Significance of Linguistics in Translation Education at the University Level [*]

İsmail Erton [a] †, Yasemin Tanbi [b]

[a] Atılım University, Ankara, Turkey
[b] Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract

Translation studies – that is translation and Interpretation, is a field that evolved as a sub-discipline of Linguistics and its related subjects. In the course of time, it developed as a separate area of study with roots still attached to its origins. Hence, the training of translator and the interpreter cannot be totally separated from linguistics. The view presented in this paper is that linguistic-based courses in Translation and Interpretation departments contribute to the grounding and achievement of the students in translation and interpreting classes in upper-grade levels. To this end, two universities - Atılım University and Bilkent University - have been selected as sources for this study, conducting two surveys among the students studying there. The findings based on the statistical analysis represent the usefulness of linguistic-based courses and their contribution to translation and interpretation studies.

Keywords: Translation; interpretation; linguistics; translator education; learning.

1. Introduction

A great deal of attention was paid to the degree in which different linguistic approaches constructively influenced different fields of translation towards the end of the last millennium. This impact was found to be primarily of structural nature and, namely, the phonetic, phonological, morphological, and syntactic aspects were hailed as instruments for improving studies in translation as well as interpretation. As of mid20[th] century, the functional study of languages has continued to attract many, bringing about more investigation into semantics, pragmatics, style, and text-related issues in languages and, thus, bringing further insight into which factors give rise to the use of linguistic theories in translation.

Even though the arguments concerning the need for such applications still exist, it appears that today most of those in the field believe that translation highly relies on linguistics, and that there are many concepts which can only be examined and made sense of in the light of linguistics. The point in

debate is that one may not be considered well-prepared in the discipline without possessing a reasonable command of linguistics (Fawcett 1997, foreword). Also, in his book 'On linguistic Aspects of Translation', Roman Jakobson (1959) tells us of the need to take style into account in translation so as to pave the way towards creative disposition. However, the work carried out by Nida (1964) and Catford (1965) concerning the adoption of linguistic properties to translation theory did not manage to go any further than just defining the way in which meaning is taken from one language and given in another while translating. Similarly, others such as Bassnett (1980), Gentzer (1993), and Munday (2001) seem to be only partially concerned with the functional linguistic analysis of texts and their influence when it comes to on contemporary translation studies.

In early 20th century, experts noticed that sentences serve many functions other than just an arrangement of words and phrases. In this respect, the analytic approach adapted by the Prague school paved the way to a detailed structural study of languages, to be followed by Chomsky's work in the 1950 on the syntactic studies – one to be observed with his transformational generative grammar. In time, there was this understanding in the 1960s that lexical and syntactic studies are not able to properly justify the functional characteristics of a language, driving the specialists to shift from lexical to textual analysis, and discourse in particular. Later, Halliday's book (1994) 'An Introduction to Functional Grammar' showed us another way to better appreciate language use and analysis at the textual level. In 1965, the same view was used by Catford regarding translation theory, highlighting the changes in grammatical structures. The main premises put forth in that work was that equivalence in translation is only made possible by means of analyzing discourse and function - in a way, stressing the necessity of textual analysis in translation studies (Catford 1965, 20-21). Berry, in the same manner, claims that "one of the great strengths of Halliday's work is its applicability to text analysis" (Berry 1996, 2). In total, the '60s was an era throughout which linguistic theory gained its essence in forming both a systemic and a theoretical approach in translation studies.

Investigating the use of language in texts allowed scholars to discover newer dimensions in linguistics. Among these, it was seen that focusing on discourse analysis and the socio-cultural dimensions of a language may serve as useful means to spot the socio-cultural characteristics of that language in context. As Brown and Yule put it, "The analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use. . . . While some linguists may concentrate on determining the formal properties of language, the discourse analyst is committed to an investigation of what that language is used for" (Brown/Yule 1983, 1). In addition to this work, according to Wills, the outward appearance of any text can bring about clues concerning the (propositional) meaning of text's specimen, function (the intended message by the author), and the implied or explicit - and, either way, (significantly) renewable link between the producer and the recipient (Wills 1996, 165). In that same work, textual analysis was said to be taken as a problem-solving activity and that it is one of the tasks to be completed before translational analysis in order to highlight alternative ways to understanding the text as it deserves be; the argument went further that, in the absence of such analysis, comprehension can only take place at surface and not sufficiently in-depth (Wills 1996, 172-173). The main idea here is that, for a translated work to be rendered successful, lexicon, phraseology, (intersentential) grammar, and the text itself need to be combined in order to achieve elegance and a desired outcome. To take another researcher's work, Nord states, "What is important , though, is that (it) include(s) a pragmatic analysis of the communicative situations involved, and that the same model be used for both source text and translation brief – thus making the results comparable" (Nord 1997, 62). Accordingly, as Munday states, what text analysis is mostly concerned with is to define ways by which one arranges a text – mainly issues dealing with sentence structure, cohesion, and so on –whereas discourse analysis deal with the way language communicates meaning and social power relations (Munday 2001, 89-90). Also, the work by Hatim and Mason, he says, brought about a better grasp of the scopes foreseeable

