

Mirjana Daničić*

Univerzitet u Beogradu – Filološki fakultet

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9152-0877>

REVISITING THE WORKSHOP METHOD OF TRANSLATION TEACHING

The paper aims to present the concept of non-literary translation workshop designed on the principles of collaborative learning, ‘scaffolding’ and cross-ability peer learning. The workshop was organized in academic 2024/2025 with a group of six students in Translatology, an elective translation course in the master’s study programme Language, Literature, Culture at the Faculty of Philology in Belgrade. The students translated an architectural monograph into English, reflecting not only on linguistic and translational nuances that determine translator’s decision-making, but also on cultural interactions between the two texts. A social constructivist approach provides a wide theoretical framework for the discussion of the workshop as an experiential model for training translation students.

Keywords: translation pedagogy, translation teaching, translation workshop, collaborative learning, translation competence.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since business, education, research, social media became globalized and English informally accepted as *lingua franca* of all walks of life, there has been an increasing demand for translation talents and translation experts. It is therefore important to cultivate the development and practice of translation ability of the students majoring in English. The constant conscious and subconscious switching via translation between mother tongue (L1) and foreign language they learn (L2) is a natural part of a language learning process. Many researchers (Newmark, 1991, Leonardi, 2009, Pym, Malmkjær & Plana, 2013) consider translation to be “the fifth skill” after reading, listening, speaking and writing. It is surely the only one which actively exploits various interactions between L1 and L2 – linguistic, cultural,

* mirjana.danicic@fil.bg.ac.rs

sociolinguistic, pragmatic. Among numerous models for teaching translation, the translation workshop has emerged as an extremely beneficial mode of training, focusing on applied language skills. The translation workshop has proven particularly useful for dealing with the various types of L1 interference (the so-called negative transfer) since it provides a way for the teacher to instantly deal with the students' translation output. If the translation of source text (ST) is divided into several phases (as is the case in the workshop discussed here), this gives students an opportunity to avoid repeating negative transfer occurrences. Although some researchers have discredited translation as a learning tool (e.g. Carreres, 2006), this paper builds on a large body of research claiming that translation in learning process maximizes the benefits of the interaction between L1 and L2 and facilitates learning of a foreign language via establishing clear and visible similarities and distinct differences between languages, including both linguistic and extra-linguistic aspects.

It is our impression that educational psychology has for many years proven extremely valuable for the formation of various educational approaches even though it is not much referenced in the papers on translation pedagogy. For instance, the term 'workshop' first appeared in educational psychology in the U.S. to refer to a group of people who meet to discuss and exchange ideas and engage in activities such as dialogue, communication, joint discussion, problem-analysis, problem-solving, planning etc. in a relaxed and interactive way. The translation workshop as a model for teaching translation is not novel (cf. Daničić, 2004). In 1963, the first translation workshop in a university setting was jointly organized by the University of Iowa and the University of Princeton as the North American Translation Workshop (University of Iowa, n.d.). Since then, it has spread throughout universities across the globe. The translation workshop can be viewed as a forum where translators gather together and "have a wide and enthusiastic discussion on a specific translation task to produce a version accepted or agreed by all members of the group" (Grentzler, 1993). The workshop method was introduced in teaching practice as a way to connect the socio-economic reality and translation market with the texts translated in classes and to avoid the situation that trained English major students after graduation are not competent for practical translation work. The workshop model bridges the gap between the academia and the real world. In EFL teaching, it refers to a project-based learning method (Wang & He, 2019, p. 104) which should offer a practical, hands-on experience. The practical angle of the workshop model breaks the traditional *ex-cathedra* teaching by making it more relaxed and more student-oriented.

