

AN EVALUATION ON THE PEDAGOGICAL ASPECTS OF SKOPOS TRANSLATION THEORY

Skopos Çeviri Kuramının Pedagojik Yönleri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi. Semih OKATAN

Kafkas Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, Mütercim Tercümanlık Bölümü, Kars /TÜRKİYE

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5798-6278>

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi. Serkan DEMİRAL

Batman Üniversitesi, Turizm İşletmeciliği ve Otelcilik Yüksekokulu, Gastronomi ve Mutfak Sanatları Bölümü, Batman/TÜRKİYE

ORCID : <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8343-0636>

ABSTRACT

Translation science, which was seen as a sub-branch of linguistics until the second half of the XX century, is now considered an independent branch of science. The importance of translation theories is undeniable in the process of making translation science, which has three basic research areas: theoretical, illustrative and applied, undoubtedly autonomous from linguistics. Translation theories shed light on and guide translators to understand the background of the translation action and to determine the translations methods. One of these theories is the Skopos Theory developed by Katharina Reiss and Hans J. Vermeer in the 70s. In this study, which emphasizes a functional target-oriented approach in translation activity, the place and importance of Skopos Theory in translation education is evaluated and the aim is to provide translation acquirers to learners in the classroom environment within the framework of Skopos Theory. In this context, the theory was examined from a pedagogical point of view and a teaching methodology was tried to be created. In this context, how learners can improve their skills and competencies in producing translations, how to create translation skoposes, and how to give learners an educational behavior were discussed and general inferences were made for translation education.

Keywords: Skopos Theory, Translation Training, Self-regulation, Autonomous Learning/Self-directed learning.

ÖZET

XX. yüzyılın ikinci yarısına kadar dil biliminin bir alt dalı olarak görülen çeviri bilimi günümüzde artık bağımsız bir bilim dalı olarak kabul edilmektedir. Kuramsal, betimleyici ve uygulamalı olmak üzere üç temel araştırma alanına sahip olan çeviri biliminin kuşkusuz dil biliminden özerk bir yapıya kavuşması sürecinde çeviri kuramlarının önemi yadsınamaz. Çeviri kuramları, çeviri eyleminin arka planını anlama ve çeviri yöntemlerini belirleme konusunda çevirmenlere ışık tutar ve rehberlik eder. Bu kuramlardan biri de 70'li yıllarda Katharina Reiss ve Hans J. Vermeer'in geliştirdiği Skopos Kuramıdır. Çeviri etkinliğinde erek odaklı işlevsel bir yaklaşımı öne çıkaran Skopos Kuramının çeviri eğitimindeki yeri ve öneminin değerlendirildiği bu çalışmada amaç, Skopos Kuramı çerçevesinde sınıf ortamında öğrencilere çeviri edincinin kazandırılmasıdır. Bu kapsamda, kuram pedagojik açıdan ele alınarak incelenmiş ve bir öğretim metodolojisi oluşturulmaya çalışılmıştır. Bu bağlamda, çeviri eğitiminde öğrencilerin çeviri üretme beceri ve yeterliliklerini nasıl geliştirebilecekleri, çeviri skoposlarını nasıl oluşturulabilecekleri ve öğrencilere nasıl bir eğitsel davranış biçimi kazandırılması gerektiği tartışılmış ve bu doğrultuda çeviri eğitimine yönelik genel çıkarımlarda bulunulmuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Skopos Teorisi, Çeviri Eğitimi, Öz düzenleme, Özerk Öğrenme/Öz yönetimli öğrenme.

1. INTRODUCTION

The fact that translation education, which is included in the applied basic research area of translation science, does not have certain methods and techniques shows that there is a great deficiency in this field. However, methods and techniques can be developed for the applied teaching of translation, which is a scientific research field today. Translations for different types of texts (medicine, law, literature, technique, etc.) naturally require the creation of different methods and techniques, and these methods and techniques should be transferred to translation students through translation education. In other words, today, professional translators specialize in certain types of texts and translate such texts. In this study, we will

evaluate methodological approaches to translation education within the framework of Skopos translation theory for the development of written and oral translation competence, and we will try to contribute to the field of translation education to have a scientific structure.

1.1 Skopos Theory

Skopos theory is an outstanding theory in translational studies as it brings a new perspective related to the relationship between source text (ST) and target text (TT). Thus, the theory allows a translator to produce a translation in terms of different purposes according to a given commission.

Given the theoretical groundwork, Skopos theory exists among the functional theories of translation studies, and it was developed by Vermeer in the 1970s. The theory, which brings the intended purpose of the target text into the focal point, undertakes its meaning from Greek and it refers to the meaning of the word *purpose* (Schäffner, 1998). Given the principles of the theory defined by Vermeer and Reiss, some basic components in a hierarchical order come to the fore. As a basis, the translation of the TT is determined according to its *skopos*, and there is an information flow between ST and TT. However, there is not clear reversible information in TT. When the theoretical groundwork is handled in more detail, the relationship between ST and TT reveals an intertextual coherence. Namely, when TT is taken into consideration, there must be an internal coherence and a coherence with ST. Here, intra-textual and inter-textual coherences take place under the *skopos* of the *translatum*. That's, the *skopos* of the *translatum* and the commission determine the way of the coherence between ST and TT, and the notion of *adequacy* may override the term *equivalence* between the two as a result of the *skopos* in the act of translation. When the *skopos* determined by the commission is presented in TT, it is regarded as *adequate* in terms of function and communication; the notion of *equivalence* is reduced to functional fidelity between ST and TT despite the exception of full functional fidelity. Based on these principles, some distinctive explanations should be touched upon. Firstly, cultural and linguistic contexts in ST and TT separately operate. Here, the translator is in the center position when intercultural communication and production of the *translatum* are created. Secondly, when the irreversibility is taken into consideration, it reveals that the *translatum* between ST and TT may show changes. Lastly, the extent to which the translation action between ST and TT is successful emerges as a result of inter-and intra-textual coherences (Munday, 2008).