in translation studies, while their research specifically concentrated on realizing the role of ideational and interpersonal functions in translation (rather than merely the textual function) (Munday 2001, 99). Baker (2006) provides us with a brief on the whole concept, stating "in both translation and interpreting, participants can be repositioned in relation to each other and to the reader or hearer through the linguistic management of time, space, deixis, dialect, register, use of epithets, and various means of self and other identification" (Baker, 2006, 132).

On top of what was just mentioned, when one looks at translation studies in broader sense and at the macro-level, they cannot ignore other important components, such as structure, textual framework and the manner of speech production. In this light, Gillies states that note-taking while consecutive interpretation is in progress signifies the body work the speech at hand – in a sense, a compilation of thoughts strung together in a certain arrangement, and not just optional muddle of scattered ideas (Gillies 2005, 6). There are always particular reasons why certain things are expressed in certain ways, for instance giving additional information to elaborate or make the receiver of the message believe in a certain point. Having said so, it is vital to have a text with structure, meaning that the interpreter is tasked with the study and identification of these e intentions. Otherwise, the speaker's intended message cannot be fully re-stated.

Setting aside what was mentioned before, consecutive interpreting involves not just note-taking skills, but a handful of other abilities to use finite and equally-corresponding intellectual capacities – in other words, multitasking. Daniel Gile (1995: 178 formulates these skills in two stages: first, listening, analysis, note-taking, short-term memory operations, and the coordination of these tasks as one; second, note-reading, remembering, and production. As a result, before moving on to the study of consecutive-like translation and interpretation courses it is no challenge to understand that this issue in interpretation is related with linguistics. To illustrate this, Gillies writes:

"A student interpreter hears often the sentence "note the ideas and not the words!". However, what is an idea for the student? Thus, grammar enters into it. And how can we recognize them so that we can reproduce them properly in interpretation? You might say that a whole speech boils down to one idea, but will that help us in our note-taking? Each word might seem like an idea, but they won't all be as important as each other" (Gillies, 2005. 35).

Based on this, according to Gillies, sentences and linguistic analysis in are the essentials for noting, once more then returning to linguistics as the very foundation, and that those involved – one way or the other - in translation and interpretation know all too well that that the field contains a certain, perhaps minimal, degree of non-trivial comprehension, which goes beyond just recognizing words and linguistic structures – a concept, yet, probably as old as translation itself. Most researchers know that no two languages share one-to-one correspondence in their words and structures as these are not formulated based on identical patterns, implying that no language is isomorphic – just another reason for comprehension to play a crucial role in translation and interpreting, and once more, boiling down to the fundamentals of linguistics and not simple phonetics and words alone.

Concerning how linguistics play out within studies in translation, Mellen states, "Only by understanding the author's meaning thoroughly can the translator be sure to choose the best available words and to present them in the best possible structure" (Mellen, 1988, 272). The same issue has been reiterated by Kurtz on interpreting, which requires a grounding in translation. In his words, "The basic principle is that an interpreter cannot interpret, what he does not understand" (Kurz 1988, 424). As it appears, there are many who share the same view that within the field of translation, comprehension is truly a major subject in itself. Again, Gile explains this as:

"Translation can be modeled as a recurrent two-phase process operating on successive text segments: the first phase is comprehension, and the second is reformulation in the target-language. (...)

In the case of highly specialized texts or speeches in fields translators are not very familiar with, they can do a good job in the comprehension component by relying on their knowledge of the language, their extra linguistic knowledge, and analysis" (Gile, 1995: 86).

Gile goes on to say that   "For the translator, it is essential to understand the functional and logical infrastructure underlying sentences so as to be able to reproduce in the target-language" (Gile 1995, 93). Again, it goes without saying that, seen from the translator's perspective, linguistic and discoursal analysis prove to be vital in order to achieve the best outcomes.

