

# Indicators of translation competence: Translators' self-concepts and the translation of titles

Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow & Gary Massey

Zurich University of Applied Sciences (ZHAW) | Switzerland

**Abstract:** The parallels between writing research and translation process research range from the objects of study (text producers and texts) to the methods employed in investigating them. Similar to writing research, translation studies has recently moved from an almost exclusive focus on products towards considering workplace and cognitive processes and the effects of those processes on the quality of products. In this paper, we outline how the methods common to both fields can be applied to the investigation of translators' understanding of their roles and responsibilities as text producers and their treatment of the specific problem of title translation. The data are drawn from a corpus built up in a longitudinal research project about the relationship of translation competence and the translation process. The multi-method approach we use combines keystroke logging, screenshot recording, eye-tracking, retrospection, and interviews. It allows us to monitor translators at their workplace in as controlled and non-invasive a manner as possible. It also provides rich data that make it possible to infer the practices and metalinguistic awareness that characterize the translation competence of translators with different levels of experience.

**Keywords:** self-concept, titles, translation competence, retrospection, multi-method



Ehrensberger-Dow, M., & Massey, G. (2013). Indicators of translation competence: Translators' self-concepts and the translation of titles. *Journal of Writing Research*, 5(1), 103-131.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2013.05.01.5>

Contact: Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow, ZHAW Institute of Translation and Interpreting (IUED), Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Theaterstrasse 15c, Winterthur, CH-8041 | Switzerland – ehre@zhw.ch.

Copyright: Earli | This article is published under Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 Unported license.

## 1. Introduction

As has been argued and well-documented elsewhere (e.g. Bazerman 2007), recent technological developments have dramatically altered text production processes in practically all domains of human endeavor. The metonyms of “penning a few lines” or “penciling in an appointment” may soon be as mysterious to future generations as the simile “as fine as vellum” is to most contemporary readers. The image of writers dipping quills into inkpots has become as dated as that of translators toiling over manuscripts, surrounded by piles of dictionaries. In both professions, computer workplaces with a wide range of digital resources have become commonplace, if not absolutely essential. Not only are most contemporary texts produced on computers, many are transmitted to their audiences solely in electronic form and printed on-demand, if at all. By the same token, most translators not only produce their translations on computers but also expect to receive the source texts in digital form, or even charge extra if they have to work “only” from paper.

Further parallels between writing and translating are the opportunities that the computerization of both professions presents to researchers seeking to understand the respective processes. At each phase of their production, texts and translations can be reconstructed and analyzed by using non-invasive techniques such as keystroke logging (see Van Waes & Leijten 2006 on the use of InputLog in writing research and Jakobsen 2006 on the use of TransLog in translation research). Keystroke logs are extremely useful for tracking pauses and micro-changes in emerging texts and translations, although they provide little or no information about what happens when a writer or translator is not entering text into the computer. However, continuous screen recording and eye-tracking technology overcome this limitation and have been used successfully in investigations of writing and translation processes (e.g. Asadi & Séguinot 2005; Degenhardt 2006; Dragsted 2010). Monitoring changes that take place on the computer screen as well as any shifts in visual attention, such as when a person switches screens to refer to a source of information or check for a word in an on-line thesaurus, provides much richer information about the respective process.

Another important source of data in both writing and translation research is self-report by the writers and translators themselves, in the form of either concurrent or retrospective verbalizations. Although concurrent reports have been used in psychology and language studies for over a century (Camps 2003), they have been criticized for affecting the process that is being commented upon. For example, Jääskeläinen (1999: 151-158) found evidence that thinking aloud may influence translators' lexical decisions, and Jakobsen (2003) observed that thinking aloud reduces translation speed, forcing translators to process text in smaller segments.

Retrospection, performed immediately after task execution, is a useful alternative to concurrent verbalization. One important advantage of this technique is that different modes of expression (writing and talking) do not have to be used simultaneously; the

talking has no impact on the writing or translation process because it happens afterwards. It is often used in combination with other methods such as keystroke logging or screen recordings (e.g. Alves 2005; Kujamäki 2010). Replaying a recording of a process and asking the writer or translator to comment produces cue-based retrospective data that is less susceptible to memory decay, a concern often aired regarding non-cued retrospection (cf. Hansen 2006; for potential disadvantages of retrospection, see Göpferich 2009 or Jääskeläinen 2011).

The combination of various techniques makes it possible to examine writing and translation processes from different perspectives, in order to gain more insight into the competence and resources that writers and translators draw on as they work. Progression Analysis, a method first developed by Perrin (2001, 2002, 2003, 2006a) to examine journalists' writing processes, combines ethnographic observation, interviews, computer logging, and cue-based retrospection. It has also proven valuable in studies of the writing processes of schoolchildren (e.g. Gnach et al. 2007). Recently, it has been extended to include screen recording and eye-tracking and applied to investigations of translation processes in controlled settings (e.g. Ehrensberger-Dow & Künzli 2010; Massey & Ehrensberger-Dow 2010; Ehrensberger-Dow & Perrin 2013).

Information from the various types of computer logging and from retrospective comments allows inferences to be made about reading processes, revision, research, consultation, problem-solving, and other practices during translation. It also allows a more detailed examination of the treatment of particular problems than most product analyses do, since each action performed on the computer can be reconstructed from the recordings.

Using rich data from screen recordings and cue-based retrospection, the present study addresses the question of whether indicators of translators' self-concepts, as measured by a focus on various aspects of the translation process (i.e. as part of a social system or a cognitive act), are related to how the translators deal with the problems posed by the translation of titles. We have chosen to examine self-concept because various psycholinguistic and cognitive models explicitly (e.g. Kiraly 1995, Göpferich 2009) or implicitly (e.g. PACTE 2003, 2005, 2011) consider this a fundamental aspect of translation competence. The focus on titles is prompted by their status as an independent text type providing quintessential source texts (Nord 1993: 280-286) which, when translated, generically represent the translation process both as an event in the sociological sense and as an act, or set of observable practices, triggered in the mind of the translator (cf. Nord 1993: 286).

## **2. Translation competence and translator self-concept**

It is reasonable to assume that translation practices are related to translation competence, which has been described in various models (see Göpferich 2008 for a review). For example, the PACTE group has proposed a holistic model comprising six interacting sub-competences or components (2003, 2005, 2011). Three of them are

considered common to all multilingual producers of texts: the bilingual and extra-linguistic sub-competences and the psycho-physiological components (e.g. attention). However, the other three (the translation-knowledge, instrumental, and strategic sub-competences) are assumed to be specific to translation. The translation-knowledge sub-competence involves knowledge of translation principles and the profession, which can be assessed in interviews and questionnaires. The instrumental sub-competence includes research, information literacy, and IT skills, which can be observed as translators perform their tasks. The strategic sub-competence is assumed to control the entire translation process and can only be accessed indirectly, potentially when translators reflect on their actions and decisions.

Such reflection can lend insight into translators' concepts of their roles and responsibilities as linguistic mediators and text producers, which Kiraly (1995: 100) describes as follows:

The self-concept includes a sense of the purpose of the translation, an awareness of the information requirements of the translation task, a self-evaluation of capability to fulfill the task, and a related capacity to monitor and evaluate translation products for adequacy and appropriateness.

In line with Toury's (1995) classic distinction between the cognitive translation act and the situated, communicative, socio-cultural event in which that act is embedded, we can therefore loosely define translator self-concept as the awareness of the multiple responsibilities and loyalties imposed by both the act and the event of translation.

Kiraly (1995: 101) places translator self-concept at the center of his psycholinguistic model of the translator's mental space, a model based on analyses of concurrent verbalizations (i.e. think-aloud protocols) done by students and professional translators. Translator self-concept is also incorporated into Göpferich's (2008: 155; 2009: 22) model of translation competence. Related to the translator's education and aspects of social responsibility and role (see also Risku 2009), it forms a constituent element at the model's base. As part of Göpferich's longitudinal TransComp study designed to test her model (cf. Göpferich 2009 or Göpferich et al. 2011), participants completed questionnaires about translator self-concept at three points: at the beginning of the study, after three semesters, and at the end of the study. Their answers might support the hypothesis that the development of self-concept is indeed related to the development of translation competence.

This assumption has already been made by Gross (2003: 91) and others. The former argues that translator self-concept can and should be positively affected by trainers drawing students' and translators' attention to the similarities between journalism and translation. A similar parallel between translation and writing is also drawn by Tirkkonen-Condit and Laukkanen (1996: 45-46), who suggest that:

If the translator sees herself as merely a text-processor, she concentrates on finding "equivalents" for what is in the text. If, however, she sees herself as a writer who reports the relevant dimensions of the original communication to her

addressee she then takes a full responsibility for designing the target text in such a manner that it makes sense to the addressee.