In sum, in line with the information given above, one can conclude that Skopos theory helps a translator to produce a translation in different ways in accordance with the purpose of TT and the commission given to the translator.

1.2 Decision-making Process in Translator Training

“The aim of translation pedagogics is to provide trainees with a professional identity” (Yazıcı, 2004, p. 312). In this line, considering translation training from only one perspective is not a correct approach, namely, translator training should be handled with all its aspects. In addition, the translation training process must also be evaluated through the lens of a theoretical aspect. In this evaluation, the teaching of theoretical groundwork of translation forms one of the key elements of the pedagogical design in translator training. In this context, it is significant to highlight the place of functional approaches in translator training and to make them applicable in this area. According to Nord (2010), students who are trained to be a profession in translation must know how to make various types of translations, to interpret the briefs, and to acquire the information to be able to make acceptable translations; and one of the ways to achieve this is that functional translator training requires not only *skopos* but the needs of professional practice as well. In addition, it is claimed that the decision-making process forms the first groundwork of a translation process as it affects two terms: *Gain* and *Loss*. “Gain can take the form of increased clarity, more readable and convincing texts, a lower probability of misrepresenting the author’s ideas, etc. Loss may involve loss of information, lessened credibility because of inappropriate terminology, lower cultural acceptability because the Target Text says something or says it in a way which is not acceptable to Target-Text readers” (Gile, 2009, p. 108). When viewed from this aspect, translator training requires a groundwork involving translation theories and their practicality to apply some terminologies to achieve a high level of translation. Here, the decision-making process before an act of translation plays a key role to enable learners to be able to produce a high level of translation quality, which will help novice translators to acquire a professional identity.

1.3 Autonomous Learning

Learner autonomy is not a new key concept in literature, but it must be highlighted in translation training as it is an interactive learning process in which learners are encouraged to take on their own responsibilities in learning, to define their own needs, and to determine the strategies to overcome the challenges they have faced. Learner autonomy is defined by Holec (1981) as “the ability to take charge of one’s own learning” (as cited in Little, 2007, p. 15). In addition, a learner goes through a step of the process to be autonomous. According to Nunan (1997), five-level model of learner autonomy involves:

a) *Awareness*, involving learner’s awareness related to pedagogical goals and the materials to be used, and learner’s identification of the pedagogical strategies and his/her own preferences about the styles and strategies; b) *Involvement*, focussing on learner’s choice of his/her own goals from among the alternatives offered; c) *Intervention*, involving the process of learner’s adaptation and modification of the tasks in the learning program; d) *Creation* indicating the process in which learner creates his own goals and objectives then, in this line, the tasks; e) *Transcendence*, which is the process of the reflection of a learner’s acquisition in the classroom on her professional life (as cited in Dang, 2012, p. 54).

1.4 Self-regulation

Self-regulation is a pedagogical term that encompasses three subcategories: *self-observation* or *self-monitoring*, orienting learners to be aware of what they do; *self-judgment*, comparing the present performance with the intended goal; and *self-reaction*, affecting learners’ motivation to accomplish and to complete a task (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2012).

2. METHODOLOGY

The present study was based on a qualitative research design involving Grounded Theory (Cresswell, 2009). The Grounded Theory is a process of production of knowledge in social sciences developed by Glaser and Strauss in 1967 (Arik & Arik, 2016). This abductive research approach proposes to develop theories directly from empirical data reversing the traditional relationship between theories, hypotheses, and data by opening more fields for observation. While many branches of the social sciences have gradually adopted Grounded Theory, several misconceptions and misinterpretations about the nature of this research process have so far left it outside the teaching of research methodology. Its presupposition is indeed daring, if not disturbing, for the researcher. It consists of disregarding pre-existing theoretical frameworks to let an object of study produce its building blocks on a theory. While the traditional canons of research have explanatory aims, Grounded Theory assumes the understanding of an object and the extension of a social or managerial environment among its objectives (Quattrone, 2000). In the search for scientific legitimacy, Grounded Theory has adapted the tools of qualitative research and developed its tools. According to Strauss and Corbin, data from the field are found in the discourse of individuals. This must then be carefully recorded and transcribed. It can then be done an open coding by the researcher. This technique should make it possible to identify categories to classify parts of the speech of individuals by key words. The coding must then be the subject of several iterations according to the contacts with the field and the existing literature in which Strauss and Corbin see the secondary data to be helpful for the understanding of the studied object. The coding is done abductively by successive iterations and progressive groupings. If the categories obtained are too surprising to compare to those already existing, the researcher must understand the origin of these discrepancies. If satisfactory classifications for the studied object exist in the literature, the researcher can refer to them and borrow them. But if no pre-existing typology seems sufficiently explanatory to him, he is free to suggest new ones. The second step is to analyze the results of open coding. This consists of finding similarities and relationships in the different forms of discourse (axial coding) in the light of the categories identified in the previous step. Finally, the researcher must select the central phenomenon which emerges from the axial coding, and which constitutes the emergent structure of his/her theory (selective coding). As with the classification, the researcher is supposed to compare the ex-post findings with the previous information and to suggest variations that are specific to the research context. If there is not enough information in the literature, it is his/her responsibility to search for further information to evaluate the theory he/she thus discovered (Joannides & Berland, 2008).