In this paper we will present the concept of non-literary translation workshop organized in academic 2024/2025 with a group of six MA students of English in *Translatology*, an elective translation course in the master's study programme *Language, Literature, Culture* at the Faculty of Philology in Belgrade. The workshop was designed and implemented on the principles of collaborative learning, scaffolding

(Gonulal & Loewen, 2018) and cross-ability peer learning. The aim of the paper is to showcase the contribution of the translation workshop to the development of translation teaching through empowering the students with real-life experience and collaborative formation of knowledge. What we would like to show is that this practical and experiential teaching mode is not only learner-centred because students take responsibility for their learning, but it is also learning-centred because knowledge is not simply distributed by the teacher but is equally reached through students' proactive individual and collaborative efforts. We also underline the role of translation teacher (the workshop supervisor) as crucial in the sense that they have to pre-measure the student translators' competence with meticulous precision since the translator's task must be adjusted to their level of competence.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Although there is still a certain body of opinion which states that L1 should be left at the doorstep of an English teaching classroom, a large number of researchers and ESL teachers (e.g. Harbord, 1992, Deller, 2003, Harmer, 2012) believe that the total exclusion of L1 from the classroom is almost impossible as students are most likely to translate what they are learning from L1 to L2, as well as from L2 to L1 in their heads (Harmer, 2012, p. 133). The constant conscious and subconscious switching (via translation) between L1 and L2 is a natural part of a language learning process because the learners are trying to make sense of a new linguistic and conceptual world through the linguistic and conceptual world they are familiar with. Ideally, translation teaching should result in this switching between L1 and L2 reaching its minimum at the higher phases of interlanguage development. Obviously, in translation pedagogy, the interaction of L1 and L2 should be carefully balanced by the translation teacher so as to integrate it productively in the learning process. Translation should maximize the benefits of L1 and L2 interaction as it establishes clear similarities and visible differences between the two languages, including not only linguistic aspects, but also extra-linguistic such as socio-pragmatic and cultural aspects of language usage. The goal of translation is to find the proper communicative values for the constructions from one language in another, which means establishing structural, semantic and communicative-functional (pragmatic) equivalence (Widdowson, 1978, p. 65). The author of this paper humbly thinks that the values of the translation skill are immense: it is highly productive in the way that it employs other language skills, it promotes critical thinking and deductive reasoning, and it improves cultural competence.

According to Schäffner (1998, p. 131–132), there are two types of pedagogical translation: (1) pedagogical translation or classroom translation aimed at enhancing students' language skills and language competence by highlighting the similarities and distinguishing differences between L1 and L2 thus increasing L2 awareness in students; and (2) real translation or market translation (market-oriented) which is

aimed at improving students' practical translation skills by putting translation theory into practice and whose objective is professional training of students. The translation workshop method described in this paper strongly favours the second approach. At this point it is essential that we make a difference between pedagogic translation and translation pedagogy (Nik Mohamed, Aziz, Kamlun & Othman, 2021). The former uses translation as a tool for language learning, while in the latter translation is a goal. Training students to become language professionals improves a number of their linguistic abilities, but it also means that they will be able to provide professional translating services to a satisfying degree under the market conditions. This is strongly in line with those trends in translator education which view the professional expertise (including the skill to apply translation technologies) as the key objective (cf. Ulyrich, 1996). Similarly to translation theory, translation practice too can be defined in a narrower and a wider sense: it can refer to text production for transcultural interaction, and it can refer to the activities from securing a translation commission to customer care after delivery of the product. (Schäffner, 2005) Programmes for training students for the daily job of practising translators need to be structured to integrate translational competences on the one hand, and awareness of the social role translators play in society, their responsibility towards clients and the profession in a specific cultural, institutional or social environment including ethical issues on the other. (Schäffner, 2005)

The translation workshop concept is fundamentally based on the idea of practice-oriented collaborative learning, which implies that learning is an interactive process, not a mere transfer of knowledge. This kind of construction of knowledge can only be done in a classroom which is not teacher-centred. This is why social constructivist approach is well-suited for our discussion – it suggests learning should take place through social interaction. According to social constructivists, translation in particular is the skill for which collaborative forces are important: “In the case of translation, for example, the learning of professional translation skills would best be achieved through the collaborative undertaking of professional translation tasks, in all of their complexity, under the guidance of a professional translator” (Kiraly, 2000, p. 43). In Kiraly's view, collaborative learning does not simply refer to the division of labour, but it is a joint accomplishment of the translation task (Kiraly, 2000, p. 36). It starts with a group work on the meaning comprehension and extends to the adoption of linguistic, terminological, cultural and professional knowledge by each member of the learning group as “translation workshop can be used as means of solving problems and resolving dilemmas when teaching translation to university students” (Josipović, 2018, p. 135). So far, a certain body of research was published on the authentic collaborative translation projects implemented in the university setting (cf. Mastela 2020, Mastela 2023, Thelen 2018). Based on the previous research, our objective in writing this paper is to demonstrate that project-based approach to the education of

translators rooted in social constructivism can evolve into a translation feat far beyond the scope of the traditional translation classroom – an interdisciplinary, multi-skilled team-learning environment.