Reporting on a global survey of professional translators' sense of empowerment and self-image, Katan (2009: 135) refers to the divide between a faithful "copier" and a "creator" of texts. Likewise, Koskinen (2008: 103) found in her ethnographic study of Finnish EU translators that they seemed constrained by "the double bind present in all translation: [...] a need to simultaneously reach towards the target text readers ('readability') and to remain faithful to the source text". An alternative to this simple dichotomy, which echoes earlier long-standing debates in translation studies surrounding "literal" or "faithful" and "free" translation (cf. Munday 2008), is provided by Kiraly (1997:152). He proposes a continuum "extending from the simple retrieval of spontaneous associations at the word level to a complex, multistage, problem-solving process in which extra-linguistic factors are taken into consideration". A well-developed self-concept, then, might enable a translator to move back and forth along a continuum from words to readers as required by the particular task at hand.

The first part of the present article addresses the question of whether, depending on the degree of translation experience, there are different focal points along the continuum stretching from literal word-level translation to complex reader-oriented transfer. Continuing in the tradition of letting translators tell us what they think, we analyzed retrospective commentaries to identify which aspects of the translation process translators focus on when they view their own processes, in order to gain insights about their self-concepts.

### **3. Data collection and corpus**

As part of our longitudinal study *Capturing Translation Processes*, we have asked translators with various levels of expertise to do translations under controlled conditions. The data we have collected for our corpus allow us to make comparisons between the performance of students at different stages in their career (i.e. at the beginning and end of their degree program as well as 2 years post-graduation); between professionals and students in different degree programs (i.e. BA and MA); between different language versions (e.g. German-English or English-German); and between translation into the first or second language (L1 or L2). In the present study, the groups represent three levels of experience: BA beginners, tested at the beginning of the first semester of their first translation course; MA students with an undergraduate degree in translation, tested in the first semester of their graduate program; and professionals with more than two years' experience working as staff translators. The group sizes are as balanced as possible within the constraints of the available corpus. An overview is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Groups, experience, direction, and source texts

Group (n)	Level of experience	Version	Source text(s) translated
BAG (9)	BA beginners	into German (L1 )	<i>whales</i>
BAE (9)	BA beginners	into English (L2 )	<i>Wale</i>
MA (8)	MA students	into English (L2)	<i>Wale</i>
		into German (L1 )	<i>whales</i>
ProG (8)	Professionals	into German (L1 )	<i>whales</i>
ProE (7)	Professionals	into English (L1 )	<i>Wale</i>

For logistical reasons, the data collection procedure and setting differed slightly for the groups. The BA beginner groups comprised two randomly chosen sub-sets of a large cohort tested at the beginning of the longitudinal study. After providing background information such as the level of their languages, education, and work experience in an individual interview, the BA beginners were randomly assigned to do a translation either into their L1 (German) or into their L2 (English). They worked at a special computer workstation in the departmental library that had the same user interface and access to all of the tools and resources they were familiar with from the other computers in the department. While they translated a short journalistic source text, a keystroke logging program (InputLog 2.0) registered all of their keyboard and mouse activities,<sup>1</sup> and another program (Camtasia Studio) recorded all of the changes on the screen, including switching between windows, changes to the emerging translation, text editing, and searches in library and internet resources. The BA beginners were encouraged to work at their own pace and assured that they did not have to complete the translation in the time available (approximately 20 minutes). Immediately afterwards, they went to a quiet room with a bilingual research assistant to view the screen recording of their process and, in the language of their choice, commented on what they saw themselves doing (cue-based retrospection).

The two source texts (STs) for this study were chosen because they were considered easy enough for beginners to handle, yet demanding enough for professionals to find challenging. The instructions for the translation task explained that they were extracts from articles that had appeared in daily newspapers in the source culture (the name of the newspaper and date of publication were specified), and that they should be translated for a similar publication in the target culture. The two STs had approximately the same number of words, came from newspapers with comparable readerships, had a similar number of potential challenges for translators, and were both ostensibly on the same topic (*whales* or *Wale* in German; see Table 1). They differed, however, in the length and syntactic complexity of the titles and in the content of the text (see Appendix A).

The MA students and the professionals translated the same STs as the beginners did, but they were not randomly assigned to a particular translation version. The MA students produced two translations within about eight weeks: the first into English (their L2) and the second into German (their L1).<sup>2</sup> Since these translations were done after three semesters of translation instruction, it was assumed that the slight time difference

in the data collection would not have a significant effect on their performance or self-concepts. The professionals all translated into their L1, which is their normal translation direction. The other difference in data collection procedure as compared to the BA beginners was that the MA students and professionals were tested in a usability lab at a computer equipped with an eye-tracking monitor and software<sup>3</sup> in addition to the keystroke logging and screen recording programs. The first task for them after the calibration of the eye-tracker was a warm-up Internet search exercise intended to provide them with the opportunity to become familiar with the translation workplace, to find the browser, etc. They had to find the answer to a simple question that required on-line research (i.e. How big is the Pacific Ocean?). The second task, which is the focus of interest in the present study, was to translate the *whales* or *Wale* ST into German or English, respectively. The MA students were asked to work as usual at their own pace and told that they would be recorded for approximately 20 minutes; the professionals were simply asked to translate the text and to indicate when they were done. There was a short break while the technician rendered the eye-tracking gaze plots to .avi files, and after this the MA students and professionals also completed a cue-based retrospection in the language of their choice by commenting on the eye-tracking gaze plots overlaid on the screen recordings (see videoclip ProG\_sample.avi for an example | available at the Writing Knowledge Center: [WritingPro.eu](http://WritingPro.eu)).

#### **4. Analysis and findings: self-concept categories**

The recordings of the translation processes were very rich in information and served as high-quality cues for the retrospective commentaries. The commentaries were transcribed using the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI 2008) conventions, as suggested by Göpferich (2008: 72-81), and the screen events were coded with XML tags adapted for the Capturing Translation Processes project (see Appendix B). The comments that indicated a meta-linguistic awareness of what the participants were doing and why (i.e. those that were not simply descriptions of the screen events or research activity) were extracted and coded in an iterative process with respect to their focus. The resulting thirteen codes were then grouped into five categories that were placed on a continuum from a focus on the micro level of words and phrases to an awareness of the readership (see Table 2, with example utterances from participants from the three levels of experience given for each code and category).

The number of BA beginners, MA students and professionals whose comments related to each of the self-concept categories was converted to percentages and reported separately for each ST. Any overt comment made about aspects of translation was taken to indicate an awareness of that particular aspect, and thus to serve as an indicator of the focus of attention.

**Table 2.** Continuum of self-concept categories derived from the retrospective commentaries

Categories	Codes	Examples (participant code_version)
Words & phrases	literal	<i>I more or less translated it word for word (BAE1_GE)</i>
	word-for-word	<i>I sort of stayed stuck to the source text (MA1_EG)</i> <i>I tend to write a literal translation (ProE5_GE)</i>
Sentence structures	moving	<i>I also moved things around with respect to sentence structures (BAE2_GE)</i>
	changing	<i>and then I had to adapt the sentence construction to English (MA3_GE)</i>
	word order	<i>divide this up into two sentences in German (ProG2_EG)</i>
Text quality	esthetics	<i>find something else instead of using the same word twice (BAG8_EG)</i>
	naturalness	<i>whether it flows well (MA6_GE)</i>
	style	<i>how I could reword it to make it sound a bit nicer (ProE5_GE)</i>
Loyalty to ST	loyalty to text	(none of the BA beginners referred to this)
	completeness	<i>you don't necessarily have to say 'Meer' [sea] (MA6_EG)</i> <i>check again to see whether everything's there (ProG8_EG)</i>
Readership	audience	<i>I tried to make it a bit easier to understand (BAE7_GE)</i>
	readability	<i>it is still readable and understandable (MA1_EG)</i>
	function	<i>it's for a newspaper it's not for a scientific journal (ProE4_GE)</i>

Table 3 presents the percentages of translators making comments in each self-concept category when translating from English into German, their L1. They are grouped according to experience level, i.e. BA beginners (BAG), MA students (MA), and professionals (ProG).