3. ON PEDAGOGICAL ASPECTS OF SKOPOS THEORY

Based on the literature mentioned above, the following concepts are discussed in the light of the theoretical groundwork of Skopos theory to show the pedagogical aspects.

Given Skopos theory and its principles, the literature neatly indicates how it may be used in translation studies, but the ambiguity is related to its application in a classroom setting, especially in translator training. Here, the main aim is to unearth the fundamental aspects of the theory in terms of pedagogical aspects and to discuss the extent of its impact on translator training. In addition, considering the functional aspects of this theory, the process of teaching and learning in translator training may be constructed to enhance learners' competencies in translation in respect of both textual and non-textual elements. Here, the theoretical background of the theory is discussed in terms of the *skopos* of the *translatum*, and the quality of translation at the textual level together with the strategies or the methods to be applied in the act of translation.

The first aspect is handled with the definition of the *skopos* of a text from the pedagogical point of view and how it affects the decision-making process. The act of translation should be designed on a theoretical base by considering all angles affecting the quality of a translation. Admittedly, the prerequisite of Skopos theory is to determine the *skopos* of a translation defined by the commissioner and formed according to the needs of the target recipients. When viewed from this aspect, norm-based approaches must be taken into consideration alongside the *skopos* during the production of a *translatum*. This is because, translation norms shape the translator's decision before the act of translation, and some norms define the strategies which will be employed by a translator in the process of translation (Palumbo, 2009). In this context, Gideon Toury described three kinds of translation norms: (a) *preliminary norms*, involving the decision of the translation strategy and the selection of the text which will be translated; (b) *initial norms*, governing the translator's decision in terms of adherence to the source text or the target culture; and (c) *operational norms*, controlling the actual decisions which are made during the act of translation. On the other hand, Andrew Chesterman proposed two kinds of norms: *Expectancy norms*, which reveal the expectation of readers about how a translation should be, especially for a particular community, and *professional norms* which govern the methods and strategies which may be employed professionally in a translation process. The *professional norms*, determined by *expectancy norms*, are classified into three sub-categories: The *accountability norm*, which is an ethical norm, makes the translator take over the responsibility of the work to be produced for the commissioner and reader. The *communication norm*, which is a social norm, provides communication among the parties; The *relation norm*, which is a linguistic norm, reveals the relationship between ST and TT (Munday, 2008).

Based on this theoretical background, it may be argued that the *translatum* made in line with a *skopos* determined beforehand and interwoven with translation norms may or may not exert an effect on the quality of the translator's production. In this line, it is undeniable that the acquisition of the prerequisites of the Skopos theory together with translation norms will undoubtedly affect the enhancement of the learner's competence in translation at a professional level. This is because Skopos theory and the norm-based teaching process directly affect the quality of the translation product as both of them orient the translator in the decision-making process. Depending on this claim advocating that a high quality of the translation may be produced in consequence of a good decision-making process, another claim can be raised on how the teaching process based on prerequisites of Skopos theory based on translation norms can be pedagogically effective. According to Schäffner (1998), the explicit or implicit statement of *skopos* should be given in every translation commission. On this basis, determining the *skopos* of a text is a non-textual element and directly affects the process of translation. Here, the translation of a source text into a target text is produced according to the different purposes. From this aspect, if the purpose of the translation is defined by the commissioner, the translator should be able to produce the translation product in line with this purpose by considering the translation norms; but if the purpose of the translation is not defined, the translator must be capable of undertaking the responsibility of determining the implicit purpose according to the target text recipient. In defining the implicit *skopos* of the text to be translated, the translator must acquire some skills and abilities in the decision-making process. The acquisition of this sort of skill requires a training process, which will enable translation learners to be aware of the learning process, namely, a process to make them autonomous learners.

As mentioned above, an autonomous learner is supposed to raise awareness to reach the pedagogical goals and objectives which are required in the process of teaching and learning, to play an active role in material preferences in line with the goals and objectives defined by himself/herself, to decide if the materials or tasks cover the defined goals and objectives, and finally, to manage to go through a process of transferring of this acquisition to the life. Within this framework, text translation activity must provide an outlet for pent-up creativity. In other words, learners should be encouraged to enter a process of *self-regulation* involving three categories: *self-observation* or *self-monitoring*, *self-judgment*, and *self-reaction* (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2012). When these terms are matched with the theoretical aspect of Skopos theory, learners, who goes through this process, take over the responsibility both in their own learning and in their own productions. That is to say, learners may find an opportunity to assess themselves in terms of their own decisions, how these decisions affect the translation process, and the extent of the translation quality. As a result of this assessment, they enter a process of regulation affecting their subsequent translation qualities. To illustrate such a case, when a text translation activity is made through Skopos theory, novice translators are oriented to take an active role in the decision-making process, which is determined according to the demands of a commissioner and the needs of the recipient. Based on the prerequisites of Skopos theory, the following scenario to be applied before the act of translation may be suggested to make learners autonomous in translation classes.

