International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2021
Homepage: http://ijlts.org/index.php/ijlts/index
DOI: https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlts.v2i1.108

Translation Technology in the Curricula of the Department of Translation at the Faculty of Languages and Translation, Aden University

Adel Abdulkhaliq Abdulkarim Dulul
University of Aden, Yemen
adel.dulul@gmail.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 29/11/2020

Accepted: 24/12/2020

KEYWORDS

Translation Technologies, Curricula, Attitude

Abstract

Translation technology offers a great contribution to the field of translation, bringing strong changes to the way translation is studied and done. This research paper examines the translation technology in the curricula of the Department of Translation at the Faculty of Languages and Translation, the University of Aden. It also aims to identify the extent to which students of the fourth level in the Department rate their abilities in using such translation technologies and to specify their attitudes towards them. To attain these aims, the researcher used a descriptive method. A questionnaire was distributed to the sample of the study, which consisted of 24 participants who were selected randomly. The findings of the study show that the participants rated their abilities in using translation technology such as CAT tools and OCRs, etc. as 'poor'. They confirmed that the curricula of the Department of Translation do not help equip them with the required knowledge and skills to use and deal with such translation technologies and resources. The participants stated that using translation technologies are important due to their numerous advantages. This study concludes with some recommendations, one of them is that it is necessary to add at least one additional course that deals with translation technologies. It also recommends that it is essential to update the curricula of the Department of Translation taking into consideration the students' needs and requirements of the local and regional markets.

1. INTRODUCTION

Translation process is not an easy task. It is made up of many sub-processes and comprises tasks of various types. Different computer tools can be utilized to improve the efficiency, velocity or value of some of these tasks or their results. The need to combine computer processes and tools with those used in translation, together with their continuous development, has given rise to a new discipline known as translation technologies, also it has been called computer-aided translation or computer translation.

The field of translation technology has started to attract the attention of translation scholars in the world in the recent years due to several factors. The first factor is the changing nature of the translation profession, with more complex translation tasks requiring translators with greater technological competence, such as using desktop publishing (DTP) tools and CAT tools to name a few. The second factor is obviously the new demands and practices in the field, such as post-editing MT output and web translation. As these new demands and practices have emerged, translation educators have highlighted the need to investigate their benefits, and the need for these to be integrated into translators training curricula. The third factor is, of course, the changing profile of the learners, usually called “digital natives” (Prensky, 2001). The new generation of learners often considers the use of traditional

methods of teaching such as translation when lecturing is unattractive, unproductive and demotivating. This research paper focuses on translation technology and resources in translators training curricula in the Department of Translation at the Faculty of Languages and Translation, the University of Aden.

Problem Statement

This study focuses on translation technology and resources in curricula of the Department of Translation at the Faculty of Languages and Translation. Translation technology and resources over the past thirty years have benefited from the development of a range of computer-assisted translation tools and other technology. These tools include: translation memory software, machine translation software, electronic dictionaries and online glossaries voice recognition software, OCR and PDF conversion software, spelling and grammar checkers. Pym and Garcia (2010, as cited in Taghizadeh & Azizi, 2017, p. 3).) pointed out that in the near future being an expert in IT skills will be more vital for translators than language mastery. Emphasizing the importance of IT skills, Mikhailov (2015) asserted that in this era, IT skills are an indispensable part of a translator's job; therefore, this will be considered immediately after language proficiency in the order of priority. Moreover, Li (2007) stated that translator curriculum should be designed according to the needs of the market, and changes must be done based on the evaluation of the local and international market demand. The researcher went over the curricula taught in the Department of Translation at the Faculty of Languages and Translation, Aden to gain a general idea of the integration of technology teaching in translators training program. He found that only one course is taught, that is, Computer Assisted Translation, in the four-year translation program at the Faculty of Languages and Translation/ Aden. Moreover, there are two courses of computer at the first level providing basic knowledge about Word Office program. Consequently, it is necessary to conduct this study among the students of Translation Department to examine the status of translation technology in the curricula from their point of view.

Objectives of the Study

The study aimed:

1. To recognize whether or not the curricula of the Department of Translation at the Faculty of Languages and Translation, the University Aden involve sufficient knowledge regarding the translation technology tools from the students' point of view.
2. To identify the students' ability in using translation technology tools and resources.
3. To investigate the translation students' attitudes regarding the importance of using translation technology tools and resources.

Research Questions

1. To what extent do the curricula of the Department of Translation at the Faculty of Languages and Translation, Aden provide sufficient knowledge regarding translation technology tools from the students' point of view?
2. To what extent do the students rate their ability in using translation technology tools and resources?
3. What are the translation students' attitudes towards the importance of using translation technology tools and resources?