The workshop method has shown to be extremely beneficial to tackle the “negative transfer” phenomena (Lado, 1994, p. 125) when students’ translations stick more closely to the L1 patterns. In the history of translation studies there has been an abundance of the definitions of interference between L1 and L2 (the so-called negative transfer). For the purpose of this paper guided by the language-pedagogy principles, it may be best to adhere to Gideon Toury’s explanation of his second law of translation – “the law of interference” (Toury, 1995, p. 274–279). He explains that translators tend to bring across structures from the source text even when those structures are not usual in the target language. He also claims that these interferences can be found both on macrostructural level (text organization, paragraphing, etc.) and on smaller levels of the sentence and the phrase (*ibid.*). Accordingly, the “negative transfer” can impede the development of the translation skill even at very high levels of language proficiency. This means that, in translation teaching, this issue has to be seriously dealt with as the translation proficiency implies that the students have learnt how to associate language with particular areas of usage and discourses which cut across linguistic and cultural boundaries (Widdowson, 1978, p. 71).

The principle of scaffolding is another important concept in social constructivist approach which is applied in the translation workshop method. It means that the translation teacher (or workshop supervisor in this case) should provide the necessary guidance, assistance and support to students in finding solutions to translation problems and then gradually remove “the scaffold” as the students make progress in developing the translation skills. Instead of filling the students with knowledge, translation teacher should serve as a guide or an assistant (facilitator). (Kiraly, 2000, p. 18) In the workshop described in this paper, scaffolding was most often used when resolving semantics dilemmas – it was a determining factor when overt cues were absent in the source text.

Lastly, this author shares Díaz Cintas’ view (2003, p. 201) that translation students “must be able to work in groups and under pressure, with very stringent deadlines; they must be familiar with software packages and the Internet and they must have an insight into the inner workings of the professional world, not only view it from the inside of the academic cocoon”. There are several ways to expose students to the real world of translation, project-based work probably being the most effective one since it provides an opportunity for students to develop their translation competence through an authentic professional experience. A business-life simulation in translation teaching in particular and professionally-oriented translation pedagogy in general can significantly increase students’ employability and respond to the requirements prescribed by the professional standards for translation services (ISO

17100: 2015 Translation services – requirements for translation services). These standards call for a new set of skills including not only language proficiency, but also cultural knowledge, a number of extra-linguistic competences and tech-savviness. Thelen (2014: 235) classifies translator's competences into two groups: fundamental competences (translating, linguistic, textual, cultural competences, information seeking and technological skills) and professional competences (entrepreneurial, interpersonal and social competences, management skills, analytical skills and learning potential). The workshop model aims at equipping students with a whole set of the said competences, but if they cannot be developed fully on the individual level, they may be grown through a division of competences within a whole team.

3. METHODOLOGY

The method of this paper is a process-oriented descriptive-explanatory analysis. Its objective is pedagogical since it presents a possible model how to organize and conduct a project-based translation workshop with students majoring in a foreign language. The paper should be instrumental in guiding translation teachers how to become translation workshop supervisors.

In the workshop discussed here, six master's students worked on the Serbian into English translation of the architectural monograph on monasteries located on Fruška Gora Mount, the home of a large number of historical Serbian Orthodox monasteries. The source text (A. Radojević, *The Monasteries of Fruška Gora*) consisted of a 36,000-word-long textual and pictorial introduction to the monograph, describing the Mount and its monasteries followed with a two-page-long text containing technical, historical and architectural information on each of seventeen monasteries. The nature of the source text was non-literary, meaning factual and functional even though the author occasionally employs poetic manner in addressing historical and geographical topics. Translation-wise, the non-literary features of the text implied that translators should prioritize clear transfer of facts and information, usage of straightforward, unambiguous language and well-organized sentence structures. For this reason, clarity and accuracy should have characterized every translation strategy deployed in the course of translation process. In terms of pedagogy, the source text comprised three tenable macro-components of a translation course curriculum: background (cultural) knowledge, translation practice, and translation theory. The fact that the target text (translation) was intended for publication gave authenticity to the whole translation process.