**Table 3.** Percentages of translators in each E-G group making comments in each category (*whales* ST)

Group	Experience level	Direction	Words & phrases	Sentence structures	Text quality	Loyalty to ST	Readership
BAG	BA beginners	L2-L1	44	33	33	0	78
MA	MA students	L2-L1	50	25	25	50	63
ProG	Professionals	L2-L1	25	75	88	50	88

The focus of attention for the English-German beginners appears to be very narrow, with most of them commenting on the readership but few of them making comments in the other categories. The attention to readership could be an indication of their self-concepts as writers and text analysts, since they had completed text production and analysis courses in both the source and target languages the previous semester. A closer



examination of their comments makes it apparent that most of them are referring to the source text (ST) readership and not the target text (TT) readership. By contrast, the MA students spread their attention over three categories, with half of them indicating an awareness of the importance of conveying the message of the ST and tending to talk about target text readership. Half of the MA students indicate that their focus is also on the level of words and phrases, far more than in the group of professionals. In general, there seems to be a greater awareness of responsibilities among the professionals: from their comments, they seem to be juggling responsibilities in four areas and to have the attention resources to deal with multiple concerns. These multiple concerns have also been identified in a self-report questionnaire survey of professional translators, who cumulatively spread their attention across various focal points, including ST, TT, and client (Katan 2009).

The percentages of translators making comments in each self-concept category when translating from German into English are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Percentages of translators in each G-E group making comments in each category (*Wale ST*)

Group	Experience level	Direction	Words & phrases	Sentence structures	Text quality	Loyalty to ST	Readership
BAE*	BA beginners	L1-L2	50	75	75	0	38
MA*	MA students	L1-L2	38	50	63	25	38
ProE	Professionals	L2-L1	29	71	100	86	86

\* *translation into L2*

The results indicate that the BA beginners and MA students focus on textual level features and the quality of the emerging TT, with little or no mention of loyalty to the source text as a whole or to what the ST author might have intended. The loyalty to the ST and awareness of readership that the MA students refer to when commenting on their translation processes into their L1 seem to be missing when they comment on their translation processes into their L2. In fact, the MA students' focus suggests that they might consider translation into their L2 primarily as a language exercise for applying their linguistic and textual competence in the foreign language. On the other hand, the lack of mention of readership or loyalty to the source text might simply be an indication of cognitive overload when reviewing their translation processes into their L2, although the retrospective commentaries were all done in their L1. Since the German-English professionals translating into their L1 demonstrate the same spread of attention that the English-German professionals do, the different patterns noted between the results for the self-concept categories for the BAG and BAE beginners (between groups), and between the same group of MA students translating E-G or G-E (within groups), are not merely a function of the source texts or the version per se but seem to be related to translation direction (i.e. translation into the L2). In a follow-up study, it would be

important to include professionals who regularly translate into both their L1 and L2 to determine whether self-concept is robust enough to be independent of translation direction.

Our analysis of the commentaries indicates that training, experience, and translation direction appear to affect the way translators perceive their roles. The professionals, who only translated into their L1, seem more aware than the students of their multiple responsibilities to language, text(s), author, and readership. The MA students' comments suggest less homogeneity, with attention less evenly distributed across lexical, syntactic, textual, and pragmatic categories. This is even more pronounced among the BA beginners, who indicate a strong focus on the source text readership in the L2-L1 translation direction, but demonstrate little consideration or awareness of other categories – and thus of the complexity of the translator's task. The BA groups make no mention of loyalty to the source text, either in the L2-L1 direction, or when translating into their L2. Indeed, they seem to view translation into L2 primarily as a language exercise, a tendency also observable, though to a lesser extent, among the MA students.

The question to ask now is how these results relate to actual translation practices. In order to evaluate this, we examine the ways in which the same groups of BA beginners, MA students, and professionals tackle the problems posed by title translation.

##### 5. Translation of titles

As Nord (2004a: 908) points out in relation to literary texts, a considerable body of literature has been devoted to investigating titles *per se*, but relatively little attention has been paid to title translation, “a rather neglected area in translation studies” (Viezzi 2011: 193). While earlier studies tended to explore the equivalence-oriented dichotomy between literal and free translation (Nord 2004a), the cultural turn in translation studies saw a shift of focus to title translation as a prime example (Doyle 1989) or even paradigm (Nord 1991, 1993) of intercultural communication and functional translation. Thus, Doyle examines a corpus of recently translated Spanish and Spanish-American fiction titles from the perspective of “culturally re-contextualized semantic transfer” (1989: 41), replacing the simple faithful-free dichotomy with a more complex concept of “tropes of fidelity” along a “spectrum of the translation process from literal to near-literal to liberal or free translation” (1989: 46) that is reminiscent of Kiraly's continuum (1997). For Nord (1993: 286), title translation is a complex purpose- or skopos-driven act involving multiple loyalties to the partners involved in the translation event (commissioner/client, source-text author, target audience). As such, it is typical of all forms of translation in pursuing both loyalty to the intentions of those partners and functional adequacy within the constraints of a specific new communicative situation – which goes far beyond the simple opposition of “faithful” and “free” translation (Nord 1993: 291). Nord adopts a very similar approach in more recent studies (e.g. Nord 2008). Viezzi (2011) draws on Nord's functionalist approach to propose ten main functions of titles,<sup>4</sup> which he then uses to analyze title translations along an implicit continuum stretching from semantic equivalence to Rabadàn's (1991;

cited in Viezzi 2011) notion of translemic equivalence: “the unique relationship characterizing any pair of source and target texts above the mere ‘linguistic’ level” (Viezzi 2011: 192). According to the functionalist paradigm adopted in translation studies – and studies of title translation – over the past twenty years, translators are the only participants in translation events capable of weighing up the demands of adequacy and loyalty, which underlines the importance of translators’ responsibilities and carries key implications for their status and self-image (cf. Nord 1993: 293).

Against this background, we have analyzed the way the participants in our study handled the translation of titles and have related these findings to the results on translator self-concept discussed above. The previous contributions mentioned above have all presented product-oriented analyses of title translation. Our investigation goes further by combining this approach with the analysis of process data. Process-oriented analyses of title translation are rare: to our knowledge, only Johnsen (2011) has presented findings in this field.

## 5. Analysis and findings: titles

The corpus described for the self-concept analysis (previous section) also served as the source of data for the analysis of title translations. In addition to the final versions of the titles in the target texts, the recordings of screen events and eye-tracking paths were examined to detect the type and timing of every revision and instance of resource use related to translating the titles. All comments about titles in the retrospective verbal protocols (RVPs) were also collated and analyzed.

The analysis of the titles revealed a wide variety of German translations of the relatively complex English ST title: no two of the 23 TT titles were identical (see Appendix C). However, the linguistic patterns can be summarized by four general forms (Nord 2004b), as shown in Table 5.

In the most common pattern, a verb conveyed the second unit of information in the ST and the positions of the other two information units were reversed. The same number of BA beginners (BAG) and professionals (ProG) produced titles with this form, although none of the MA students did. A related pattern, produced by members of all three groups, was a non-finite variant of the first, with the verb as a passive participle rather than in the present tense. The difference from the English constituent order is conditioned by German grammatical constraints.

The other two most common patterns are similar to the English ST pattern in that they are complex noun phrases with post-modifying preposition phrases. The order of information in the more frequent pattern (produced by 2 BA and 2 MA students) matches that of the English ST and is reversed in the less-frequently-produced pattern.

**Table 5.** Forms and examples of titles for each group (E-G)

<b>Form of ST title</b>	<b>English ST title</b>			
Whales <sub>1</sub> -at N <sub>2</sub> -in NP <sub>3</sub>	Whales at risk in sonar sea exercises			
<b>Form of German titles</b>	<b>Examples of German titles [English gloss]</b>	<b>BAG</b>	<b>MA</b>	<b>ProG</b>
NP <sub>3</sub> -V <sub>2</sub> -Wale <sub>1</sub>	Sonarübungen im Meer gefährden Wale [Sonar exercises in sea endanger whales]	4	-	4
Wale <sub>1</sub> -durch NP <sub>3</sub> -V <sub>2</sub>	Wale durch Schalltests gefährdet [Whales by sound tests endangered]	2	1	1
Wale <sub>1</sub> -in N <sub>2</sub> -X <sub>3</sub>	Wale in Gefahr aufgrund von Sonartests im Meer [Whales in danger because of sonar tests in sea]	2	2	-
NP <sub>3</sub> -als N <sub>2</sub> -für Wale <sub>1</sub>	Marine Sonartests als Gefahr für Wale [Marine sonar tests as danger for whales]	-	1	1
	(other variants)	1	2	2
	(no title)	-	2	-

*Note.* The unit with information content matching that of the source text has been numbered in subscript for ease of comparison

From the product analysis, it could be claimed that the BA beginners performed very similarly to the professionals and that the MA students were quite different, which contrasts with the pattern observed for the self-concept categories. However, an analysis of the English-German processes provides a more differentiated evaluation of the similarities and differences between these groups. Various measures about whether, when, and how the titles were translated were derived from the data in the screen recordings of the translation processes and from the RVPs. Almost all of the participants translated the title in the first 10 minutes of the process. However, two of the professionals (ProG) did not translate the English title until they had done a first draft of the German TT (i.e. in the revision phase) and two MA students did not translate the title at all. Because of the slight differences in the data collection methodology mentioned in the previous section, not all of the students produced a complete first draft in the time available. Consequently, only the first 10 minutes of the actual translation process was examined in detail.