To return to Hatim and Munday (2004: 27), "Language has two facets; one to do with the linguistic system (a fairly stable langue), the other with all that which a speaker might say or understand while using language (a variable parole)" (Hatim and Munday 2004, 27). Consequently, in a language, features pertaining to linguistics or the implicit are not the only factors, since there are re other elements, for instance what one can read 'between' the lines. This issue has had such importance that the booths where interpreters are located are always in a spot from where the individual is able to observe the speaker so as to detect, in the meantime, body language, thus helping to better and more accurately interpret.

As from a different point of view on the issue of text linguistics, Gonzales states that, according to Hatim and Mason (1990) in 'Discourse and the Translator', in contrast to a reader- or author-oriented analysis of translations, text-oriented analysis needs to also take into account the communicative, semiotic, and pragmatic aspects (Gonzales 2004, 69), adding that the communicative competence and the idea that the communicative purpose lies at the core of the translator's alternatives - Reiss and Vermeer's skopos (1996), later developed by Christiane Nord (1997) – as   theories relevant to translation with a linguistics approach (Gonzales 2004, 75). When translating, one should consider the target audience; for example, if a recipe book is meant to be used by children, naturally the language has to be adjusted accordingly. This means that, linguistically, certain patterns and lexicon need to be changed in a way contrary to the source. As children do not have the same linguistic knowledge and, so text adaptation becomes indispensable. Considering this, one can say that the job of the translator is not only decoding, but also serving as a social entity – an individual who reads, interprets, and produces a given material in the most convenient way to fit the needs of the receivers. In a translator's work, communication is made possible with the proper language, which, if troubled, is likely to render communication ineffective. From this perspective, competence in language plays an important role, not only within the source, but also and the target language, as without understanding and satisfactory linguistic knowledge, there will be no proper translation. On this, Gonzales states:

"Linguistic knowledge refers to the level of language competence and performance, which will carry according to the students' ability, that is, to the combination of their aptitudes and attitudes. The greater their command of the languages involved in the translation, the better. This is a good moment to emphasize not only the importance of the source language (usually their L2), but also the even greater importance of correct expression in the target 29 language (usually their L1) and of being aware of interferences and negative transfer" (Gonzales 2004, 132).

From his point of view, and apart from the level of comprehension in the target language, it is necessary to have a certain degree of knowledge regarding one's own language for the purpose of translation as translators working in this field usually translate into their own languages, which is also the same case in a training session. Once starting the studies, it can be assumed that students are likely to translate from one language to their own rather more easily. Only to realize soon that they are not competent enough when it comes to knowing either or both languages. This is why familiarity with linguistics takes on an even bigger role.

Another study by Neubert also refers to successful translation at the semantic level, as reflected in the following excerpt:

"[Meaning is] the kingpin of translation studies. Without understanding what the text to be translated means... the translator would be hopelessly lost. This is why the translation scholar has to be semanticist over and above everything else. By semanticist we mean a semanticist of the text, not just of words, structures and sentences. The key concept for the semantics of translation is textual meaning" (Neubert 1984, 57).

Here, Neubert's point is that words do not mean a thing unless they are used in a certain text, while their essence as in 'specific meaning' depend on the context built in the form of sentences, paragraphs, and textual clues as a whole. In addition, when different audiences get access to this text, in either writing or oral form, the content starts to have different meanings simply because, generally, no two individuals think, understand, or speak in exactly the same way. This is why no matter of what nature, any translation has the potential to become subjective unless certain conditions are taken into account. In addition, Beaugrande states that "The reader is likely to discover not one definite meaning for the text, but rather an increasing range of possible meaning . . . Only if the reading process is consistently pursued to the point where interpretation is maximally dominated by text- supplied information can a truly objective translation be produced" (Beaugrande 1978, 87- 88). Summarized by Bruce, the same issue is dealt with in the following remark: "Translation requires the recognition of discourse typologies in order to ascertain the fundamental characteristics of particular texts to be translated. That is to say, the conscious theorization of the problematic embodied in a particular source text is a useful and, I would argue, necessary step in achieving as 'satisfactory' translation" (Bruce, 1994, 47).

Finally, efforts made by Fawcett regarding the relationship linking linguistics and translation without doubt assert that linguistic-based courses are, in essence, a positive addition to translation and interpreting courses. According to him:

> "Earlier linguistic theories of translation fell mainly within the domain of contrastive linguistics, which is not the same as a translation linguistics but still an important element of translation studies. Without systematic comparisons you have no basis for discussion. But the comparisons need to be, and have been, extended beyond the confines of differential semantics and grammar into the broader areas of text structure and functioning, into the sociocultural functioning of translation and how it is shaped and constrained by the place and time in which it takes place. In all of this, linguistics will have a part to play" (Fawcett 1997, 145).

