

Raising Student Consciousness about Machine Translation

学生の機械翻訳についての意識を高める

Tim Newfields (Toyo University) & Ivan Botev (Toita Women's College)

Abstract

With the rise of virtual assistants and the proliferation of digital translation software, it is time to question what role, if any, machine translation services should have in foreign language classes. This paper describes some activities designed to raise awareness about the use and misuse of machine translation within a task-based learning framework. Inspired by Sharwood-Smith's 2001 notion of "consciousness-raising" and Johns' 1991 notion of data-driven learning, it outlines five activities to highlight some of the benefits and problems of machine translation. An analysis of five translation exercises by 86 tertiary students in Japan underscored that many felt uncertain of the quality of their translations and most used online computer translations (primarily from Google or Weblio) to help them. Moreover, semi-structured interviews with six undergraduates following these activities underscored the difficulties many EFL students have in judging translation quality. The paper concludes with a discussion of some resources for EFL students seeking to improve their translation skills.

Keywords: computer-assisted translation (CAT), consciousness-raising classroom tasks, data-driven learning, machine translation, EFL classroom materials for Japanese speakers

概要

バーチャルアシスタントの台頭とデジタル翻訳ソフトの普及に伴い、外国語の授業で機械翻訳サービスが、もしあるとしたらどのような役割を担うべきかを問う時期にきている。本稿では、タスクベース学習の枠組みの中で、機械翻訳の使用と誤用についての認識を高めるためにデザインされたいくつかの活動について説明する。Sharwood-Smithの2001年の「意識向上」の概念とJohnsの1991年のデータ活用型学習の概念に触発され、機械翻訳の利点と欠点を強調するために5つのアクティビティーの概要を説明します。日本の高等教育機関で学ぶ86人の人学生による5つの翻訳過程の分析では、多くの人は自らの翻訳の品質に不安を感じており、ほとんどの場合、オンラインのコンピューター翻訳（主にGoogleまたはWeblioから）を利用して翻訳支援をしていることが強調されました。さらに、これらのアクティビティーに続け、6人の学部生への半構造化面接は、多くのEFL学生が翻訳の質を判断するのに苦労していることが強調されました。最後に翻訳スキルの向上を目指すEFLの学生向けのリソースについて説明をします。

キーワード：コンピュータ支援翻訳（CAT）、意識を改革する授業課題、データ駆動型学習、機械翻訳、日本の EFL 用教材

Consciousness-raising (C-R) is a term used in a broad variety of contexts. This paper adopts Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith's description of it as a "deliberate attempt to draw the learner's attention to the formal properties of the target language" (1985, p. 274). Consciousness-raising is closely related to what Fotos (1993) and Skehan (1998) have described as "noticing" as well as what Carr and Curran (1994) have termed "attention focusing." In foreign language learning contexts, it also shares much in common with "data-driven learning" (DDL) (Johns, 1991, 1993, 2002). DDL could be broadly defined as the use of language corpora to facilitate greater lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic awareness. It is rooted in "discovery learning" concepts (Bruner, 1961) and often used in content language and integrated learning (CLIL) contexts (Corino & Onesti, 2019). As Cobb and Boulton (2015, p. 482) point out, "massive but controlled exposure to authentic input" is essential for DDL. Although software programs such as "WordSmith Tools" (1996, 2020) can be used to achieve this, for most classroom purposes websites such as Linguee (DeepL GmbH, n.d.) and ReversoContext (Reverso Technologies, 2013, 2020) are probably better.

Both C-R and DDL tend to emphasize inductive learning processes to showcase how related lexical materials differ. However, generally DDL tends to employ larger text selections than C-R.

Not surprisingly, the impact of attention on learning outcomes has generated considerable research interest. It is safe to suggest that most language acquisition researchers consider a capacity to attend to detail a prerequisite for optimal language learning. Schmidt (1990, p. 133) asserts that intention is a feature of focused consciousness and that an ability to filter out irrelevant data is also essential. Intentionality is widely thought to be closely correlated with learning results.

C-R activities in language learning contexts are often associated with grammar instruction (Bolitho & Tomlinson, 1980; Rutherford, 1987; Ellis, 2002), or exercises to enhance pragmatic awareness (Tomlinson, 1994; Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005). This article considers their use in translation activities. More specifically, it introduces some exercises to help students realize the strengths and weaknesses on online computer translation services and to conceptualize the need for various types of translations. The article concludes by offering some practical advice for those dealing with bilingual texts. Although a day might arrive when seamless, natural machine translations between vastly different languages such as Japanese and English exist, that day has not yet arrived. However, since so many students employ automatic online translation tools, there is a timely to address some of the problems with blindly relying on machine

translation. In most classes we have observed, it is not uncommon to see students using translation apps such as *Google Translate*, *Weblio*, *Naver Papago* on their cellphones to complete in-class activities as well as homework assignments. This paper does not discourage the use of automatic translation services entirely. We recognize that they can provide time-saving linguistic approximations as, well as a means to access target language vocabulary useful for language learning. However, students need to realize how mistranslations or even maltranslations* often occur when solely relying on machine output. At this point in time, human contextual post-editing is usually required to transform text excerpts into products that are socio-culturally appropriate and “natural” in the target language.

Literature Review

Although both C-R and DDL activities have been around for decades, their use in translation contexts is more recent.

Marinov (2016) used DDL activities for a one-semester EFL class in Croatia. She found that about half of her students attempted to improve their translations with a DDL corpus. The process of using DDL was admittedly tedious, but it did enable some learners to realize the inadequacies of their direct translations. Moreover, slowness of DDL is not necessarily an impediment. Marinov (p. 244) cites Cook (2012) in suggesting that, "translation might sometimes be useful to learners in formulating what they have to say or write, precisely because it slows them down, allows them to consider carefully what they are saying" (p. 101).

One point from Marinov's research that is unclear is the extent that students relied on machine translations to create their English texts. Moreover, Marinov reports that some students participated in this task with only minimal involvement. We also found some students were disengaged in the translation activities described in this paper. However, Marinov's exercises did appear to help at least a few students, "critically reconsider their initial language production

* According to Yazdanmehr and Shoghi (2014), a *mistranslation* is a minor sub-optimal translation that occurs when a target language (TL) rendition of a source language (SL) code has infelicities, but the overall lexical and socio-pragmatic intent is clear. For example, translating 「夏休みにアルバイトをしました。」 as "I worked part time while [sic.] the summer vacation," would be a mistranslation. The small mistake does not significantly impact the overall meaning. A *maltranslation* occurs when there is a significant shift (or neglect) of the source text meaning. For instance, translating the previous Japanese sentence as, "I did *arubaito* all summer" would be a maltranslation (at least for those with no knowledge of German) since several key details are obscured.

