

Recognition and Production in Translation of English to Turkish Texts

Abdulkadir Turgay (First Author)
Cukurova, Adana, Turkey

Erdoğan Bada*
English Language and Teaching, Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey

Abstract

At various stages of their lives, learners of a foreign language need to take examinations which include translation sections. Such learners are mostly asked to recognize and select the most appropriate option from a series of alternatives offered. There may be other occasions where these learners are expected to translate a text into a target language, which may be the mother tongue or the foreign language being learned. This kind of translation activity is usually employed as a tool in measuring and evaluating performance when applying for a job after graduation. Regarding the significance of the skills, namely, recognition and production, with this study, we aim to determine the performance of university-level students in recognizing correct options in a multiple-choice test in comparison to producing acceptable renderings while translating from a source text, English, in our case. The analysis of the data obtained as a result of the study in question revealed that learners of English were more successful in displaying recognition skills compared to production skills. The study may have significant implications with regard to methods and techniques to be employed in translation classes.

Keywords: Recognition skill, production skill, translation text, source language, target language.

1. Background to the Study

It is a common belief among translation scholars that the use of translation and interpreting as a means of communication is nearly as old as the history of mankind itself (Schaffner, 2004, p. 3). Individuals, groups, organizations, companies, international bodies, nations have always taken advantage of translation to both facilitate the acquisition and dissemination of information, experiences, scientific ideas, discoveries, know-how, technological inventions, values, wisdom, vision and culture.

Thus, there is undeniable evidence of the crucial role translation has always played in people's and nations' destiny whether it be by helping them build friendships, form alliances, resolve crises, admire the ecosystem, learn about extraterrestrial life forms or (re)shape the entire world order. It would not be an exaggeration to state that we, human beings, would be unable to function, in other words be as helpless as a baby, in the absence of translation activities in the multilingual and multicultural set-up of today's world.

As a research topic, translation has been much more appealing to scholars and researchers compared to its counterpart in interpreting. Although the terms 'translation' and 'interpreting' may sometimes be used interchangeably, the researcher will use translation to refer to written texts. Thus, the study's primary focus will be on translation rather than interpretation.

Different translation theorists and scholars define translation differently. Newmark characterizes it as "... a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language" (1982, p. 7). This may seem to be an easy deed to do but in fact it is quite a challenging and multifaceted task to assume and carry out.

As Bada and Turgay pointed out (1998, p. 33), in order for a translator or an interpreter to produce an appropriate or adequate text, s/he needs to exploit all of his/her L1- and L2-related linguistic repertoire as a whole. Intrinsically, the translation practitioner is someone who is obliged to perform and can be entrusted with the fidelity duty of reproducing "a written target-language reformulation of a written source text" (Gile, 2004, p. 11). The result is or can easily be catastrophic in case of a failure on his/her part to do so. For that reason, it is of paramount importance that the translation practitioner is aware of his/her professional duties and responsibilities prior to undertaking any such task(s) and is fully equipped with all the talent and the kind of skills set required to do his/her job well. Nevertheless, translation is a productive skill whose development, just like speaking and writing, comes to maturity only at later stages of the language learning process (Bada and Turgay, 1998, p. 33).

2. Statement of the Problem

Since the very early stages of life on earth, interaction has always constituted an essential aspect of human life. This interaction led to various types of interpersonal relationships distinctly manifested in such forms as friendships, festivities, education, diplomacy, trade, fights, wars, international relations, and so on. In today's modern world of advanced technology and communication, interaction and/or information exchange occur(s) due to better enjoyment of personal and/or social life, socialization, intellectualization as well as exchange of

goods, services, technology, science and culture.

Wherever and whenever people come into contact, and no matter for what purpose or under what circumstances, the need for them to express themselves - the need to hear and to be heard - is always felt. Also, wherever people are in contact, there is also a need for translation, both within the same language and between different languages - intra- and inter-language, respectively. As an inevitable outcome of recent advancements in science and technology, the need to transfer these innovations to developing countries, and the insatiable thirst for more knowledge as a direct result of the increase in world communication, the field of translation has gained even more prominence. The fact that translation has always been a need and a practice between/among people in continuous contact is evidenced by Duff's view that "all languages must occur somewhere, and all language is to be read or heard by someone" (1989: 19).

Previously, as claimed by Newmark (1982: 3), "... in the nineteenth century translation was mainly a one-way means of communication between prominent men of letters and, to a lesser degree, philosophers and scientists and their educated readers abroad...". However, "the setting up of a new international body, the constitution of an independent state, the formation of a multinational company, gives translation enhanced political importance" (Newmark, 1982, p. 3).

