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The aim of this paper is to investigate the relative effect of two translator (to be used interchangeably with interpreter) training techniques on the mode of source text processing and, subsequently, the quality of source text translation. The first technique explored was the 'deverbalization' whereby the translator is encouraged to represent the source text in a way that depicts the main ideas of the text. The second technique was 'intermediate coding', whereby the translator is instructed to render the source text in a code other than the source and target prior to the process of translation. To achieve this goal, 75 undergraduate students studying for B.A. in English at King Faisal University participated in an experiment in which they were divided into three groups of 25 each. The first group received no special treatment, the second group received training on text deverbalization, and the third group received training on intermediate coding of text. The three groups were subjected to a pre test and a post test. Their translations were evaluated by five professional raters. The scores of the three groups were compared. Results indicate that the training on deverbalization and intermediate coding led to remarkable improvement in the translations of the students at the levels of readability, informativity, and reliability. The results also point to the role of bottom up processing as triggered by intermediate coding in the accuracy of translation, and the role of top-down processing of the source text, as triggered by deverbalization in the accuracy of the target text.
التحديد اللغفي، الرمز الوسيط ونوعية الترجمة:
كتربين لتدريب الترجمين

ه. فايز ظالح الحامدي

ملخص الدراسة

يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة أثر طريقة التدريب الترجمين على معالجة النص
الترجمي عنه، وبالتالي نوعية النص المترجم. وتتناول الأسلوب الأول طريقة "التحديد
اللغفي"، وفيه يرجع المترجم إلى إعادة بناء صورة النص، والتي تشمل أفكاره الرئيسة.
أما الأسلوب الثاني فينطوي على استخدام الرمز المترجم إليه. ولتحقيق هذا الهدف تم
إجراء تجربة أشترك فيها 75 طالبة بجامعة الأردنية بقسم اللغات الأجنبية بجامعة
الملك فيصل، حيث تم تقسيمهم إلى ثلاث مجموعات قوم سكل واحدة منها 25 طالبة. ولم
تخضع المجموعة الأولى منها لأية معالجة تجريبية، أما المجموعة الثانية فتدريب بطرقية
التحديد اللغفي، وت대حت المجموعة الثالثة على الرمز الوسيط. ولقد خضعت المجموعات
الثلاث لاختبار فعلي واختبار بعدي، وقد قام بتقييم أدائهن خمسة محكميون، ومن ثم
تمت مقارنة درجات المجموعات الثلاث. ولقد أوضح النتائج البحث إلى أن التدريب على
التحديد اللغفي والرمز الوسيط يؤدي إلى تحسن ملحوظ في أداء الطلاب على مستوى
الانتقائي (قراءة) النص ومدى توصيل المعلومات ومصداقيته، كما أشارت النتائج أيضاً إلى
دور المعالجة من أسفل إلى أعلى للنص والذي تحفزه إستراتيجية النص الوسيط في دقة
الترجمة.
INTRODUCTION

It goes without saying that translation has become an indispensable means of intercultural communication given the tremendous advances in communications systems coupled with the intricacies of international relations. Both oral and written translations have become common practice in political, economic, cultural, and educational transactions. This explains the increasing interest in the theory and practice of translation.

The place of translation courses in foreign language learning is paramount. On the one hand, such courses provide a basic foundation in the preparation of professional translators and interpreters. On the other hand, they serve as training grounds for teaching all language skills ranging from reading comprehension to grammar knowledge and effective writing. This last point invites a careful scrutiny of the content and methodology of translation courses in foreign language education programs. It is commonly agreed that the effectiveness of a given approach for translator training can be judged on the basis of the quality of translation produced by the trainee.

The problem of producing a high-quality translation has preoccupied the minds of translators and academics for ages. As early as 1790, Tytler (1992: 128; in Bassnet and Lefevere (1992) wrote in his Essay on the Principles of Translation that:

"I would therefore describe a good translation to be, That in which the merit of the original work is completely transfused into another language, as to be as distinctly apprehended, and as strongly felt, by a native of the country to which that language belongs, as it is by those who speak the language of the original work." (Original emphasis)

He proceeds with his 'laws' of translation:

1- That the Translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work.