(translations)" (p. 244) in light of new linguistic input. In that sense, her work was a modest success.

Singer Contreras (2016) has also considered how DDL might facilitate translator training. His study, which is actually a course proposal, recommends incorporating DDL translations within a task-based learning (TBL) framework. Well-designed DDL materials can, in his view, offer affordances to sharpen translation skills. However, he echoes Whistle's (1999) caution DDL activities should not last more than 30 minutes per class since they quickly become tedious. Moreover, he adds that, "DDL-based tasks alone may not provide enough ground for the development of all four language skills" (p. 160). The author concurs with Gabrielatos (2005) that DDL should be merely one component of a wider task-based learning framework.

In 2017 Li described a two-semester C-R course for 21 undergraduate translators in Macau. That course was designed to help participants become more consciously aware of eight discrete translation techniques described by Guo (2010) and Xu (2012)*. After explaining how each translation technique is used, students were asked to translate sentences, then paragraphs while using as many different translation techniques as possible to render the text appropriately into the target language. Midway through the course, students were divided into small groups and asked to translate a 1,000+ word document based on their understanding of the translation techniques learned so far. Utilizing *WeChat*, a popular instant communication tool in China, they discussed the pros and cons of employing various translation techniques in small groups before giving a final presentation to the entire class. By the end of the course, student reflective journal entries and WeChat logs suggest that most students had internalized their understanding of the eight translation techniques highlighted in the course.

What research gaps does this specific study intend to fill? First, it documents the prevalence of machine translation in Japanese tertiary EFL contexts. Second, it shows practical ways to problematize the blind reliance on machine generated texts. Third, it introduces some alternatives to machine translation for novice EFL students not majoring in translation studies. One best way to frame this study is as a classroom material development case study. Problems with the initial "consciousness-raising" materials are analyzed and suggestions for adapting the materials to various classroom contexts are offered.

* According to this typology, *diction*, *conversion*, *addition*, *deletion*, *negation*, *affirmation*, *division* and *combination* are the specific translation techniques. Similar typologies have been suggested by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995, pp. 249- 254), who draws on earlier works by Bally (1909, cited in Pym (2014, pp. 5-6)).

Research Questions

This paper answers the following four research questions: (1) To what extent did the EFL students in this sample rely on digital translation software or online translation sites to complete their schoolwork? (2) How did the undergraduates in this sample conceptualize the translation process? (3) What sort of errors did the students in this sample make when attempting Japanese-English translations? (4) To what extent, if any, did these activities appear to change the way the students regarded machine translation?

Method

Sample

The activities described in this paper were conducted with 87 students from two tertiary institutions in Tokyo. However, since those activities were conducted over five class sessions, only about 90% of the students completed all of the activities. 21 of the respondents were economic majors at a private university and the remaining 66 were studying “international communication and culture” at a women's college. The demographic characteristics of these respondents is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. *Demographic Characteristics of the Student Respondents Who Participated in the Written Translation Exercises*

Gender	Male	14	Female	72
Nationality	Japanese	78	Non-Japanese	9
Academic Year	1 st Year	64	2 nd Year	22

Respondents ranged in age from 18 to 22 and their CEFR levels varied from B1 to A1, with most at a A2 level. Four respondents were Chinese, two were Vietnamese, one was Mongolian, one was Finnish, and another had dual British/Japanese citizenship. The first two printed classroom activities for this sample included informed consent statements, and none of the participants opted out. In addition to the sample specified above, a smaller convenience sample of six student volunteers participated in semi-structured interviews after all the of the printed materials were administered. We chose a semi-structured interview format because its balances consistency with flexibility, permitting clarification of issues raised by respondents while insuring that core questions are raised.

Volunteers for this activity were obtained this way: after the final C-R activity, a call for volunteers was issued. Nine students initially volunteered, but three became busy with other activities. As a result, six were interviewed and their characteristics are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants in the Semi-Structured Interviews.

<i>Pseudonym</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Nationality</i>	<i>Native Language</i>	<i>Other Languages</i>	<i>TOEIC Score</i>
Airi	F	19	Japanese	Japanese	English, some French	735
Akari	F	19	Japanese	Japanese	English	560
Reia	F	19	Japanese	Japanese	English, some French	600
Daiki	M	19	Japanese	Japanese	English, some Chinese	750
Esther	F	21	British-Japanese	Japanese	English	770
Peppi	F	27	Finnish	Finnish	English, Japanese	985

Finally, to observe how teacher and student responses to the translation exercises differed, six EFL teachers were asked to evaluate the written exercises in Appendices A - E. Two teachers never completed that request, so we had access to four teacher evaluations.

In summary, this research project consisted of three groups of informants: (1) 87 undergraduate classroom participants, (2) a sub-set of six undergraduate interviewees, and (3) four tertiary level EFL teachers.

Instruments

To address the first research question, students and teachers were asked to translate a 133-character Japanese new year's card (*nengajō*) into English. After finishing that task, which is in Appendix A, respondents were requested to indicate which computer translation services they used. Moreover, during the semi-structured interviews described in Appendix F, nine questions about computer-assisted translation were raised.

To answer the second research question, we relied on seven semi-structured interview questions.

To address the third question, all of the classroom materials in Appendices A-E were helpful.

For the final research question, we relied on four semi-structured interview questions.

A brief word about how the classroom materials were developed is in order.

The first classroom task was chosen for its brevity and seasonal appropriateness. It came directly from the online New Year's card collection of the Japan Post, Japan's primary postal service. Although new year's cards typically employ highly formulaic language that is daunting to translate for novices, the obligatory nature of *nengajō* in business contexts provides a rationale for its use.

The second classroom task, appearing in Appendix B, consisted of six sample student translations of the previous text. The task was to decide which of those translations, if any, seemed "natural."

The third task, in Appendix C, highlighted the errors in the student translations made during the previous lesson. English translations of the Appendix B texts by students were randomly juxtaposed with Japanese language back-translations. The back-translations were made by the

authors and then corroborated by two fluent bilinguals. The task was to match the four English sentences on the left with the four Japanese translations on the right.

The fourth task, as seen in Appendix D, compares five different Japanese machine translations of an English Christmas letter. The task was to decide which of the computer translations, if any, seemed both “natural” and “faithful”, then to discuss some issues regarding computer translation. On hindsight, we came to realize the whole notion of “naturalness” and “faithfulness” merits critical examination because, as Crisafulli (2003, p. 29) suggests, most post-structuralists today regard such notions as at least partly flawed.

