Here we are not concerned with whether the TT is SL oriented or TL oriented. No matter what orientation the translator opts for, the important thing is that s/he should have the necessary TC to do that. The translator, therefore, should have, in addition to other competences, the communicative competence (CC) of writing in English. Writing is then taught in the DoT to

develop the students' CC through writing activities in English.

According to Hymes (as cited in Tavakoli, 2012, p. 68), CC refers to our ability to communicate, comprehend messages, and negotiate meanings with others in particular settings. In relation to second language teaching, Canale and Swain (as cited in Tavakoli, 2012) see the construct of CC as including four components:

Grammatical competence: refers to our knowledge of lexical items and morphological, syntactic, sentence-grammar, semantic, and phonological rules (p. 68).

Discourse competence: refers to our ability to link sentences or utterances in a meaningful way (p. 68).

Sociolinguistic competence: refers to our knowledge of the sociocultural rules pertinent to language and discourse (p. 68).

Strategic competence: refers to those communication strategies, whether verbal and/or non-verbal, that are employed to avoid communication breakdowns (p. 69), for example, the use of a paraphrase or a circumlocution to compensate for the lack of a particular word or structure (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 559).

What does this imply for writing? How can these aspects of CC be realized in actual writing? The student is expected to:

1. produce grammatically correct sentences,
2. use vocabulary adequately. Vocabulary does not only include single words but also routines, idioms, and collocations (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 227). Here, even if the student resorts to compensatory strategies, this can be taken as adequate because this is evidence of strategic competence realized in the use of these strategies. These strategies include circumlocution, for example, “*the thing you open bottles with for corkscrew*” (Tavakoli, 2012, p. 67), approximation, for example, “*ship for sailboat*” (p. 67), use of all-purpose words, for example, overusing the words *thing* and *stuff* (p. 67), and paraphrase, for example, “to make someone something appear or feel younger” for “*rejuvenate*” (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 421),

3. produce a text that is coherent. Coherence in a written text refers to how a text makes sense to readers throughout its content organization, as well as the relevance and clarity of its concepts and ideas (p. 94),
4. produce a text that is cohesive. Cohesion refers to the grammatical or lexical relationships that hold between the different text elements (p.94),
5. produce a text that follows the norms of the genre in question as well as its respective stylistic requirements. Genre is a type of discourse that takes place in a certain environment, has recognizable and distinctive patterns and conventions of organization and structure, and has unique and specific communication purposes, for example, letters (p.245). Style is a variation in one's writing from casual to formal depending on the type of situation, the person or people addressed, the location, the topic discussed, and so on (p. 566). Genre and style are incorporated together because we believe that there is a correlation between both. For example, writing a formal or an informal email requires that the writer takes into consideration the requirements of both genre and style, and
6. produce an appropriate text. Appropriateness refers to the degree to which the use of language corresponds to the linguistic and sociolinguistic expectations and practices of the native speakers of that language, for example, *open the door* is grammatically correct but not appropriate in terms of politeness. A more polite request would be *Could you open the door?* (p. 30), and follow the mechanics of writing, viz., punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and paragraphing.

These abilities can then be put in the form of criteria for the assessment of writing as will be shown later in this study.

CC competence is to a great extent similar to PACTE group bilingual knowledge. This knowledge involves the following (PACTE Group, 2017, pp. 40-41):

1. Pragmatic knowledge: It is the understanding of the pragmatic conventions needed to perform language acts that are acceptable in a certain context; they enable the use of language for the expression and comprehension of linguistic functions and speech acts,

2. Socio-linguistic knowledge: It is knowledge of the socio-linguistic conventions which are necessary to perform acceptable language acts in a certain context; including knowledge of language registers and of dialects,
3. Textual knowledge: It is an understanding of texture in terms of coherence and cohesion, as well as different genres and their pertinent conventions on the levels of structure, language features, and so on, and
4. Grammatical-lexical knowledge: It is knowledge of vocabulary, morphology, syntax, and knowledge of phonology and graphology.

It goes without saying that CC or bilingual sub-competence of TC cannot be tackled without the extralinguistic sub-competence, which involves, as said earlier, bicultural, encyclopedic, and subject knowledge, all of which are necessary for the accomplishment of writing tasks.