2- That the style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of the original.
3- That the Translation should have all the ease of the original composition.

Although his 'approach' is simplistic, it foreshadows the upsurge that later takes place in translation studies in general and in Translation Quality Assessment (TQA) in particular. His emphasis on comprehensibility and normality (in the sense of a translation' effect on the native speaker) clearly evinces two yardsticks that are and will be present in any TQA model – viz. informativity and naturalness.

Ülsever (1999: 48) dubs the period in which Tytler, Belloc, and others appeared as the pre-linguistic studies on translation evaluation. Despite his concession that it has paved the way for the new branch to emerge, he views it as providing an 'anecdotal approach to translation assessment' by focusing on 'such issues as "faithfulness to the source text", " the recreation of the original work's specific flavour," "the local colour and spirit as opposed to a natural flow of translation," and "the reader factor" (ibid).

Enani (2003:87-94) explicates seven strategies emphasized by Ülsever, giving examples from English and Arabic:

1- Borrowing: e.g. writing انتفاضة as 'Intifadah'.
2- Calque: e.g. 'in the final analysis' as في التحليل الأخير.
3- Literal translation: e.g. 'I left my spectacles on the table downstairs' as تركت نظارتي على المنضدة في الطابق الأسفل.
4- Transposition: e.g. translating 'as soon as she got up' into فور استيقاظها.
5- Modulation: e.g. 'Playing the lute is his favourite hobby, but singing is where he excels' as عزف العود هوايته المفضلة، ولكنه يتفوق في الغناء.
6- Equivalence: e.g. 'he got off scot-free' as كتبته له السلامة.
7- Adaptation: e.g. translating إدام into 'butter' despite the difference in meaning.
Nida (1964:4-8; in Ülsever [1999: 52]) suggests three criteria for assessing a translation: (i) general efficiency of the communication process, (ii) comprehension of intent, and (iii) equivalence of response. The last criterion, Ülsever explains, is closely linked to Nida's principle of dynamic equivalence where the effect on the target reader is the locus of attention (see also Nida, 1996).

In his book *Approaches to Translation* (1982), Newmark discusses several issues touching upon translation evaluation. He comments (ibid: 128-129) on the naturalness of translation, emphasizing that 'the translator should write within his own idiolect or his conception of the SL text author's, always provided the text appears to be written naturally.' He (ibid) provides examples from French, giving his own impressions. Thus, 'Le coefficients respiratoires sont médiocres et ne portent guère á l'audace' should be translated as 'The respiratory quotients are poor and scarcely encourage radical treatment.' He (ibid: 140) discusses 'ideal translation' very impressionistically, stating that 'for any linguistically difficult passage, there are often several equally good (if in some respect inadequate) solutions'.

House's pioneering studies (2001) have virtually given a new lease of life to TQA through shunning impressionism and setting up clear criteria for assessing a translation. Ülsever (1999: 60) deems her model comprehensive, as it includes dimensions such as language user, social role relationship, social attitude and province.

Hatim and Mason (1992: 93-96) voice important opinions about the status of Target Text (TT). They integrate linguistic approaches into cultural considerations to judge the effectiveness of a translation. They also link culture to the 'cognitive environment' of source and target text users, benefiting from the maxims of Grice. They pose the question of what to include and what to omit from a text. They touch upon (ibid: 187-189) the limits of the translator's freedom in relation to Reiss's concept of text typology. This implies in some text types (e.g. Holy Scripts) the translator cannot exercise any degree of deviation from the original text. Their approach is thus mainly discoursal, focusing on ideational and interpersonal functions, together with a view to the semiotic level of discourse (Enani, 2003: 191-192). They (ibid: 190)
conclude that the appropriateness of translation can be judged in the light of such considerations as the translator's decisions about lexical, syntactic and other choices, especially the rhetorical purpose 'as the basis of the evolution of text type.'