Signifiance of the Study

The study has highlighted the place of translation technologies and resources in translators training curricula in the Department of Translation at the Faculty of Languages and Translation, Aden. This might help pay the decision makers attention in the Department of Translation and the Faculty to reconsider and conduct an update to the curricula in order to involve such translation technologies and resources based on the students' needs and requirements of local and regional markets. Furthermore, according to the best knowledge of the researcher, such a topic has NOT been subject to any study in the Department of Translation in particular, and the public Yemeni universities in general. Therefore, it may significance lies in its contributions regarding the need to add an additional course that may help to equip students with the required knowledge and skills regarding translation technologies and resources.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Translation technology can serve as an umbrella term for a wide variety of technology tools integrated into the translation process. This research paper focuses on translation technology tools and resources that are most relevant and useful for the students of translator-training program and to what extent the curricula of the Department of Translation involve such e-tools and resources.

Translation Technology and Translator Training Curricula

The objective of this section is to assess how the literature presents translation technology within translator training curricula. The impact of technology on translation as a profession and as a process is indisputable. According to Quah (2006), in order to perform some parts of the process of translation, translators use computer. To cover the need in this area and to standardize the lessons on translation tools, some projects have been carried out with the European Union funds. Çetiner (2018) mentioned that Letrac (1998), Ecolore (2002), Ecolotrain (2005) and Optimale (2010) and Balkul's (2015) comprehensive thesis on the teaching of translation technologies in Turkey are some of these projects. The main aims of these projects are to integrate translation tools into the curriculum and to teach translation technologies in the Departments of Translation.

Translation technology tools have been a common research topic in Translation Studies, For instance, Quah (2006) and Yamada (2011) conducted studies on Translation technology tools use in translation processes. Other studies such as Olohan (2011) and Teixeira (2013) were done on their relationship with the human factor. Translation technology tools effect on Translation Studies was the topic of O'Hagan's (2013) study; their integration into translator training was the main topic of Alcina's (2008) study, and was the topic of Alcina, Soler and Granell's (2007) study, as well as in a study conducted by Doherty and Moorkens (2013).

Alcina (2008) described translation technologies as the field of study that deals with the design and adaptation of strategies, tools and technological resources that help make the translator's job easier and facilitate the research and teaching of such activities. In fact, no one can deny the role of translation technology tools in the process of translation, Pym and Garcia (2010, as cited in Taghizadeh & Azizi, 2017, p. 3) pointed out that in the near future being an expert in IT skills will be more vital for translators than language mastery. Emphasizing the importance of IT skills, Mikhailov (2015, as cited in Taghizadeh & Azizi 2017, p. 80) asserted that in this era, IT skills are an indispensable part of a translator's job; therefore, this will be considered immediately after language proficiency based on their priority.

Because technology has already become a significant part of translation practice, today almost all models of translation competence involve technology as competence in its

own right. However, translation studies do not have a widely accepted model of competence. This is probably because all models proposed so far lack empirical support (Göpferich, 2009; Orozco & Albir, 2002; Pym, 2009). Translation competence and the acquisition of translation competence have nevertheless been one of the most discussed topics in the discipline (for some of the **existing models**, see (Kelly 2005, PACTE 2005, 2008, Tan 2008, EMT 2009, Rico 2010) and for a description of some of the existing translation competence definitions and models, see (Göpferich,2009; Pym, 2003, as cited in Yılmaz-Gümüş (2017).

Arguing that technology is a necessity rather than an option in translation practice, Pym (2013) and Chunzhi (2014) noted that these new ways of translation tools facilitate the translators' tasks, accelerate the translation process, and increase productivity.

The EMT expert group (2009) defined technological competence (or mastery of tools) as one of the six areas of the key competencies for translation services (i.e., language competence, thematic competence, information mining competence, intercultural competence, technological competence, and translation service provision competence).

In the translator-training literature, there are different views on how and to what extent technological skills should be taught in training programs. For instance, Mossop (2003, p. 21) indicated that "students need basic skills to use Windows, Internet, E-mail and Word and that they can learn the rest later". On the other hand, some translator profiles require students to graduate with advanced computer and technology skills, ranging from advanced word-processing skills to the ability to use translation memories and terminology management tools (Mackenzie 2004, Aula.int 2005, Optimale 2012). Moreover, Pym (2013) suggested that technology is not a separate component of translation competence but should be integrated into the whole training process. As a result of this integration, technology is expected to affect all other components of a training program and thus the final professional profile of learners.

Translation technologies represent an important new area of interdisciplinary study lying midway between computer science and translation. Its development depends on its academic progress and the effective introduction of translation technologies in the translators training curriculum. Mossop's (2003, p. 21) argument that "if you cannot translate with pencil and paper, you cannot translate with the latest technology". For him, pencil, paper and print dictionaries were means of translating in the past, whereas computers and technologies are means of translation practice today. Thus, if training programs set out to teach the practice of translation, they are required to teach computer and technology skills as well.