Although there were training programs to train professional translators to be employed in such fields as business and industry, especially in countries other than those where English is spoken, translation remained unpopular as an independent academic discipline or course. Even where and "when it was taught, it appeared only as an adjunct to foreign language learning" (Bassnett, 2014). It was only toward the middle of the second half of the twentieth century that translation began to be viewed as a scientific field worthy of primary attention.

Use of translation as a pedagogical tool in learning/teaching of foreign languages received controversial opinions, and is also a practice long neglected. Duff (1989, p. 5) asserts that "for the past two decades or more, translation has been generally out of favor with the language teaching community." In spite of all kinds of arguments for and against translation as a tool in learning/teaching foreign languages, it is part of the curricula at most universities where there are foreign language teaching departments.

Being the language of global communication, science and technology, English, more than any other language, is translated into almost all languages (rather than the other way around). This, however, does not suggest by any means that there are no translations made from other languages into English.

3. Purpose of the Study

There are numerous studies dwelling on various aspects of translation studies. Additionally, there are research projects looking into recognition and/or production skills in other fields which lie beyond the compass of the current research study. However, there have thus far been none specifically focusing on both recognition and production skills in translation simultaneously, particularly the same way the two skills are handled within the context of this study.

It is for that very reason that the current study is intended to ascertain to what degree translation competence of junior English Language Teaching (ELT) students and sophomores of the Department of Applied English and Translation (AET), Çağ University, has been developed as a result of their instruction. What exactly the researcher is trying to find out and display is how well these students performed with regards to recognition and production skills in translation. In other words, were they more successful when they were asked to spot the only acceptable Turkish rendering of an English sentence or did they do better when they were tasked with the production of a TL reformulation themselves? Based on this premise, this study aims to find responses to the following questions.

3.1. Research Questions

1. Are AET students more successful in translation from English to Turkish in recognition skill compared to production skill prior to field-specific training?
2. Are AET students more successful in translation from English to Turkish in recognition skill rather than production skill following a period of field-specific training?
3. Are ELT students more successful in translation from English to Turkish in recognition skill compared to production skill prior to field-specific training?
4. Are ELT students more successful in translation from English to Turkish in recognition skill rather than production skill following a period of field-specific training?
5. How do AET students compare to ELT students in terms of performance in both recognition and production skills?

4. Recognition and Production Skills in Translation

As is common knowledge to all those well versed in linguistics, language learning/teaching and translation studies, the four language skills (namely, listening, speaking, reading, and writing) are categorized as input or

receptive and output or productive skills (retrieved February 28, 2016 from SIL International and Englishclub.com). Popular belief among educators is that in the field of language development receptive skills come to fruition way earlier than productive skills. "Although there is no absolute consensus about the description of the interaction between perception and production during L2 phonological acquisition, most researchers consider that – overall – perception precedes production" (Racine and Zay, 2013).

According to Chomsky "the language faculty has at least two different components: a "cognitive system" that stores information in some manner, and performance systems that make use of this information for articulation, perception, talking about the world, asking questions, telling jokes, and so on. He continues that "the language faculty has an input receptive system and an output production system, but more than that; no one speaks only Japanese and understands only Swahili" (2000, p. 117). Larsen-Freeman's view is that "in the 1960s and 1970s research gave rise to the hypothesis that language learning should start first with understanding and later proceed to production" (2000, p. 107). In relation to emphasis on language skills, she adds that "understanding the spoken word should precede its production" (Larsen-Freeman: 2000, p. 115). With respect to receptive and productive skills (listening and speaking), Krashen elucidates that "real language acquisition develops slowly, and speaking skills emerge significantly later than listening skills, even when conditions are perfect" (1982, p. 7).

In terms of translation studies, especially within the context of this research study, recognition skill refers to the ability to recognize and select the only acceptable option from among a series of multiple (usually five) options offered whereas production skill is producing the closest possible TL approximation of a SL text.

McAlester defines the production aspect of translation as the process of reformulating a new text in a new language different from that of a source text and describes the relationship between the two texts as "translation as product" (2000, p. 231).