AIM OF THE STUDY

The aim of this research is twofold: First, it aims to review some of the common practices in the teaching of translation with reference to the foreign language education program at King Faisal University. Second, it attempts to compare, in an experimental framework, three methods of interpreter training: deverbalization, intermediate coding and the traditional approach. The research also aims at investigating the cognitive bases for the first two approaches in view of existing psycholinguistic models and the experimental results.

QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY

The study is set to answer the following questions in an experimental framework

1. What is the role of different translator training techniques - specifically intermediate coding and deverbalization- on the development of translation skills as judged by translation quality?

2. What are the variant roles of global vs. local processing of the source text in successful translation?

3. How can frame semantics be utilized in translation training?

APPROACHES TO TRANSLATOR TRAINING

Most EFL programs in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the program at King Faisal University being no exception, offer courses in translation. In most cases these programs offer multi-level courses in translation. However, by virtue of their being part of EFL program, such courses are geared towards the acquisition and/or the consolidation of EFL basic skills. In other words, training professional translators is not the main concern of these courses. However, the training provided in the
translation courses can provide a good basis for a graduate program focusing on translation. A survey of course descriptions and personal contacts with translation teachers leads to a conclusion that the bulk of translation training within the EFL training is limited to practice and error correction. Utilizing translation as vehicle for language learning has been observed and even encouraged by translators trainers (see Gouadec: 1999; Kiraly: 1995; Pym: 2002).

In spite of the fact that translation can be and is actually used as means of teaching basic EFL skills, as stated above, it has observed that the translator training methodology is in a state of flux. Kiraly (2000) goes further to observe that "a methodology for the training of translators and translation teachers has not yet been properly developed" (p.1). He (ibid) goes on state that ", examples abound of intuitive, "impressionist" methodologies, based for the most part on models imported from other areas and on the standards adopted by the institutions offering such courses. Without further discussing the inappropriateness of such methodologies, they do not contribute to establishing systematic procedures which guarantee some degree of efficiency in training translators for the real world."

It can also be observed that the bulk of translator training methodologies that have been developed recently are founded on cognitive basis. In this trend, the trainee (translator or language learner) is encouraged to approach the source text as a learning material. According to Svinicki (1997) (Cited in Goff-Kfouri (1995)), six principles of cognitive learning can be directly applied to learning.

1. Students must see the information to be learned as important to their lives.

   Implication: the instructor must show the students how this information is beneficial.

2. During learning, learners act on information to make it more meaningful.

   Implication: Instructors and students should clarify information through examples, images, elaborations and links to prior knowledge.
3. Learners store information in long-term memory in an organized fashion related to their existing understanding of the world.

   Implication: Instructors should provide an organized structure in their presentation of information.

4. Learners constantly check understanding which results in refinement of what is retained.

   Implication: Instructors should provide opportunities.

5. Transfer of learning to new contexts is not automatic; it results from exposure to multiple applications.

   Implication: Instructors should provide links for later transfer.

6. Learners who are aware of their learning strategies and monitor their learning habits will learn more rapidly.

**TRANSLATION AS A COGNITIVE PROCESS: THE PLACE OF FRAME SEMANTICS**

In simple terms, the process of translation involves two interconnected process; the processes of making sense out of the source text, which is traditionally known as ‘decoding’, and the process of formulating a representation of that ‘sense’ in a different code, traditionally known as encoding. However, the terms ‘decoding’ and ‘encoding’ fall short of describing the process of sense extraction which is highly dependent on the translator’s knowledge, not only of the source language code, but also of the real world and his/her ability to formulate ‘cognitive frames’ or some type of ‘silhouette’ for the source text. Similarly, the term ‘encoding’ falls short of describing the reverse of the above process, where the ‘silhouette’ is transformed into a linguistic code. This is a roughly a process of organizing chaos, which involves a good deal of creativity. In other words, the translator is able to perceive the wholeness, get the whole picture so to say, and thus has the ability to evaluate the results of this "competition" between entropy and order as illustrated in Fig. 1 (after Astrand 1992). This implies that the process of
creativity results from the tension between order and disorder as shown in Fig. 2.