Although the relationship between translation and computers began with the development of software for machine translation, the real boom of translation technologies started with the development of electronic dictionaries and terminology databases, the arrival of the Internet with its numerous possibilities for research, documentation and communication, and computer-assisted translation tools. The digitization of content generated at the source, and computerization of institutions, organizations, private business, professional workplaces, etc. also played a significant role. The computer has been an integrated part of the infrastructure needed by translators for some time now, but the amount of knowledge and the skills linked to the translation technologies that the translator has to acquire and have a command of is growing every day. Moreover, the constant increase and variety of electronic documents formats and continual rise in the number of computers and users, and the rate at which they circulate over the Internet have given rise to a new specialized area called localization, that is, the translation of the documentation, interfaces and help files included in computer software applications and the translation of websites – which requires translators have a wide, thorough knowledge of computer science.

The development of technologies that support translation, such as electronic multilingual dictionaries and machine translation systems, has the potential to enhance a great

number of intercultural, multilingual interactions and activities. Such technologies can allow users to access online material in languages that they do not actually know. Even in cases where the current technologies cannot fully enable the user to comprehend a given text, he or she can often grasp the main ideas expressed.

In his evaluation of technology, Hartley (2009, pp. 106–127) considered "which technical tools should be used to enhance productivity, performance and cost-efficiency". He encouraged practitioners to evaluate and assess tools, instead of allowing software developers to rule the roost. Hartley's overview is indeed comprehensive and indispensable to students in terms of declarative knowledge, yet it does not answer the question to what degree technology is essential to the translator, or how it can be managed and controlled, and if and how it could be addressed in translator training. Munday (2009) indicated that Hartley's overview of the technology is much needed. He continued that translation theories, so far, have neglected the discussion of technology and stresses the importance of, for instance, web potential and storage on servers to the translator. These developments require teamwork supported by technological tools.

Furthermore, Pym (2009) observed that the curriculum in translator training depends on the views held in the respective educational establishments. For instance, does the training serve the needs of the market or its own internal academic requirements? Should teachers in higher education be professional translators themselves? Pym (2009) asserted that the invitation of professionals into the classroom and 'real-world translations tasks' as well as 'modelling competencies and skills' are serious steps in the right direction. Additionally, he referred to the apparent opposition between different methodologies, for instance, competency-based methods and social constructivism, where the former is focused on the enhancement of competencies and skills, while the latter assumes that all will happen through social interaction in class. Pym explained that in practice the dividing lines between the different methods are not as clear as they seem: a learner-centred approach does not mean that syllabus and activities will not be set by the teacher. The fact that in their publications Nord and House do not refer directly to technology in translator training does in no way detract from their valuable pedagogical input: for instance, Nord (1996, as cited in Pym 2009) proposed diversification in the teaching of translation, and House (2000, as cited in Pym 2009) pointed out the benefits of translation in 'interaction', in pairs or group work. Pym preferred a process-oriented teaching style to the product-based methodology that is advocated by Hatim and Munday (2004, pp.3–10). Pym's view is that changes in the market require continual and serious rethinking of curricula. In other words, methodologies in the classroom need to be mixed and eclectic. The importance of integrating technology tools and resources in translation curricula has been discussed by many scholars, Bowker (2002) stated that:

> Integrating technology into the translation curriculum can have an impact on the way in which translation itself is taught. For example, a number of changes in teaching have been brought about by the fact that data are available in electronic form. Technologies such as optical character recognition and voice recognition can be used to convert data into electronic form, which makes it easier to share resources, such as corpora and translations, among students as well as between students and trainers. (p.15)

Furthermore, Austermuehl (2001) argued that word possessors, electronic dictionaries, tools for the internet, CAT tools, PDF tools, desktop publishing tools and proofreading tools are useful electronic tools used for translation In the same line, Bowker (2002) explained that an additional benefit to be gained from introducing technology into the translation curricula is that a by-product of the use of this technology is the gradual accumulation of data that can be used for other types of studies. For some time, translation

theorists (e.g., Holmes 1988; Toury 1980) have been calling for a more empirical basis for their discipline. Electronic corpora and translation memories can provide large quantities of easily accessible data that can be used to study translation. Bilingual parallel corpora (such as those produced through alignment or by using translation-memory systems) can be used to investigate translation strategies and decisions.