- a) Defining the commission,
- b) Determining the demands of the commissioner,
- c) Defining the target recipient,
- d) Determining the needs of the target recipients as a reader,
- e) Defining the text type to be translated and organizing the translation process in line with the key factors stated above.

A study conducted by Okatan (2020) revealed that such an activity, applied under the guidance of the instructor who gave the objectives of the lesson before the activity and allowed a self-assessment process at the end, enabled the translation learners to engage in the translation process actively, and then, to consider these premises before their acts of translation. In doing so, the learners in translation classes took over the responsibility in inferring the *skopos* of the translation, and they raised text awareness and positive attitudes because of their active participation. Later on, it was observed that learners could manage to consider the *skopos* of the text in their subsequent text translations and easily infer the purpose of the text, even when it is not given. In addition, the self-assessment process applied after determination of the *skopos* of each translated text indicated that translation learners could manage to identify their strengths and weaknesses related to the decision-making process and to make effort to eliminate these weaknesses in their subsequent decision-making process.

In conclusion, such a scenario suggested above may be beneficial to foster the translation learners to be autonomous in translation classes as it will help the learners to be aware of the teaching objectives, to identify their lacking information related to the decision-making process, their needs in the subsequent translation activity, and so to reflect their in-classroom acquisition onto their later translation products. Such an acquisition makes the learners elicit the implicit purpose of the translation thanks to the experience which they gained in the classroom setting, even when the *skopos* of the translation is not defined by the commissioner. In addition, in the phase of the decision-making process, learners, who are encouraged to self-assess to identify their own weaknesses related to the text that they have translated, may regulate themselves by considering these weaknesses and to overcome the existing weaknesses in the subsequent texts to be translated. Such an acquired ability will undoubtedly make the learners consider the non-textual elements before every act of translation in their following products.

The second aspect of the Skopos theory, which should be touched upon from a pedagogical angle, is related to the quality of translation at the textual level, in other words, the functional relationship between ST and TT, and the strategies or the methods to be applied in the act of translation. According to Reiss and Vermeer (2014), “the *skopos* of the *translatum* may be different from that of the source text” (p. 92). From this aspect, the main issue to be considered in the act of translation of ST to TT is intra-textual coherence and inter-textual coherence (fidelity). According to Reiss and Vermeer (2014), “The message should be coherent ‘in itself’ and ‘sufficiently’ coherent with the situation in which it is received, the latter

aspect being the crucial one. Roughly speaking, we can say that ‘understanding’ means to relate something to one’s own situation and the background knowledge it implies” (p. 98). Given intra-textual and inter-textual coherences, intra-textual coherence indicates that the message and the communication between the translation producer and the recipient must be sufficiently coherent, and the inter-textual coherence is related to how a translator understands and interprets a source text by considering the *skopos* which governs the *translatum*. Based on the *Fidelity rule*, the transfer of coherence between ST and TT is provided by a translator in three stages: encoding the message in the ST, interpreting the message, and decoding the message for the target recipient (Reiss & Vermeer, 2014). Here, as ST gives the information flow, TT is the focal point. In this line, a translator finds an opportunity to release from the restrictions in the act of translation and to produce an adequate translation in a wide range of translation strategies in accordance with the purposes or intentions which are aimed to be achieved (Du, 2012). According to Reiss and Vermeer (2014), “There were instances where translation was not the extension of a communication using another code but, rather, it was a new communication about a previous communication” (p. 60). On the one hand, considering the information flow between two languages, the way of communication in the source language should be transferred to the target language. On the other hand, the purpose of the translation may lead the translator to produce a translation in different ways. That is to say, the information offered may show differences between source and target recipients.

Given intra-and inter-textual coherences, a learner who is in the process of translation training must be equipped with the necessary knowledge to both provide the coherence in the produced text in the target language, and to remain faithful to the *skopos* of the translation. Considering the *skopos* of the translation, the text types to be translated in a classroom setting must be selected according to the purposes determined beforehand and macro-and micro-learning targets which are aimed to be achieved. According to Palumbo (2009), while micro-level focuses on linguistic features and requires formal equivalence between ST and TT, macro-level evaluates the translation as an act of communication involving both linguistic factors and social, cultural, and historical factors. In this sense, the text-types must be chosen so carefully that the possible challenges, which learners may face, could be foreseen and the predetermined teaching and learning targets at micro and macro levels could be met. According to Katharina Reiss, text types were mainly classified as informative, expressive, operative, and audiomedial texts (Munday, 2008). Based on this classification, the convenient text type must be used to meet the learning targets; and the strategies to analyse the text must be determined before the act of translation. Here, top-down strategies or bottom-up strategies may be suggested to be used in analyzing the text to be translated in a classroom setting. However, a translator, initially, must be an efficient reader to understand the intended message in the text prior to the act of translation. An efficient reader is defined as follows:

The reader will not just try to decipher the meaning of individual lexical items but will also have clear ideas about the overall rhetorical organization of the text. With the influence of Schema theory, ‘top’ has come to mean not only linguistic elements such as discourse but also conceptual elements such as associated background knowledge in our memory. The essential features of the bottom-up approach are that the reader tries to decode each individual letter encountered by matching it to the minimal units of meaning in the sound system (the phoneme) to arrive at a meaning of the text, whereas with the top-down approach, the interaction process between the reader and the text involves the reader in activating knowledge of the world, plus past experiences, expectations, intuitions, to arrive at a meaning of the text (McDonough, Shaw, & Masuhara, 2013, pp. 119-120).

