Jurnal ini terbit dua kali setahun berisi tulisan ilmiah tentang ilmu bahasa dan sastra, baik yang ditulis dalam bahasa Indonesia maupun dalam bahasa Inggris. Tulisan yang dimuat dapat berupa analisis, kajian pustaka, hasil penelitian, dan resensi buku.

Pengelola Jurnal

Prosodi menerima sumbangan tulisan yang belum pernah diterbitkan dalam media cetak yang lain. Persyaratan bagi penulis tercantum pada sampul dalam belakang. Tulisan yang masuk akan dievaluasi dan disunting. Dalam hal ini, penyunting dapat melakukan perubahan pada tulisan yang dimuat untuk keseragaman format tanpa mengubah isinya.

Prosodi diterbitkan oleh Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Universitas Trunojoyo.

DAFTAR ISI

A Product or Process-Based Approach to Translation Class?
A Glance on Translation Practice

Donald Jupply*

Abstrak: Makalah ini berangkat dari sebuah refleksi mata kuliah praktik penerjemahan dalam dua semester di sebuah program pasca sarjana, tempat penulis mengambil studi lanjut. Di program tersebut, metode lawas pengajaran praktik penerjemahan masih mendominasi. Pengajar membagikan teks sumber dari pelbagai bidang kepada mahasiswa tanpa diawali pemberian penjelasan-penjelasan tentang penugasan penerjemahan, melainkan penuh dengan "jebakan-jebakan". Metode pengajaran demikian dikenal sebagai metode berpendekatan produk yang cenderung membuat mahasiswa tidak berkembang. Karena keterbatasan ini, beberapa pakar penerjemahan seperti Gile and Kussmaul mengklaim bahwa pengajaran praktik penerjemahan dengan pendekatan proses lebih cocok mengingat esensi terjemahan berkualitas sejatinya tidak berada di hasil akhir terjemahan, melainkan pada proses terjadinya produk akhir. Namun demikian, penekanan semata-mata hanya pada proses tanpa melihat produk akhir sebagai manifestasi proses penerjemahan tidak juga memberikan manfaat yang siknifikan bagi mahasiswa. Dalam pada itu, makalah ini menawarkan pendekatan ekletik terhadap pengajaran praktik penerjemahan.

Kata kunci: product-based approach, process-based approach, translation training, translation practice course

Introduction

The title may not be new as some translation scholars (to name a few: Gile 1995, 1993, Kussmaul 1995, Hatim and Mason 1990,2001, Al-Mijrab 2005) have discussed either one or both of the approaches with their own strengths and limitations when practiced in translation research and teaching. As a result, either one of them has its proponents. However, I am not one of either proponents. My answer to the question is that both approaches are best used with some argumentations here and there. Before I proceed further to how I arrive at this integrated approach, it is necessary for me to elaborate the point of the departure of this paper. The paper basically embarks from my own experience for two semesters in a graduate program in translation or perhaps that of others in general during attending translation practice

The Prevailing Translation Practice Class

As I witnessed in the translation practice class that I attended for two semesters in a graduate program in translation, the basic approach to academic training for translators seems, up to these days, to remain unchanged from the time of the School of Scribes in ancient Egypt (Chriss, 2002: 1). The traditional method of teaching translation practice remains

---

* Donald Jupply adalah dosen Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

"ruling the wave." The teacher distributes source texts of varied disciplines to each student without any briefing and notes. When the presentation day comes, the presenter, as scheduled, displays the target text and offers his/her translations to the class in a transparency. The class usually challenges and scrutinizes the translations. They are then discussed in great depth and detail among all the students in the class and the teacher. This happens due to the fact that a source text will result in different target texts by different translators. This coincides with Pym's suggestion that translating should not be understood as a single target text production (2003:489). It is instead a production of several target texts from which a translator should choose the one that functionally best serves the target readers (Schaffner, 1997).

As can be predicted, there will always be a hot debate in the class. This is of course the nature of translation practice class. However, sadly speaking, the debate seems futile since there are no briefing and notes leading to criteria and theoretical framework to evaluate the text. To asses a translated text, we need some criteria. The criteria depend on the purpose and theoretical framework. In other words of House (1997:1), evaluating the quality of a translation presupposes a translation theory. Thus, different views of translation theory lead to different concepts of translation quality, which in turn leads to different ways of assessing it.

Teacher as The Decision-Maker

In dead lock situations, the teacher is as always the master of the class; all the students can do is to turn to the teacher to make the call. He plays his role as the judge who decides whether or not the proposed translation is an accurate, equivalent and good one. As a result, the translation practice class always ends up in searching for "good" translation. A question to answer is then "good for whom? or on what criteria and bases?".