Table 6 presents the means per group of the process data collected for the analyses of the titles translated from English into German in these initial ten minutes.

**Table 6.** Process data for title translation analyses of whales ST (E-G): means per group

<b>Process measure</b>	<b>BAG</b>	<b>MA</b>	<b>ProG</b>
Time in process of 1st version of title (hh:mm:ss)	00:03:10	00:01:32	00:01:20
Consulted dictionary for title translation	89%	25%	50%
Consulted other resources for title translation	11%	38%	75%
Number of revisions to title during first 10 min.	3.8	4.0	4.8
Percentage of translators commented title in RVP	56%	50%	100%

The first measure for the title analysis was the time between the translator hitting the space bar to access the source text and starting to type the first version of the title. The BA beginners (BAG) produced their first version of the title significantly later in the process than either of the more experienced groups ( $p=0.05$ ; one-tailed t-tests for groups with unequal variance). Far more of the BA beginners than MA students or professionals consulted dictionaries for the title (89%), and far fewer of them consulted other resources such as on-line encyclopedias or parallel texts for the title (11%). The majority of the professional group (ProG) did refer to the latter types of resources.

The number of revisions to the title seems to be inversely related to the level of experience, with the professionals making almost five revisions in the first ten minutes and the other two groups about four. Since most of the professionals had a distinct revision phase after the drafting phase, the number of revisions they made to the title was also calculated over the entire process ( $av=6.9$ ). Some of the professionals revised the title a number of times during the drafting phase and others primarily in the revision phase. The five professionals who made two or more revisions to the title before they finished their first draft of the target text made a total of 8.8 revisions to the title by the end of the process. By contrast, the three professionals who left work on the title until the revision phase (i.e. those who made only one or no revisions to the title during the drafting phase) made only an average of 3.3 revisions to the title overall. Saving a complicated title until after the drafting phase seemed to be an efficient strategy for those professionals.

In the retrospective verbal protocols (RVP), all of the BA beginners mentioned the title (e.g. "and then I just started to translate ... right with the title"), but only 56% of them commented on it in detail (e.g. "I thought about how I should formulate the title in German so that it sounds good"; see Appendix D for the comments). Only half of the MA students commented on the title (one of whom realized, when watching the process, that she had forgotten to translate it, and two of whom said that they did not know why they had translated it at the beginning because they normally wait until the end). This contrasted with the professionals translating into German (ProG), who all commented in some detail on the title and their approach to translating it.

Moving on to the translations from German to English, we see that the three-word German ST title seemed to present fewer difficulties, despite the fact that the BA

beginners and MA students were translating into their L2. As Table 7 demonstrates, the nine different variants (out of 23 translated titles; see Appendix C) can be summarized in four general patterns that at least two translators produced (i.e. the pattern “Ven-Ns” in Table 7 includes both Beached whales and Stranded whales).

**Table 7.** Forms and examples of titles for each group (G-E)

<b>Form of ST title</b>	<b>German ST title [English gloss]</b>				
Vungen <sub>1</sub> -von Ns <sub>2</sub>	Strandungen von Walen [Strandings of whales]				
<b>Form of English titles</b>	Examples of English TT titles	<b>BAE*</b>	<b>MA*</b>	<b>ProE</b>	
Ven <sub>1</sub> -Ns <sub>2</sub>	Beached whales	4	-	4	
Ving <sub>1</sub> -of-Ns <sub>2</sub>	Beaching of whales	3	2	1	
N <sub>2</sub> -Vings <sub>1</sub>	Whale beachings	1	1	2	
N <sub>2</sub> -Ving <sub>1</sub>	Whale stranding	-	3	-	
	(other variants)	1	2	-	

\* *translation into L2*

**Note.** the unit with information content matching that of the source text has been numbered in subscript for ease of comparison

The most common pattern was to keep the order of the information units but shift the focus slightly by changing the post-modified noun phrase into a pre-modified noun phrase. The second most common pattern was a closer match to the German ST, with the same order of information and syntactic structure. The third most common variant matched the plural noun form in the ST but reversed the order of information, and the final common variant (produced by three of the MA students but none of the other translators) was the same form in the singular.

Parallel to product results for the titles translated into German, one interesting and potentially surprising outcome of this product-based analysis is that the BA beginners' and professionals' patterns were more similar overall to each other than to the MA students' pattern. On the basis of the products alone, it is hard to find a convincing explanation for this apparent anomaly. As in the case of English-German translations, therefore, the process data was also analyzed and the means calculated for each group in the first ten minutes of the translation. The results are shown in Table 8.

**Table 8.** Process data for title translation analyses of Wale ST (G-E): means per group

<b>Process measure</b>	<b>BAE*</b>	<b>MA*</b>	<b>ProE</b>
Time in process of 1st version of title (hh:mm:ss)	00:02:30	00:02:07	00:01:37
Consulted dictionary for title translation	78%	75%	29%
Consulted other resources for title translation	22%	63%	29%
Number of revisions to title during first 10 min.	2.2	1.0	2.1
Percentage of translators commented title in RVP	78%	38%	43%

\* *translation into L2*

Although the professionals translating into English were somewhat faster than the BA beginners and MA students in producing the first version of the title, the differences were not significant. Whereas only one-third of the professionals consulted dictionaries, most of the BA beginners (BAE) and MA students did so, one probable factor being that both groups were translating into their L2. However, 63% of the MA group also consulted other resources, which may indicate a greater awareness of the need to address target-culture conventions than among the BA beginners, especially when translating into the L2. By the same token, consultation of other resources appears to have been less necessary for the professionals translating into their L1, perhaps because of their greater familiarity with title conventions and forms in the target language and culture.

The results shown in Table 8 contrast to a certain degree with those for the translation process data into German (Table 6). There is a clear difference in the search behavior of the two groups of professionals (i.e. 75% of ProG consulted other resources compared with only 29% of ProE), which may be due to the higher semantic and syntactic complexity of the English ST title compared with the German source text title (i.e. *Whales at risk in sonar sea exercises* vs. *Strandungen von Walen*). This might also explain why two of the MA students and two of the professionals did not translate the title in the drafting phase of the translation process.

However, it cannot explain why few of the MA students performed any kind of research for the English title whereas most of them did research for the relatively simple German ST title. In this case, a likely reason again seems to be this group's increased problem awareness and caution when translating into their L2. The consultations for the German ST title do indeed appear to have helped more MA students find solutions that they were confident about, since they made fewer revisions to their titles in the first 10 minutes of the process than the BA beginners and professionals did.

Across groups, there were significantly more revisions to the German title in the first 10 minutes than to the English title (4.2 and 1.8, respectively;  $p < 0.05$ ; two-tailed t-test for groups with unequal variance). Dealing with the title seems to have slowed down the translation process somewhat for the German professionals, since they produced much

less TT in the first 10 minutes than the English professionals did (59.0 and 85.9 words, respectively). Both groups of professionals were significantly faster in producing TT in the first 10 minutes than the less experienced groups in the respective version were ( $p < 0.05$ ; one-tailed t-test for groups with unequal variance). The BA beginners (37.9 and 43.8 words produced in the first 10 minutes for translation into German and English, respectively) and the MA students (43.6 and 36.0 words for German and English, respectively) did not differ much in their speed between the two versions: perhaps the complex English source text title slowed them down at the beginning of the L1 process as much as the (presumed) extra effort of translation into their L2 did.

The RVPs support the assumption that the English source text title presented more of a translation challenge than the German one: a higher overall proportion of the groups commented on the title (E-G 68% vs. G-E 54%; see Appendix D). The difference was especially apparent in the professional groups (ProG 100% vs. ProE 43%), perhaps reflecting the degree of cognitive effort that was required to find solutions. There was a trace of this pattern among the MA students (E-G 50% vs. G-E 38%), but actually the reverse in the two groups of BA beginners (BAG 56% vs. BAE 78%). Several of the BAE group's comments on the title reflected their uncertainty about finding the correct equivalent for one of the words. This is consistent with the strong focus by the beginners on the micro level when translating into their L2 (see Table 4).

On the basis of the product- and process-oriented data presented above, interesting differences appear to exist between the groups of translators in terms of problem awareness and (strategic) problem-solving patterns. In the following, these results are related to the findings for translator self-concept, with brief implications drawn for how the insights gained may contribute to a better understanding of the way translation competence develops.