The translation management in the workshop was organized similarly to a commercial translation agency: the source text was divided into equal segments and each one of six translators received almost the same word count to translate. The web-based document (Google doc) was formed and access with the option to enter changes was granted by the translation teacher to each student in the workshop.

Within the deadline set for the translation of each segment the students were expected to complete the translation of the allotted segment and mark the problems they came across during the translation process so that they could be addressed jointly as part of the group work. The workshop lasted for four months whereas joint translation activities (teamwork) were organized once a month so as to integrate face-to-face discussions with the Internet-based translation work.

The limitation of this particular project-work was that students did not participate actively in the selection of the source text and in initial agreements with the author due to the discrepancies between the time frame of the academic year and deadlines set by the editors. For the same reason, they did not take a big part in post-editing of the translation. Because of the complex nature of the planning process, the students did not take part in defining the time plan and the temporal structure of the overall project whereas, ideally, all aspects of translation workshop management should be co-designed.

4. DISCUSSION

The main principle underlying the translation workshop is the principle of collaborative learning. This means that the students participating in the workshop become part of group translation activities when they brainstorm ideas, identify translation problems and discuss possible solutions. Linguo-pragmatic features of the source text are discussed collaboratively, as well as their translatability. Some professional registers are characterized by highly differentiated terminology used by a comparatively limited speech community often in specific linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts, while others are easily recognized and used by the speakers outside strict professional contexts. The semantically and culturally challenging context of the source text translated in the workshop belongs to the former rather than the latter as it includes both religious and architectural terminology, which requires a strong linguistic and cultural background to produce effective translation. This is where collaborative effort overshadowed individual because solutions for translation equivalence were found more adroitly and more creatively in group sessions. The tasks and assignments for group sessions were designed to develop learner autonomy and included preparing a draft translation of certain number of pages, but with the option to leave gaps where equivalence of meaning was hard to establish either because of the difficulty to convey exactly the same meaning or because of a plethora of possible solutions and strategies that could be applied. The students jointly agreed on the application of particular translation strategies, thus profiling their ability to work on collaborative translation projects. In this way, in addition to translation skills, students developed a set of soft skills such as interpersonal skills and peer networking, time management and awareness of deadlines, teamwork and cooperation ability, research skills and research management, e-correspondence skills, professional

responsibility and etiquette, all necessary for the translation career. As Kiraly points out, translators' work depends on their "grasp of prior real experience in the world: as translators of course, but also as communicators, team members, information seekers and managers, and computer users" (Kiraly, 2012). Following the said principles, we can see that the workshop as a translation teaching model is beneficial as it puts students at the centre of their own teaching and learning – students strive to find practical solutions to various kinds of problems, not only translation-related ones. The concept of collaborative effort is perhaps present in the translation profession more than in others – collaborative translation also referred to as 'co-translation' is used to describe the interaction of two or more translators working together. In the history of translation, co-translation has played a distinguished role, particularly in the translation of the sacred texts (the Bible, the Buddhist texts etc.). In the present times with the ever-increasing number of documents to be translated within near-impossible deadlines, collaborative achievements are a common practice among professional translators. This is why the collaborative practice in the translation workshop where the translation task is negotiated through the interaction of workshop participants proved to be of great value. This learning outcome means that students, in addition to having the competence to work independently, develop and take responsibility as a translation team member.

One of the most striking concepts of collaborative efforts is cross-ability learning, which we could simply describe as on-the-go exchange of different units of knowledge. In the workshop, students learn from each other, educating each other about the unfamiliar concepts, meanings, terminology. The feedback they give to each other becomes a learning tool, fostering their capacity to solve the translation problems on their own. Consequently, this synergy raises their professional self-confidence and motivation to go on.