In the phase of reading the text and the act of translation, learners’ cognitive process must not be ignored as they enter a cognitive process, because a translator, as a reader, must not only make sense of the lexical units but comprehend the rhetorical organization of the text, and in this line, he/she attempts to translate not only the clauses but the message which is aimed to convey to the target recipient. Here, a translator has to comprehend the content of the text to translate it in accordance with the explicit or implicit *skopos* of the text to be translated. Given the cognitive process of learners, *schema theory* explains how the information is arranged in a learner’s mind. That is to say, the learner must comprehend the text, make it meaningful in his/her mind, and then, relate it with his/her pre-existing knowledge (Zhao & Zhu, 2012). Bartlett (1932) defends that memory involves a reconstructive process and individuals use their pre-existing knowledge or schemas to encode the information. From this aspect, the translation training must be designed firstly to enhance the learners’ reading skills as translation learners read the text to be translated before the act of

translation. Zhang (2010) claimed that “students’ failures to reading comprehension are mainly due to the lack of appropriate schemata matching the writers’ schemata. Therefore, what teachers should do is to help students activate and make full use of new schemata, when interpreting a text” (p. 459). On this basis, one can conclude that a high level of translation may be provided through reading comprehension skills. When schema theory is matched with an act of translation, such a scenario may occur: a translation learner goes through a cognitive process in which he/she bases the content of the text on his/her pre-existing knowledge and on the explicit or implicit *skopos* of the translation (if the *skopos* is not given explicitly, it is determined by the learner’s own pre-existing knowledge or previous experiences by considering the target recipient), processes the information that he/she understands, interprets what is understood, conveys the message from ST to TT, and finally, a translation product occurs.

Another issue to be touched upon is culture and its effect on the translation process. In this sense, the theoretical background of the theory highlights the relationship between language and culture. According to Reiss and Vermeer (2014), “The translators must therefore know both the source and target cultures; they must be bi-cultural” (p. 23). In this respect, novice translators should be equipped with the knowledge to enable them bi-cultural to be able to interpret the culture-specific concepts and to reach a high level of quality in their translations. Otherwise, the misinterpretation of this kind of concept can cause a lacking translation and semantic shift between source and target cultures. Here, a translator aims to prevent misinterpretation and to produce an adequate translation or an acceptable rendering by applying various translation strategies, because “... the meaning of the target-language text should be ‘equivalent’ to the meaning of the source-language text” (Reiss & Vermeer, 2014, p. 29). To illustrate the translation of culture-specific concepts in the research context, the study carried out by Barut and Odacıoğlu (2019), who examined the culture-specific concepts in the translation of Charles Dickens’s *Oliver Twist* from English to Turkish, focused on some key points related to the translation of children’s literature. Here, it was determined that the translation of some statements belonging to Turkish culture such as “hanım teyze, faturası kabarmak, başına hayır getirmemek, kalıbımı basmak” (p. 69) took place in the translated version of the text, namely in the TT although these statements do not exist in the ST; and they pointed out that the translator created a cultural interaction between ST and TT by considering the target recipient’s culture, and so the target recipient’s culture was put forward to provide equivalence.

Based on the culture-specific concepts in translation, the method to be used in the act of translation must be determined. That is to say, it should be decided whether the translation action will be source text-oriented or target text-oriented. In this area, Newmark’s classification of translation methods sheds light on the translation training process. Newmark (1988) drew a ‘V diagram’ for the translation method to show the way of a translation.

Figure 1: Newmark’s V diagram

SL emphasis	TL emphasis
Word-for-word translation	Adaptation
Literal translation	Free translation
Faithful translation	Idiomatic translation
Semantic translation	Communicative translation

Source: V diagram (Newmark, 1988, p. 45)

After the determination of the *skopos* of a translation, the translation process is formed according to whether the translation will be source language-based or target language-based translation. Here, the implicit or explicit *skopos* of the text is a key factor in the selection of the convenient method to be used in the process of translation. The learner must acquire the necessary skill to use a proper translation method in his/her own act of translation. This acquisition will undoubtedly help the learner to have enough knowledge about the text types and make the translation according to the *skopos* of the translation by using one of the methods or more than one method given above. For instance, while the translation of a user manual, which is an informative text type, may be source language-oriented; the translation of a novel, which is a narrative text type, may be target language-based. The way of the translation here is shaped according to the implicit or explicit *skopos* of the target text in consideration of target recipients’ needs.

In the translation of a text in accordance with a *skopos*, the next step is to talk over the form of the communication between ST and TT. Given the communication between the two, discourse analysis as a strategy comes to the fore as it constructs a bridge between ST and TT in terms of conveying the communication. Here, the outstanding point is to convey the effect in ST to TT, which the discourse

creates in ST. To open a pedagogical application in this area, the text translation training must be based on a framework involving discourse analysis. In the research context, Paltridge (2012) defined discourse analysis as follows:

Discourse analysis examines patterns of language across texts and considers the relationship between language and the social and cultural contexts in which it is used. Discourse analysis also considers the ways that the use of language presents different views of the world and different understandings. It examines how the use of language is influenced by relationships between participants as well as the effects the use of language has upon social identities and relations. It also considers how views of the world, and identities, are constructed through the use of discourse (p. 2).