The final task, as Appendix E suggests, compared the quality of various Japanese-English machine translations. Five different machine translations of a brief Japanese letter were evaluated. Again, students were asked to ascertain which, if any, of the translations were deemed apt. This activity concluded with a discussion of some issues concerning translation.

Since we view learning as a cyclic process, student feedback and responses to the tasks prompted us to reevaluate and improve the existing materials. A revised set of classroom materials that we feel might be useful for tertiary level EFL classes in Japan appear in Appendices G-H.

Procedure

Except for the semi-structured interviews, all activities were conducted during the 2019 winter holiday season and in early January 2020. For this reason, texts with Christmas and New Year motifs were selected.

Translation Exercise 1 was distributed to students about ten minutes before the end of a class in December 2019. After a brief explanation of the informed consent procedure and invitation for any students to opt out, participants were asked to translate a Japanese post card into English. They were free to use any digital applications they wished to complete this task. Before collecting their papers, however, they were requested to indicate which apps or online translation sites (if any) they used. At the end of the session, participants were invited to take digital snapshots of their documents, then all papers were collected.

One week later Translation Exercise 2 (in Appendix B) was distributed and the same procedure was used. Some students worked on their translations individually while others preferred collaborative work. The researchers merely observed, indicating no preference for either choice. Again, after about ten minutes students were invited to take snapshots of their papers before documents were collected.

The following week Translation Exercise 3 was administered under the same procedures. We observed that many students had trouble matching the English sentences with the Japanese texts.

Based on reactions to this activity, it became clear that future versions of this activity should be shorter and more time for discussion should be allowed for discussion.

In the next class, Translation Exercise 4 was distributed and the same procedures were employed. Most Japanese students had little difficulty ascertaining which Japanese translations of the English text seemed “natural.” However, it became clear that some non-Japanese students struggled with the Japanese text. Observing these reactions, we felt an abridged version of this activity might be optimal in the future. Moreover, we realized this activity was not suitable for those who were not adept at written Japanese.

The final activity was distributed a week after the previous exercise. About twenty minutes were needed for most participant to complete the exercise and discuss all of the questions at the end of the exercises. As with the other exercises, students were invited to take snapshots of their work sheets before the papers were collected.

Finally, a call for student volunteers was made. Initially, nine of the 86 students responded positively. As mentioned, six of them actually did the interviews.

After collecting the student papers, the main researcher coded them. Although independent coding would have been optimal, that was deemed too time-consuming. Two levels of coding were involved: Exercises 2 - 5 consisted of a mechanical process of comparing student and teacher responses. However, Exercise 1 involved a more complex level of coding. Since this was an English translation of a Japanese text, a typology recommended by Fujita et al. (2017) was adopted. Briefly, the translations were coded according to the six categories indicated in Table 3.

Table 3. A Typology of Translation Error Types Suggested by Fujita Et Al. (2017)

Type	Description
Level 1	Missing, unfinished, or incomplete translations
Level 2	Contains semantic errors resulting incorrect content
Level 3	The content is translated, but there are grammatical, spelling, or punctuation issues
Level 4	The meaning is preserved, but the result is overly literal or awkward.
Level 5	Social register issues – the target text is either too formal or else too casual.
Level 6	The text is appropriately translated; no issues need to be addressed.

Other coding schemes such as those used by the American Translators Association (2017) or Daems, Vandepitte, Hartsuiker, and Macken (2017) would have been possible. We opted for the code recommended by Fujita et al. (2017) primarily because of its ease of use.

It should be noted some sample texts contained multiple level errors. However, for heuristic simplicity, we focused on which errors predominated while coding.

Student interviews were held in February and March 2020. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, three of these interviews were conducted by video conference. Adopting a semi-structured format described by Kvale (2008), the interview questions were based on earlier studies by the PACTE Group (2005), Jones (2011) and Cheng (2017). After informed consent was obtained, the

interviews were audio recorded and during this process, interviewers took notes. If any responses seemed unclear, additional questions were raised. Interviewees were welcome to use either English or Japanese since both interviewers were proficient in these languages. Student responses to the 39 semi-structured interview questions were compared. Finally, after the results were written up, we contacted the interviewees to confirm whether their responses were correctly recorded, engaging in a process Murphey and Falout (2010) describe as “critical participatory looping.”

As a final step, based on student feedback as well as classroom observations, we revised some of the classroom materials. Those revised materials are available in Appendices G - I.

Results and Discussion

Regarding machine translation use

Now let us consider the first research question. To complete the first task, 66% ($n=57$) of the informants relied on some type of machine translation. Seventy-nine percent ($n=45$) of those doing so chose *Google Translate*, which is both a website and cellphone app. Fourteen percent ($n=8$) opted for *Weblio*, which also has a dual cellphone app/website format. Two respondents used *Naver Papago*, which has similar formats. Moreover, two respondents reported using *LINE Dict*, a cellphone app useful for single-word translations but not designed to handle sentences or phrases. Almost 34% ($n=29$) indicated they used no machine translation for this task.

The qualitative interviews provided further insights into automatic translation use. Four of the six informants interviewed reported using some type of translation app at least occasionally. Daiki, for instance, indicated he would translate short and relatively simple passages by himself, but rely on apps for longer, more complex passages. Moreover, most informants realized the machine translations were sometimes problematic. Conceding that such translations were often flawed, they still relied on machine translations because in their view “no alternatives” existed in the time frame required that were also free of charge. Paying for professional translations was not an option considered by any of the interviewees. Hence, four of the interviewees regarded translation apps as useful expedients capable of producing “more or less” correct results. Airi added, “If you have a friend who speaks English or the language you want to translate [into], I think you should talk to that friend..., but [if] you don’t have any friend[s], then [apps are good].” [32:19]. Other interviewees concurred with her opinion.

Beliefs about translation

Next, let us consider the second research question. The qualitative interviews suggest that none of the respondents thought deeply about translation issues prior to the exercises. More

precisely, we should say they struggled to explain what makes a good translation because most were accustomed to having teachers point out which of their sentence-level translations were “good” or not. Their quandary echoes Huddleston-Edgerton's remark (2010, p. 54) that although translations are frequently possible, they are also “always problematic, undecidable, and dynamic.” The six informants rarely worked with multi-paragraph texts, except when giving speeches in English. At that point, three respondents indicated they outlined their speeches in their L1, then attempted to render them into English, often referring to online dictionaries or translation websites while constructing English texts.