In this study, the recognition aspect of translation on one hand refers to and deals with the ability to identify that connection between the source and target texts, which mostly focuses on translation as product. The production aspect of translation addresses the generation of a TT originating from the ST, which concentrates mostly on translation as process. Nonetheless, neither skill is in isolation. In other words, neither recognition skill is completely devoid of the process angle of translation nor production skill is totally set apart from the product aspect. In general, translation theorists concur that creating a TT is a multi-faceted process that can be downsized to a minimum of three phases involving "comprehension, reformulation and verification" (Grammenidis and Nenopoulou, 2007, p. 298). As for Wilss, "There is no homogeneous concept of translation creativity; translation involves various levels, areas, and manifestations of creativity; it may vary with the age of the translator and the circumstances of his or her translation task" (1996, p. 53). Adab describes these stages differently and equates translating with "... learning to drive: you have to be able to undertake various independent procedures (such as changing gear, controlling speed, looking in the mirror), without losing sight of the overall purpose towards which these processes all contribute - namely, being a safe driver" (2000, p. 219).

In the Turkish-education system, these two types of translation skills - recognition and production - are widely used. Recognition is a skill especially tested and assessed in the country's standardized foreign language examination (aka YDS) while production is mostly used by universities' foreign-language departments as a method to assess students' ability to translate. Once poised to work as professional translators, these ELT or AET graduates will also be expected and tasked to produce TL reformulations of multifarious texts on almost any topic as part of their job requirements or routine work schedule. It is for this very reason, among others, that the current study has chosen to focus on these two specific aspects of translation.

The classroom atmosphere was so designed to approximate to a real-life like situation, to the extent possible, just like they would do at an exam or in a translation office although it lacked the comfort and freedom of one. Knowing that they would earn extra credit (for the AET participants only) for their participation in the study seemed to help lower their anxiety level and enabled them to focus on their tasks, taking the translation activity as seriously as they could. They were allowed to have access to either a printed or an online dictionary, or both simultaneously.

Soon after the first data collection session at the beginning of the 2014 fall semester, translation-specific training commenced for the AET students. The researcher exerted himself in the training, consciously selecting translation texts appropriate for componential analysis and comparative and contrastive linguistics, which helped initiate lively discussions about both the translation product and into the translation process. Concisely, these translation activities were intended to serve as an awareness-raiser, eventually contributing toward the evolvment and acquisition of translation competence.

There was no training specially designed to help enhance the ELT students' translation competence, other than their regular ELT-specific courses that they were scheduled to take as part of their ordinary curriculum. This is exactly what the term 'training' refers to in the case of the ELT participants. The reason the researcher chose to name this process 'training' is that the regular ELT courses - all conducted in English - were considered and expected to contribute to their overall proficiency in English, which would inevitably contribute to their

general translation competence in the end.

5. Research Design

The current study is a mixed-method research primarily attempting to find out if the SL (English) instruction in a university setting has any impact on ELT and AET students' receptive (recognition of acceptable translation solutions) or productive (generating TL reformulations themselves) skills. Also, whether or not the length of the SL instruction and/or the amount of exposure to the SL in general has any effect on their overall translation competence is a secondary focus of this study.

As part of the two-tier data-collection session, the students were first given a multiple-choice test (MCT) created by the researcher out of an authentic English-language article on a topic of their own choice. They were expected to recognize and select the only one acceptable rendering among a total of five options / answers provided. This forms the receptive aspect of the study. As for the productive angle, they were given the same article to perform a direct translation of that piece from English into Turkish. Analysis of the both sets of data - the students' answers to the MCT and their direct translations - provided the researcher with data and evidence to answer the research questions regarding the difference between their ability to select the only acceptable answer among a series of five options offered as well as to generate a TL reformulation for the SL text given.

5.1. The Participants

The participants in this study included Çağ University's third-year ELT students and the second-year AET students. At Çağ University, where the medium of instruction is mainly English, the ELT department (an affiliate of the Faculty of Science and Letters) offers four years of instruction. The instruction, on the other hand, is limited only to two years at the AET department, which is affiliated with the Vocational Higher School (MYO).

All native speakers of Turkish, the two groups of participants were chosen to participate in the study because they either had already taken or were still taking both English-language and translation-specific courses as part of their instruction at the university. A total of 41 participants, including 31 ELT and 10 AET students, took part in the study aimed to find out if these students' overall translation competence enabled them to score higher in recognition or production in translation. The study also intended to reveal if the ten-week long field-specific training at the two afore-mentioned departments had any impact on the students' overall translation performance, namely recognition and production skills. The study did not deal with any other variables such as the instructors teaching the courses, the course materials used, and the strategies / techniques employed while teaching.