In the research context, the literature indicates another model, which is known as Hallidayan model of discourse analysis. It covers, in turn, the sociocultural environment, genre, register involving three key terms (field, indicating what a text is written about; tenor, revealing who is communicating to whom; and mode, highlighting the form of communication), discourse semantics (ideational, interpersonal, textual), and lexicogrammar (transitivity, modality, theme-rheme/cohesion) (Munday, 2008). Here, in the first step, the socio-cultural role in ST comes to the fore as it will inevitably affect the way of the translation in TT. This is because, “the *skopos* can be described as a variable of the intended recipient (sociological rule)” (Reiss & Vermeer, 2014, p. 90). Here, the *skopos* of the translation shapes the style of the address in TT. For instance, the form of address in a translation of a medical text may show differences according to the intended recipients; say, the translation of a medical text that addresses a surgeon will not be the same as that of the public as it must be an academic style for a surgeon and it has a simple style to be understandable for the public. From this viewpoint, a novice translator should be provided enough background to define the sociocultural role of the intended recipients, especially, if the *skopos* of the *translatum* explicitly is not given. In this step, creating a teaching and learning process to analyse the genre of the text makes the learners produce their translations considering the specific communicative style in the text to be translated (e.g., a contract involving a formal discourse, a user manual revealing a technical discourse). On this basis, the analysis of the register (field, tenor, and mode) in the ST sheds light on the translator while forming the content and the communication style in the TT. Finally, the analyses of discourse semantics and lexicogrammar elements help novice translators to base their translations on proper wording and syntactical form, which will create a coherence between the two texts, ST and TT.

In the last stage of the text translation activity, it is suggested to encourage all the learners to through a *self-regulation* (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2012) process in which they can evaluate their translation quality, identify their deficiencies while making the translation, and monitor their own progress. In this step, it is aimed to make the learners aware of what they do in accordance with the *skopos* determined prior to the act of translation, to help them to self-assess whether or not they could reach the intended pedagogical objectives through their own translations, and then, to help them engage in a self-reaction process in which they evaluate themselves if the translation is made in line with *skopos* of the text.

In conclusion, given the whole process involving the teaching of a text translation in accordance with Skopos theory, translation trainers must base the training process on a theoretical base that unearths the pedagogical factors or elements affecting the learners’ decision-making process and the quality of their text translations. In addition, having engaged in decision-making and self-regulation processes by considering the *skopos* of the translation, translation learners turn to be autonomous learners as they raise awareness towards the way of translation, involve in defining the way of translation by selecting convenient strategies for their own translation, overcome their own weaknesses in the existing translation activity and create their own goals for the subsequent translation activity, and finally, apply their in-classroom experiences in their own professional lives.

4. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

To make Skopos theory understandable and applicable in a classroom setting, the following pedagogical implications are recommended for translator trainers.

In the first step, translation learners are oriented to create a scenario to infer the *skopos* of the text to be translated. In this step, the decision-making process should be based on a norm-based approach as the translation norms govern the process and the way of the translation. According to Toury (1995), translation

activities must involve a cultural significance as the translator takes on a social role, and the acquisition of translation norms requires the prerequisite of being a translator. On this basis, the teaching process in this stage must be constructed on a frame that will enable the learners to acquire translation norms. Having acquired such norms, learners are encouraged to think about the possible purposes prior to their act of translation. After defining the *skopos* of the text to be translated, learners are oriented to self-assess to identify their strengths and weaknesses in the decision-making process.

In the second step, the text, which was previously selected to meet the needs of the learning objectives, is translated in accordance with the *skopos* determined in the first stage. In this step, the way of the translation is determined, namely whether the translation will be source text or target text oriented in line with the *skopos*, and then, learners are informed about, in turn, how to form textual coherence and the communication between ST and TT so as to produce an adequate or acceptable translation. While making the translation, learners' cognitive process as a reader must be taken into consideration. Here, it must not be ignored that the translation between ST and TT at a high-level quality may be provided through an ability of a well-reading ST and understanding the information within it. While making the text translation, *scaffolding*, which "refers to support that is designed to provide the assistance necessary to enable learners to accomplish tasks and develop understandings that they would not be able to manage on their own" (Hammond & Gibbons, 2001, p. 3), when required, is given by trainer to open learners' viewpoints in the act of translation. By doing so, it enables learners to produce a high level of translation by remaining faithful to the *skopos*. Given this process as a whole, the learners are oriented to gain the acquisition of producing a high level of translation at the textual level by considering the *skopos* determined prior to the act of translation. As such, learners will raise awareness towards non-textual elements as well as textual elements.

In the last step, the translation learners are allowed to go through a self-regulation process. In addition to self-assessment to identify their weaknesses in the decision-making process in the first step, they are allowed to self-assess to define their weaknesses after their act of translation. In this stage, learners are encouraged to identify their deficiencies, to show a reaction to overcome these deficiencies, to go through a self-regulation process to correct the existing lacking knowledge. Thus, translation learners will be able to have the opportunity to start the next translation action by overcoming their own deficiencies which they have previously identified.