B. Course Objective(S) amid Institutional and Nonlinguistic Constraints

The answer to the question of why writing is taught in DoT has not only answered the question but has also identified the objective of our course. However, identifying course objective is not enough for choosing a teaching method that fulfills this objective. The teacher should consider what Raimes (2002, p. 306) calls “institutional constraints” that can seriously influence the formulation of course objective which should be applicable and attainable.

The institutional constraints present in the context of DoT include the following:

1. No writing tasks are given to our students in high school. When they come to college, they have no idea whatsoever about how to write a composition in English.
2. Most of our applicants are the product of a traditional teaching system where good performance is judged in terms of how well the student can reproduce the content in the assigned curriculum.
3. Applicants are enrolled in DoT on the basis of their general average rather than their average in English. This means that students with a very low average in English can be

found.

4. Writing is taught together with Reading. Time allocated to both is three credit hours per week in semesters 1 and 2, and two credit hours per week in semester 4. It is, therefore, very short.
5. Our classes are large and multilevel ones.
6. Our classes lack new technology, they are just equipped with data projectors and nothing more.
7. Job opportunities after graduation are very limited; a factor which affects motivation to a considerable degree.

Nonlinguistic constraints, on the other hand, include the following:

1. Our students live in a non-native environment. There is no interaction outside the classroom with native speakers to facilitate and improve learning of English as a second language. This applies to most of the students, not the few of them who have managed to learn their English through personal effort, or thanks to being taught in a private school or spending some years abroad.
2. Some of our students live under very different socio-economic conditions which consequently affect the learning process. For example, they live in hostels, do not have access to the internet, and cannot afford to enroll in a language course to improve their English, not to mention the adverse effect of Covid-19.

In the light of these constraints, our course objective seems too ambitious. It should be amended to become applicable and attainable. In the suggested amendment, we have two objectives. One of them is an immediate one whereas the other is a long-term one.

Enabling our students to write in as much communicative English as possible in specific writing tasks.

The first objective

Empowering our students with the strategies of building their CC or bilingual sub-competence as well as their extralinguistic sub-competence through writing

The second objective

C. Deciding on the Approach

Now that the course objectives have been clearly identified, the teacher should be guided by some assumptions and beliefs about language and the learning of language (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, pp. 20-24). Guided is underlined because teachers are not obliged to follow these assumptions and beliefs to the letter, but to take from them what satisfies their teaching needs and students' needs. Teachers can also develop their own personal approach inspired by specific views about language and language learning, and the continuous process of revision and modification of that personal approach (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 24).

The approach adopted in teaching writing in this study draws on some of the views of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, pp. 223-243).

1. Theory of language

The TBLT theory of language stems from the three models of language, viz., structural, functional, and interactional. Structural in the sense that it is a system of related elements on

the level of structure for meaning coding (p. 20); functional in the sense that it is a means for expressing functional meaning (p. 21), and interactional in the sense that it is a means for realizing interpersonal relations and for performing social transactions between participants in a social setting (p. 21).

The translator's role as a writer in TL supports this view of language. The translator realizes that both the SL and the TL are systems for the coding of meaning, that the source text (ST) has a certain function to convey, for example, to persuade, to instruct, to advice, to convey information, and that s/he is actually a mediator between the SL writer and the TL readers.

2. *Theory of learning:*

To facilitate the realization of course objectives, the following principle of TBLT learning theory is adopted: Tasks promote learning through improving learners' motivation because they

- b. involve authentic language use,
- c. have a clear outcome,
- d. are collaborative, and
- e. are meaningful and relevant to real life situations.

(Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 161 & p.229; see also Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011, p.156)

However, other supporting principles are needed. We will call them *the practice principle*, *the criteria-based assessment principle*, and *the feedback principle*.

1. The practice principle: Practice is essential for learning (Child, 2011, p.162).
2. The criteria-based assessment principle: Assessment of performance on the basis of clearly defined criteria which, if met, will lead to success, irrespective of how other students perform, promotes motivation (Hughes, 2003, p. 55).
3. The feedback principle: Providing the students with feedback promotes motivation, especially when the results are good (Child, 2011, p. 244); There is little reason for

students to attend a writing course if they cannot receive feedback.” (Kroll, 2001, p.219). The teacher should also ask for the students’ feedback to improve the teaching method.