In so doing, the translation practice course does not provide significant benefits for the students. This lack of a systematic pedagogical framework for the last two decades has been criticized by Albir (1999:10). House (1981:7-8) even has depicted the typical translation learning setting in bleak terms, just like the setting I have found in my own translation practice class. To get things worse, source texts to translate by the students are even full of traps. House argues that this procedure is naturally very frustrating for the students (ibid).

Translation Practice Class as A Test-Case for "Theory and Practice Meet"

I claim that translation practice should not have been used only to seek for correct translation. It is instead used to see how deep and far the students have understood, mastered, practiced and made use of the concepts and norms (such as method, strategy, technique and evaluation) of various translation theories given during the translation training. In this matter, Perez (2005:2-6) argues there are seven trends of translation theories that should be introduced to, understood and mastered by translation students. With the comprehensive knowledge of various

translation theories and methods, students are expected to be more tactful in solving all the problems found during a translating assignment (2005: 7-9).

There are academics who believe that theory helps in practical translation work. Reiß (1992) as cited by Perez (2005), for instance, argues that theory is necessary on at least two accounts, namely for the practical tasks of a) revision, and, b), criticism of translation. Some teachers such as Trampus (in Perez 2005) also claim that theory may be used: "While working towards an 'open minded' general coordination of all translation classes in order to facilitate students in developing self-confidence" (Trampus, 2002:38). And, finally, scholars such as Hatim (2001:7) and Venuti (2000:26) argue that theory helps to raise awareness amongst students and encourages them to make conscious decisions, and to explain these decisions to other students participating in the translating process. Venuti (2000:33-34) compares translators to cooks. Cooks may be able to prepare wonderful dishes without any theoretical knowledge. But when they research the origins and usages of (multicultural) foods, cooks stop reproducing learnt knowledge and instead start creating personal menus.

Nevertheless, what happened in my class indicates a tendency that translation practice was used to examine how good a student in practice skill was just by looking at the product, and that translation practice seems always to end up in translation quality assessment or evaluation. This is shown by the fact that the class is always searching for "good" translation, instead of searching for the reasons (Avelling 2002, Gile 1995, Kussmaul 1995) why the students propose and end up at that kind of a translation.

In essence, translation class in this situation is engulfed with a student errors analysis and efforts of searching for a perfect translation. Regardless of the old sayings that we all should learn from our mistakes, talking too much about mistakes made by the students will only deteriorate their self-confidence in making decisions. In addition, Fries and Beeth (1999:1) suggest that translator class should be emphasized on internal observation and experiencing of a process rather than external observation and measurement of a product. This is because they are convinced that the secret of "quality translation" is to be found not so much in the constituents of the end product but in the process by which it is arrived at. In other words, a better process is likely to produce a better product.

The Role of Training and Education in Translation

On its way to be an established and newly emerging science, translation studies has been up to these days marked by dichotomies and debates over its concepts, from the pure theoretical to applied ones such as literal vs free (translation method), and equivalence against adequacy, dichotomy between theory and practice, and different approaches to translation training. The sometimes heated debate on whether "translators are born, not made or made, not born" has also characterized the nature of translation studies.

Some natural and gifted translators believe that they do not need to go to any translation trainings to be a skillful translator. This seems to be the fact in Indonesia since many translation services are run by people with

just a good command of English in addition to their tertiary educational background. Moreover, they believe that good mastery of English has made them eligible to be a freelance translator.

Nevertheless, according to translation studies, bilingualism does not guarantee that s/he will produce a good and functional translation (Nord 1999). It has been repeatedly said by translation scholars that translating is not an easy job. Translation is not merely a language operation, replacing the source language with the target one. Translation is a special act of social communications between two opposing languages and cultures (Hatim and Mason 1997, Shreve 1997). Nord (1999) suggests that a translator should be a mediating agent with a solid text competence since she believes that translating is a text-production activity. Therefore, it seems logical to make prospective translators "fit" for a wide range of text-producing activities. Due to this complexity, the need for translation training is increasing and many faculties in translation have been established.