1.1. Statement of the Problem

At the department of translation and interpretation, learners need to know that courses such as linguistics, reading and text analysis, and composition skills can be highly beneficial to them when they proceed to speech delivery in note-taking courses for consecutive translation, literary translation, translation of economics texts and the like. In the first two years of their departmental education, the students might not be aware of the significance of linguistics based courses especially the 'Discourse Analysis' since the course is overloaded with linguistic theory and practice. However, as students begin to gain expertise in their courses by the third and fourth years, they come to the realisation that linguistics courses significantly help in translation studies, whether or not in theory or in practice, so as to achieve accuracy, clarity, and success. Despite this fact, one can see that those who fail in linguistics also face difficulties in translation, in particular when trying to succeed in the 3rd- and 4th- year courses.

1.2. Purpose of the Study

The aim here is to strengthen this view by means of recollecting responses from the students so as to help us, trainers, to reshape and reformulate our courses in translation studies in such a way that learners can both acquire and produce more. As such, the findings here may be of help to trainers who choose to employ certain methods, and those who have not done so by now.

1.3. Hypothesis

The purpose here is to assert that courses based on linguistics are a major contribution to the theoretical or practical study of translation, and that they are a key element in core translation and interpreting courses at the junior and senior level. (3rd and 4th year)

1.4. Scope of the Study

The study is based on the information provided from the 3rd- and 4th-year students of Hacettepe University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Translation and Interpretation. As to the details of the questions asked, their purposes, together with all other relevant details appear in the methodology part of the study.

1.5. Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions considering the present study can be listed as follows:

-There is common awareness among educators regarding the obstacles as mentioned earlier. Also that the time allocated to the courses, alongside their content and design is spent in a constructive way.

-Trainers who give these preliminary courses work in tandem and unison with other trainers who offer higher-grade courses. Continuous collaborations and discussions take place on a regular basis to guarantee a smooth transition of the students through each grade level.

When considering the *limitations* of the study, one may refer to the following:

-Though similar in many universities, courses such as translation and interpreting also have differences not just from the trainers' perspectives, but also in terms of course design and definitions. Therefore, what might be relevant for one group of students in one institution may not apply to the other group.

-Students in some universities are trained in two foreign languages (i.e. English and French), Yet, Hacettepe University trains in single foreign language (English). This issue can potentially alter the outcomes in an unpredictable fashion.

2. Method

2.1. Sample / Participants

In order to limit the scope so as to achieve more tangible outcomes, the questionnaires were distributed among the senior-year students of Translation and Interpretation in both universities towards the end of the second term, 2010 academic year. Numerically, there were 21 students at Atılım University and 42 students at Bilkent University. The questionnaires were distributed to 63 students in total. At Bilkent University, 'Translation for EU Texts' is a course given only to the

students focused on 'written translation', and 'Simultaneous Translation' is an elective course offered only to those wanting to focus on the 'conference interpreting', 35 students rated the skills for the course "Translation for EU texts" and 7 rated the skills for the course "Simultaneous Interpretation".

2.2. Curriculum

Taking alone, the curricula of the universities subject of this study very well represent the skill-building blocks required to achieve the stated goals... As it can be presupposed, since both departments in question aim for the same purpose of training high-level translation and interpreting students, there are certain similarities shared by the two institutions.

2.2.1. Curriculum of Atılım University

Atılım University, the Department of Translation and Interpretation had a definite advantage in being able to draw from the experience of similar departments before them and also employ a myriad of already-tested trainers whose capabilities had been approved through years of practice and experience in other institutions. However, incorporating all of these elements in a team-playing effort is not simple - which is basically what a curriculum is about – as combining ideal practices and examples cannot always yield the results one may desire to achieve.

Atılım's curriculum for the Translation and Interpreting Department is a very successful example of being able to put together a program that not only works, but draws on, the strength of previous examples.

2.2.2. Curriculum of Bilkent University

The second Translation and Interpreting Department to be established in Ankara was Bilkent University, Department of Translation and Interpretation. They did, however, set up for the first time a program involving two foreign languages – English and French - in addition to Turkish as the native language. Being the first private University to enter such a venture, the original conception of the curriculum had to enjoy a flexible structure that could, at points, be manipulated in order to fit market demands. A rich variety of trainers, combined with a robust infrastructure, provided by the administration has brought about the benefit of serving many needs and a range of skills for differing sectors.