D. Developing the Instructional Design

Having clearly identified our course objectives as well as our language theory and learning theory, it is time to decide on the instructional design that helps us attain our course objectives. The design includes making decisions on syllabus, types of learning and teaching activities, and the roles of students, teacher, and the instructional material (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, pp. 24-31). These will be discussed in turn:

1. Syllabus

What content to select and how to organize it are key questions in syllabus design. The translator’s role as a reader of the ST and a writer of the target text (TT) can inform the selection of content. As said earlier, as a reader of the ST, the translator realizes that the text in question has a certain function to serve. It is the translator’s duty as a writer to reproduce that function in the TT. Accordingly, content can be selected on functional grounds. In other words, the function that a given text is expected to serve, for example, to persuade, to advise, to convey information. In this way, content becomes meaningful and relevant to the would-be translators because it is related to their specialization and so can be operationalized in the workplace.

As far as organization is concerned, content can be organized on the basis of its level of difficulty. It is, therefore, advisable that the teacher makes a writing diagnostic test first to assess students’ knowledge and ability before embarking on the process of organizing content. However, organization can never be decided on once and for all. It should always be checked to see if any modifications are needed on the basis of continuous writing tasks given to the students.

2. Types of learning and teaching activities

Our first course objective focuses on the notion of “task” and so does our theory of learning

which inspires the method of teaching. But what is task? A task, according to Breen(1987, p. 26, as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 233) is a structured plan for providing opportunities for the purpose of refining knowledge and capabilities associated with learning a new language and using it in communication. A work plan of this type will have its own specific objective, appropriate content to be worked on, and a working procedure.

Hayland (2003, pp. 114-115) provides a list of the commonly used types of writing task accompanied by five areas of writing knowledge which writers need to control to write effectively. These areas are (p. 113):

1. Content (ideas and topics),
2. System (appropriate language forms for the creation of text),
3. Process (drafting and revising),
4. Genre (communicative purpose as well as rhetorical structure), and
5. Context (expectations and beliefs of the readers).

Among all the types mentioned by Hayland, we have identified one main type and ten other types which will be called sub-types because they are all practiced to create the main type. Table 1 illustrates the main type and its subtypes with their corresponding knowledge areas following Hayland (2003, pp. 114-115) with some minor additions and omissions that have been introduced to suit our course objective.

Table 1. Commonly Used Types of Writing Task and their Pedagogic Functions

	Main Type	Content	System	Process	Genre	Context
	Create a parallel text following a given model		+		+	[+]
	Subtypes					
1	[Extract vocabulary] lists for writing	+		...	[+]	

2	Brainstorm to generate ideas			+		
3	Identify purpose and use of the text				+	+
4	Analyze an authentic text for patterns and features		[+]		+	
5	Practice use of metalanguage and identify parts of text, for example, introduction, body, and conclusion				+	
6	Practice identifying genre stages and presentation				+	
7	Draft a text on the outcome of pre-writing activities	+		+		
8	Practice specific rhetorical patterns, for example, description			...	+	
9	Practice various text types, for example, letters			...	+	
10	Revise a draft in response to others' comments	+	+	+	+	+

When we discuss the procedure below, we will explain how the main type and sub- types of the writing task can be incorporated.

As far as the remaining points are concerned, viz., the role of students, teachers and instructional material are concerned, they will be explained very briefly. The procedure will help illustrate them more elaborately.

3. *The role of students and the role of teacher*

The students assume more than one role. They can be engaged in whole-class work, group work, pair work, and/ or individual work in accordance with the requirements of the task in question.

The teacher also assumes more than one role as necessitated by the activities involved in the phases of the task. The teacher selects and sequences the task according to the students' knowledge and ability, prepares students for the tasks (See Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 236), and monitors and gives feedback to the students' performance.

The roles can even be integrated and exchanged between the teacher and students to empower students eventually to work on their own. These roles are best explained by the four phases of self-regulation, according to Cash (2017) who based his understanding on work by Zimmerman et al. (1996) and Zimmerman & Kitsants (1997, as cited by Cash, 2017):

1. Modelling and observing: Demonstration “I do, you watch.”
2. Copying and doing: Shared demonstration “I do, you help.”
3. Practice and refinement: Guided practice “you do, I help.”
4. Independence and application: Independent practice: “you do, I watch.”