Another advantage of this teaching model must not remain neglected: it offers a relaxing and friendly learning environment. First of all, the students participating in the workshop were not chosen randomly – they volunteered to take part in this particular activity in the *Translatology* course they elected in their master's study programme *Language, Literature, Culture*. On their previous academic path, they completed undergraduate studies in English language, literature and culture. In the beginning of the *Translatology* master's course, various activities were offered to students (e.g. writing a research paper, or participating in research on the translation of hate speech, or translation workshop). The six students who applied for the workshop were both interested in the subject matter of the source text and in the translation method. It was students' need for new knowledge that was a key entry criterion, not some requirements imposed by the teacher. Thanks to such a recruitment model, a group of translation-studies-driven enthusiasts keen on working in active team atmosphere was profiled. As a result, when students put hands together to complete a common

translation task, they created a harmonious learning atmosphere. Their similar interests, high motivation and joint desire to see the effectiveness of their translation training generated a pleasant and strain-free learning environment. Additionally, ease with which they expressed their opinions in a non-threatening group discussion built up their translator self-esteem, so important for developing their professional identity.

All six of workshop participants had already acquired a bachelor's degree in English, which means they had passed eight semesters of explicit and practical instruction in translation, including four semesters of intensive course in English into Serbian and Serbian into English (both literary and non-literary) translation. This made their language proficiency indisputable. Furthermore, their language competence made it redundant to provide explicit grammatical and lexical instructions, which shifted the focus of the workshop on finding the right structural, semantic, communicative and cultural value for the L1 structures in the target language. Since errors caused by insufficient language knowledge were almost non-existent, the focus of the workshop was on issues and dilemmas caused by interference, cultural non-equivalence and gaps in translation equivalence. This was how the workshop became integration of previously learned skills, newly acquired knowledge and interactive sharing of translator competences and perspectives. In order to produce a high-quality translation, students joined hands to weigh pragmatic and cultural equivalence, to investigate connotational meanings, to elaborate on culture-specific semantics, to find strategies for rendering semantic intensity, idiomatic expressions and stylistic marking, without losing communicative value of the source text. The translator's decision-making, crucial for the translation process, thus became an output of collaborative dynamics.

Another important aspect to this learning mode has to be mentioned here – students' self-study. Through self-study the students obtained knowledge from different channels. The whole project was research-based since the subject matter was very specific (monastery architecture), requiring students to check various background issues on the network, primarily regarding certain concepts and terminology. As we live in the age of technological advances applicable in various fields, including translation, the usage of various online resources and AI-assisted tools was welcome in the workshop as part of the preparatory activities. For instance, the students could use online language resources to improve and polish their linguistic competence, particularly to reflect on terminology dilemmas, and thus prepare themselves for the face-to-face sessions where all these issues were discussed in a group activity. However, the initial agreement was made that translation, a complex cognitive activity, required in-depth human decision-making and post-editing. Different AI-assisted translation tools could thus be used only as a supplement to the translation work done by students and self-study only as a preparation for collaborative learning. Since translation is becoming a highly technologized profession, we believe that education of translators should also undergo a similar revolution. It is our impression that this

kind of revolution in academic courses is comparatively slow in translation pedagogy where translation classroom moves towards the translator's job without hurrying.

Besides computer-based work, there was another type of assistance the students were encouraged to seek – external human resources. Specialized knowledge or expertise of people whom the students know either as friends, acquaintances or family members, serve to scaffold the learning process and bring us closer to the aim of the workshop that the students jointly reach solutions based on what they have previously individually researched. In this way, student-centred approach, derived from constructivist learning theory, emphasizes students' active involvement in the construction of their knowledge. Encouraging students for self-study prepares them for the life-long learning, so imperative in the translation profession. The qualified translator must be ready to constantly and energetically face new terminology resulting from new concepts which dynamically arise in everyday world. The terminology includes fewer lexical novelties than an infinite number of word combinations and connotations. In this context, we appreciate another value of the workshop – it teaches students to play the translator's role by assessing and weighing numerous translation options and by taking into account the constraints of their translation task. The workshop trains them to produce a target text that will satisfy the client, the editor, the reader and hopefully the translator.