2.3. Selected Courses

To limit the scope of the study in the analysis, a selection of courses were made considering their relation with linguistic studies. A series of criteria was applied to these choices. Mainly, this entailed that there needs to be sufficient similarity between the courses to be regarded as equivalent; next, the number of students attending the courses be sufficient enough to yield results; a third concern was that the courses had to be grouped under a certain perspective, implying that if the selected courses were a collection of differing skills or aims, it would be extremely difficult to analyse them to the extent that each would serve as a different study. Thus, with these limitations in mind, this study aims to show the contribution of the linguistics-based courses for three translation courses and two interpreting courses listed as follows:

Table 1. Selected Translation and Interpreting Courses for the Survey

Course Code and Semester Offered / University	Course Title
ETI 407 / ETI 408 (7th and 8th semesters / Atılım University) TRIN 364 / 366 (6th semester / Bilkent University)	Literary Translation
ETI 416 (8th semester / Atılım University) TRIN 265 (3rd semester / Bilkent University)	Translation of Texts on Economics,
ETI 412 (8th semester / Atılım University) TRIN 485 / TRIN 486 (7th and 8th semesters / Bilkent University)	Translation of EU Texts
ETI 413 (7th semester / Atılım University) TRIN 335 (5th semester / Bilkent University)	Consecutive Interpretation
ETI 411 (7th semester / Atılım University) TRIN 336 / TRIN 481 (5th and 7th semesters / Bilkent University)	Simultaneous Interpretation.

As the study is conducted in two universities, the titles of the two linguistics-based courses vary, but the syllabi are the same. These courses are:

Table 2. Selected Linguistics Based Courses from Bilkent and Atılım Universities

Selected Linguistics Based Courses from Two Universities
Atılım University: 'Linguistics and Translation' and 'Discourse Analysis'
Bilkent University: 'Applied Linguistics' and 'Texts and Composition'

2.4. Instruments

The source of the study is the course on linguistics-based Discourse Analysis. The instrument used for testing was a survey prepared specifically for this purpose. To assess the level of contribution by this course to the other third and fourth year courses, a questionnaire was prepared

The questionnaires were originally designed by Assistant Professor Dr. İsmail Erton, Atılım University and the focal point of the questionnaires is the students' perceptions and, therefore, related with the skills which have to be achieved at the end of the courses.

There are ten skills in each questionnaire intended to be achieved at the end of the course. Once again these skills are those deemed necessary and even compulsory for Translation and Interpreting student training in most countries, and not in Turkey alone. The students were asked to rate the contribution of each skill learnt in each course they had taken. A 1-5 Likert-Type scaling was made.

The scaling used in the survey is as follows:

5. very useful

4. useful

3. useful from time to time

2. not useful

1. not useful at all

2.5. The Reliability Analysis

Due to the research being based on an assumption by means of observation and skill-level analysis, there also needed to be a reliability analysis stage so as to test this property of the data being gathered...

2.6. Results of the Analysis

In order to assess the statistics, SPSS was applied between 0 and 1. In this way, the first survey's standard deviation was estimated at alpha=0.9210 (r=0.9210), and the second at alpha=0.9282 (r=0.9282), thus yielding highly consistent questionnaires in both cases.

2.7. T-test Comparing Results for Translation and Interpreting Courses

A t-test was applied to compare the two groups. The t-test is a statistical hypothesis test that uses t-distribution to evaluate the null hypothesis (which is the interest of this study) by using sample evidence. As stated before, a comparison of the student responses was carried out in two groups of classes between each individual question concerning the skills mastered.

Given that the test aims to compare the two class groups, a two-sample test of the hypothesis needs to be used. Given that, the samples are independent, variances are different, and the population variances are unknown. Thus, two sample tests were used of the hypothesis under unknown and unequal variances assumption. The hypothesis is:

H_0: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$

H_0: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

The decision rule requires a comparison of the test statistics (t-computed) with a critical value obtained from the t-distribution with a determined level of significance (alpha level) and degrees of freedom. Rejecting the null hypothesis is decided if t-computed is larger, in absolute value, than the critical value.

Otherwise, rejecting the null hypothesis has failed to conclude that sample evidence does not provide sufficient evidence against the null. A large test statistic represents the difference between the two populations to be too large to have occurred randomly.

To calculate the statistic, the following equation is used:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

X-bar (x*)* represents the sample means and si represents the sample standard deviations. The sample sizes are given by n1 and n2. The degree of freedom is corrected by the following formula for the unequal variances.

$$df = \frac{[(s_1^2/n_1) + (s_2^2/n_2)]^2}{\frac{(s_1^2/n_1)^2}{n_1 - 1} + \frac{(s_2^2/n_2)^2}{n_2 - 1}}$$

The t-test used for this study aims to prove that the linguistics-based courses are useful for both translation and interpreting courses. As a result, a comparison has been made between the selected translation courses which are Literary Translation, Translation of Texts on Economics, and Translation of the EU texts, with the two interpreting courses – consecutive and simultaneous - for each skill to be mastered at the end of the two linguistics-based courses.