Fig. 1 The holistic Self (after Åstrand 1992)

Fig. 2 The birth of creative thought (after Åstrand 1992).
According to Fillmore (1977:62) “people, in learning a language, come to associate certain scenes with certain linguistic frames”. He says that “scenes and frames, in the minds of people who have learned the associations between them, activate each other”. Thus a scene may activate an associated frame, and a frame may activate a scene. The scenes can be “relatively simple or relatively complex; thus, writing is simpler than letter writing, and letter writing is simpler than carrying on a correspondence. The frames that are activated by these scenes, and which activate these scenes, are correspondingly simple or complex”. Some scenes are dynamic and involve the notion of time, or history, as those I have just mentioned or those associated with words like scar or widow. Fillmore (1985) also stated that frame semantics “requires an account of the ability of a native speaker to ‘envision’ the ‘world’ of the text under an interpretation of its elements” (1985:235).

Understanding (sense extraction, or silhouette formation, in our terms) is the activation of certain scenes in the interpreter’s repertory of scenes triggered by the speaker’s choices of linguistic material. “These original scenes get linked into larger scenes, their ‘blanks’ get filled in, and perspectives within them are assumed. Much of this linking and filling-in activity depends, not on information that gets explicitly coded in the linguistic signal, but on what the interpreter knows about the larger scenes that this material activates or creates. Such knowledge depends on experiences and memories that the interpreter associates with the scenes that the text has introduced into his consciousness” (Fillmore 1977:74-75).

According to Kussmaul, (1995: 15) “psycholinguistic studies of the process of understanding have shown that there is no division between linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge”. He compares Fillmore’s model to the psycholinguistic model of top-down and bottom-up processes, where “top-down” can be described as “from scene to frame”, i.e. the interpretation of a linguistic expression from the holistic picture of a scene, and “bottom-up” as “from frame to scene”, i.e. the activation of the picture of a scene from the linguistic material used by the speaker. According to Kussmaul, it is necessary to strike a balance between these two ways of processing in order to understand and translate a text properly. He has observed that bad translations are often
the results of an imbalance between “top-down” and “bottom-up” processes and that this imbalance “is typical of the approach of the non-professional” translators (1995:28). He gives several examples of bad translations produced by students relying too heavily on top-down processing, thus missing the meaning of the explicit linguistic material and sometimes distorting the meaning of the text.

In summary, text processing according to frame semantics can be represented in psycholinguistic terms as either ‘top-down’, i.e. proceeding from scene to frame, or ‘bottom-up’, i.e. proceeding from frame to scene. A top down approach implies the interpretation of a linguistic expression from the holistic picture of scene. Conversely, a bottom-up approach implies the activation of a picture (a silhouette) of a scene from the linguistic material used by the speaker.

DEVERBALIZATION AND INTERMEDIATE CODING

In the present paper, two approaches to translation are considered: deverbalization and intermediate coding. In this section, both approaches are briefly defined and their cognitive bases will be discussed. The operational implementation of the two approaches in translation training is also presented.

Deverbalization implies the interpretation of linguistic expressions from the holistic picture of a scene. In the terminology of frame semantics, it implies moving from scene to frame. It should be noted that this corresponds to a top-down approach to text processing. In translator training, the process of cognitive deverbalization is triggered by instructing the trainee to approach the source text, not sentence by sentence, or even as a concatenation of sentences, but as an integrated whole with the aim of forming an abstract image or a ‘silhouette’, and then rendering that abstract image into the target language. The following schematic diagram shows how the translator proceeds in the process of translation. Notice that this approach triggers more top-down and less bottom up processing of the source text. (ST= source text; TR= translation; TT= target text)
Intermediate coding, on the other hand, implies processing the source text through an intermediate code (IM). In this research, it is a substandard vernacular, which is Saudi colloquial Arabic. This intermediate code serves as a second level source text which is then translated into a target language. In the terminology of frame semantics, this implies moving from text to frame. In psycholinguistic terms, this approach invites less top-down and more bottom-up processing as shown in the following diagram.