## 6. General discussion

From a purely product-oriented perspective, the practice of translating titles observed among the BA beginners, MA students, and professional translators does not necessarily seem to be a function of experience – which is all the more surprising given that, as already noted, the title translation event is seen to possess the quintessential features characterizing the translation of any text type (cf. Nord 1991, 1993). Almost equal numbers and very similar proportions of BA beginners and professionals produced titles in German that bore close formal resemblance to one another and that conformed to the target-language norms of German ( $NP_3-V_2$ -Wale<sub>1</sub>, Wale<sub>1</sub>-durch  $NP_3-V_2$ ) identified by Nord in her corpus analysis (1993: 59-60). It would appear that the BA beginners and professionals share what Nord (1993: 62) calls “title experience”. Yet, this is a less-than-convincing explanation in the light of the professionals' manifestly greater experience and, above all, the results from the MA students. The latter can be expected to possess more experience than their junior colleagues, but their translation products matched target language norms to a lesser degree.



The process data can help us to interpret the apparent anomaly. Perhaps because of the challenge presented by the English ST title, all of the professionals doing that version commented on their title translations in some detail, suggesting a homogenous awareness of the problems the ST title entailed. The range of variants for this title produced by the MA group and professionals, its omission by two of the MA group, and its translation by two of the professionals after the first draft of the target text was completed all argue for the interpretation that the translation into German of the complex English ST title may have represented a non-routine task that demanded a high degree of reflection. However, only about half of the BA beginners and half of the MA students made any really detailed comments on the English ST title. There is a distinct possibility, therefore, that both the BA and the MA students adopted a less reflective approach than the professionals. Indeed, in relying heavily on linguistic resources to solve the challenges of the title, which suggests an attempt to compensate for deficits in bilingual competence, the BA beginners seem less aware of pragmatic issues and functional aspects of the translation event than their products might at first indicate – and less secure about their solutions.

The interpretation that the BA beginners seem to reveal a preoccupation with micro-level aspects of translation and thus lack the pragmatic, functional awareness of the more experienced groups may be supported by the process data on self-concept and on the translations of the German ST title. A close look at the self-concept data suggests that, as translators gain experience, their focus of attention probably moves from the micro level of words and phrases through to the message of the source text (including the intention of its author) and to the TT readership. This broadening of focus in the professionals' commentaries may be related to their awareness of multiple responsibilities and loyalties in the translation event of which they are part. It could also be a consequence of cognitive resources being available for higher-level tasks and reflection, because lower-level tasks have become routine. The relatively straightforward transfer of the German source text title into English might be an example of this type of routine, which Göpferich (2009: 19) terms "translation activation competence". Although most of the BA beginners translating into English made comments about the title, fewer of the MA students or professionals did, perhaps because their translation processes, including their research behavior, have become more routinized.

Translation competence thus appears to be intimately connected with the translator self-concept described and defined in the second section of this paper. A competent translator is able to adapt to the requirements of the task at hand, spreading cognitive resources along a continuum ranging from the components of texts to authors, clients, and readers – as the event and the situation demand. It therefore follows that those who train translators should aim to broaden students' self-concepts by deflecting attention from micro-level interests in words, phrases, and sentences alone and encouraging a sustained and sustainable pragmatic awareness of translators' roles and responsibilities beyond the surface features of the text.

The present study has focused on the use of process research methods to investigate translators' self-concepts and practices. Such techniques are well known in writing research and have been used in coaching sessions to raise awareness in writers (cf. Perrin 2006b). They have also shown potential for developing the self-awareness of students, as discussed by Massey and Ehrensberger-Dow (2011) and Dam-Jensen and Heine (2009). Their use in the classroom may well provide a fruitful means of fostering translators' self-concepts and, consequently, of promoting translation competence.

### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all of the project participants for their valuable time and contributions to our corpus as well as to gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Swiss National Science Foundation for this project (Grant 13DFD3\_124653/1; see [www.linguistik.zhaw.ch/ctp](http://www.linguistik.zhaw.ch/ctp) for further information).

### References

- Alves, F. (2005). Bridging the gap between declarative and procedural knowledge in the training of translators: meta-reflection under scrutiny. *Meta*, 50(4). Retrieved from <http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2005/v50/n4/019861ar.pdf> doi: 10.7202/019861ar
- Asadi, P., & Séguinot, C. (2005). Shortcuts, strategies and general patterns in a process study of nine professionals. *Meta*, 50(2), 522-547. doi: 10.7202/010998ar
- Bazerman, C. (Ed.). (2007). *Handbook of research on writing. History, society, school, individual, text*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Camps, J. (2003). Concurrent and retrospective verbal reports as tools to better understand the role of attention in second language tasks. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13/2, 201-221. doi: 10.1111/1473-4192.00044
- Dam-Jensen, H., & Heine, C. (2009). Process research methods and their application in the didactics of text production and translation. Shedding light on the use of research methods in the university classroom. *trans-kom Journal of Translation and Technical Communication Research*, 2(1), 1-25.
- Degenhardt, M. (2006). CAMTASIA and CATMOVIE: Two digital tools for observing, documenting and analysing writing processes of university students. In L. Van Waes, M. Leijten & D. Neuwirth (Eds.), *Writing and Digital Media*, (pp. 180-186). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Doyle, M. S. (1989). Contemporary Spanish and Spanish American fiction in English: tropes of fidelity in the translation of titles. *Translation Review*, 30, 41-46. doi: 10.1080/07374836.1989.10523464
- Dragsted, B. (2010). Coordination of reading and writing processes in translation: An eye on uncharted territory. In G. M. Shreve & E. Angelone (Eds.), *Translation and Cognition*, (pp. 41-61) Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/ata.xv.04dra
- Ehrensberger-Dow, M., & Künzli A. (2010). Methods of accessing metalinguistic awareness: a question of quality? In S. Göpferich, F. Alves & I. M. Mees (Eds.), *New Approaches in Translation Process Research* (Copenhagen Studies in Language 39) (pp. 113-132). Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.
- Ehrensberger-Dow, M., & Perrin, D. (2013). Applying newswriting process research to translation. *Target*, 25(1), 79-94. doi: 10.1075/target.25.1.07ehr
- Gnach, A., Wiesner, E., Bertschi-Kaufmann, A., & Perrin, D. (2007). Children's writing processes when using computers. Insights based on combining analyses of product and process.

- Research in Comparative and International Education*, 2(1), 13-28. doi: 10.2304/rcie.2007.2.1.13
- Göpferich, S. (2008). *Translationsprozessforschung. Stand - Methoden - Perspektiven*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Göpferich, S. (2009). Towards a model of translation competence and its acquisition: the longitudinal study *TransComp*. In S. Göpferich, A. L. Jakobsen & I. M. Mees (Eds.), *Behind the Mind: Methods, Models and Results in Translation Process Research* (Copenhagen Studies in Language 37) (pp. 12-37). Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.
- Göpferich, S., Bayer-Hohenwarter, G., Prassl, F., & Stadlober J. (2011). Exploring translation competence acquisition: Criteria of analysis put to the test. In S. O'Brien (Ed.), *Cognitive explorations of translation* (Continuum studies in translation) (pp. 57-85). London: Continuum.
- Gross, A. (2003). Teaching translation as a form of writing. Improving translator self-concept. In B. Baer & G. Koby (Eds.), *Beyond the Ivory Tower. Rethinking translation pedagogy* (pp. 83-93). Amsterdam: Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/ata.xii.06gro
- Hansen, G. (2006). Retrospection methods in translator training and translation research. *Journal of Specialised Translation*, 5, 2-41.
- Jääskeläinen, R. (1999). *Tapping the Process: An Explorative Study of the Cognitive and Affective Factors Involved in Translating* (Publications in the Humanities 22). Joensuu: University of Joensuu.
- Jääskeläinen, R. (2011). Back to basics: Designing a study to determine the validity and the reliability of verbal report data on translation processes. In S. O'Brien (Ed.), *Cognitive explorations of translation* (pp. 15-29). London: Continuum.
- Jakobsen, A. L. (2003). Effects of think aloud on translation speed, revision, and segmentation. In: F. Alves (Ed.), *Triangulating Translation* (pp. 69-95). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/btl.45.08jak
- Jakobsen, A. L. (2006). Research methods in translation – Translog. In K. P. H. Sullivan & E. Lindgren (Eds.), *Computer Key-Stroke Logging and Writing: Methods and Applications* (pp. 95-105). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Johnsen, Å. (2011). Revision in translation. Unpublished paper presented at the conference *Text-Process-Text: Questions in Process-Oriented Research on Translation and Interpreting*, November 17-19, Stockholm University.
- Katan, D. (2009). Translation theory and professional practice: a global survey of the great divide. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 42, 111-153.
- Kiraly, D. (1995). *Pathways to Translation: Pedagogy and Process*. Kent: Kent State University Press.
- Kiraly, D. (1997). Think-aloud protocols and the construction of a professional translator's self-concept. In J. H. Danks, G. M. Shreve, S. B. Fountain & M. K. McBeath (Eds.), *Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting* (Applied Psychology: Individual, Social and Community Issues, vol. 3.) (pp. 137-160). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Koskinen, K. (2008). *Translating Institutions. An Ethnographic Study of EU Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kujamäki, P. (2010). Auf der Suche nach treffenden Worten. Bildschirmvideos als Mittel zur Analyse von studentischen Übersetzungsleistungen [Searching for the right words. Using screen videos to analysis student translation performance]. In L. Kolehmainen, H. Lenk & A. Liimatainen (Eds.), *Infinite Kontrastive Hypothesen. Beiträge des Festsymposiums zum 60. Geburtstag von Irma Hyvärinen* (pp. 141-164). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Massey, G., & Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2010). Investigating demands on language professionals. *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée*, 2010(1), 127-141.
- Massey, G., & Ehrensberger-Dow, M. (2011). Commenting on translation: implications for translator training. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 16, 26-41.
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