As far as feedback is concerned, we have developed for the sake of this matter an assessment analytic rubric for writing which runs as follows:

Table 2. Rubric for the Assessment of Writing

	Criteria	Excellent to very good (8-10)	Good to average (5-7)	Fair to poor (2-4)	Very poor (1)
1	Grammar	Few, if any, errors of grammar	Some errors of grammar	Frequent errors of grammar	Errors of grammar are very severe

2	Unity and coherence	Ideas are connected to the topic, and arranged in a clear and logical way	Ideas are somewhat connected to the topic and arranged	Ideas are confused	Ideas are irrelevant and unarranged
3	Genre	Requirements of genre are followed	Requirements of genre are somewhat followed	Requirements of genre are frequently not followed	Requirements of genre are noticeably followed
4	Style and appropriateness (S & A) of language use	Requirements of S & A are followed	Requirements of S & A are somewhat followed	Requirements of S & A are frequently not followed	Requirements of S & A are noticeably not followed
5	Mechanics of writing	Few, if any, errors in mechanics of writing	Some errors in mechanics of writing	Frequent errors in mechanics of writing	Errors in mechanics of writing are very noticeable

This scoring scale is inspired by the scales devised by John Anderson (based on the oral ability scale found in Harris (1968) and Jacobs et al. (1981) (as cited in Hughes, 2003, pp. 100 and 104). The terms used in the rubric have already been defined in (A) above, only unity is left. Unity means that all ideas are linked to a single topic (Zemack & Rumisek, 2005, p. 78). Vocabulary is not explicitly stated because it runs through the criteria of the rubric. Words are used to express ideas, link elements of text together, represent a particular genre and style, and

meet the requirements of appropriate language use. Cohesion is seen here as one of the means that create coherence.

4. *The role of instructional material*

The instructional material is authentic texts fulfilling various functions and text types. This is in keeping with the task of translation where the translator is expected to be engaged in identifying text functions and translating different text types.

E. The Procedure

Process describes the moment-to-moment methods, practices, and behaviors that are used to teach a language in accordance with a specific method (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 31). Our procedure would be explained in terms of an example from one of our lectures given to second-year students.

The procedure includes three phases: pre-task activities, task activities, and post-task activities.

1. *Pre-task activities:*

The teacher

- a. states course objective(s),
- b. explains the building of CC or bilingual sub-competence, and extralinguistic sub-competence through writing,
- c. explains how this competence is operationalized in practice,
- d. gives a thorough explanation of the criteria of assessment, and
- e. presents a sample of written text and starts to train the students how to extract evidence of CC or bilingual sub-competence, and extralinguistic sub-competence through writing.

The teacher gives an authentic piece of written text, for example, the advantages and

disadvantages of learning online as a sample of a discursive essay where an argument is investigated and analyzed through more than one opposing perspective. The teacher explains how this type of writing is organized, what useful expressions are used to fulfil the text's function, the use of the appropriate tense(s), how ideas should flow to ensure continuity of sense, the use of cohesive ties, and so on and so forth.

Following the self-regulative learning, the teacher chooses another topic but follows the same model and demonstrates how the same written text can be used as a template for writing another similar topic, for example, the advantages and disadvantages of the internet. Here *the teacher does, and the students watch*. Then *the teacher does, and the students help*. The idea is that practicing writing on the same template in context more than once helps store information in the students' memory. This information will function as a database for the student to depend on when similar contexts are encountered, eventually leading to arousing language awareness in context, accomplishing writing tasks successfully, and consequently boosting self-confidence.

The main writing task is, therefore, creating a parallel text by following a given written text which works as a model. The other sub-types of writing tasks mentioned in Table (1) can also be practiced, such as brainstorming to generate ideas for a similar topic, extract vocabulary lists for writing from the existing template, search sources for more synonymous expressions, and so on and so forth.

This procedure is also suitable for multilevel classrooms because it helps low level students learn and encourages high level students to improve even more. High level students can even be encouraged to write without a template.

This procedure further helps fulfil the immediate objective of writing in as much communicative English as possible and the long-term objective of empowering the students with the strategies of building their CC or bilingual sub-competence, and extralinguistic sub-competence in English through writing with the ultimate aim of building some of the sub-competences of TC.

Task activities:

Students work in pairs or in groups to extract evidence from another sample with the teacher's help; *you do, I help*.

Each pair or group is asked to work on one aspect. One pair or group on grammar, another on vocabulary, and so on.

Each time roles are swapped so that pairs or groups can work on all aspects.

The teacher studies evidence and gives feedback.

When an agreement is reached on all aspects, students are asked to work individually writing on another similar topic to see how evidence can be utilized in practice; *you do, I watch*.