In conclusion, given all the steps mentioned above, as the learners engage in the decision-making process actively and take on the responsibility of self-regulation, they will turn to be autonomous learners.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Given the translation training, the pedagogy must be constructed on a translation theory and a theoretical aspect of translation learning (Sang, 2011). On this basis, translation training may be designed through various theoretical aspects. When the act of translation is taken into consideration, the taxonomical framework of Skopos is based on this triad: "first, culture-specific concepts of translation, second, on the *skopos*, third, on the text type or genre, etc." (Reiss & Vermeer, 2014, p. 108). In addition, "*Skopostheorie* claims to establish a coherent theoretical and methodological framework for the justification of the translator's decisions in any type or form of translation task" (Nord, 2010, p. 127). In this line, the main aim of the present study is to present the pedagogical aspects of Skopos theory to enhance the novice translators' translation competence in the decision-making process and then, to shed light on the quality of their translation products at the textual level. To this end, the present study puts forward the following pedagogical aspects, and it opens up a field of pedagogical discussion.

First, the literature has shown that Skopos theory as well as other theoretical foundations, is one of the significant cornerstones to enhance a translator's ability in translation in terms of theoretical perspective and to enable them to be aware of the non-textual factors affecting their translation quality in the decision-making process (Zhang, 2015). In this sense, learners must know the purpose of the translation of ST to proceed to an end in translation, and to this end, they could easily determine the functional way of a translation. According to Pérez (2004), translator trainers should design translation classes overtly and consciously by considering the strategies derived from translation theories to enable learners to be proficient in selecting translation strategies and in the complex decision-making processes. Given translation education as a whole, it is a dynamic process between translator trainers and trainees. Here, the other factors as well as textual elements such as teaching style, learning strategies based on translation



theories, and the decision-making process to affect translation must be considered by trainers. Before the act of translation, learners firstly go through a process of decision, so the teaching design should present a better understanding for the learners. Skopos theory forms the theoretical base in this phase to enable the learners to raise awareness towards the text to be translated as it provides the information about ST which will affect the way of the translation in TT.

Second, given the quality of translation at the textual level, Skopos theory dethrones the effect of ST on the translator and re-shapes it in TT in accordance with the factors determined before the act of translation. In this step, the translator undertakes the role of a good reader of ST, and then the role of a writer of TT. According to Beaugrande and Dressier's textual-cognitive model, translation requires interpretation, which is a grasp of textual meaning, and which is related to cognition. This model, in brief, underlines the cognitive elements in texts which reminds translators of the significance of reading before the act of translation. Thus, the translator interprets the text to be translated in a dynamic way by considering the relevancy between ST and TT, adequacy, and different translational attitudes towards the same original (Xuanmin, 2003). In this sense, Skopos theory functions as a key factor in proceeding to an intended translation of the text as it opens a framework for the translator to understand, analyse, and interpret the text in accordance with the needs of a particular recipient. Namely, Skopos theory constructs the pragmatic aspect of translation training as it orients a trainee translator to achieve an acceptable translation. According to Petrescu (2015), an integrated approach involving linguistic and pragmatic features is required for translation training as it presents flexibility and suitability. Another claim suggests that combining translation theories such as Skopos theory, translation techniques, and practices in a classroom setting requires motivation and creativity (Karimnia, 2013). In addition, Skopos theory enables translation strategies to be used and it provides equivalence which is required to form an adequate translation (Nord, 1997). In this line, it is undoubted that matching Skopos theory with translation training affects the translation learners' way of translation. In the research context, a study conducted by Jian-tao (2016) examined the process of teaching English based on Skopos theory and it indicated that the various purposes of the translation may determine the way of the learners' translations.

Third, the self-regulation process positively affects translator trainees' performance as they engage in the learning process actively. In this context, the studies conducted in various areas of translation education have confirmed that the self-regulation approach has exerted a positive effect on the enhancement of translation students' motivation, critical thinking, and translation quality (Hashtarkhani, Ghonsooly, & Ghanizadeh, 2019; Hu, Zheng, & Wang, 2020; Yang & Wang, 2020). On this basis, the cognitive process of translation students must be considered to enable them to raise awareness towards the translation process in which they engage and to encourage them to produce a high quality of translation. In other words, the translation students present a better performance in the process in which they could do self-regulation which will enable them to identify their strengths and weaknesses. Matching Skopos theory with self-regulation opens a new frame in the theoretical base. Although it is claimed that every translation cannot be made purposefully and the translator has no specific purpose in mind and having a purpose may restrict the possible procedures of translation and interpretations (Jabir, 2006), it is defended that some of the functionalist approaches enable the trainers to define some yardsticks and they help translators to determine the factors affecting their decisions in any given case (Nord, 1997). Based on functionalist theories, Skopos theory will enable the translation students to form a new product by considering ST and the demands of the commissioner as a guideline. As such, they can, in turn, internalize the purpose of translation, define their own strengths and weaknesses in line with this purpose, overcome the weaknesses defined prior to the act of translation or during the process of translation, hear their own voices in their own translations as well as the purpose of the text to be translated; and finally, they may correct their lacking information in the next step in which they will make a new translation. According to Motta (2016). "the situation in which learning is acquired cannot be separated from learning itself, but rather is an integral part of what is being learnt" (p. 146). Here, Skopos theory forms one of the basic steps of autonomous learning as it opens the theoretical base for the learners to make the objectives of the learning and the way of the translation clear and understandable. That's, if the learners know the purpose of the translation, they may easily engage in the process of translation, and monitor and self-regulate themselves in line with the explicit or implicit *skopos* as autonomous learners.