Convenience sampling technique was employed so as to decide who the participants were going to be. As the researcher wanted to administer the first test at the beginning of the fall semester, the ELT and AET students were the most readily available two groups that were, at the same time, more appropriate due to their long-term exposure to the English-language and translation-specific instruction at the institution.

5.2. Instrumentation

In order to select an English-language news article that would help the researcher to collect data for his research study, the students were given a questionnaire to decide on the main theme of the article they would later be called upon to translate. Based on the students' responses to the questionnaire, the researcher picked an online article on the mostly-preferred topic, which was 'travel and tourism'.

The selection of the article was based on several criteria. Firstly, it was on a topic of the participants' choice. Secondly, it was an authentic text from an original source. Thirdly, the language used was relevant, clear and comprehensible. Fourthly, it was current, informative and instructive; its content concerned Ebola outbreak in Africa, which at the time attracted the media's attention almost on a daily basis as it was negatively impacting the entire continent's tourism industry. In other words, the article was "related to real-life situation" and chosen to "simulate some conditions of the professional environment" (Adab, 2000, p. 222) as the trainee translators could have possibly been called upon to translate a similar text if they were employed in any sector such as tourism, health, transportation, border security where this information would be relevant.

Once selected, the authentic English-language article was reformatted for translation. Out of it, both a five-item multiple-choice test (MCT) and a translation text (TT) were produced to help ascertain the level of these students' recognition and production skills. The MCT contained a total of 20 SL (English) sentences, each followed by five Turkish-language options, including one acceptable answer and four distracters.

At the beginning of the fall semester, these two groups of Çağ University students were first given the MCT, based on the selected TT, in order to determine the level of their recognition skills. The MCT was intended to help find out how well the participants were able to use their ability to recognize (and select) the one acceptable rendering out of the five offered. Immediately afterwards, they were given the TT to translate into Turkish so as to ascertain how effectively they would use their ability to produce an acceptable target-text reformulation of the original text.

Toward the end of the same semester, they were given the two exams for a second time to see if the elapse of time had any impact - positive or negative - on their receptive and/or productive skills in translation. During this time period, the AET group gained increased exposure to the SL via translation-specific instruction intended to boost their overall TC while the ELT group attained heightened exposure to the SL via continued ELT-specific instruction.

The data elicited were analyzed to find out to what extent the participants used their source- and target-language awareness as well as their latent language(s). The study also helped surface potential deviant structures used by the participants in their own translations.

6. Data Collection

Because Çağ is a primarily English-medium university, the students there need to have attained a certain level of proficiency in English. Once the students get to enroll in the University, they have to take two semesters of English at the Prep School (PS) unless they have already scored high enough in the English test administered by the PS.

During the four-year instruction, the ELT students attend ELT-related courses (ranging from 57.14% up to 85.71%) aimed at developing and improving their overall proficiency and efficiency in English. Two years of mostly translation-specific courses (ranging from 80% up to 87.5%) at the AET department also contribute toward the students' mastery of English proficiency as well as their acquisition of translation competence.

As Bada and Turgay pointed out (1998, p. 33), one significant observation as well as a chief complaint on the part of both instructors and students themselves were the fact that students had difficulty in producing effective and meaningful written and verbal communication. In other words, students were doing better with regards to reading and listening (both receptive skills) compared to writing and speaking - the two productive skills. The assertion put forth above is interrelated to and substantiated by the theory Jakobson and Halle formulated with regard to phonemes:

Not seldom do we acquire the ability to discern foreign phonemes by ear without having mastered their production, and in a child's learning of language an auditory discrimination of adults' phonemes often precedes the use of these phonemes in his own speech (1956, p. 34).

Similarly, the same problem persists in translation, which is also a form of written communication. Thus, setting out with this empirical evidence, the researcher decided to investigate to see if, in fact, the acquisition of productive skills is harder than receptive ones. To that end, a research study, limited to only the third-year ELT majors and the second-year AET students at Çağ University during the 2014-2015 academic year, was conducted.

An authentic English-language article was selected and reformatted. Out of this article, a five-item multiple-choice test (MCT) and a translation text (TT) were produced to help ascertain the level of recognition and production skills.

The main corpus of the study's data collection instrument comprises both the results of the MCT the participants took (recognition) and the text they translated (production). The article entitled "Can the African Tourism Industry Survive Ebola?" was selected to serve as the source text for both of the two-tier data elicitation sessions. The main theme of the article was the 2014 Ebola outbreak in West Africa and how it began to impact the tourism industry in the entire continent, especially in East and South Africa. The article was shortened to a workable size of 20 sentences in total as we focused on core ideas reflected by core sentences, thus avoiding peripheral sentences that were repetitive of the main ideas.