- Nord, C. (1991). Der Buchtitel in der interkulturellen Kommunikation: Ein Paradigma funktionaler Translation [The book title in intercultural communication: A paradigm of functional translation]. In S. Tirkonnen-Condit (Ed.), *Empirical Research in Translation and Intercultural Studies. Selected Papers of the TRANSIF Seminar, Savonlinna 1988* (pp. 121-130). Tübingen: Narr.
- Nord, C. (1993). Einführung in das funktionale Übersetzen. Am Beispiel von Titeln und Überschriften [Introduction to functional translation: The case of titles and headings]. Tübingen: Francke (UTB).
- Nord, C. (2004a). Die Übersetzung von Titeln, Kapiteln und Überschriften in literarischen Texten [The translation of titles, chapters and headings in literary texts]. In H. Kittel et al. (Eds.), *Übersetzung – Translation – Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung* (pp. 908-914). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Nord, C. (2004b). Die Übersetzung von Titeln und Überschriften aus sprachwissenschaftlicher Sicht [The translation of titles and headings from a linguistic perspective]. In H. Kittel et al. (Eds.), *Übersetzung – Translation – Traduction. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung* (pp. 573-579). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Nord, C. (2008). Ungetreuer oder kluger Verwalter? Überlegungen zu Form, Funktion und Übersetzung von Perikopentiteln [Unfaithful or clever custodian? Considerations of the form, function and translation of pericope titles]. In L. Schippel (Ed.), *Translationskultur – ein innovatives und produktives Konzept* (pp. 211-236). Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- PACTE (2003). Building a translation competence model. In F. Alves (Ed.), *Triangulating Translation: Perspectives in Process-Oriented Research* (pp. 43-66). Amsterdam: Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/btl.45
- PACTE (2005). Investigating translation competence: conceptual and methodological issues. *Meta*, 50(2), 609-619. doi: 10.7202/011004ar
- PACTE (2011). Results of the validation of the PACTE translation competence model. *Translation problems and translation competence*. In C. Alvstad, A. Hild & E. Tiselius (Eds.), *Methods and Strategies of Process Research* (pp. 317-343). Amsterdam: Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/btl.94
- Perrin, D. (2001). *Wie Journalisten schreiben. Ergebnisse angewandter Schreibprozessforschung*. Konstanz: UVK.
- Perrin, D. (2002). Investigating writing strategies in the workplace. In C. M. Levy & T. Olive (Eds.), *Contemporary tools and techniques for studying writing* (pp. 105-117). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. doi: 10.1007/978-94-010-0468-8\_6
- Perrin, D. (2003). Progression analysis (PA): Investigating writing strategies at the workplace. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(6), 907-921. doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00125-X
- Perrin, D. (2006a). Progression analysis: An ethnographic, computer-based multi-method approach to investigate natural writing processes. In L. Van Waes, M. Leijten & C. M. Neuwirth (Eds.), *Writing and digital media* (pp. 173-181). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Perrin, D. (2006b). Schreibforschung im Kursalltag. Was die Progressionsanalyse praktisch nützt [Writing research in training. The practical uses of Progression Analysis]. In O. Kruse, K. Berger & M. Ulmi (Eds.), *Prozessorientierte Schreibdidaktik [Process-Oriented Writing Didactics]* (pp. 279-294). Bern: Haupt.
- Risku, H. (2009). *Translationsmanagement. Interkulturelle Fachkommunikation im Informationszeitalter* [Translation management. Intercultural technical communication in the information age]. Tübingen: Narr.
- TEI (2008). *TEI P5: Guidelines for Electronic Text Encoding and Interchange*. Retrieved from <http://www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/html/>
- Tirkonnen-Condit, S. & Laukkanen, J. (1996). Evaluations – a key towards understanding the affective dimension of translational decision. *Meta*, 41, 45-59. doi: 10.7202/002360ar
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Van Waes, L. & Leijten, M. (2006). Logging writing processes with Inputlog. In L. Van Waes, M. Leijten & C. Neuwirth (Eds.), *Writing and Digital Media* (pp. 158-165). Oxford: Elsevier.

Viezzi, M. (2011). The translation of book titles: theoretical and practical aspects. In P. Kujamäki, L. Kolehmainen, E. Penttilä & H. Kemppanen (Eds.), *Beyond Borders – Translations Moving Languages, Literatures and Cultures* (pp. 183-195). Berlin: Frank & Timme.

## Notes

1. The keystroke logging data have been particularly useful for pause analyses but will not be considered further here.
2. The MA students also did a peer commentary in the middle of the semester, which is reported elsewhere (Massey & Ehrensberger 2011).
3. A Tobii T60 monitor and Tobii Studio software were used (<http://www.tobii.com>). The eye-tracking data will not be considered in the analysis here.
4. According to Viezzi (2011), these ten functions consist of three essential functions (naming, phatic, informative) and seven optional functions (distinctive, descriptive, expressive, suggestive, seductive, intertextual and poetic).

## Appendix A: Source texts for the translation task

### English source text (95 words)

#### *Whales at risk in sonar sea exercises*

Recently, a US judge banned the American Navy from testing a similar system to that which the MoD is keen to introduce. The judge concluded that the booming sounds could damage marine life, yet his comments have done little to deter Britain from entering the low-frequency race in which powerful speakers on a metal post are lowered into the sea. An intense burst of noise designed to detect enemy vessels floods the ocean, causing panic among whales, which use similar sonic booms to find food and mating partners. (The Observer)

### German source text (96 words)

#### *Strandungen von Walen*

Ein Hang zum Selbstmord dürfte dem Phänomen nicht zugrunde liegen. Vielmehr sind es wohl meist mehrere und oft von Fall zu Fall verschiedene Faktoren, die Strandungen lebender Wale verursachen oder begünstigen. Die am besten untersuchten Strandungen sind die von Schnabelwalen, für die ein Zusammenhang mit dem Einsatz bestimmter Sonartypen vermutet wird. Nach solchen Sonareinsätzen beobachtete man mehrfach ein für die Gattung ungewöhnliches Strandungsmuster: Viele Schnabelwale strandeten innert weniger Stunden, über viele Kilometer Küstenlinie verstreut. Bei manchen von ihnen stellten die Forscher Verletzungen der Hörorgane fest, die auf einen Verlust der Navigationsfähigkeit schliessen lassen. (Neue Zürcher Zeitung)

## Appendix B: XML tags for screen events

```

<incident type="autocorrects"></incident>
<incident type="changes language setting"/>
<incident type="changes view"/>
<incident type="consults" subtype="" src="" item="" start="00:00:00" end="00:00:00"/>
<incident type="copies"></incident>
<incident type="cuts" after="XXX" before="YYY"></incident>
<incident type="deletes" after="XXX" before="YYY"></incident>
<incident type="formats"/>
<incident type="inserts" after="XXX" before="YYY"></incident>
<incident type="moves from" after="XXX" before="YYY"></incident>
<incident type="moves to" after="XXX" before="YYY"></incident>
<incident type="pastes" after="XXX" before="YYY"></incident>
<incident type="pause" start="00:00:00" end="00:00:00"/>
<incident type="selects" after="XXX" before="YYY"></incident>
<incident type="sic"></incident>
<incident type="undoes"></incident>
<incident type="writes"></incident>

```

## Appendix C: Target text titles

Code	Final version of title in TT (E-G) (ST: <i>Whales at risk in sonar sea exercises</i> )
BegG1	Sonartest auf hoher See gefährdet Wale
BegG2	Wasserradar-Übungen gefährden Wale [sic]
BegG3	Echolotübungen gefährden Wale
BegG4	Schallwellentests im Meer gefährden Wale
BegG5	Wale durch Übungen mit Unterwasserortungsgeräten gefährdet
BegG6	Wale durch Sonar Anwendung in Meer gefährdet
BegG7	Wale sind bei der Durchführung von Übungen mit Echolot gefährdet
BegG8	Wale in Gefahr während Schallmessungen
BegG9	Wale in Gefahr bei Unterwasser-Sonarexperimenten
MA1	(no title)
MA2	Wale gefährdet durch Versuche mit Sonargeräten
MA3	Wale in Gefahr ...
MA4	titel
MA5	Wale durch sonare Meeresübungen bedroht
MA6	Sonar als Gefahrenquelle für Wale
MA7	Wale in Gefahr aufgrund von Sonartests im Meer
MA8	Risiko für Wale durch Unterwasser-Sonarsystemtests