An interesting observation was made by the workshop supervisor: owing to self-study, the students also improved their linguistic competence in L1 in the register of architecture and building. For instance, the Serbian word denoting a type of fruit (*jabuka* – an apple) takes on a different value in architecture, denoting a particular shape of a bell-tower (*jabuka* – an apple-shaped bulge). To create a meaningful translation, the translator must first realize that there is a lexical difference in the target language (unlike L1) and then look for a reliable technical terminology. Similarly, students' understanding of certain archaic vocabulary in L1 whose usage nowadays is mainly restricted to specific contexts has been strengthened. For example, after a group discussion, it was jointly decided to use a brief definition to render an obsolete but culturally-charged word *prnjavor* (a village on the monastery land) rarely used in contemporary Serbian.

Lastly, the role of translation teacher (the workshop supervisor) needs to be discussed as crucial. Generally speaking, translation teachers are distinguished from language teachers by different teaching competences. In addition to language competence, teaching skills, and disciplinary knowledge expected from a language teacher, translation teachers must also acquire first-hand personal experience of translation profession along with the knowledge of market trends. Hence, the profile of a translation teacher includes the trinity of: professional practice, academic knowledge of the discipline they teach (translation and cultural studies), and teaching skills. In other words, the translation teacher needs to be a practitioner, a researcher and an

educator. When a translation teacher becomes a workshop supervisor, their instructing role is only seemingly diminished. Allowing students to make their own discoveries and to construct knowledge does not mean that teacher's role is annihilated. The teacher first has to adjust the translation task to the students' level of competence so that the students wouldn't feel disheartened and discouraged to continue their work. In this way, teacher mobilizes students' enthusiasm, creating favourable conditions for their learning. Then the teacher guides the students to carry out the translation task and directs the workshop in such a way to enhance the students' participation in it. The teacher (workshop supervisor) is seen as a creator of motivating educational environment and a facilitator of students' exchange of ideas. Teaching translation should by no means be one-way transmission process, but sharing of perspectives.

It is indisputable that translation skills constitute a strategic ability that translation students need to possess together with linguistic competence. This is why university translation courses mainly focus on these aspects. However, there are other interactions between the source text and the target text which have to be taken into consideration when the target text is used not only for pedagogical purposes, but is being prepared for publication. These interactions will help tailor the target text to the potential readership and editorial translation-wise policies. The workshop is an ideal place where these editorial practices can be discussed and where the translation students can be taught to apply high professional standards. The input received from different stakeholders – “the client”, the proofreader, editors, develops certain sub-competences which are normally not found in the curriculum of a translation course which is not project-based. While in traditional translation teaching the focus is on the individual translator and their translation skills, the workshop method targets “four different contexts: (1) the translation process of the individual translator, (2) the production process of a translation team, (3) the business process of a translation service organization, and (4) the generic workplace context of dealing with tasks, people, teams, and organizations.” (Konttinen, Veivo et al., p. 152)

Taking into consideration the target audience and their background knowledge when deliberating on translation solutions is another learning outcome of teaching the market-oriented translation. For instance, one of the carefully weighed decisions was whether to use the archeological term *naos*, which is the Ancient Greek borrowing used in the Serbian source text, or domesticated term *nave*, or both terms with the in-text and in-brackets explanation ‘the *naos* (central nave)’. Through social negotiations and shared meaning-making the translators collaboratively made the decision on how to achieve equivalence while retaining the source text style and register, taking the perspective of target audience. The workshop thus became a simulation of the translation market, which facilitated building up students' professional ability and competence because its chief pedagogical mode was sound practicality – ‘learning by doing’. It put students in the situation to learn about challenges, pressures and

potential pitfalls that professional translators are often subjected to during their studies not after their completion. Therefore, one of the pioneers of authentic projects in translation teaching describes this educational method as “self-creating” (Kiraly, 2012) construction of knowledge since the students are engaged in many facets of the actual work of translators.

As *Translatology* is a course in which students earn a grade upon its completion, a few words need to be said about grading scheme. Unlike the traditional grading principles, the main focus in the assessment of workshop work is on the overall learning process. The students are empowered to learn individually and collaboratively, and their improvement is assessed through evaluating their understanding of tasks, application of skills and measuring the efforts invested. These cannot be graded in the traditional way as the whole learning process is not traditional. When deciding on the final grades, the teacher allots a shared group grade, meaning that all workshop participants receive the same grade because the group has submitted one product and the students’ individual efforts towards achieving the collective goal are encouraged in this way.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