Translation training or education is needed by those people with varied conditions and motivations. Some need optimization on what they have been doing as natural translators, since they think that they never advance beyond a certain point. Some are expecting to have an established position in the market (Gile 1995:2-9). However, Li (2002) has studied in Chinese University of Hong Kong that contrary to a widely held assumption, the great majority of students taking translation did not and do not intend to be professional translators/interpreters. The same assumingly happens in Indonesia especially in graduate program as I witnessed in my graduate class. Most of my classmates took the degree just to have a better position in their office which is in other activities but not translating. No matter what the motivations are and although translation training is not mandatory, it can perform two important functions. One is to help individuals who wish to be professional translators enhance their performance to the full realization of their potential. The other is to help such individuals develop their translation skills more rapidly than through field experience and self instruction (Gile 1995:3). The question to ask is "how does the faculty achieve the two functions in an attempt to prepare them to compete in the market on their own?

A Product- Or Process- Based Approach to Translation Class?

A. Product-based Approach

A debate on the approach of educating prospective translators has not come to an end yet. Either approach has its proponents, and the former in particular is still practiced thus far despite the latter proponents' disagreement (Gile 1995, 1993 Kussmaul 1995). According to some translation teachers or scholars, the traditional method, or widely known as product-based approach, is still valid for the globalized world in which translation practice has profoundly been influenced by the advance in IT. Recently Al-Mijrab (2005) through his article entitled "A Product-Based Approach to Translation Training" proposes the validity of its practice in translation training. His study seeks to demonstrate that active interaction between learner and teacher rather than passive reception by the teacher — as occurred in traditional teaching models —

is essential. He claims that a product-based analysis of actual training makes it possible to identify a translation problem and subsequently apply theoretical considerations. Depending on the nature of the text being translated, error analysis can be used effectively not only for monitoring student progress but also for appraising general performance.

However, in so doing Al-Mijrab clearly bases his approach largely on error analysis and evaluation criteria, which process-based approach proponents to translation education do not agree with. Many scholars of translation have agreed upon the lack of product-based approach in developing and enhancing the translation students' skill since, during the training, they have been profoundly disempowered. Kussmaul (1995:6) even claims that diagnoses based on error analysis are largely speculative because the teacher can only infer what is going on in his/her students' mind. There are some times that the inference coincides with what happens in the translation process, but there are also cases when the mistakes in the student translations are not mistakes at all after they give their reasoning which shows their different point of view from the one the teacher has. It has been understood by many that translating is largely characterized by interpretation. Hall (1996) states that translating activity means the birth of the "interpreter".

I find that translation practice in particular which bases solely on error analysis and evaluation contradicts with two basic premises in relation to the nature and context of translator training. Firstly, translation practice should have been used to examine to what extent theory and practice meet in "the black box" of the students and what kind of theory and norms of translation the translator students adhere to in arriving at such a translation. In other words, the course is used to search for bases and criteria the students use in transferring the representation in source text into target text, which in turn explores what is going on the "black box" of the students. In the context of translator training particularly for those who are considered to be novice translators, what is chiefly emphasized on is *awareness* that translating means dealing with opposing cultural transaction in a communicative manner. Secondly, education institution is well known for its supporting and encouraging nature. With the above method of teaching, it is justified to say that the students will not be confident in making decisions on their own since their translation is judged on the scale between "good or bad" without asking the reasons why they end up at that kind of translation. We all know that translation is not a matter of good or bad. It is, instead, functionally appropriate or not. In such condition diagnose and therapy, thus, cannot be given.

However, despite its limitation and less effectiveness in translator training, the product-based approach can benefit the students by studying the way how a translation works through translation techniques which emerged in the target text. Molina and Albir (2002:498-9) show that translation techniques are the actual steps taken by the translator in communicating the meaning from source text in target text. In this way, product based approach as typical of product fine tuning can be carried

out in class. This of course should be initially based on theoretical framework and aim of the translation.

Referring to these, I can assume that translation technique is perhaps the basis when Hatim and Mason (1990) say that the process of translating can be sensed based on the product. However, I do not think this is justifiable based on the discussion in the subsequent section.

B. Process-based Approach

This approach has been considered to give more benefits for the translation students (Gile 1993:107-8). During the training, students are considered as the students of translation methods rather than as the producers of finished products. The idea is then to focus in the classroom not on the results, that is, on the process of translation instead of the end product of the translation process. Unlike the product approach which focuses and largely talks about what is right and wrong as commented by other translation students and the teacher as well, the process-based approach instead encourages the students to grasp and understand translation principles, methods, and procedures during translating exercises (Gile 1995:10). When correcting their exercises, the teacher comments on the process involved in spite of the micro unit of translated text, the point which I think should be commented on as well with a particular way. The teacher does so by asking the students why they arrive at that translation, not judging on "right and wrong". The questions, for example, can be like the following: "why this choice?" "if so, what made you choose this solution?" "Did you consider alternatives?" "Are you satisfied with this solution as far as logic/clarity/language is concerned?" (Gile 1993: 108).