3. METHODOLOGY

This section displays the methodology adopted to conduct this research paper. This study adopted a quantitative approach where a descriptive method was used and data collection was carried out by using a structured questionnaire. The population of this study was the students of the fourth level of the Department of Translation. They were 65 students. The sample of the study consisted of 24 participants (6 males and 18 females) who were randomly selected from the fourth level of the Department of Translation at the Faculty of Languages and Translation, the University of Aden, in the first semester of the academic year 2019/2020. The researcher selected fourth level students because they have awareness of all courses taught in the Department. Thus, they can state the status of translation technology in the curricula. The researcher used the simple random sampling technique in this study to assure the representativeness of the population of the study. A structured questionnaire was used to collect the required data. The questionnaire was designed to obtain the required information with emphasis on the objectives and questions of the study.

The students' questionnaire was divided into three parts. The first is about the participants' skills to use the translation technologies tools, that is, software in translation (e.g. Ace Translator, Memo Q, Omega T) and using online encyclopedias when doing their translation projects during their study in the Department of Translation. The second is about the importance of the translation support technologies such as E-dictionaries, computer-aided translation, corpus and machine translation from participants' point of view. In the third part, the participants were required to rate their ability in using the following translation support technologies like different types of translation software (e.g. Ace Translator, Memo Q, Omega T) and electronic corpora, …etc. The questionnaire also included two items; one of them is a structured item which compares between traditional translation (pencil & paper) and translation with the help of electronic tools. The other is an open-ended item. It aims to elicit whether or not the curricula helped to equip the participants with sufficient knowledge required to use translation technology tools. One open-ended item was added in order to gain clarifications to enrich the data. Dornyei (2008, p, 47) argued that the open responses can offer graphic examples, illustrative quotes, and can also lead us to identify issues not previously anticipated. Furthermore, sometimes we need open-ended items for the simple reason that we do not know the range of possible answers.

Once the first draft of the questionnaire was designed, it was given to three PhD experts who teach at the Faculty. A pilot study was performed on five students at level four of the Department of translation, at the Faculty of Languages and Translation to elicit information concerning the content of the items, and clarity of instructions. After revising the questionnaire based on modifications of the experts and the pilot study findings, the final version of the students' questionnaire was administered to the participants.

The study was conducted after receiving approval from the dean of the Faculty of Languages and Translation. The students' questionnaire was distributed during lecture time with the assistance of a female teacher at the same level. The researcher had explained the aims of the questionnaire and clarified all parts. Thirty-five copies of the questionnaire were distributed. All of them were collected, however, 24 copies were only used and analyzed as the participants answered all items, the other copies were excluded because the participants did not fill in all items.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

The data collected were processed statistically and analysed by using frequencies and percentages, means and standard deviations. The data have been entered into the computer software SPSS programme (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). Thus, the interpretation and analysis of statistical results were implemented according to the sections of the questionnaire.

The analysis

This section shows the analysis of the students' responses to the questionnaire. **Part one** of the questionnaire consisted of nine closed-ended items where the participants were asked to choose one option of the five-point scale (i.e. very few or no skills, elementary skills, basic skills, many skills, and comprehensive skills). It was designed to check to what extent the curricula of the Department of Translation help to equip the participants with translation technologies skills. Table 1 reflects the participants' responses to each item of part one.

Table 1 Participants' responses regarding the skills they learned about the translation technologies tools based on the curricula of the Department of Translation

	Items	Very Few or No Skills %	Elementary Skills %	Basic Skills %	Many Skills %	Comprehensive skills %
1	I use online encyclopedias and e-dictionaries when doing your translation projects	**4.2**	**12.5**	**33.3**	**8.3**	**41.7**
2	I use machine translation (i.e. GT, Bing.com)	**0**	**0**	**0**	**16.7**	**83.3**
3	I use translation Software (e.g.: Ace Translator, Memo Q, Omega T)	**71.3**	**16.2**	**12.5**	**0**	**0**
4	I use Word Processing, such as Microsoft Office tools to create, edit, and print documents	**0**	**0**	**16.7**	**54.2**	**29.1**
5	I use Subtitling tools such as Aegisub and Visual SubSync	91.6	**4.2**	**4.2**	**0**	**0**
6	I use Optical Character Recognizing (OCR)	70.8	**12.5**	**12.5**	**0**	**4.2**
7	I use Electronic corpora	70.8	**20.8**	**4.2**	**4.2**	**0**
8	I use Terminology Management System	62.5	**12.5**	**12.5**	**4.2**	**8.3**
9	I use Translation Memory System	70.8	**12.5**	**12.5**	**4.2**	**0**