---

ProG1	Militärische Sonar gefährden Wale
ProG2	Tests mit Sonarsystemen im Meer : Gefahr für Wale
ProG3	Sonarübungen gefährden Wale
ProG4	Wale durch Schalltests gefährdet
ProG5	Marine Sonartests als Gefahr für Wale
ProG6	Sonar Marineübungen gefährden Wale
ProG7	Sonarübungen im Meer gefährden Wale
ProG8	Sonar-Tests schädlich für Wale

---

<b>Code</b>	<b>Final version of title in TT (G-E) (ST: <i>Strandungen von Walen</i>)</b>
-------------	--

---

BegE1	Beaching of whales
BegE2	Stranding of whales
BegE3	Beached Whales
BegE4	Whale Beachings [sic]
BegE5	Running aground of Wales
BegE6	Beaching of whales
BegE7	Stranded wales
BegE8	Beached Whales
BegE9	Stranded whales

---

MA1	Beaching of whales
MA2	Whale stranding
MA3	Stranding whales
MA4	Whale strandings? Beached [sic]
MA5	Stranding of whales
MA6	Whale Stranding
MA7	Whales running aground
MA8	Whale stranding

---

ProE1	Beached whales
ProE2	Stranded whales
ProE3	Beached whales
ProE4	Whale beachings [sic]
ProE5	Beached whales
ProE6	Whale beachings [sic]
ProE7	Beaching of whales

**Appendix D. Comments about titles in RVPs**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Verbalizations about title (E-G)</b>	<b>Category</b>
BAG1	und dann habe ich eigentlich mal angefangen mit übersetzen, gerade beim titel einmal	mention
BAG2	und dann habe ich mal irgendwie probiert, den titel mal zu übersetzen.	mention
BAG3	dann habe ich angefangen den titel zu übersetzen.	mention
BAG4	vor allem überlege ich auch noch am titel rum, wie ich das auf deutsch gut formulieren soll, dass es so tönt..	comment
BAG5	da habe ich einmal angefangen, den titel zu übersetzen. den ich eben zuerst falsch verstanden habe [...] nach dem titel geht es dann in der regel etwas schneller.	comment
BAG6	und dann fange ich an den titel zu übersetzen. [...] und nachdem ich den titel auf deutsch geschrieben habe, lese ich den nächsten satz auf englisch	mention
BAG7	und ich habe mir in dieser zeit schon ein wenig gedanken gemacht, trotz allem, wie ich das etwa übersetzen möchte. den titel oder so [...] und fange jetzt einmal an, mit dem titel. ich war mir dann nicht so sicher. ich hab ihn einfach mal ziemlich wortwörtlich übernommen [...] ich habe mir noch keine gedanken darüber gemacht, ob das ein guter zeitungstitel dann wäre.	comment
BAG8	und jetzt übersetze ich mal den titel, einfach was mir in den sinn kommt	comment
BAG9	es ist einfach... schon beim titel habe ich dann eigentlich schon ein bisschen mühe gehabt. ja, wegen diesen sonar sea exercises. ich hab eigentlich schon gewusst, was das heisst aber, keine ahnung, wie man das auf deutsch sagt. darum hab ichs dann, glaube ich, einfach ausgelassen [...] da hab ich wirklich einfach den titel, wirklich nicht gewusst. [...] da hab ich jetzt einfach noch schnell schnell nachgeschaut. einfach um zu schauen, ob es noch eine andere bedeutung hat. wegen dem titel. ja, ich bin nicht so glücklich gewesen mit diesen lösungen [...] dann hab ich einfach schnell meinen titel fertig machen können. ja, ich weiss nicht, warum hab ich dann da noch... exercises als experiment übersetze, das ist vielleicht auch nicht so glücklich. weil sie tun ja... sie wissen ja wahrscheinlich wie es funktioniert, sie müssen es ja nicht ausprobieren, sie müssen es einfach üben. es sind eigentlich eher übungen als experimente, aber tja. gut.	comment
MA1	jetzt habe ich gerade gemerkt dass ich den titel vergessen habe. titel habe ich gar nicht übersetzt. [...] dann habe ich einmal angefangen mit übersetzen aber, eben mit dem fliesstext und habe gedacht ich mache den titel nacher, was ich nacher nicht mehr gemacht habe [...] und jetzt hätte ich noch ganz kurz den titel machen können, was ich aber, irgendwie vergessen habe.	comment



<b>Code</b>	<b>Verbalizations about title (E-G)</b>	<b>Category</b>
MA2	und dann war ich wahrscheinlich nervös, weil ich normalerweise nicht zuerst mit dem titel anfangen. wir haben von mehreren dozenten gelernt, dass man dn titel besser am schluss setzt [...] also, da habe ich den titel mal sein lassen und angefangen mit dem eigentlichen text [...] also, eben, ich habe zuerst mit dem titel angefangen, das würde ich nicht machen.	comment
MA3	da habe ich mal den titel angefangen. meist, ja nein, ich weiss nicht, manchmal mache ich den am schluss, weil man dann schon weiss, worüber das thema handelt, und dann kann man am besten den titel einschätzen und wissen, wie man den übersetzen kann. und jetzt habe ich einfach mal den ersten, ja drei wörter geschrieben vom titel, aber ich habe hier gedacht, den titel würde ich dann am schluss nochmals machen. [...] dann habe ich bei dem titel einfach noch markiert, dass ich den noch muss, oder später nochmals machen müsste.	comment
MA4	(no comments about the title)	-
MA5	dann habe ich versucht zuerst einmal herauszufinden, was der titel heisst, was jetzt im nachhinein wahrscheinlich eher nicht so sinnvoll war, weil ich nicht wusste wirklich, worauf er sich bezieht. wahrscheinlich hätte ich ihn eher am schluss machen müssen [...] zu dem, eben das sonar sea exercises ist in irgendein, ein ausdruck, den ich überhaupt nicht einordnen konnte oder keine ahnung hatte, was das auf, was das sein könnte auf deutsch, und habe es dann sonst einmal einfach wörtlich übersetzt. und dann einfach mal stehen gelassen, aber das ist jetzt definitiv keine endgültige version vom titel [...] meeresleben hat es mir auch vorgeschlagen, aber das hat mir eigentlich gar nicht gefallen, weil im titel ist es die rede von den walen, und darum geht es für mich mehr um die lebewesen als um das leben allgemein.	comment
MA6	(no comments about the title)	-
MA7	(no comments about the title)	-
MA8	(no comments about the title)	-
ProG1	den titel hab ich ausgelassen. das mache ich eigentlich immer so. dass ich den dann am schluss, wenn ich den text kenne, noch übersetzen tu [...] dann ist aber eben dann der titel noch gewesen. ich glaube, der ist dann... den habe ich nachher übersetzt. ja, da hab ich mich so ein bisschen gefragt, wie ich das lösen soll im deutschen: geräuschübungen. da hab ich dann mal eine version vom titel gehabt.	comment
ProG2	habe eine über... einen titel, eine überschrift gefunden. diese fett gemacht, so wie im ausgangstext [...] dann habe ich angefangen mit überarbeiten. nachdem ich die erste rohfassung gehabt habe. und da habe ich gemerkt, dass diese sonar sea exercises, die ich mit radarübungen übersetzt habe, dass das jetzt nicht mehr stimmt, weil ich weiter unten eben... weil ich mich eben mal entschieden gehabt habe, innerhalb des textes	comment