With this background, perhaps it should no surprise that four of the informants felt sometimes perplexed by Translation Exercises B-E. Many of the examples in those exercises had more than one “correct” answer, while others had no choices that seemed fully satisfactory. Based on their feedback, we became aware of a dilemma perhaps all translation instructors face: should a simplified, heuristic model suggesting clear-cut “right” and “wrong” translations be offered, or as Hervey, Higgins, and Loughridge (1995, p. 22) suggest, a more complex model pointing out how translation is fraught with compromise and often messy?

In summary, we can say that all of the informants had only rudimentary notions of translation. Moreover, unless they were taking a high-stakes test involving sentence-level translation problems, accuracy was not a major concern. Daiki summarized this view by stating:

原文の意味を全て伝えるのが難しい場合、大体の意味を伝えればそれで良い。それには大意で良い。。。特に長文の場合、機械訳は助かります。[If it is difficult to catch the full meaning of a text, the overall meaning suffices. Machine translation is good for that... it is especially helpful for long sentences.] (12:45).

In short, micro-level lexical-grammatical factors (rather than macro-level socio-pragmatic factors) seemed to be the main drivers influencing how informants translated. Moorkens and O'Brien (2015) have also found that novice and experienced expert translators tend to translate differently, with the latter group operating much more quickly and tending to post-edit more extensively. Daems, Vandepitte, Hartsuiker, and Macken, (2017, par. 20) echo this by stating, “Inexperienced translators have been shown to treat the translation task as a mainly lexical task, whereas professional translators pay more attention to coherence and style.”

Error types

Concerning the third research question about translation errors, we should point out that all but one of the 86 translations of Exercise 1 had at least some errors. Rather than going through the entire exercise sentence-by-sentence, let us focus on two sentences highlighting the key problems. The third sentence of the Japanese new year's card was:

Example 1. 今年も変わらぬお付き合いのほどよろしく願いいたします。

Six percent of the informants ($n=5$) produced Level 1 errors according to the typology of Fujita et al. (2017). In other words, they provided either no translation or else incomplete target language renditions of the text. Twelve percent ($n=10$) produced Level 2 semantic errors resulting in mistranslations, omissions, or unwarranted additions. For example, one person rendered the text as, “I want to keep this close relationship,” significantly distorting the nuance of the original message. 6% ($n=5$) of the texts had Level 3 errors with non-standard grammar, spelling, or punctuation. Only one sample contained a Level 4 felicity error, in which the basic meaning of the source text was intact, but the translation was overly literal, awkward, or wordy. 5% ($n=4$) of the texts exhibited Level 5 social register errors. Since the source text was quite formal, a casual rendition would be inappropriate. Hence a translation such as “Hope we still be friends this year” is not only too casual in tone, it also contains other problematic issues.

Forty percent ($n=41$) of the respondents translated Example 1 in a way that Fujita et al. (2017) would likely deem satisfactory. Contrary to our expectation, the most common “correct” translation ($n=35$) did not seem to be a verbatim rendition from any widely used online translation engine. One hypothesis is that many of the students correctly translating this text worked with other fluent peers whose opinions were trusted. After spending over a semester together, many students likely had some ideas regarding which peers were proficient in English. Since many students preferred working in pairs or small groups, leading students might have influenced the outcomes of their peers. Another possibility is that some students successfully parsed lexical chunks from their cellphone apps, making minor morphological changes on the fly. The *Weblio* app, for example, provides useful snippets of parts of the material in Example 1. Future research should make more use of video monitoring to ascertain how students actually translate in real time.

Now let us consider how students tackled the most problematic sentence in this translation exercise. The sixth sentence of the Japanese new year’s card stated:

Example 2. お互い健康に気をつけてがんばっていきましょう。

Twenty-two percent ($n=19$) of the students translated this literally as, “Let’s do our best while taking care of each other’s health.” It is probably no coincidence that *Google Translate* renders the source text this way. However, the Japanese text contains a sort of “politeness myth” that seems distinctly odd if translated directly into English. Since non-family members are not actually responsible for each other’s health, perhaps a liberal translation – or to use Venuti’s (1995) terminology, a more domesticated *translation* – such as, “Please take care of your health.” would be apt. Example 2 offers a wonderful opportunity to underscore Venuti’s distinction between *foreignization* (preserving the linguistic/cultural elements of a source text) and *domestication* (changing the linguistic/cultural elements of a text to make it more akin to a target

language/culture text). Notice how the boundaries between individual responsibility and collective responsibility differ in the *domesticated* and *foreignized* renditions of this text.

It is noteworthy that 5% ($n=4$) of the respondents did not attempt to translate Example 2. Fujita et al. (2017) would code such non-attempts as Level 1 errors. 35% ($n=30$) produced Level 2 semantic errors, characterized by mistranslations, omissions, or unwarranted additions. For instance, “Let’s both take care of our health and work hard” mentions hard *work* – a factor not explicit in the original text. 37% ($n=32$) of the samples had Level 3 grammar, spelling, or punctuation errors. None had any Level 4 felicity errors, and only one exhibited a Level 5 register error. The fact that only 2% ($n=2$) of the respondents translated the Japanese text in a natural, albeit highly *domesticated*, way underscores the difficulties that translations can often entail.

The other translation activities revealed a wide disparity between teacher norms and student responses. Rather than point all of those differences, let us focus on two examples. In Translation Exercise 2 in Appendix B, the second sentence was as follows:

Example 3. 今年も変わらぬお付き合いのほどよろしくお願いいたします。

All of the four teacher respondents felt Option (E) “I look forward to working with you this year.” was the most natural choice since it maintained an appropriate professional tone. By contrast, many students selected Option (A) “Please keep the same relationship this year.” The undergraduates were likely unaware of the intimate innuendo that option entails. The interviews corroborated this insight: all of the respondents confessed it was often difficult to discern the nuance of many English passages – students tend to take words literally without fully realizing the rich social-cultural landscapes embedded in many textual artifacts.

In Appendix E, Translation Exercise 5 further exemplifies how teacher and student preferred translations differed. The third sentence of that exercise was:

Example 4. 先生は、良い冬休みを過ごされましたか。

All of the teacher respondents felt none of the options were really appropriate because of a difference in how Japanese and English handle deictic pronouns. In Japanese (as well as many other Asian languages) people are often addressed directly by their job titles. When addressing a teacher, for example, *sensei* is generally used rather than the pronoun “you.” As Rijkelijhuizen (2018) states:

Use of the second person pronoun (a.k.a. “you”) is very complex in Japanese and fraught with the risk of saying something completely inappropriate, when so many forms exist, all loaded with specific nuances denoting your relationship with the person you are speaking to. (par. 2)

The pronoun “you” [*anata*] in Japanese is often reserved for more intimate contexts. However, in English addressing people directly by the title “teacher” would seem distinctly odd. Few

students seemed to understand this, and hence the most popular student translation was “Did the teacher [sic.] spend a good winter break?”