2.8. Data analysis and Discussion

The data is analysed in two stages. First, to provide an objective and unbiased input for the sake of interpretations, a quantitative analysis is to be made and represented in the form of graphics.

The second part is composed of the elements of interpretation of this quantitative data parallel to the aim and the scope of the research conducted. Doing this allows us to decide whether the original premises are supported or refuted.

2.8.1. Survey Information

There are two sets of questionnaires involved in our survey:

The first deals with the linguistics-based courses "Linguistics and Translation" / "Applied Linguistics" and the second one is about the course "Discourse Analysis" / "Texts and Composition".

In order to achieve tangibly-comprehensible and analytical data, the students were asked to use a simple rating system. Students were asked to rate the skill to be achieved at the end of each related course using a scale from 1 to 5. These courses were:

Course 1: Literary Translation,

Course 2: Translation of Texts on Economics,

Course 3: Translation of EU texts,

Course 4: Consecutive Interpretation,

Course 5: Simultaneous Interpretation.

It should be mentioned let us remember that the questionnaires had been circulated among, respectively, 21 and 42 students (a total of 63 students) of Translation and Interpretation of Atılım University and Bilkent University. Both sets of questionnaires were to be graded from 1 to 5 as to the level of contribution to the skills in five courses – Literary Translation, Translation of Texts on

Economics, Translation of EU texts, Consecutive Interpretation and Simultaneous Interpretation - which have to be achieved at the end of the linguistics based courses "Linguistics and Translation" / "Applied Linguistics" and "Discourse Analysis" / "Texts and Composition". It should be noted that a skill is considered useful when graded between 3 and 5.

3. Results and Discussions

Table 3. Results for "Linguistics and Translation" / "Applied Linguistics" Courses (Survey #1)

Skill	Relevance percentage
1	83
2	88
3	81
4	85
5	82
6	86
7	85
8	75
9	75
10	78
Average	81.8

Concerning "Linguistics and Translation"/ "Applied Linguistics", 83% of the students claimed to be aware of the roles of linguistic theory and its related fields in professional and personal decision-making during the translation process. Furthermore, 88% declared they were able to recognize the importance of the use of precise and clear language, and appropriate sentence-construction for translation purposes. Apart from this, 81% could tackle problems related with discourse and provide solutions during translation. In consequent questions, 85% stated that they thought that they could identify the arguments in written/spoken texts for the translation process; at the end of this course, 82% of the students could distinguish the premises and conclude arguments in written/spoken texts for translation purposes; the ability to make clear the links between subordinate arguments and main arguments for translation has been useful for 86% of the students. As regards the issue of translation per se, 85% believed to be able to recognize and avoid common fallacies in translation. The other three skills in question which are the use of linguistics in texts for accuracy, reliability, relevance, inter-textuality and sufficiency in translation, the capacity of developing a critical outlook of the texts to be translated and the use of analytic, conscious and critical attitude in translation were found less useful than the others with respectively 75%, 75% and 78% ratings by the students. The average results indicate that 81.8% of those in the Translation and Interpreting course were of the opinion that the two linguistics-based courses are beneficial and that they greatly assist them in translation and interpreting courses.

Table 4. T-Test results for the "linguistics and translation" and "applied linguistics" courses (survey #1)

Skill	$\bar{x}_1$	$\bar{x}_{\square}$	t-computed	p-value
1	3,50345	3,66667	-0,90482	0,36698
2	3,86986	3,88372	-0,08196	0,93479
3	3,54167	3,68605	-0,81030	0,41889
4	3,63014	3,94186	-1,93612	0,05458
5	3,28767	3,75581	-2,69125	0,00782
6	3,77931	3,95294	-1,02130	0,30869
7	3,67832	3,90698	-1,33164	0,18482
8	3,62937	3,41176	1,09163	0,27679
9	3,59441	3,27381	1,65020	0,10096
10	3,58741	3,75294	-0,84092	0,40164

The figures shown above imply that the two skills (no.4 and no.5) which have to be achieved at the end of the courses "Applied Linguistics" / "Linguistics and Translation" are found to be more useful for the interpretation courses. This value means that the skill "identification of arguments in written/spoken texts for the translation process" and the skill "distinction of the premises and conclusion of arguments in written/spoken texts for translation purposes" are more useful for interpreting classes. These outcomes, nevertheless, do not imply that, this course is more useful for interpreting courses thanks to these two skills, since they are only two out of ten. The p-values of the eight other skills cannot be overlooked. Briefly, the table above shows that the courses "Applied Linguistics"/ "Linguistics and Translation" are useful for both the translation and the interpretation courses.