With this method of teaching translation, it is expected that students will not be disempowered. Psychologically, they have less stress than they do in the product-based approach. When coming to talk about strategies for solving problems, they are likely to learn how to implement translation strategies faster if such strategies are explained than if they advance by trial and error (see Davies et. al 2001). By concentrating on the reason for errors or good decision made on each translation unit, there will be sharing among the students about strategies of translating. Moreover, it is generally acknowledged that sharing and discussion among those with equal positions will not disempower the interactants. Therefore, students are encouraged to share and improve their translation competence among them. In this atmosphere, teachers are not the agents of transferring knowledge of translation, but the mediator and facilitator.

However, this approach of teaching has limitations as well. Since students are mainly corrected on the process involved, it will not be a powerful tool for fine tuning product. On this matter, Kussmaul (1995) suggests that all processes that have been done are materialized in the translation. There are many times that a translator is aiming at particular end and doing efforts and strategies to achieve the goal, but in the translation s/he fails to do so. Therefore, the product-based approach comes into play in a particular way that keeps students from being disempowered.

Process- and Product-based approaches work hand in hand in translation practice course

A. Students' Expectation of Academic Training for Translators

To start discussion of how both approaches complement each other, I would like to begin by a question: what is really given to translation students, or emphasized during translation class? I believe that all students who wish to take or are taking translation training are expecting to improve their translation competence since it is the aspect that defines them as different from those who are bilinguals claiming themselves as translators. The next question to ask is "which competence is emphasized and improved?" Talking about competence is complicated since Translation Studies, as Orozco and Albir claim, has not yet yielded a generally accepted definition and model of translation competence in written translation. The problems with the definition of this concept start with its denomination (2002:375). There are even various names for translation competence by translation scholars (see Nord, 1991: 161; Toury, 1995: 250-51; Chesterman, 1997: 147; Kiraly, 1995: 108; Wilss 1989: 129; Pym, 1993: 26;).

However, in my opinion, sticking to the combination of "translation and competence" is enough to show that what is meant by translation competence is an expert knowledge of translation. Competence here means the ability of knowing how to translate (Hurtado 1996:48). If this is the case, we are then talking about how to improve the students' ability and capacity to solve any problems that appear during translation assignment in the competing market in the future. The reason for this is, as Kussmaul (1995:9) suggests, that translation is not only a skill but also a problem solving process. With this in mind, what the students are exposed to in translation practice course is then problem-solving strategies that are available at their disposal. A research project conducted by Davies et, al (2001) a University of Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona, Spain shows that specific strategy training creates a learning experience clearly perceived as satisfactory by all the participants, according to the teacher's class diary and the students' course evaluation. In the same vein, Kussmaul (1995:32) has also suggested, by citing Honig (1991, 1993), that macro and micro strategies can be taught as and should be part of a translation curriculum. He also adds that pragmatic and text analysis, the proper use of dictionaries and translation quality assessment are certainly part of the strategies.

B. Translating as Theorizing for Problem Solving

Each time a student is translating a source text, s/he is then theorizing. To explain this, the idea of Chesterman (1993:89-0) who makes use of the idea of Karl Popper to illuminate translation teaching in class is, I think, worth noting. Chestermen (1993:90) suggests that translation in itself as the product of translation process can be seen as a tentative theory. In other words, macro and micro units of a translated text are the proposed or alternative solution to problems emerging in a translating assignment. Therefore, different translators in addition to different contextual productions would likely to come up with different

translations. It is for this reason that there will not be any perfect translation as the theory itself is never final. What the translation students need to know is that translating is not a single production of target text, but various alternative texts from which they should choose the one that best serves the expectation of target readers. With this in their disposal, they are dealing with managing and reducing the risks of the translated texts from inadequacy (Pym 2004). This coincides with Karl Popper's ideas on empirical science as applied by Chestermen to explain translation teaching.

Conclusion

Based on the above discussion, since actual practice of translating is a process of production of varied translations, from which the translator should choose the best that best serves the aim of the translation and the target readers, it is justified to conclude that an eclectic approach of process- and product- based methods of teaching translation is expected to enhance and optimize the translation competence of the translation students. Process--based approach is strong in developing self-confidence and self-awareness in making decision since actual translation activity is usually characterized by problem solving process. They may have to apply various strategies in order to achieve appropriate translation on macro and micro levels. Meanwhile, product-based approach is strong on production fine tuning by analyzing translation techniques materialized to see how the translation works in relation to the aim of translation and the target readers.