THE EXPERIMENT:

As stated earlier, one of the aims of this experiment is to compare the relative effectiveness of three approaches to interpreter training on the basis of comparing the quality of the translated texts. In addition to the traditional interpreter training approach in which the trainee reads the target text in chunks and looks up the difficult words in a bilingual or a monolingual dictionary, and then proceeds to translate, the present study considers the two approaches, namely, deverbalization, and intermediate coding. The study is based on the following assumptions:
Deverbalization triggers more top-down than bottom up processing of the source text. Intermediate coding triggers more bottom-up than top-down processing of the source text. Writing a summary of the source text prior to translation prompts deverbalization. Translating the English source text into colloquial Arabic first, then into MSA is a case of intermediate coding.

SAMPLE AND PROCEDURE:

Seventy-five female students studying for a B. A. in English at the Department of Foreign Languages of King Faisal University participated in the experiment. The program of study includes a translation course in which students receive instructions and practice translation for Arabic into English and vice versa. The students participated in the study for course credit. Their EFL proficiency level was upper intermediate to lower advanced. The participants were divided randomly into three groups of 25 each. The three groups represented one control group and two experimental groups. As shown in table 1, experimental group 1 received the deverbalization treatment and experimental group 2 received the intermediate coding treatment, the control group received no experimental treatment and continued their translation training as usual.

Table 1: Groups and treatments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SS</th>
<th>TREATMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp. 1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Deverbalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp. 2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Intermediate Coding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TREATMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS

All three groups were subjected to a pre-test and a post test. Experimental groups 1 and 2 were given 5 training sessions in their respective treatments (see table 1) prior to the post test. The training sessions and the pre and post test included short passages (155-165 words) of a general nature. In the pre and the post tests as well as the training sessions (for experimental groups 1 and 2), the instructions given to the students were as follows:

Control Group: Translate the passage into Arabic.

Experimental Group 1: Paraphrase the passage using your own words; then translate it into Arabic without reference to the original.

Experimental Group 2: Translate the passage using your own colloquial dialect; then translate it into classical Arabic without reference to the original.

TRANSLATION EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Five juries participated in evaluating the translation output of the trainees. All juries were teachers of EFL at university level with strong background in teaching and practicing translation. It was imperative to develop evaluation criteria for the juries to apply consistently. An attempt was made to develop a set of criteria that is not totally impressionistic, and concise enough to ensure feasibility and reliability. A number of existing criteria were reviewed. This included House’s model of TQA (House, 2001), Darwish (1995, 2001), and Hönig (2004). An eclectic model was then developed and given to five translation experts for evaluation. Their suggestions were taken into consideration in developing a final form of an evaluation model.

The proposed model carries a total of 150 points distributed equally along three parameters, namely accuracy & readability, informativity, and reliability. Each parameter subsumed a number of criteria constitute a total score of 50 points. Table 2 shows the final form
of the TQA that was given to the juries along with the students’ translations. It should be noted here that only the pre and the post tests were subjected to that proposed TQA.

Table 2: Criteria for TQA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>WEIGHT IN POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCURACY/ Readability</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATIVITY</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact rendering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy handling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural filtering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS:
The scores obtained from five raters for individual students were tabulated, and then an average score was calculated. The average scores were tabulated for both the pre and post tests of the two experimental groups and the control group along the three parameters of accuracy/readability, informativity, and reliability. Score averages were used as a basis for comparison.

A comparison of pre and post test scores for the three groups revealed a very slight improvement for the control group (G1), (79.08 vs. 79.64). As per the two experimental groups, there occurred a remarkable improvement in the total score; 79.68 vs. 100.88 for the experimental group 1 (G2), and 79.56 vs. 103.88 for the experimental group 2 (G3).
Notice that the average scores for the three groups in the pre-test were quite comparable (see figure 5).