Code	Verbalizations about title (E-G)	Category
	sonarsysteme zu gebrauchen für sonar... im zusammenhang mit sonar exercises. und darum habe ich das korrigiert in tests mit sonarsystemen.	
ProG3	und dann hat es schon angefangen mit ersten schwierigkeiten. sonar-sachen sind nicht wirklich mein spezialgebiet und da musste ich schauen, ob es diese ausdrücke gibt, wo ich es jetzt... von denen ich dachte, wie es heissen könnte, ob es das wirklich gibt auf dem internet. und dann wollte ich zuerst einmal auf dem leo nachsehen, ob es dort vielleicht gerade eine übersetzung gibt von s, sonar exercise [...] da bin ich jetzt eben am wörter suchen, die es wohl gibt. und da sieht man, dass es sogar im zusammenhang mit walen hat es sogar mit sonarübungen etwas gehabt. und habe gewusst, okay, dieses wort will ich. dann war noch die frage, wie ich das, den titel machen soll, weil gefährdete wale hat irgendwie einfach nicht so, hat nicht so reingepasst. sie werden ja gefährdet durch diese sonarübungen und das hab ich irgendwie in den satz, oder in den titel hineinbringen müssen. da habe ich es noch fett markiert, damit es gleich aussieht wie der ausgangstext.	comment
ProG4	habe mir zuerst überlegt, ob ich den titel gerade übersetzen soll, aber dann habe ich gefunden, dass mache ich dann nachher. ich fange jetzt einmal zuerst mit dem ersten satz an.	comment
ProG5	da habe ich jetzt mal kurz überlesen, um was es überhaupt geht [...] jetzt unschlüssig, was diese sonar sea exercises genau sein sollen und habe dann eigentlich meinen standardtrick angewendet, einfach den Suchbegriff tel quel im google eingeben und deutsche matches anzeigen lassen. und da bin ich dann auch gleich, schon auf der ersten seite, auf ein sehr hilfreiches pdf gestossen, in dem eigentlich ziemlich gut erklärt wurde, um was es da geht. da habe ich jetzt kurz überlegt, wie ich die, die drei wörter sonar sea exercise in, in einen, in ein, in einen vernünftigen deutschen begriff übersetzen kann.	comment
ProG6	das grösste problem war eigentlich die terminologie, dort vor allem im, in der überschrift drin, dort mit sonar und sea exercises. fachidiotisch ist es relativ schwierig, also , umzusetzen nachher auf deutsch. verstanden habe ich es eigentlich schon, aber es ging mehr darum, das nachher irgendwie wiederzugeben, dass es, dass es auch etwas hergibt im deutsch und darum habe ich dann nachher zuerst nach dem, nach einer vernünftigen lösung oder gesucht. [...] und habe dort einfach relativ lange zeit verbracht mit dem titel. einerseits weil es mir keine ruhe liess, dass ich keine vernünftige lösung finde irgendwie, und habe mich dort nachher ein bisschen festgefahren. normalerweise, im tages im tagesgeschäft drin mache ich, gehe ich, gehe ich eigentlich schneller vorwärts, wenn ich irgendwo feststecke. ich habe jetzt wirklich relativ lange daran herumgebrütet, weil	comment

<b>Code</b>	<b>Verbalizations about title (E-G)</b>	<b>Category</b>
	mir, von der formulierungen her einfach nichts gescheites in den sinn gekommen ist [...] selbst nach dem ersten satz, selbst nach dem selbst beim ersten satz hatte ich einfach der, der, der, die überschrift einfach nicht ganz losgelassen, konnte mich einfach nicht losreißen, weil ich einfach keine saubere lösung fand.	
ProG7	ja, mit diesem sonar sea exercise hatte ich zuerst mühe, ja. also diese recherche, die hat, glaube ich, nicht viel gebracht, zuerst habe ich, glaube ich, sonar eingegeben. sonar, ja, sonargeräte, sehr wahrscheinlich waren das spezialgeräte. ich habe lange gebraucht, bis ich angefangen habe, also ich glaube, das ist immer noch wegen diesem sonar sea exercises. [...] ja, sonar sea, eben. ein paar recherchen, nachher habe ich dann, glaube ich, eben nach eigenem empfinden übersetzt, so etwa. [...] also scheinbar hatte ich so lange mit dem titel. das überrascht mich jetzt gerade ein bisschen. also ja, jetzt vielleicht doch noch wegen der satzstruktur und wegen des inhalts auch, ist mir noch nicht ganz. doch, es war ein problem mit dem cursor. ich habe den cursor nicht mehr gefunden. deshalb konnte ich da lange zeit nicht anfangen. aber jetzt geht es dann, glaube ich, los. jaja, das war der titel, den wollte ich, glaube ich, noch fett machen, doch das habe ich dann nicht gefunden, das habe ich dann sein lassen.	comment
ProG8	erster blick auf den titel. und was mir gerade als erstes in den sinn gekommen ist, einmal hinschreiben. obwohl der titel normalerweise bei mir dann am schluss nochmals überarbeitet wird [...] und dann, was ich dann auch immer mache, wenn ich so etwas geschrieben habe, und ich habe einen titel, der kommt dann ganz am schluss nochmals dran. versuche dann den titel wirklich auf den inhalt von meiner übersetzung abzustimmen, dass der titel und die übersetzung dann auch eine einheit bildet, dass die der titel den inhalt von der übersetzung aufnimmt. bin dann auf diesen titel gekommen, den ich jetzt habe.	comment
<b>Code</b>	<b>Verbalizations about title (G-E)</b>	<b>Category</b>
	dann habe ich grad schon mal den leo aufgemacht, weil ich das wort vom titel nicht gewusst habe, also was strandung heisst [...] und dann hab ich mal den titel gesetzt. und dort war ich mir auch nicht ganz sicher. ich wollte zuerst noch googeln, ob man das beaching of whales, whale beaching oder... aber ich hab gedacht ich warte noch, mach das	
BAE1	nachher [...] und dann habe ich den titel fett gemacht.	comment
BAE2	(no comments about the title)	-
	und den titel nachgeschaut, was strandung heisst.	
BAE3	habe dann den titel, der mich noch nicht so überzeugt, muss ich sagen,	comment

Code	Verbalizations about title (G-E)	Category
BAE4	weils ein zeitungsartikel ist. ja, aber ich habe ihn mal so gelassen zuerst hab ich gerade den titel einmal eingegeben, bevor ich den text überhaupt richtig gelesen habe. hab ich gedacht, ich übersetze mal den titel. was an und für sich nicht so eine top idee ist, weil es geht ja darum, zu sehen, was für eine strandung ist gemeint, um was geht es eigentlich? aber man kann ja immer wieder zurück und den titel noch einmal	comment
BAE5	ändern. zuerst mal den ersten satz lesen und den titel probieren zu übersetzen.	comment
BAE6	strandung nachschauen. keine ahnung, was das heisst. es hat schon beim titel angefangen. also die strandung habe ich eigentlich nicht gewusst. [...] und dann hab ich jetzt mal den titel	comment
BAE7	irgendwie eingegeben, wie es mich gedünkt hat, dass es sein könnte. und dann habe ich zuerst mal überlegt, dass ich vom titel den gleichen	comment
BAE8	font und so alles haben muss ich habe jetzt nicht zu viel zeit einfach schon beim titel verlieren wollen, weil ich sonst, ja, wahrscheinlich nicht mehr gross, zu gar nichts mehr... gross zum übersetzen gekommen wäre. darum habe ich mich jetzt mal mit dem zufrieden gegeben, aber ich denke am schluss hätte ich nochmals nochmals weiterrechechert, ob ich es noch hätte besser übersetzen können. und dann bin ich mir nicht sicher gewesen, ob ich es jetzt soll gross schreiben, also das w von whales, weils im titel ist. aber eben, ich habe es einfach jetzt einmal so hingeschrieben und dann, am schluss hätte ich noch einmal darauf zurückkommen wollen [...] und oben, also oben habe ich beim titel, habe ich das partizip dann	mention
BAE9	genommen.	comment
MA1	(no comments about the title)	-
MA2	(no comments about the title)	-
MA3	(no comments about the title)	-
MA4	eigentlich hätte ich als titel schreiben können stranding of whales, ja. aber das war mir dann, glaube ich, nicht in den sinn gekommen. also zuerst mal der titel, bei so einem einfachen titel mache ich ihn gleich, sonst würde ich vielleicht eher am schluss mir überlegen,	comment
MA5	vielleicht doch einen anderen titel zu wählen. und dann lese ich das sehr genau und lande beim titel und versuche, den titel zu übersetzen. [...] und da jetzt das ein begriff ist, von dem ich annehme, dass er im zusammenhang von anderen texten auch schon vorgekommen ist, dann habe ich das bei linguee gewählt. titel	comment
MA6	aufgeschrieben...	comment
MA7	(no comments about the title)	-
MA8	(no comments about the title)	-

<b>Code</b>	<b>Verbalizations about title (G-E)</b>	<b>Category</b>
ProE1	(no comments about the title)	-
ProE2	(no comments about the title)	-
ProE3	and just here, some time out to think, translated the title [...] just to check that we say beached whale	comment
ProE4	(no comments about the title)	-
ProE5	but i decided to leave the title, that's the beached whales, just cause i think that whilst that it's not that, whilst that it's quite colloquial, i thought it'd be maybe better as a head... as a headline looking up the words for the title. [...] changing my mind. and i'm just checking in google to see whether it's a phrase that is used in english.	comment
ProE6	just to check that i got the right english words.	comment
ProE7	(no comments about the title)	-