Table 5. Results for the "Discourse Analysis" and "Texts and Composition" Courses (Survey #2)

Skill	Relevance percentage
1	79
2	81
3	82
4	76
5	77
6	81
7	86
8	84
9	83
10	79
Average	80.8

According to 79% of the students, creating a distinction between reading for pleasure and reading for translation and interpreting courses proves to be a useful practice. When it comes to reading skills, 81% could apply such skills as skimming and scanning while translating. On the other hand, with reference to discourse, 82% of the students stated that they could solve discourse problems and offer solutions during the translation at the end of the course. When asked about argumentation, 76% were able to identify the arguments in written/spoken texts in the translation process. Furthermore, 77% claimed they were able to distinguish the premises and conclusion of arguments in written/spoken texts for translation purposes throughout the five courses in question. Also, they 81% said to have mastered the ability to link subordinate arguments with their main arguments. What appears to be noteworthy is that, as per the accumulated data, the most useful skill for the students is the identification of language functions such as representing, expressing, and appealing for translation - which 86% found to be useful; 84% of the students stated that the evaluation of the function of the clue, utterance, or the evidence in text for accuracy, reliability, relevance, and sufficiency in written/spoken texts for translation was useful. To be able to tell the connection between language functions and text types for translation is another skill found useful by 83% of the students. 79% declared that that the ability to identify different text types in translation was a useful skill. Based on these outcomes, 80.8% of the students are adamant about the usefulness of the "Discourse Analysis"/ "Texts and Composition" course for the five translation and interpreting courses.

Table 6. T-Test Results for the "Discourse Analysis" and "Texts and Composition" Courses (Survey #2)

Question	$\bar{x}_1$	$\bar{x}_{\square}$	t-computed	p-value
1	3,69697	3,58667	0,53299	0,59496
2	3,73485	3,66667	0,34288	0,73219
3	3,56589	3,67105	-0,53818	0,59131
4	3,40152	3,51282	-0,53660	0,59240
5	3,57576	3,57692	-0,00568	0,99548
6	3,59231	3,85897	-1,42663	0,15582
7	3,71970	4,05263	-1,85989	0,06489
8	3,68939	3,72368	-0,18529	0,85325
9	3,81818	3,80769	0,05234	0,95834
10	3,62595	3,64474	-0,08922	0,92904

Based on these values, skill no.7, to be achieved at the end of the courses "Discourse Analysis" / "Texts and Composition", is considered more beneficial for interpreting courses. Also, that the skill "identification of language functions, such as representing, expressing, appealing for translation" is more useful for the interpretation classes, though this outcome does not mean this course is more useful for interpretation courses only thanks to this particular skill, as it is only one among ten; one cannot ignore the other remaining nine skills' p-values. Therefore, the table shows that the courses "Discourse Analysis"/"Texts and Composition" are useful for both translation and interpreting courses.

4. Conclusions

To begin with, it turns out that the existence of a form of continuity is vital when it comes to courses; this issue is well-understood by the students of translation studies since they need to concentrate on the aim of the courses in addition to what they need to master or, rather, the skills that need to internalize within the courses. This is necessary to maintain balance in the classroom, while also making room for each learner to properly take in and master the skills. The trainer, while initiating the afore-mentioned, is also to explain the objectives and clearly define the aims for the upcoming courses to follow – a practice seemingly common at the two universities scrutinized.

Secondly, it is clear that the linguistics and discourse analysis-based courses help the students in the courses that they take in later years as they have achieved a better understanding of the discipline through the study of these courses. The students clearly state these facts according to the figures in the previous section.

As per the t-test, no difference prevails between preparatory courses that end up in either translation or interpreting courses, leading us to the core of the study being that that the new approach to be favored more in classrooms is now the student-centered training approach and regardless of the nature of the programme or what field its is about. This can be clearly noted from the results given by the 'conscious' students. Once the student has clear objectives set in front of him, he is definitely more successful and more objective in judging the training and the trainer. With these, the scenario becomes a win-win situation, not just for the establishment, but for the learner population.

Based on the findings of the present work, it can be said that the use of linguistics and discourse courses with particular formulations and aims towards advancing student skill levels contribute to a better understanding and achievement of translation and interpreting courses.