At the beginning of the fall semester, the students, due to the two-tier data collection session, were asked to put their recognition as well as production skills at work by both taking the MCT and then translating the original text into Turkish. At the end of the semester, they were asked to re-take the MCT and re-translate the original text in order to help the researcher to try to gauge the level of their recognition skills and to assess the level of their production skills in translation. To put it differently, the MCT was intended to encourage the participants to maximize and display their ability to select the only acceptable option out of the five offered while the target-text reformulation aspect was expected to reveal their ability to generate a viable text as a replacement of the translation text they were given.

The data collection sessions were supervised by both the researcher and a lecturer. During the two sessions of data elicitation, the participants were given almost about three hours in total for both recognition and production tasks in order to alleviate, if not completely eliminate, any possible time pressure. Also, they were free to make use of printed and/or online dictionaries during their translation assignments although they were not permitted to talk or ask questions to each other. That is, they were on their own to maximize their language repertoire and demonstrate their overall translation competence through recognition and production skills. In other words, they were expected to bring about the best translator in them, to the extent possible.

The data obtained as a result of the both receptive and productive aspects of these translational acts were used to help reveal whether or not recognition skill seems to develop at a much earlier stage compared to

production skill. Also, an analysis and evaluation of the English-language TT - specifically prepared for the purpose of this study and translated by the ELT and AET students at Çağ University - carried out to help categorize the most common types of difficulties encountered by the participants in the translation of the English-language text into Turkish, and investigate possible causes for those difficulties/idosyncracies.

Overall Performance Pertaining to Recognition and Production Skills

For the purposes of clarification, the researcher has produced a tabular presentation of the results with regard to all the participants' overall performance in both recognition and production skills.

Table 1 below provides a tabular summary of the statistical data depicting the AET participants' capacity to both recognize and produce during pre- and post-training sessions.

Table 1. AET Participants' Overall Performance

SKILL	OUTCOME	PRE-TRAINING		POST-TRAINING		P
		Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)	
RECOGNITION	CORRECT	112	56.0	133	66.5 (18.8%)	0.180
	INCORRECT	88	44.0	67	33.5 (23.9%)	0.092
PRODUCTION	CORRECT	49	24.5	71	35.5 (44.9%)	0.045
	INCORRECT	151	75.5	129	64.5 (14.6%)	0.189

As Table 1 (above) explicitly illustrates, the AET participants did in fact perform way better in recognition (pre-training: 56.0% versus post-training: 66.5%) rather than production (pre-training: 24.5% versus post-training: 35.5%) during both pre- and post-training sessions. The P value (0.010) for this group's performance in recognition skill also supports this progress. The mean values for this group's recognition-related performance also indicate the achievement in favor of recognition (pre-training: 56.0 versus 66.0) rather than production (pre-training: 26.9 versus 44.0).

Additionally, this group of participants recorded a steady improvement in their overall ability to perform both the tasks of recognition and production during the two sessions, which is an obvious indication of expanded translation competence (TC). The ensuing growth is two layered in the sense that while the level of the participants' expertise in both recognizing and producing enlarged, the ratio of them making translation errors dropped off, which is also a clear sign of a decrease in their lack of TC or incompetence on the whole.

To put all these in statistical terms, after the training period this group's ability to recognize and to produce improved by 18.8% and 44.9%, respectively. Furthermore, they improved their overall performance by reducing the number of incorrect options in both recognition and production. The rate of decrease in recognition is 23.9% and in production, 14.6%. The predicted increase in overall TC and the favorable diminishing of translation errors are both desired outcomes and absolute proofs of a two-dimensional general pattern of improvement.

In addition, Table 1 reveals that there is a statistically insignificant increase (0.180) when the number of correct answers given for the recognition skill during pre- and post-training sessions is compared. Similarly, when the number of incorrect answers are compared for the same skill, there seems to a statistically insignificant decrease (0.092).

As for the production skill, a comparison of the correct answers given for the production skill during pre- and post-training sessions points out to a statistically significant (0.045) increase, while the amount of decrease in the number of incorrect answers for the same skill is statistically not significant (0.189).

Table 2 below offers a tabular presentation of the same data for the ELT participants.