![Figure 5: Pre and post scores of the three groups](image)

Table 3: Mean Scores of the Three Groups in the Three Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.28</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>27.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.56</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>34.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>34.36</td>
<td>38.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows a comparison of the mean scores of the three groups in the three evaluation criteria. At the level of accuracy and readability, experimental group 1 (G2) performed best (mean=34.56), followed by experimental group 2 (mean=30.56), then the control group (mean=26.28). In other words, training on deverbalization shows more
positive effect on accuracy and readability compared to training on intermediate coding and both techniques have better effects than the traditional approach (see figure 6).

Figure 6: Accuracy and readability in the performance of the three groups.

Regarding informativity, experimental group 2 performed better than the other two groups (mean=56), followed by experimental group 1 (mean=31.36), then the control group (mean=26.2). This implies that training on intermediate coding produces better informative level of the translated text compared to training on deverbalization. (see figure 7).

Figure 7: Informativity in the performance of the three groups
Finally, experimental group 2 scored the highest on the reliability score (mean=38.96), followed by experimental group 1 (mean= 34.96), then the control group (mean=27.16). Again, this implies that intermediate coding in translation training has more positive effects on translation quality compared to deverbalization (see figure 8).

![Figure 8: Reliability in the performance of the three groups](image)

Table 4: A comparison of the pre and post scores of the three groups in the three evaluation criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Criteria</th>
<th>Cont pre</th>
<th>Cont post</th>
<th>Exp1 pre</th>
<th>Exp1 post</th>
<th>Exp2 pre</th>
<th>Exp2 post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.28</td>
<td>26.24</td>
<td>34.56</td>
<td>26.68</td>
<td>30.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informativity</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>34.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>27.28</td>
<td>34.96</td>
<td>27.28</td>
<td>38.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows a comparison of the pre and post scores of the three groups in the three evaluation criteria. A close examination of the table reveals that there was no remarkable improvement in the performance of the control group in any of the three evaluation criteria, accuracy, informativity, and reliability.
Both experimental group 1 and 2 showed remarkable improvement in three criteria of evaluation. At the level of accuracy, experimental group 1 showed more improvement in accuracy (26.24 vs. 34.56) and reliability (27.28 vs. 34.96) than in informativity (26.16 vs. 31.36), whereas experimental group 2 showed more improvement in reliability (27.28 vs. 38.96), followed by informativity (25.6 vs. 34.36), than accuracy (26.68 vs. 30.56). It should be mentioned that experimental group 1 received training in deverbalization and experimental group 2 received training in intermediate coding (see figures 9-11).

Figure 9: Pre and post test scores on the readability/accuracy scale in the translation performance of three groups

Figure 10: Pre and post test scores on the informativity scale in the translation performance of three groups
Figure 11: Pre and post test scores on the reliability scale in the translation performance of three groups.
CONCLUSION:

Experimental findings point to the positive role of deverbalization and intermediate coding as instructional techniques in interpreter training. The two experimental groups produced markedly better translations compared to the control group in the three criteria of evaluation. What is remarkable here is that although deverbalization and intermediate coding trigger two different cognitive processes of the source text, both techniques contribute to a better translation. As stated earlier, deverbalization triggers more top-down than bottom up processing of the source text, whereas intermediate coding triggers more bottom-up than top-down processing of the source text.

It is also notable that intermediate coding has more positive effects on both accuracy/readability and reliability than on informativity. This indicates that bottom-up processing of source text makes the translator more conscious of wording and sentencing. On the other hand, the fact that deverbalization has more positive effect on informativity compared to intermediate coding indicates that top down processing makes the translator more sensitive to the information structure and the informative function of the source text.

An important implication of the present results is that the planning of interpreter training programs, as well as the evaluation of trainees output, should be based on the principles of cognitive psychology, and text linguistics. It is possible to approach information loaded texts with a deverbalization technique and more literary or form dominated texts with an intermediate coding technique. It should also be noted that both techniques are not mutually exclusive and both can contribute to a better training of interpreters and a better translation of texts of various textures.
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