In terms of future studies, more work needs to be done in this field to decide whether the same applies to other fields, such as cultural studies, and whether the same outcomes can be achieved. Our research can also be taken as an example where there is a discipline proving useful to potentially develop the translation and interpretation courses.

References

Baker, M. (2006). Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account. London: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (1980). Translation Studies. London: Methuen.

Beaugrande, R. de (1978). Factors in a Theory of Poetic in Translation. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Berry, M., et al. (1996). Meaning and Form: Systemic Functional Interpretations. New Jersey: Ablex.

Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruce, D. (1994). Translating the commune: Cultural Politics and the Historical Specifity of the Anarchist Text. Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction, 1: 47-76.

Catford, J. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fawcett, P. (1997). Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained. Manchester: St Jerome.

Gentzer, E. (1993). Contemporary Translation Theories. London: Routledge.

Gile, D. (1995). Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Gillies, A. (2005). Note-Taking for Consecutive Interpreting – A Short Course. Manchester: St Jerome.

Gonzales Davies, M. (2004). Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Arnold.

Hatim, B and Mason, I. (1984). Discourse and the Translator. London: Longman.

Hatim, B and Munday, J. (2004). Translation. An Advanced Resource Book. London: Routledge.

Jakobson, Roman (1959). 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation', in R. A. Brower (ed.) On Translation, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 232-39.

Kurz, I. (1988). Conference Interpreters – Can They Afford not to be Generalists? In Hammond, D.L. (ed.) 1988. pp. 423-428.

Mellen, D. (1988). Translator: Translator or Editor? In Hammond, D.L. (ed.) 1988. pp. 271-276

Munday, J. (2001). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications. London: Routledge.

Neubert, A. (1984). Text-bound Translation Teaching. In Wilss and Thome (eds), Die Theorie des Übersetzens und ihr Aufschlusswert für die Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschdidaktik. Tübingen pp. 61-70.

Nida, E.A. (1964). Towards a Science of Translating. Leiden: Brill.

Nord, C (1997). Translation as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Reiss, K. and Hans J. V. (1894/1991). Grundlegung Einer Allgemeinen Translations-Theorie. Tübingen: Max Neimeyer.

Wilss, W. (1996). Knowledge and Skills in Translator Behaviour. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Üniversite Düzeyinde Çevirmen Eğitiminde Dilbilimin Önemi

Öz

Mütercim Tercümanlık, yani Çeviri Bilim çalışmaları, Dilbilim ve onun bağlantılı alt dallarından doğmuştur. Çeviri Bilim, Zaman içerisinde dilbilim çalışmaları ile olan bağlarını kopartmadan gelişmiş ve ayrı bir bilim dalı olmuştur. Ancak, her ne kadar bu olsa da, mütercim tercümanlık eğitimini dilbilimden tamamen ayırmak mümkün değildir. Bu araştırma, Mütercim Tercümanlık bölümlerinde okutulan dilbilim derslerinin öğrencilerin üst sınıflarda kazanacağı becerilerin altyapısını oluşturduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Bu bağlamda, Atılım ve Bilkent Üniversiteleri, Mütercim Tercümanlık Bölümlerinde okuyan öğrencilere 2'şer anket dağıtılması yoluyla bu bağlantı ortaya konulmuştur. İstatistiksel yöntemlerle değerlendirilen sonuçlar dilbilim derslerinin mütercim tercümanlık çalışmaları için son derece yararlı olduğunu ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar sözcükler: Mütercim; tercümanlık; dilbilim; çevirmen eğitimi; öğrenme

AUTHOR BIODATA

Dr. İsmail ERTON completed his MA at the department of English Linguistics and PhD at the English Language Education Department of Hacettepe University. He worked at Ankara University, Bilkent University and currently working as an assistant professor of Translation and Interpretation Studies at Atılım University since 2005. He is also the Director of Atılım University Writing and Advisory Center (AWAC) which became a trademark of Atılım University over the last two years. He has numerous national and international articles and also presented numerous papers at various conferences. His main focus of interest is Linguistics, Educational Psychology, TEFL, ELT, Translation studies and Academic research techniques.

Yasemin TANBI completed her MA at the department of Translation and Interpretation at Atılım University. She is about to complete her PhD at the Translation Department of Universite Lyon-Lumiere, France. She has been working as an Instructor at the Translation and Interpretation department of Bilkent University since 2001. She has numerous articles and also presented papers at national and international conferences. Her main focus of interest is Translation studies and academic research.