If we believe that translators are professional language and culture mediators, then interaction has to be the foundation of translation pedagogy. If we accept that learning is meant to be highly interactive and proactive, then there should not be a rigid order in translation teaching in an academic setting. Instead, knowledge should be generated and constructed through interactions between individual students, small groups or larger groups. The translation workshop has emerged as both learner-centred and process-oriented teaching model. As an authentic learning experience focused on the collaborative completion of a real-world translation task, it optimizes the translation teaching since the core of this teaching model is practice. “The collaborative undertaking of authentic translation projects in an institutional setting can be seen as self-similar to the work done by individual professional translators and teams of translators across the entire translating community of practice” (Kiraly, 2012). Namely, students’ knowledge is applied to a practical process and the result is visible in the form of completed translation of the source text. We hope that this discussion will contribute to remodelling of the existing pedagogical approaches in translation teaching and learning and make them more empowering and transformational. A master’s degree is expected to offer students a wide range of possibilities on the job market: besides translation work, students who have acquired master’s qualification in foreign languages should be able to apply for positions in a variety of communication-related fields.

As previously shown, the workshop supervisor (the translation teacher) has a guiding, facilitating and scaffolding role instead of firmly designing and structuring

teaching and learning activities. Students achieve learning autonomy and take responsibility for completing assigned tasks. The workshop practicality helps to meet self-actualization (psychological, linguistic, cultural) of the students and, at the same time, to meet the fundamental principles of training translation professionals in the new era. Through it, students' translation skills are effectively improved and their competence in evaluating translation quality is strengthened. Moreover, their personal satisfaction because of professional accomplishment cannot be ignored. Even though experiential approach to translation teaching may sound postmodernist, in an academic institution it certainly helps develop translators' expertise. And not only that – it contributes to the formation of independent thinkers and decision-makers, competent problem-solvers and knowledgeable professionals with a set of skills useful when dealing with complex situations.

References:

- Carreres, Á. (2006). 'Strange bedfellows: translation and language teaching. The teaching of translation into L2 in modern languages degrees; uses and limitations'. Retrieved March, 8, 2025, from: https://www.academia.edu/27650215/Strange_Bedfellows_Translation_and_Language_teaching
- Daničić, M. (2004). Jedan eksperiment u nastavi teorije i tehnike prevodenja. *Philologia*, 2, 143–146.
- Deller, S. (2003). The language of the learner. *English Teaching Professional*, 26.
- Díaz Cintas, J. (2003). Audiovisual translation in the third millennium. In G. Anderman & M. Rogers (Eds.), *Translation Today. Trends and Perspectives* (192–204). Multilingual Matters Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.27710953.18>
- Grentzler, E. (1993). *Contemporary translation theories*. Routledge.
- Gonulal, T., Loewen, S. (2018). Scaffolding Technique. In J.I. Lontas (ed.). *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*. John Wiley and Sons Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0180?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate
- Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother-tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 46/4, 350–355. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.4.350>
- Harmer, J. (2012). *The practice of English language teaching*. Pearson.
- International Organization for Standardization. (2015). *Translation services – requirements for translation services* (ISO Standard No. 17100: 2015). <https://www.iso.org/standard/59149.html>
- Josipović, S. (2018). A translation workshop as a means of solving problems and dilemmas in teaching translation to university students. *Teaching Innovations*, 30/4, 135–143. <https://doi.org/10.5937/inovacije1704135J>