REFERENCES

- Arık, F., & Arık, I. A. (2016). Grounded Teori Metodolojisi ve Türkiyede Grounded Teori Çalışmaları. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, (58), 285-309.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Barut, E., & Odacıoğlu, M.C. (2019). Çocuk Edebiyatı Çeviri Eserlerinde Kültürel Aktarım İncelemesi: Oliver Twist Örneği. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*. 12(62), 66-70.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Dang, T. T. (2012). Learner autonomy: A synthesis of theory and practice. *The Internet Journal of Language, Culture and Society*, 35(1), 52-67.
- Du, X. (2012). A Brief Introduction of Skopos Theory. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 2(10), 2189-2193.
- Gile, D. (2009). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training* (Vol. 8). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V.
- Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2001). What is scaffolding? In J. Hammond (Ed.), *Scaffolding: Teaching and learning in language and literacy education* (pp. 1-14). Newtown, NSW: PETA. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED456447.pdf>
- Hashtarkhani, F., Ghonsooly, B., & Ghanizadeh, A. (2019). The Effect of Private Speech and Self-Regulation on Translation Quality among Iranian Translation Students: A Mixed-Methods Study. *Journal of Language and Translation*, 9(2), 81-95.
- Hu Z., Zheng, B., & Wang, X. (2020). The impact of a metacognitive self-regulation inventory in translator self-training: a pre-post study with English-Chinese translation students. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 1-20. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2020.1844436
- Jabir, J. K. (2006). Skopos Theory: Basic Principles and Deficiencies. *Journal of the College of Arts. University of Basrah*, 41, 2. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=tr&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=deficiencies+in+skopos&btnG=
- Jian-tao, Q. I. (2016). Teaching Translation from the Perspective of Skopos Theory. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 13(12), 928-931.
- Joannides, V. & Berland, N. (2008). Grounded theory: quels usages dans les recherches en contrôle de gestion? *Comptabilité Contrôle Audit 2008/3 (Tome 14)*
- Joannides, V. & Berland, N. (2008). Grounded theory: quels usages dans les recherches en contrôle de gestion? *Comptabilité Contrôle Audit 2008/3 (Tome 14)*
- Karimnia, A. (2013). Undergraduate translation training: In search of a model. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 915-921.
- Little, D. (2007). Language learner autonomy: Some fundamental considerations revisited. *International Journal of Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 14-29.
- McDonough, J., Shaw, C., & Masuhara, H. (2013). *Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide* (3rd eds.). UK: Wiley-Blackwell
- Motta, M. (2016). A blended learning environment based on the principles of deliberate practice for the acquisition of interpreting skills. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 10(1), 133-149 DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2016.1154347
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (2nd Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation* (Vol. 66). New York: Prentice Hall.

- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Nord, C. (2010). Functionalist approaches. In Y. Gambier & L. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies, 1*, (pp. 120-128). USA: John Benjamins B.V.
- Okatan, S. (2020). *A Formative Approach to Translator Training* (Doctoral dissertation). İstanbul Aydın University Institute of Graduate Studies, Turkey. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp>
- Palumbo, G. (2009). *Key terms in translation studies*. New York NY: Continuum.
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. 2nd ed.* London: Bloomsbury.
- Pérez, M. C. (2004). Applying translation theory in teaching. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology, 12*(2), 119-133. DOI: 10.1080/0907676X.2004.9961495
- Petrescu, C. (2015). Trainer's Choices in Teaching Translating/Interpreting. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 197*, 922-929.
- Quattrone, P. (2000). Constructivism and accounting research: Towards a trans-disciplinary perspective. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 13*(2): 130 - 155.
- Reiss, K., & Vermeer, H. J. (2014). *Towards a general theory of translational action: Skopos theory explained*. New York: Routledge.
- Sang, Z. (2011). An Activity Theory approach to translation for a pedagogical purpose. *Perspectives, 19*(4), 291-306. DOI: 10.1080/0907676X.2011.590591
- Schäffner, C. (1998). Skopos theory. *Routledge encyclopaedia of translation studies, 17*, 235-238.
- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2012). Self-regulation and learning. In Weiner, I. B., Reynolds, W. M., & Miller, G. E (Eds.). *Handbook of Psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 7, pp. 59-78). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Toury, G. (1995). The nature and role of norms in translation. *Descriptive translation studies and beyond, 4*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V.
- Xuanmin, L. (2003). A textual-cognitive model for translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology, 11*(1), 73-79. DOI: 10.1080/0907676X.2003.9961464
- Yang, Y., & Wang, X. (2020). Predicting student translators' performance in machine translation post-editing: interplay of self-regulation, critical thinking, and motivation. *Interactive Learning Environments, 1-15*. DOI: 10.1080/10494820.2020.1786407
- Yazıcı, M. (2004). Translator training in turkey. *Perspectives, 12*(4), 303-314.
- Zhang, C. (2010). The teaching of reading comprehension under the psychology schemata theory. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(4), 457.
- Zhang, M. (2015). Teaching translation with a model of multimodality. *Asia Pacific Translation and Intercultural Studies, 2*(1), 30-45, DOI: 10.1080/23306343.2015.1014081
- Zhao, X., & Zhu, L. (2012). Schema Theory and College English Reading Teaching. *English Language Teaching, 5*(11), 111-117.