Possible attitudinal shifts

Responses to the final research question were varied. As Kaminska and Foulsham (2013) point out, interviews are often fraught with social desirability bias so it is difficult to ascertain whether any significant attitudinal or behavioral changes occurred as a result of these activities. Basically, the goal of the activities outlined in this paper was to problematize the overuse of unedited machine translations. However, five of the informants said they already understood this prior to the activities. Moreover, since we failed to offer any realistic alternatives to machine translation, many informants echoed Reia by pointing out, “Not using machine translation is ideal, but hmm . . .[for] people who are not native speakers . . . it is [sometimes] necessary” [28:10].

What is striking is that none of the informants underscored the importance of ascertaining the functional purpose -- or what Reiß and Vermeer (2014) refer to as *skopos* -- before engaging in the translation process. Since none of the informants were translation majors, perhaps it would be unrealistic to expect nuanced thoughts about translation. These interviews underscored the need to teach how translation is not a monolithic process, but a variety of complex choices that can be made. If the purpose of a translation is to gain insight into a target language culture, then literal *foreignized* translations are often appropriate. If the purpose is to facilitate ease of target language comprehension, however, then more liberal *domesticated* translations are generally preferable. Moreover, if the purpose is to simply gain a quick, rough sense of a source text in which no high-stakes outcomes are involved, machine translations frequently suffice. None of the informants clearly indicated how socio-pragmatic purposes should drive translation choices. In other words, they considered translation as a largely cognitive semantic and grammatical exercise rather than as a social act. This echoes the observations summarized by Daems, Vandepitte, Hartsuiker, and Macken, (2017, par. 20) who state, “Inexperienced translators have been shown to treat the translation task as a mainly lexical task, whereas professional translators pay more attention to coherence and style.”

Most of the informants indicated that they lacked access to fluent bilingual speakers who could help them with their translations: they had to either rely on guesswork or accept machine translations *prima facie*. Although our classroom activities might have had some value in highlighting the shortcomings of machine translations for some, in terms of changing actual behavior it cannot be said that these activities were a success. The interviews made it clear to us that our instructional approach needed to be revised in at least four ways: (1) Early on, the notion of *functional purpose* should be introduced, along with the distinction between what Japanese call *choku-yaku* (direct, *foreignized* translations) and *i-yaku* (applied, *domesticated*

translations). Examples of both translation types should be provided soon after students complete the first translation exercise. They will also need more time to digest the concepts presented and discuss them in greater depth. (2) To enhance clarity, Exercises B-F should have fewer choices and perhaps at least one suggested optimal answer for each situational context. The interviews also showed us that it frustrated some students to be presented with problems with no “correct” solutions, although the whole notion of “correctness” needs to be more nuanced (3) more information about ways to help students improve their translation skills clearly needs to be mentioned, and finally (4) the overall material could be streamlined or expanded, depending on course purposes, target language proficiency levels, and participant interest.

Let us now discuss each of these points in more detail.

(1) Framing translation within a functional approach

The de facto mode of many students seems to be to cherish simplistic grammar-based notions of “right” and “wrong” translations. After Exercise A is completed, we recommend handing out Worksheet A and discussing how different desired textual outcomes often shape translation processes. In short, we want to look at the social act of translation itself and why people translate and what translations are used for. For these activities to sink in, we recommend at least a thirty-minute time frame. Since this is not a translator training course per se, extensive theory is not needed. However, participants should understand the conditions under which direct translations, free translations, or *prima facie* machine translations are valid choices.

(2) Sharpening clarity

The interviews afforded a chance to engage in an instructional design development process. Following the ADDIE design model (Branson, et al., 1975), we used some information from student interviews and classroom observations to pinpoint the strengths and weaknesses in the initial version of classroom materials.

What became clear is that Translation Exercise 2 in Appendix B had too many choices, some of which lacked satisfactory model translations. A revised version in Appendix H offers one *foreignized* translation, one *domesticated* translation, and two problematic translations for each source text sentence. Also, if students do not like any of these four choices, we provided spaces for them to write out their own translations.

Since none of the persons interviewed knew about the *Excite*, *Reverso*, *Tradukka*, or *Yandex* translation engines, we felt that Translation Exercises 3 and 4 should probably focus on the three translation engines most popular in Japan: *Google*, *Bing*, and *Baidu*. Also, instead of judging the quality of sixteen translated sentences, we believe that a smaller number would suffice. In

Appendices D and E, items recommended for deletion are shaded in gray ink. Some courses with a strong translation focus might wish to retain these items, but for most undergraduates the material in black ink alone will suffice.

(3) More information about translation resources

We believe additional translation resources should be presented when students complete the final Translation Exercise in Appendix E. Specifically, this information might be useful: (1) details about bilingual concordances, (2) facts about online peer translation services, and (3) information about human translation groups outside of cyberspace. A 5 to 10-minute mini-lecture about these resources should be provided before students complete Worksheet B in Appendix H.

Let us briefly mention the concordance resources. Although some students are aware of the online services offered by *Weblio*, none seemed aware of those provided by *Linguee* or *Reverso-Context*. Our experience is that it is often useful to consult multiple concordances to get a richer sense of textual landscapes compiled from wide databases. For example, many Japanese are unsure how to translate the word *tsukiau* (付き合い) in English. The online concordances apps/websites listed in Appendix H provide helpful examples of such expressions based on human-edited corpora rather than computer-generated machine renditions.

Regarding peer translation services, we found that none of the interviewees were aware of any peer translation resources that use crowd sourcing. To reduce the reliance on machine translation, we recommend *Hi-Native* when working on short sentence-level texts and *Lang-8* when working with longer passages. Also, since most interviewees made it clear more access to fluent English speakers was needed, we also recommend two online language exchange networks: *Tandem* and the *Language Exchange*.

Finally, regarding real-time non-virtual resources, in large urban areas such as Tokyo there are periodic non-digital meetings for translator trainees. The Marco Polo Translation Club and the Tokyo Translator Study Group, both which advertise regularly on AlleyCorp's *MeetUp* app, may be viable resources for some students.

(4) Framing translation within a functional approach

A one-size-fits-all approach to translation is probably not educationally valid. Linguistic proficiency, curricular goals, and student interest should be taken into account when determining which activities to present and how they should be presented.

On reflection, we recommend deleting Translation Exercise 3 in Appendix C entirely if the target group is non-translation majors and/or the skill in the target and source language is below a CEFR C1 level. Although that activity might have value in some translator training contexts, it

is probably too difficult for most undergraduates. Also, it fosters a myth that two disparate languages somehow “match” smoothly. A close examination of the material reveals some of the supposed corresponding sentences are in fact not such neat fits. Moreover, Exercise 1 (Appendix H) makes Translation Exercise 3 in Appendix C somewhat redundant.