Table 2. ELT Participants' Overall Performance

SKILL	OUTCOME	PRE-TRAINING		POST-TRAINING		P
		Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)	
RECOGNITION	CORRECT	425	68.5	453	73.1 (6.7%)	0.345
	INCORRECT	195	31.5	167	26.9 (14.6%)	0.141
PRODUCTION	CORRECT	177	28.5	312	50.3 (76%)	0.000
	INCORRECT	443	71.5	308	49.7 (30.5%)	0.000

As evidenced by the statistical data obtained from the ELT participants' realization of recognition- and production-specific tasks during pre- and post-training sessions (see Table 2), the ELT group, just like the AET participants, consistently improved their overall TC. As can be clearly seen in Table 2, the ELT participants scored explicitly higher in recognition (pre-training: 68.5% versus post-training: 73.1%) compared to production (pre-training: 28.5% versus post-training: 50.3%), as did the AET participants. The mean values for the ELT group's performance in recognition skill (pre-training: 67.4% versus post-training: 71.5%) are way higher than those for their production-related achievement (pre-training: 39.4% versus post-training: 55.1%).

In recognition skill, there seems to be a statistically insignificant increase (0.345) in the number of correct answers given during pre- and post-training sessions. There is also a statistically insignificant decrease taking into account the number of incorrect answers for the same skill (0.141). A comparison of production skill during pre- and post-training sessions indicates that there is a statistically significant increase (P=0.000) in the number of correct answers. Likewise, the decrease in the number of incorrect answers given for the same skill is also statistically significant (P=0.000).

Furthermore, the statistical data attest an overall advancement in both recognition and production skills, which is reflected in the ELT participants' obtaining a higher average of acceptable renderings and a lower average of incorrect renderings during the post-training session, as opposed to the pre-training session. Similarly, we can come to notice of a pattern of growing betterment on the part of this group of participants with regard to their recognition and productions skills. During the post-training session, the ELT participants rated 6.7% higher in recognition skill, where the increase in average is minimal. The biggest stride achieved by the same group, in fact the biggest ever, is in production (76%).

The findings revealed that the AET group performed much better in recognition skill compared to production skill, scoring slightly above average during both pre- and post-training sessions (56.0% and 66.5% respectively). With reference to their production skill, the same group performed poorly, scoring way below average in both pre- and post-training periods (24.5% versus 35.5%). However, the participants' span of improvement was noticeably higher in production skill (44.9%) as opposed to recognition skill (18.8%). This higher level of achievement in the AET group's production skill may be attributed to the fact that the field-specific training for this group mostly focused on the production aspect of translation rather than recognition with the assumption that if/when the participants managed to sharpen their production skill then their ability to recognize would also sharpen automatically. The P value (0.000) confirms that the difference (improvement in production skill) is statistically significant.

On a separate front, the ELT participants performed noticeably better in recognition skill compared to production during both pre- and post-training sessions (68.5% versus 73.1%). Interestingly enough, the ELT participants, just like the AET group, made a considerable progress in production skill (76.0%), rather than in recognition skill (6.7%). The overall improvement in the ELT group's recognition and production skills for the most part can be attributed to the elapse of time during which they continued to take ELT-specific courses. Likewise, the relatively bigger stride in production is also believed to have arisen from the fact that the ELT-centered curriculum was more conducive to productivity in production skill rather than in recognition skill. The progress is statistically significant since the P value is 0.000.

To sum up, the two groups of participants displayed a two-fold improvement, steadily bettering their correct responses in both recognition and production skills.

6.2. Impact of Field-Specific Training on Recognition-related Achievement

A conspicuous advancement is observed and documented in recognition-related performance of the two groups of participants, which can be confidently ascribed to the training period whether it is an influencing experience as a result of the translation-specific training aimed at enhancing the AET participants' TC in general or an extended period of exposure to the existing ELT-centered curriculum intended to heighten the level of overall proficiency in English in the case of the ELT participants. Consequent to the training period, both the AET and the ELT participants unevenly improved their capacity (by 18.8% and 6.7%, respectively) to recognize the only correct option in a five-item MCT, including one acceptable answer and four distractors. For the sake of brevity, the researcher has chosen to give up the second repeat of the statistical data presented earlier (see Tables 1 and 2) in support of this outcome. A brief summary of conclusion reached as a result of the two groups' measurement of recognition skills is that the ten-week training period manifestly contributed to the both groups of participants' performance in recognition skill. Based on the findings of the current study, it would be fair to infer that a longer period of the afore-mentioned training would lead to a much higher level of performance in the skill under scrutiny here.