References

Al-Mijrab, R. A. 2005. *A Product-Based Approach to Translation Training*. Meta V, Vol 50 No 4.

Aveling, H. 2002. *"Mistakes" in Translation: A Functionalist Approach*. A Paper Prepared for the Third Workshop on "The Art of Translation",London, 19-20 September 2002.

Chriss, R. 2002. *Training Translators*. Article XI on Translation as profession.

Caldaza Perez, M. 2005. *Applying Translation Theory in Teaching New Voices in Translation Studies 1 (2005), 1-11.*

Chesterman, A. 1997. *Memes of Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chesterman, A. 1993. Karl Popper in Translation Class, in DOLLERUP, C. and A. LODDEGAARD (eds.): *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2: Insights, Aims, Visions* Edited by Cay Dolleroup and Annette Lindegaard. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company. P 89-96.

Davies, M. G. et al. 2001. *Training in the Application of Translation Strategies for Undergraduate Scientific Translation Students*. Meta, XLVI, 4, P 737-744

Gile, D. 1995. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Gile, D. 1993. *The Process-oriented Approach in Translator Training in DOLLERUP, C. and A. LODDEGAARD (eds.): Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2: Insights, Aims, Visions* Edited by Cay Dolleroup and Annette Lindegaard. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company. P 108-112.

Fraser, B and H. T. Beeth. 1999. *The Hidden Life of Translators The quest for the roots of quality*: Translation Service, European Commission

Hatim, B. & I. Mason. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*, London & New York: Longman.

Hatim, B. & I. Mason.1997. *The Translator as Communicator*, London & New York: Routledge.

Hatim, B. & I. Mason. 2001. *Teaching and Researching Translation*, Harlow: Longman / Pearson Education Limited.

Hall, K. R. 1996. *Cognition and Translation Didactics*. Meta XLI,I. P.114-117

House, J. 1981. *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr.

House, J. 1997. *Translation Quality Assessment*. A Model Revisited. Tübingen: Narr.

House, J.2001. *Translation Quality Assessment:Linguistic Description versus Social Evaluation*. Meta, XLVI, 2, 2001

Hurtado Albir, A . 1996. 'La traductología: lingüística y traductología', TRANS 1: 151-160.

Hurtado Albir, A . 1999. *Enseñar a traducir*. Madrid: Edelsa.

Kiraly, D.C. 1995. *Pathways to Translation*, The Kent State University Press.

Kussmaul, P. 1995. *Training The Translator*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Li, D. 2002. *Translator Training: What Translation Students Have to Say.* Meta, XLVII, 4, P 514-531

Molina, L and A. Hurtado Albir. 2002. *Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach*. Meta: XLVII, 4,

Nord, C. 1991. *Text Analysis in Translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Nord, C. 1999. *Translating as a Text-Production Activity in INNOVATION IN TRANSLATOR AND INTERPRETER TRAINING*: Symposium Homepage.

Orozco, M. and A. Hurtado Albir. *Measuring Translation Competence Acquisition*. Meta, XLVII, 3, 2002

Pym, A. 1993. *Epistemological problems in translation and its teaching.* Teruel: Caminade.

Pym, A. 2003. *Redefining Translation Competence in an Electronic Age: In Defence of a Minimalist Approach'*, Meta, 48(4): 481-497.

Pym, A. 2004. *Text and Risk in Translation*. http://www.fut.es/~apym/

Reiß, K./Vermeer, H. J.984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translations theorie*. Tübingen:Niemeyer.

Schäffner, C. 1997. *From 'Good' to 'Functionally Appropriate': Assessing Translation Quality*. CURRENT ISSUES IN LANGUAGE & SOCIETY Vol. 4, No 1, 1997.

Snel Trampus, R. D. 2002 *Aspects of a theory of norms and some issues on teaching translation, in Alessandra Riccardi (ed) Translation Studies*. Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline, Cambridge: CUP,38-55.

Shreve, M.G. 1997. "*Cognition and the Evolution of Translation Competence," in J.H. Danks et al. (eds.).* Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Toury,G. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Venuti, L. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*, London, Routledge.

Venuti, L. 2000. '*¿Será útil la teoría de la traducción para los traductores?*', Vasos comunicantes 5(16):26-35.

Venuti, L. 2001. *The Translator Reader*. Manchester: Jerome.

Wilss, W. 1989. *Towards a Multi-facet Concept of Translation Behavior*, Target, 34. pp. 129-149.