Table 1 reveals the participants' responses to each item regarding the skills they learned to deal with the translation technologies tools based on the curricula of the Department of Translation. In response to item 1, most of the participants 41.7 % indicated that they learned comprehensive skills in using online encyclopedias and e-dictionaries when doing translation projects and 33 % participants indicated that they have learned basic skills of the same. Only 4.2 % of participants stated that they have learned no skills. Participants' responses to item 2, using machine translation (e.g.: GT, Bing.com, … etc.) scattered among the two options, where 83.3 % participants stated that they have learned comprehensive skills, while 16.7 % participants revealed that they have many skills. Item 3 is about using translation software (e.g.: Ace Translator, Memo Q, Omega T), the majority of participants 71.3 % revealed that they have very few or no skills in using translation Software and 16.2 % participants stated that they have learned elementary skills. No one of them stated that he/she has comprehensive or many skills of the same. In response to item 4, using Word Processing,

such Microsoft Office tools to create, edit, and print documents, the participants' responses scattered among three options, 54.2% of participants indicated that they have learned many skills, 29.1% of them stated that they have comprehensive skills and 16.7% of them stated that they learned basic skills of Word Processing, such Microsoft Office tools to create, edit, and print documents. In response to item 5, that is, subtitling tools such as Aegisub and Visual SubSync, the majority of participants 91.6 % stated that they have learned no skills. Table 1 shows that the majority of participants' responses 70.8 % to item 6, that is, Optical Character reorganizing (OCR) indicated that they have learned few or no skills of technology tools, the same responses (i.e. 70.8 %) were given to item 7, that is, electronic corpora. Regarding the responses to item 8, that is, terminology management system, the majority of participants 62.5% stated that they have learned few or no skills. In response to item 9, 70.8 % participants indicated that they have learned few or no skills regarding translation memory system.

Part two of the students' questionnaire consisted of nine closed-ended items, where the participants were asked to choose one option of the five-point scale (i.e. Not important, Somewhat important, No idea, Important, and Very important). It was designed to check the participants' attitudes towards the importance of the translation support technologies given. Table 2 reveals the participants' responses to each item of part two.

Table 2 Participants' responses regarding the importance of translation support technologies.

Items		Not important	Somewhat important	No idea	Important	Very important
1	E-dictionaries and online encyclopedias	0	8.3	0	29.2	62.5
2	Machines translation systems (e.g. GT, Q Translator, Bing.com)	0	0	4.2	45.8	50
3	Different types of translation software (e.g. Ace Translator, Memo Q, Omega T)	4.2	20.8	8.3	45.8	20.8
4	Word processing (to create, edit, and print documents.	0	12.5	0	50.0	37.5
5	Subtitling tools	8.3	16.7	54.2	16.7	4.2
6	Optical Character Recognizing (OCR)	0	25.0	0	30.0	45.0
7	Electronic corpora	4.2	16.7	20.8	50.0	8.3
8	Terminology management system	0	4.2	29.2	50.0	16.7
9	Translation memory system	0	4.2	4.2	62.5	29.2

Table 2 reveals the participants' responses regarding the importance of the translation support technologies from the students' viewpoints. In response to item 1, that is, the importance of e-dictionaries and online encyclopedias 45.8 % participants indicated that they are important and 33.3 % participants also stated that they are very important. Item 2 is about the importance of machines translation systems (e.g. GT, Bing.com, …etc.) 50 % participants stated that they are very important and 45.8 % participants indicated that they are important. In response to item 3, that is, different types of translation software (e.g. Ace Translator, Memo Q, Omega T), the participants' responses scattered among the five options, where 45.8 % participants indicated that they are important, and 20.8 % participants stated that they are very important and 20.8 % participants indicated that they are somewhat important, while 8.3 % stated that they have no idea and 4.2% of them stated that such translation software is not important. The participants' responses to item 4, that is, Word processing (to create, edit, and print documents, revealed that 50.0 % of them stated that it is important, and 37.5% of them stated that it is very important and 12.5 % participants indicated that it is somewhat important. In response to item 5, that is, the subtitling tools, the majority of the participants 54.2% indicated that they have no idea about them, and 4.2 % participants indicated that they

are important. Regarding item 6, that is, the optical character recognizing (OCR), 45.0 % participants revealed that OCRs are very important and 30.0% of them stated that they are important. The participants' responses to item 7, regarding the importance of electronic corpora, 50% participants indicated that they are important and 16.7% of them stated they are somewhat important, while 20.8% revealed that they have no idea about the importance of electronic corpora. In response to item 8 concerning the importance of terminology management systems, 50.0% participants and 16.7% of them indicated they are important and very important respectively, while 29.2 % participants revealed that they have no idea about the importance of terminology management systems. Item 9 is about the importance of translation memory systems, where the majority of the participants' responses 62.5 % stated that they are important and 29.2 % of them indicated that they are very important.

Part three of the students' questionnaire consisted of nine closed-ended items, where the participants were asked to choose one option of the five-point scale (i.e. no skills, poor, fair, good, and excellent). It was designed to rate the participants' ability in using the translation support technology tools given from their viewpoint. Table 3 shows the participants' responses to each item of part three.