6.3. Impact of Field-Specific Training on Production-related Achievement

In the case of production-specific performance, the degree of translation-specific courses offered to the AET participants and the intensity of ELT-focused courses offered to the ELT participants resulted in a clear difference between pre- and post-training sessions held to measure the skill in question. The extent of ensuing progress manifested itself differently with each group, ranging from 44.9% in the AET participants' production-related performance to 76% in the case of the ELT group. At this point, the reader is recommended to refer to the preceding sections (see Tables 1 and 2) for a tabular summary of the statistical data specifically related to this skill. Again, the kind of generalization made in the previous section might as well be re-articulated here: the longer the period of the field-specific training, the higher the rate of success in production skill.

6.4. Impact of Field-Specific Training on Overall Translation Competence

The overall statistical data obtained as a result of the study conducted here display a higher level of TC in the two groups of participants following the training period. One noteworthy finding regarding the both groups' performance is that each group individually demonstrated a climb in the two skills despite the fact that the degree of their overall uptrend is uneven. Though in varying degrees, the overall progress in recognition and production skills is a concrete manifestation of improved TC, which is believed to have resulted from the training period.

As discussed earlier, an analysis of the statistical data displayed a two-layered increase in both recognition and production skills, the participants' two translation-related skills measured through the study. Both an increase in positive performance and a decrease in negative execution in general are two favorable outcomes as well as two overt indicators of improved TC.

7. Discussion

This chapter aims to touch upon conclusions arrived at as a result of all the findings this study has thus far helped to discover, with a specific reference to the research questions presented earlier.

Research Question 1: Are AET students more successful in translation from English to Turkish in recognition skill compared to production skill prior to field-specific training?

Regarding the research question above as to whether or not the AET participants are more successful in recognition skill prior to the training session, this group did in fact score nearly twice as higher in recognition skill (56.0%) as opposed to production skill (24.5%).

Research Question 2: Are AET students more successful in translation from English to Turkish in recognition skill rather than production skill following a period of field-specific training?

About the question regarding the AET participants' performance in recognition skill following the training session, they continued to display a notably better performance in recognition, raising the level of success to 66.5% from 56.0% earlier. Comparatively, their performance in production skill rose from 24.5% during the pre-training session to 35.5% during the post-training session. Another noteworthy outcome is that the level of the AET group's performance in recognition skill was above average during both pre- and post-training sessions while the rate of success in production remained way below average during the two sessions.

Research Question 3: Are ELT students more successful in translation from English to Turkish in recognition skill compared to production skill prior to field-specific training?

Similarly, the ELT group's performance in recognition skill during the pre-training session was about twice as much better compared to their achievement in production: 68.5% and 28.5%, respectively.

Research Question 4: Are ELT students more successful in translation from English to Turkish in recognition skill rather than production skill following a period of field-specific training?

Following the training period, the ELT group once again performed much better in recognition skill, increasing their success rate to 73.1% from 68.5% earlier. As for their achievement in production, the level of success was barely above average, going up to 50.3% after the post-training session from 28.5% earlier.

Research Question 5: How do AET students compare to ELT students in terms of performance in both recognition and production skills?

Though not identical, both AET and ELT groups are also compared to see how well each group performed with respect to both recognition and production skills in translation. Compared to the AET group, the ELT participants' performance in recognition skill was much better off in both pre- and post-training periods. The two groups were more successful in recognition skill as opposed to production skill during both pre- and post-training sessions. Compared to the AET group, however, the ELT participants' performance in recognition skill was much better off in both pre- and post-training sessions. Just like the AET group, the ELT participants also performed poorly in production skill prior to the commencement of the training period (28.5%). However, the ELT group bettered their performance by 76.0% following the training period, scoring just above average but still marking a distinguishing achievement.

8. Conclusion

This study was carried out to find out if the study participants did a better job in recognizing a correct TL rendering for a SL sentence or producing the TL rendering themselves.

As evidenced by the statistical data obtained from the research study and summarized in Tables 1 and 2, one significant finding arrived at is that the two groups of participants - AET and ELT majors - performed observably better in recognition skill compared to production skill. This general outcome is consistent with what Chomsky (2000) and Larsen-Freeman (2000) have proposed about language learning and directly in line with the views of Racine and Zay (2013), and Krashen (1982) that receptive skills are acquired way earlier than productive skills.