- Katan, D. (2008). Translation as intercultural communication. In J. Munday (Ed.), *The Routledge companion to translation studies* (74–92). Routledge.
- Katan, D. (1999). *Translating cultures: an introduction for translators, interpreters and mediators*. St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kiraly, D.C. (2012). Growing a project-based translation pedagogy: A fractal perspective. *Meta*, 57/1, 82–95. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1012742ar>
- Kiraly, D.C. (2000). *A social constructivist approach to translator education: Empowerment from theory to practice*. St. Jerome.
- Kontinen, K., Veivo, O., Holopainen T., & Salmi, L. (2017). Multilingual translation workshop: developing professionals in a simulated translation market. *MikaEl, electronic journal of the KaTu symposium on translation and interpreting studies*, 10, 150–164. <http://doi.org/10.61200/mikael.129427>
- Lado, R. (1994). *Language Teaching, A Scientific Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Leonardi, V. (2009). Teaching business English through translation. *Journal of Language & Translation*, 10(1), 139–153. <http://doi.org/10.22425/jul.2009.10.1.139>
- Mastala, O. (2023). A Holistic, Interdisciplinary and Socially Engaged Approach to Translator Education: Learning through Meaningful Projects. *Między Oryginałem a Przekładem*, 29(4/62), 25–51. <https://doi.org/10.12797/MOaP.29.2023.62.02>
- Mastela, O. (2020). Retelling Legends and Folk Tales: A Transcreative Approach in the Collaborative Translation Classroom. *Research in Language*, 18(2), 151–171. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1731-7533.18.2.03>
- Newmark, P. (1991). *About translation*. Multilingual Matters.
- Nik Mohamed, N. Z., Aziz, A. A. A., Kamlun, K., & Othman, I. W. (2021). Translation Pedagogy Versus Pedagogical Translation. *Language Learning. International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, 6 (43), 83-96. <http://doi.org/10.35631/IJEPC.643008>
- Pym, A., Malmkjær, K., & Plana, M. (2013). *Translation and language learning: The role of translation in the teaching of languages in the European Union – a study*. European Commission. <https://doi.org/10.2782/13783>
- Schäffner, C. (2005). Preparing students of translation for the real world: Needs, methods, constraints. In J. Peeters (Ed.), *On the relationships between translation theory and translation practice* (pp. 237–248). (Studien zur romanischen Sprachwissenschaft und interkulturellen Kommunikation, Band 19). Peter Lang.
- Schäffner, C. (1998). Qualification for professional translators: Translation in language teaching versus teaching translation. In K. Malmkjær (Ed.), *Translation and Language Teaching* (pp. 117–134). St Jerome Publishing.
- Thelen, M. (2018). Collaborative translation in translator training. *Konin Language Studies*, 4(3), 253–269.

- Thelen, M. (2014). Facing new challenges: Updating the training curriculum. In M. Forster, N. Garbovskiy & H. Lee-Jahnke (Eds.), *CIUTI-Forum 2013. Facing the world's new challenges* (pp. 227–254). Peter Lang. <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-0352-0245-8>
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. John Benjamins.
- Ulyrich, M. (1996). Real-world criteria in translation pedagogy. In C. Dollerup & V. Appel (Eds.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 3: New Horizons. Papers from the third language international conference, Elsinore, Denmark, 1995* (pp. 251–263). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.16>
- University of Iowa (n.d.). *History of the Program*. Iowa College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Retrieved June, 9, 2025, from <https://translation.uiowa.edu/history>
- Wang Z. & He, J. (2019). On application of translation workshop in translation teaching for English majors. In S.A.R. Khan & H. Zhao (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2019 International conference on advanced education and social science research (ICAESSR 2019)*, vol. 345 (pp. 104–106). (*Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icaessr-19.2019.24>
- Widdowson, H.G. (1978). The deep structure of discourse and the use of translation. In C.J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Eds.), *The Communicative approach to language teaching* (61–71). Oxford University Press.

Mirjana Daničić

JOŠ JEDAN OSVRT NA PREVODILAČKU RADIONICU KAO METOD IZVOĐENJA NASTAVE PREVOĐENJA

Rezime

U radu se opisuje prevodilačka radionica u kojoj su studenti prevodili monografiju sa tematikom iz oblasti arhitekture na engleski jezik u skladu sa načelima kolaborativnog učenja, podupiranja (engl. *scaffolding*) i učenja ukrštanjem vršnjačkih sposobnosti. Radionica je organizovana u toku akademske 2024/2025. godine sa šestoro studenata na izbornom predmetu *Translatologija* u okviru master studijskog programa *Jezik, književnost, kultura* na Filološkom fakultetu u Beogradu. Tokom rada u radionici studenti su promišljali o lingvističkim, translatološkim i kulturološkim nijansama na osnovu kojih prevodilac donosi odluke. Socijalni konstruktivizam pruža autorki širok teorijski okvir za diskusiju o radionici kao mogućem iskustvenom modelu nastave prevođenja.

Ključne reči: translatološka pedagogija, metodika nastave prevođenja, prevodilačka radionica, kolaborativno učenje, prevodilačka kompetencija.