Table 3 Participants' ability in using the translation technology tools

	Items	No ability	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
1	E-dictionaries and Using online encyclopedias	0	0	20.8	8.3	70.9%
2	Using Machines translation systems (e.g. GT and, Bing.com, …etc.)	0	0		29.2	70.8%
3	Different types of translation software (e.g. Ace Translator, Memo Q, Omega T)	0	83.3	4.2	0	12.5
4	Word processing such as Microsoft Office tools to create, edit, and print documents	0	12.5	0	62.5	25.0
5	Subtitling tools	25.0	70.8	0	4.2	0
6	Optical Character reorganization (OCR)	25.0	45.8	25.0	4.2	0
7	Electronic corpora	20.8	41.7	37.5	0	0
8	Terminology management system	33.3	29.2	25.0	0	12.5
9	Translation memory system	25.0	62.5	0	0	12.5

Table 3 displays the participants' responses regarding their ability in using translation technology tools. In item 1, the participants were asked to rate their ability to use e-dictionaries when translating, the majority of their responses 70.9% rated their ability as excellent, 8.3% participants rated their ability as good, while 20.8% of them rated their ability as fair. In response to item, 2, 70.8% participants rated their ability in using machines translation systems (e.g. GT and, Bing.com, …etc.) as excellent and 29.2 % of them as good. Regarding item 3, that is, the ability to use different types of translation software (e.g. Ace Translator, Memo Q, Omega T) 83.3% participants rated their ability as poor, while 12.5 % of them rated their ability as excellent. The participants were asked to rate their ability in using Word processing such Microsoft Office tools to create, edit, and print documents, the majority of them 62.5 % indicated that they are good in using Microsoft Office tools and 25.0 % of them stated that they have excellent ability in using the same, while 12.5% rated their ability as poor. In item 5, the majority of the participants 70.8% rated their ability as poor in using subtitling tools and 25.0% of them indicated that they have no skills at all., while 4.2 % of them rated their ability as good in using the same. The participants were asked to rate their ability in using OCRs, that is in item 6, 45.8% participants rated their ability as poor and 25.0% of them stated that they have no ability, the same participants 25.0% rated their ability

as fair. In response to item 7, 41.7% participants rated their ability as poor in using Electronic corpora, 20.8 % stated that they have no ability in using Electronic corpora and 37.5% participants rated their ability as fair in using the same. In item 8, 33.3 % participants indicated that they have no skills in using terminology management systems, 29.2% participants rated their ability as poor and 25.0% of them rated their ability as fair, while 12.5 rated their ability as excellent in using terminology management systems. In response to item 9, that is, Translation memory system, 62.5% participants rated their ability as poor and 25.0% of them stated that they have no ability, while 12.5 % rated their ability as excellent.

In another item the participants were asked to compare between traditional translation (pencil & paper) and translation with the help of electronic tools, from the perspective of difficulty, the majority of participants 58.3%, as shown in Table 4, stated that translation with the help of electronic tools is much more difficult than traditional translation, while 33.3 % indicated that Translation with the help of electronic tools is somewhat more difficult. Only 4.2 % participants indicated that translation with the help of electronic tools is somewhat easier**.** The same percentage of the participants (4.2) stated that translation with the help of electronic tools is much easier.

Table 4 participants' responses regarding traditional translation (pencil & paper) and translation with the help of electronic tools

Translation with the help of electronic tools is much more difficult.	**58.3**
Translation with the help of electronic tools is somewhat more difficult.	**33.3**
No difference between traditional translation (pencil & paper) and Translation with the help of electronic tools.	**0**
Translation with the help of electronic tools is somewhat easier**.**	**4.2**
Translation with the help of electronic tools is much easier.	**4.2**

The last item of the questionnaire, that is, to what extent do you think that the curricula of the four-year translation program have equipped you with sufficient knowledge to use translation technology tools? Table 5 shows the participants' responses to this item.
Table 5 participants' responses regarding the curricula of the Department of Translation

a. Yes	**25**
b. If not, please write why have not you learned with sufficient knowledge?	**75**

When the participants were asked whether or not the curricula of the four-year translation program has equipped them with sufficient knowledge to use translation technology tools, the majority of them 75% , as shown in Table 5, indicated that the curricula of the four-year translation program have NOT equipped them with sufficient knowledge to use translation technology tools. Many of them provided a number of reasons. I can summarize the most important of them as follows:

- Two participants referred that they have not studied many things and skills. they studied without any technologies
- Four participants indicated that the teachers are not qualified
- We have not practised the CAT tools because there is no lab
- We started to learn about translation technologies at the third level
- The practical part is missing
- The curricula should involve more subjects regarding technology
- No enough laptops and no lab

5. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

In fact, no one can deny the role of technology in the field of translation and translator training programs in general. Regarding part one of the questionnaire, which was

designed to check to what extent the curricula of the Department of Translation help equip the participants with the required translation technologies knowledge and skills. Based on the results in Table 1, 83.3%, 41.7%, and 54.2% participants indicated that they have learned adequate knowledge about using machine translation (i.e. GT, Bing.com), e-dictionary and online encyclopedia, and using Word Processing, such Microsoft Office tools to create, edit, and print Documents respectively. One can conclude that the participants learned basic skills due to the two courses which are taught at the first year. Actually, any university student who is not majoring in translation can use such technology tools due to their frequent use. However, the majority of the participants 71.3%, 91/6% stated that they lack knowledge regarding translation software (e.g.: Ace Translator, Memo Q, Omega T), subtitling tools such Aegisub and Visual SubSync respectively. In the same line, 70.8 % participants revealed that they have very few or no skills concerning translation Memory System, the optical character recognizing (OCR), electronic corpora, and 62% of them stated that they have not learned the skills of Terminology Management Systems. The researcher has checked the curricula of the Department of Translation and found that only one course, that is, Computer Assisted Translation, is taught to help students to grasp all these mentioned skills of technology tools, which is from the researcher's viewpoint, is not sufficient to equip students to use translation software, subtitling tools, terminology management systems, translation memory systems, etc. and this is what the participants' responses confirmed.

To identify the participants' attitudes towards the translation technology tools, Table 2 shows that, the majority of participants (i.e. between 62% to 80%) confirmed that the translation technology tools and resources are important. However, the findings of the study indicate that nearly 54.% participants have no idea about the importance of subtitling tools. This is because they have not studied them as they stated in part one of the questionnaires. In general, the majority of the participants' responses in this section indicated the importance of using translation technology and resources.

The findings of the study reflect that the participants' ability in using the translation technology tools was poor in general. When the participants were required to rate their ability in using different types of translation software (e.g. Ace Translator, Memo Q, Omega T), the majority of them (83 %) stated that their ability is poor. This indicates that they lack the knowledge required. It is important to pay attention that such translation technologies are important to facilitate the job of translation. Therefore, the teachers, the curricula designers and those who are responsible for the program should find a solution to increase and equip the students with the required knowledge in this area. Moreover, the findings of the study have confirmed that participants' abilities are poor in using other technology tools like terminology management systems, translation memory systems, subtitling tolls, and OCRs (41%, 62%, 70% and 45.8) respectively. These findings indicate that the participants are not equipped with the knowledge required to deal with such technology tools that they will need them in their work in the future in any field of translation like audiovisual translation or written translation in general.

The findings of the study reveal that the participants rated their abilities as good in using Microsoft Office tools. however, the responses to the other items, as shown in Table 3, reflect that they were poor in using and dealing with most of the e-tools supporting translation. Also, the majority of participants (58.3%) stated that translation with the help of electronic tools is much more difficult than traditional translation. Moreover, the majority of them 75% indicated that the curricula of the four-year translation program have NOT equipped them with sufficient knowledge to use translation technology tools. This is supported by what has been stated by them in section one of this questionnaire.

Based on the analysis and discussion of the students' responses to the questionnaire items, it is observable that the curricula of the Department of Translation do not help to equip

students with the required knowledge and skills to use and deal with translation technologies and resources. The majority of them indicated that the curricula offered no sufficient knowledge and practical skills to equip students to use translation software, subtitling tools, terminology management systems, translation memory systems, etc. The findings of the study also reflected that the participants' ability in using the translation technology tools was poor in general. The majority of them stated that they have no idea regarding some e-tools used in translation. Regarding the attitude of the students towards using translation technologies, the findings show that they considered translation technologies and resources as important due to their various advantages.

In light of these findings, the researcher recommends that it is necessary to add an additional course at the fourth level regarding translation technologies and resources. Also, there is a need to update and revise the curricula of the Department of Translation, special attention should be given to students' needs, local and regional markets requirements because since the inauguration of the Department, no changes or modifications happened to the courses taught. The researcher also recommends that it is important to establish a lab with an internet connection to train students to use such translation technologies and resources. There is a need to conduct research on a needs analysis that might help to design courses relevant to the desires and needs of students who will enroll in the Department.

REFERENCES

Alcina, A. (2008). Translation technologies Scope, tools and resources. *Target*: *International Journal on Translation Studies*. 20:1 (2008), 80–103. DOI 10.1075/ *Target*.*20*.1.05alc

Alcina, A., Soler, V., & Granell, J. (2007). Translation technology skills acquisition. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, *15*(4), 230-244.

Aula.int. (2005). Translator training and modern market demands. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology 13*(2): 132-142.