Post-task activities:

Students work in pairs or in groups to

- read the drafts and give comments,
- revise their drafts in response to comments, and
- evaluate the final version on the basis of the rubric provided in Table 2.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that in order to build TC at university levels, translation programmes should be designed in such a way as to fulfil this objective. Taking the writing course as an example, it was argued that this course should be designed with the objective of building two sub-competences of TC, namely bilingual sub-competence and extralinguistic sub-competence. The study also emphasized that for a course to be a success, it should not be

considered irrespective of the department's mission, vision, and objectives amid institutional and nonlinguistic constraints. This course serves as an example for the designing of other courses which support the main practical courses on translation. The ultimate aim is collaborative: building the students' TC.

REFERENCES

Alenezi, A. M. (2020). Task-based approach in teaching translation: A case study in Jouf University. *Higher Education Studies*, 10(2), 189-196.

https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Task-based+Approach+in+Teaching+Translation%3A+A+Case+Study+in+Jouf+University+Abduhameed+Muhatlis+Alenezi1&btnG=

Alim, C. N. (2016). How should translation competence be taught: A quest for a better approach in translation class. *Leksika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra dan Pengajarannya*, 9(2).

https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=HOW+SHOULD+TRANSLATION+COMPETENCE+BE+TAUGHT%3A+A+QUEST+FOR+A+BETTER+APPROACH+IN+TRANSLATION+CLASS+A+Case+Study+in+Jouf+University+Abduhameed+Muhatlis+Alenezi1&btnG=

Bell, R.T. (1991). *Translation and translating*. London: Longman.

Cash, R. M. (2017). *Self-regulation in the classroom: Helping students learn how to learn* [Webinar]. edWeb.net, A Professional Learning Network.

<https://media.edweb.net/edWebinar/?view=20170222edweb47>

Child, D. (2011). *Psychology and the teacher* (8th ed.). London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Department of Translation. (2013). *Mission, vision, and objectives*. Unpublished manuscript.

Esfandiari, M. R., Sepora, T., & Mahadi, T. (2015). Translation competence: Aging towards modern views. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 44-53.

https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Translation+Competence%3A+Aging+Towards+Modern+Views&btnG=

Hansen, G. (1997). Success in Translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 5(2), 201-210.

Hatim, B. and I. Mason (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.

Huges, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Kroll, B. (2001). Considerations for teaching an ESL/ EFL writing course. In M. Celce- Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 219-232). Boston: Heinle & Heinle, Thomson Learning.

Kiraly, D. C. (1995). *Pathways to translation: Pedagogy and process*. Kent State University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liang, L. (2022, June). Course design on students' translation competence: An example based on research program and practical experience of China's exhibition translations. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 66 (1571-1576). Atlantis Press. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Course+Design+on+Students%60+Translation+Competence%3A++An+Example+Based+on+Research+Program+and+Practical++Experience+of+China%60s+Exhibition+Translations&btnG=

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

PACTE Group. (2017). Translation competence model: A holistic dynamic model of

وقائع المؤتمر العلمي السابع تحت شعار (العلوم الانسانية بين التحديات الراهنة والافاق المستقبلية) الذي اقامته كلية الآداب في جامعة واسط بتاريخ 2023/7/1

translation competence. In A. H. Albir (E d .) , *Researching translation competence by PACTE group* (pp. 35-42). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
<http://library.lol/main/B29657B6958999C45C8DB7762BD317CF>

Palumbo, G. (2009). *Key terms in translation studies*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
<http://library.lol/main/6A1BE276D2404ED44A48AEAE226B31A3>

Pym, A. (2003). Redefining Translation Competence in an Electronic Age. Defense of a Minimalist Approach, *Meta*, 48(4), 481-497. <https://doi.org/10.7202/008533ar>

Raimes, A. (2002). Ten steps in planning a writing course and training teachers of writing. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*, (pp. 306-314). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University. Press.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Limited.

Tavakoli, H. (2012). *A dictionary of language acquisition*. Tehran: Rahnama Press.

Zemach, D. E. & Rumisek, L. A. (2005). *Academic writing: From paragraph to essay*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Zimmerman, B.J., Bonner, S. & Kovach, R. (1996). *Developing self-regulated learners: Beyond achievement to self-efficacy*. Washington: American Psychological Association.
<http://library.lol/main/94C88724B8BFD5A735567B5972FCC8EF>