On the other hand, some translation activities suggested in this paper could be expanded. For example, events such as World Oceans Day (June 8), World Population Day (July 11), International Translation Day (September 30), or International Students Day (November 17) each offer opportunities to engage in creative and project-oriented translation activities. We believe that translator training programs should include a broad range of engaging activities.

Conclusion

This paper has described the use of machine translation by 86 EFL learners at two educational institutions in Japan. It also probed into the way that students conceptualize the translation process and highlighted some salient errors in a few translation tasks. Finally, we explored the impact that C-R activities might have had on shaping student attitudes about automatic machine translations. What we found was despite knowing the results are often imperfect, many students rely extensively on machine translation and most have very basic notions regarding the translation process. The need to help more students conceptually ground translation in a socio-cultural context and to learn more about translator training resources was underscored.

Some limitations of the current study need to be mentioned as well as and directions for further research. Obviously, the sampling used in this study is not representative of the entire Japanese tertiary student population. Five of the six informants were female and their reported TOEIC scores were above the norm. It is quite likely that those with substantially lower levels of English proficiency would respond quite differently to the activities outlined herein. Future studies should focus on gaining students who are closer to (or slightly below) the norm. This invites the question of whether translation should be taught only to highly proficient language learners, or whether it is useful for learners at all levels. As Colina and Angelelli note:

[T]he generalizations (i.e., oversimplifications) of the past, such as the idea that translation or interpreting should not be taught until students are fully bilingual and/or that translation/interpreting should only be carried out into the L1, are now seen as inadequate and descriptively inaccurate. Consequently, teachers and scholars are more interested in learning how to teach translation/interpreting to students with various levels of linguistic proficiency and how to create reasonable outcomes and evaluation methods for a variety of student profiles. (p.114)

Another limitation of this research concerns methodology: this research relied entirely on questionnaires, interviews, and some non-systematic classroom observations to consider how a small sample of students interacted with Japanese and English texts. Future studies could adopt more sophisticated research methods such as journaling, video recording, and portfolio studies. Instead of examining how students translate merely one or two documents, a broader portfolio may yield a richer corpus of information.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Tom Gally and Hywel Evans for their comments and suggestions on this paper, as well as to Keiko Tonegawa for her assistance with the translation.

References

- AlleyCorp. (2020). *Meetup* (8.2.11) [Mobile app]. Retrieved from www.meetup.com/
- American Translators Association. (2017). Explanation of Error Categories. Retrieved from www.atanet.org/certification/aboutexams_error.php
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Griffin, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from the ESL classroom. *System*, 33 (3), 401-415. Doi: 10.1016/j.system.2005.06.004
- Bolitho, R. & Tomlinson, B. (1980). *Discover English: A Language Awareness Coursebook*. New York: Heinemann.
- Branson, R.K., et al. (1975). *Interservice procedures for instructional systems development*. Ft. Monroe, VA: U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command. ERIC Number: ED164745.
- Bruner, J. S. (1961). The act of discovery. *Harvard Educational Review*, 31, 21–32. Retrieved from digitalauthorshipuri.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/the-act-of-discovery-bruner.pdf
- Carr, T. H., & Curran, T. (1994). Cognitive factors in learning about structured sequences: Applications to syntax. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16(2), 205-230. Doi: 10.1017/S0272263100012882
- Cheng, S. (2017). *Translation competence development among learners: A problem-solving perspective*. An unpublished dissertation at the University of Manchester. Retrieved from www.research.manchester.ac.uk/portal/files/64900825/FULL_TEXT.PDF
- Cobb, C. & Boulton, A. (2015). Classroom applications of corpus analysis. In D. Biber & R. Rep-pen (Eds.) . *Cambridge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*. pp.478-497, Cambridge University Press. Doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139764377.027
- Colina, S. & Angelelli, C. V. (2015). Translation and interpreting pedagogy. In C. V. Angelelli & B. J. Baer (Eds.) *Researching Translation and Interpreting*. New York: Routledge.