Austermühl, F. (2001). *Electronic tools for translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Bowker, L. (2002) *Computer-aided translation technology: A practical introduction*. Ottawa: Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.

Çetiner, C. (2018). Analyzing the attitudes of translation students towards cat (computer-aided translation) tools. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *14*(1), 153-161.

Chunzhi, D. (2014). Computer-aided translation in student's practical translation competence. *3rd International Conference on Science and Social Research*, 494-496.

Dornyei, Z (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methodologies.* Oxford. OUP

Doherty, Steven, and Joss M. (2013) Investigating the experience of translation technology labs: pedagogical implications. *The Journal of Specialised Translation 19*: 122-136.

EMT expert group (2009). Competences for professional translators, experts in multilingual and multimedia communication. Brussels, January 2009.http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/programmes/emt/key_documents/emt_competences_translators_en.pdf, consulted 7.1.2015.

Hartley, T. (2009). Technology and translation. In J. Munday (2009) (Ed.), *The Routledge companion to translation studies*. London, New. (pp. 106–127).

Hatim, B. and Munday, J (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. Routledge Applied Linguistics. Routledge. http://linguistlist.org/issues/15/15-2787.html

Holmes, J. (1988). *Translate papers on literary translation and translation studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kelly, D. (2005). *A handbook for translator trainers: A guide to reflective practice*. Manchester and Northampton: St Jerome.

Li, D. (2007). Translation curriculum and pedagogy views of administrators of translation services. *Target, 19(1), 105- 133.*

Mackenzie, R. (2004). The competencies required by the translator's roles as a professional. In K. Malmkjaer (ed.) T*ranslation in undergraduate degree programmes.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 31-38.

Mikhailov, M. (2015). Minor language, major challenges: The results of a survey into the IT competences of Finnish translators. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 24, 89-111.

Mossop, B. (2003). What should be taught at translation school?". In A. Pym, C. Fallada, J. Ramón Biau and J. Orenstein (eds.) *Innovation and e-learning in translator training*. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group. 20-22.

O'Hagan, M. (2013). The Impact of new technologies on translation studies: A technological turn?". In C. Millan-Varela and F. Bartrina (eds) *The Routledge handbook of translation studies*. London and New York: Routledge. 503-518.

Olohan, M. (2011). Translators and Translation Technology: The Dance of Agency. *Translation Studies* 4 (3): 342-357.

Orozco, M. & Hurtado Albir, A. (2002). Measuring Translation Competence Acquisition. *Meta* 47 (3), 375-403.

OPTIMALE Progress Report (2012). http://www.translator-training.eu/attachments/article/40/Public%20part_report_2010_OPTIMALE%204018-001-001.pdf. Visited December 2012.

Quah, C. K. (2006). *Translation and technology. Basingstoke*: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rico, C. (2010) Translator training in the European higher education area". *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer 4*(1): 89-114.

PACTE (2005). Investigating Translation Competence: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. *Meta 50*(2): 609-619.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants, part 2: Do they really think differently? *On the Horizon*, *9*(6), 6

Pym, A. (2009). Translator Training. Pre-print text available at: http:// usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/publications/publications.html ED 28.10.2014. [also published as Pym (2011). Training Translators. [In:] K. Malmkjær, K. Windle (eds.) Oxford handbook of translation studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 475–489].

Pym, A. (2013). Translation skill sets in a machine translation age. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, *58*(3), 487-503.

Tan, Z. (2008). Towards a whole-person translator education approach in translation teaching on university degree programmes. *Meta: Translator's Journal 53*(3): 589-608. DOI: https//doi.org/10.7202101924ar

Taghizadeh, M. & Azizi, M. (2017). Exploring Computer-Aided Translation Competences of Some Iranian Translators. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 5(1), 78-87. Page |

Teixeira, C. (2013). Multilingual Systems, Translation Technology and their Impact on the Translator's Profession". In A. Neustein and J. A. Markowitz (eds) *Where humans meet machines: innovative solutions for knotty natural language problems*. New York: Springer. 299-314.

Toury, G. (1980). In *search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Yılmaz-Gümüş, V. (2017). An Overview of Undergraduate Translator-Training Curricula in Turkey: What We Teach to Future Translators. *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E*, 4, 112–151.

Yamada, M. (2011). The effect of translation memory databases on productivity. *Translation Research Projects. 3*: 63-73. http://isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/trp_3_2011/index.htm

About the Author

Adel Abdulkhaliq ***is an associate professor of English at the Faculty of Languages and Translation, the University of Aden, Yemen. I have been teaching English for 24 years at different levels. I currently teach Research Methodologies in Translation Studies courses at the postgraduate programs in the Department of Translation. My research focus is on Translation Technology and ELT methodology.***