One other conspicuous outcome the findings revealed is that the both groups consistently bettered their performance in both recognition and production skills measured during post-training period in contrast to their achievement during pre-training session.

There was gradual progress in performance although the increase with regard to certain variables (e.g. particularly ELT participants' achievement relating to acceptable and unacceptable recognition solutions) was only minimal in average. The level of improvement also changed from one group of participants to the other. Despite such variations, there was two-dimensional growth achieved by the two groups of participants: not only did they manage to increase the number of correct answers but they also were able to minimize the number of incorrect answers in both recognition and production skills subsequent to the training period.

9. Implications

As the current research study brought to light, exposure to translation-specific courses along with ELT-focused curriculum is conducive to higher productivity and improved performance in translation, which is the culmination of linguistic and cultural literacy in both SL and TL.

Most ELT departments discarded translation courses for good out of their curricula, ignoring all the insights that translation studies could possibly make available to language learners into the language(s) they choose to specialize in. It would certainly be a wise decision to incorporate a direct translation course into an ELT curriculum; for, it would definitely prove very useful especially if/when it is supplemented with interactive translation activities supported by such additional features as componential analysis as well as comparative and contrastive linguistics of the TTs. As mentioned earlier, no matter how small it may be, a certain number of foreign-language learners also decide to take up translation as a full-time job.

Since several research studies reviewed have clearly indicated that translators need more than just linguistic competence in order to broaden their horizons and more importantly to perish. For that reason, the question to ask here is what it is that we actually want to do with these future translators and what it is that we want them to do once they are professional translators (or interpreters). Just to exaggerate the size or dimension of possible "howlers" they might commit, do we want to create a generation of translators who will advertently or inadvertently help contribute to global peace or add fuel to ongoing fires around the globe!

10. Suggestions for Further Research

In the current study, the number of AET participants was limited to only ten as that was the maximum number of AET majors then. However, another study carried out with a much bigger population of AET majors or translation students may place the study on a more solid basis and provide more robust evidence to base generalizations on.

A second suggestion is to conduct a similar research study in which the field-specific training spans a prolonged period of time, one that is much longer than 10 weeks. That kind of a study is likely to provide a

clearer picture with regard to the size of the impact the training session may have had on the participants' TC.

A third and final suggestion is to replicate the current study, using a variety of translation texts of varying themes and levels of linguistic difficulty. A study with such an added feature may not only help gauge the dimensions and limits of the participants' TC but also enable the researcher and/or the translation teacher to identify areas for improvement in TC.

References

- Adab, B. (2000). Evaluating translation competence. In C. Schäffner & B. Adab (Eds.), *Developing translation competence* (185-228). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bada, E., & Turgay, A. (1998). Production and recognition in ELT translation classes. In *Foreign languages for specific purposes. conference proceedings. Volume I.* (33-39) Varna, Bulgaria: Varna University of Medicine.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). *New horizons in the study of language and mind*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, A. (1989). *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- EnglishClub.com. (1997). Retrieved February 28, 2016 from <https://www.englishclub.com/learn-english/language-skills.htm>
- Grammenidis, S., & Nenopoulou, T. (2007). The relevance of utterer-centered linguistics to translation studies. In Y. Gambier, M. Shlesinger & R. Stolze (Eds.), *Doubts and directions in translation studies* (297-308). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gile, Daniel. 2004. "Translation Research versus Interpreting Research: Kinship, differences and Prospects for Partnership." In *Translation Research and Interpreting Research. Traditions, Gaps and Synergies*, ed. by Christina Schaffner, 10–34. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Jakobson, R. and M. Halle. 1956. *Fundamentals of language*. Mouton & Co., Printers, The Hague: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press Inc.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McAlester, G. (2000). The evaluation of translation into a foreign language. In C. Schäffner & B. Adab (Eds.), *Developing translation competence* (229-242). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Newmark, P. (1982). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press
- Racine, I., & Zay, F. (2013). *The relationship between perception and production in L2 phonological acquisition—implications for pronunciation teaching*.
- Schaffner, Christina. 2004. "Researching Translation and Interpreting." In *Translation Research and Interpreting Research. Traditions, Gaps and Synergies*, ed. by Christina Schaffner, 1–9. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- SIL International. (2012). Retrieved February 27, 2016 from <http://www-01.sil.org/lingualinks/LANGUAGELEARNING/OtherResources/GudlnsFrALnggAndCltrLrnnngPrgm/Four>
- Wilss, W. (1996). *Knowledge and skills in translator behavior*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.