- Crisafulli, E. (2003). *The Vision of Dante: Cary's Translation of The Divine Comedy*. Harborough, Leicestershire, UK: Troubador.
- Daems, J., Vandepitte, S., Hartsuiker, R. J. & Macken, L. (2017). Identifying the machine translation error types with the greatest impact on post-editing effort. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, Article 1282. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01282
PMCID: PMC5539081
- DeepL GmbH (n.d.). *Linguee*. Retrieved from <http://www.linguee.com/>
- Ellis, R. (2002). Grammar teaching: Practice or consciousness raising? In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching* (pp. 167-174). Cambridge University Press.
- Fotos, S. (1993). Consciousness-raising and noticing through focus on form: Grammar task performance vs. formal instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 14*(4), 385-407. Doi: 10.1093/applin/14.4.385
- Fujita, A., et al. (2017). Consistent classification of translation revisions: A case study of English-Japanese student translations. In N. Schneider & N. Xue (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 11th Linguistic Annotation Workshop*, pp 57–66. Doi: 10.18653/v1/W17-08
- Hawkins, E. (1994). Language awareness, in R. Asher (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 4, pp 1933–1938.
- Hervey, S., Higgins, I., & Loughridge, M. (1995). *Thinking German Translation: A Course in Translation Method*. New York: Routledge.
- Huddleston-Edgerton, S. (2010). *Translating the Curriculum: Multiculturalism into Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Japan Post (n.d.) *Nengajō bunrei-shū*. [New Year's card sentence collection] Retrieved from yubin.jp/letters/phrases/
- Johns, T. (1991). From printout to handout: Grammar and vocabulary teaching in the context of data driven learning. In T. Johns, & P. King (Eds.), *Classroom Concordancing. ELR Journal 4*. pp. 27-45. University of Birmingham Centre for English Language Studies.
- Johns, T. (1993). Data-driven learning: An update. *TELL&CALL 1993/2*. pp. 4-10.
- Johns, T. (2002). Data-driven learning: The Perpetual Challenge. In Kettermann, B. and Marko, G. (Eds.) *Teaching and Learning by Doing Corpus Linguistics*. pp. 107-117. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Jones, F. R. (2011). *Poetry Translating as Expert Action*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Kaminska, O. & Foulsham, T. (2013). Understanding sources of social desirability bias in different modes: evidence from eye-tracking. *ISER Working Paper Series 2013-04*, Institute for Social and Economic Research. Retrieved from: www.iser.essex.ac.uk/research/publications/working-papers/iser/2013-04.pdf
- Kindaichi, K. (2001). *Shinsen Kokugo Jiten*, [New Japanese Dictionary]. Tokyo: Shōgakukan.
- Kvale, S. (2008). *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing* (Third edition). London: Sage.
- Lee, Y. O. & Ronowicz, E. (2014). The development of an error typology to assess translation from English into Korean in class. *Babel*, 60(1), 35-51. Doi: 10.1075/babel.60.1.03lee
- Li, L. (2017). Training undergraduate translators: A consciousness-raising approach. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 11(4), 245-258. Doi: 10.1080/1750399X.2017.1359757
- Marco Polo Project. (n.d.). *Translation Club*. Retrieved from www.marcopoloproject.org/translation-club/
- Marinov, S. (2016). Translation exercise aided by data-driven learning in ESP context. *ESP Today*, 4 (2) 225-250. Doi: 10.18485/esptoday.2016.4.2.5
- Matsuno, S. (2009). Self-, peer-, and teacher-assessments in Japanese university EFL writing classrooms. *Language Testing*, 26 (1) 75-100. Doi.: 10.1177/0265532208097337
- Moorkens, J. & O'Brien, S. (2015). Post-editing evaluations: Trade-offs between novice and professional participants. In I. El-Kahlout, et al (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation*, Antalya, Turkey. pp 75-81. Retrieved from www.aclweb.org/anthology/W15-4910.pdf
- Murphey, T. & Falout, J. (2010). Critical participatory looping: Dialogic member checking with whole classes. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44 (4) 811-821. Doi: 10.5054/tq.2010.237337
- PACTE group. (2005). Investigating translation competence: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Meta*, 50, (2) 2005, 609-619. DOI: 10.7202/011004ar
- Pym, A. (2014). *Vinay and Darbelnet and the politics of translation solutions*. (Unpublished paper). Retrieved from usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/translation/2014_vinay_darbelnet.pdf
- Reiß, K. & Vermeer, H. J. (2014). *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action*. (trans. by C. Nord). Abingdon, U.K.: Routledge.
- Reverso Technologies. (2013, 2020). *ReversoContext*. Retrieved from <https://context.reverso.net/translation/>
- Rijkelijhuizen, R. [Robert]. (2018, February 13). Which are the best ways to say "you" in Japanese? [Quora post]. Retrieved from www.quora.com/How-do-you-say-you-formally-in-Japanese?share=1
- Rutherford, W.E. (1987). *Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching*. New York: Longman.

- Saito, H. & Fujita, T. (2004). Characteristics and user acceptance of peer rating in EFL writing classrooms. *Language Testing Research*, 8 (1) 31-54. Doi: 10.1191/1362168804lr133oa
- Sharwood-Smith, M. (1981). Consciousness-Raising and the Second Language Learner. *Applied Linguistics*, 11 (2), 159-168. Doi: 10.1093/applin/II.2.159
- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11 (2), 129-158. Doi: 10.1093/applin/11.2.129
- Shimura, M. (2006). Peer-and instructor assessment of oral presentations in Japanese university EFL classrooms: A pilot study. *Waseda Global Forum*, 3, 99-107. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/reader/144454460>
- Singer Contreras, N. (2016). A proposal for language teaching in translator training programmes using data-driven learning in a task-based approach. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 4(2), 155-167. Retrieved from tinyurl.com/rb3o2fs
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (1994). Pragmatic awareness activities. *Language Awareness*, 3 (3-4), 119-129. Doi: 10.1080/09658416.1994.9959850
- Vinay, J. P. & Darbelnet, J. (1958, 1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology of translation*. [Benjamins Translation Library]. (J. C. Sager & M. J. Hamel, Trans. & Ed.) 249- 254. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. New York: Routledge.
- Walsh, S. (2003). Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom through teacher self-evaluation. *Language Awareness* 12 (2), 124–142. Doi: 10.1080/09658410308667071
- WordSmith Tools (Version 8) [Computer software] (2020). Lexical Analysis Software & Oxford University Press. Available from <https://lexically.net>
- Wright, T. and Bolitho, R. (1993). Language awareness: A missing link in language teacher education?, *ELT Journal* 47(4), 292–304. doi: 10.1093/elt/47.4.292
- Yazdanmehr, E. & Shoghi, S. (2014). Guidelines for effective TAP (Translation for Academic Purposes) tutorial courses. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 2 (1), 69-78. Retrieved from www.eltjournal.org/archive/value2%20issue1/7-2-1-14.pdf

Appendix A

Translation Exercise 1

私たちは、大学生がどのように日本語から英語に翻訳するかについての研究を行っています。以下の文章を見て、可能な限り英語に翻訳してください。このアクティビティを行うには10分かかります。スマートフォンを使用してオンライン翻訳サービスに接続することも、オンラインサービスなしで自分で行うこともできます。このアクティビティは、皆さんが履修するコースの成績に影響を与えることは一切ありません。ペナルティなしで参加を拒否する権利があります。この質問紙はアクティビティの最後に回収し、すべての結果は、個人情報が特定される事はありません。この質問紙に名前は書かないでください。ただし、性別、母国語、使用したデジタル翻訳サービス名を記入してください。

さらに質問がある場合は、以下の研究者に連絡してください。

Timothy Newfields (email address*) Ivan Botev (email address*)

明けましておめでとうございます

昨年はいろいろと心づかいをいただきありがとうございます。
今年も変わらぬお付き合いのほどよろしくお願いいたします。

仕事もプライベートも充実した日々を送っています。

今年は再会を果たしたいですね。

お互い健康に気をつけてがんばっていきましょう。

* To reduce spam, the email addresses do not appear in this online version.

使用したオンライン翻訳サイト / Online Translation Sites Used: _____ 性別 / Gender: __ 母語 / Native Language: _____

Appendix B

(Original) Translation Exercise 2

NOTE: A revised version of this exercise is in **Appendix H**. We recommend that version for most classes.

私たちは、大学生がどのように日本語から英語に翻訳するかについての研究を行っています。このアクティビティは、皆さんが履修するコースの成績に影響を与えることは一切ありません。ペナルティなしで参加を拒否する権利があります。この質問紙はアクティビティの最後に回収し、すべての結果は、個人情報特定される事にはありません。この質問紙に名前は書かないでください。ただし、性別、母国語、使用したデジタル翻訳サービス名を記入してください。さらに質問がある場合は、以下の研究者に連絡してください。この研究をオプトアウトしたい場合は、この時点で手を挙げてください。

Timothy Newfields (email address*) Ivan Botev (email address*)

手順: 東京に小さなお店を営んでいて、外国のビジネスクライアントに年賀状を書いていると想像してください。以下の翻訳文が日本語と調和し、英語でも自然だと思う場合は文の前に「O」を記入しなさい。自然な翻訳がない場合は、以下の空白に自分の翻訳を書き込んでください。

(1) 去年はいろいろと心づかいをいただきありがとうございます。

- | | |
|---|---|
| ___ (A) Thank you for taking care of me last year. | ___ (E) Thank you for treating me kindly last year. |
| ___ (B) Thank you for your consideration last year. | ___ (F) Thank you for having a lot of kindness last year. |
| ___ (C) I appreciate your some kindness last year. | ___ (G) Thank you for various considerations last year. |
| ___ (D) Thank you for having me last year. | ___ (H) Thank you for last year. |

(2) 今年も変わらぬお付き合いのほどよろしくお願いいたします。

- | | |
|---|---|
| ___ (A) Let's keep this close relationship | ___ (D) I hope an unchanging relationship also this year. |
| ___ (B) Please keep the same relationship this year. | ___ (E) I look forward to working with you this year. |
| ___ (C) I look forward to your continues good will this year. | ___ (F) Hope we still be friends this year too. |

(3) 仕事もプライベートも充実した日々を送っています。

- | | |
|---|---|
| ___ (A) I'm spending my days full of work and private life. | ___ (D) I have been having fulfilling days in private and work. |
| ___ (B) I spend good days both work and my private. | ___ (E) I have spent full fill days by work and private. |
| ___ (C) I'm enjoying not only jobs, but also privates. | ___ (F) I look forward to working with you this year. |

(4) 今年は再会を果たしたいですね。

- | | |
|--|--|
| ___ (A) I'm looking forward to meeting you this year. | ___ (D) I want to meet again this year. |
| ___ (B) I want to achieve a reencounter this year. | ___ (E) See you next year!! |
| ___ (C) I would like to fulfill our reunion this year. | ___ (F) Hope I will meet with you this year. |

(5) お互い健康に気をつけてがんばっていきましょう。

- | | |
|---|--|
| ___ (A) Be careful about health each other. | ___ (D) Let's take care of health each other. |
| ___ (B) Let's keep healthy and moving on | ___ (E) Let's do our best to take care of each other's health. |
| ___ (C) Let's take care of ourselves. | ___ (F) Let's do our best with health each other. |

* To reduce spam, the email addresses do not appear in this online version.

使用したオンライン翻訳サイト / Online Translation Cites Used: _____ 性別 / Gender: ___ 母語 / Native Language: _____

Appendix C

Translation Exercise 3: Introducing Subtext

翻訳するときは、サブテキスト（言外の意味）、実践的な影響、文化的規範を考慮することが重要です。日本の年賀状は、より正式で（儀礼的な）言葉を使用する傾向があり、英語の年賀状は普段通りの言葉を使用します。

指示：左側の英文と右側のサブテキストメッセージ（日本語に翻訳されている）を一致させます。

アスタリスク（伏字）付きの文は、非標準の文法を使用します。

去年はいろいろと心づかいをいただきありがとうございます。

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| __ (1) *I appreciate your some kindness last year. | __ (A) 昨年のご厚意に感謝します。 |
| __ (2) Thank you for having me last year. | __ (B) 去年、あなたは時々私に親切でした[時にはそうでなかった]。 |
| __ (3) Thank you for taking care of me last year. | __ (C) 私は子供（大人ではない）であり、あなたは私の世話をした。 |
| __ (4) Thank you for your kindness last year. | __ (D) 去年、私を迎えてくれて[または私を産んでくれて]ありがとう。 |

今年も変わらぬお付き合いのほどよろしくお願いいたします。

- | | |
|--|--|
| __ (1) I look forward to working with you this year. | __ (A) 私たちの関係は親密です。その親密さを保ちましょう。 |
| __ (2) Let's keep this close relationship. | __ (B) 来年も友達付き合いを望んでいますが、期待しないでください。 |
| __ (3) Please keep the same relationship this year. | __ (C) 今年はあなたと一緒に働くことを楽しみにしています。 |
| __ (4) *Hope we still be friends this year too. | __ (D) 私たちの(退屈な、成長していない)関係に変化がないことを願っています。 |

仕事もプライベートも充実した日々を送っています。

- | | |
|---|---|
| __ (1) *I'm spending my days full of work and private life. | __ (A) 私のプライベート(秘密の生活)は忙しく、仕事も忙しいです。 |
| __ (2) *I spend good days both work and my private. | __ (B) 今年はあなたと一緒に働くことを楽しみにしています。 |
| __ (3) *I'm enjoying not only jobs, but also privates. | __ (C) 仕事と私の秘密の生活の両方が忙しいです。 |
| __ (4) I look forward to working with you this year. | __ (D) 仕事を楽んでいるだけでなく、私の性器(プライベート)も楽しんでます。 |

今年は再会を果たしたいですね。

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| __ (1) I'm looking forward to meeting you this year. | __ (A) また来年会いしましょう！！ |
| __ (2) I want to meet again this year. | __ (B) 今年は、ようやくお目にかかれる事を願ってます。 |
| __ (3) See you next year!! | __ (C) 今年もまた会いたいな！ |
| __ (4) Hope I will meet with you this year. | __ (D) 会ったことはありませんが、今年は会える事を期待しています。 |

お互い健康に気をつけてがんばっていきましょう。

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| __ (1) *Be careful about health each other. | __ (A) お互いの健康を守るために最善を尽くしましょう。 |
| __ (2) *Let's keep healthy and moving on | __ (B) 健康を維持し、それから私たちの生活を別々に続けましょう。 |
| __ (3) Let's do our best to take care of each other's health. | __ (C) 自分自身を大事にしましょう(お互い心配しないで)。 |
| __ (4) Let's take care of ourselves. | __ (D) 互いの健康に注意しましょう。 |

使用したオンライン翻訳サイト/ Online Translation Cites Used: _____ 性別 / Gender: __ 母語 / Native Language: _____

Appendix D

Translation Exercise 4: Comparing English-Japanese Machine Translations

英日機械翻訳の比較

NOTE: If you wish to streamline this activity, the items in shaded gray can be deleted.

指示：以下はサンタクロースへの短い手紙の異なる機械翻訳です。あなたは、どの翻訳が適していると思いますか？それらの和訳文の前に「○」を付けてください。あなたは、以下の機械翻訳に問題があることに気付きましたか？翻訳が自然でなければ、文の前に「X」を付けて、誤訳を修正してください。

1 Dear Santa,

(A) __親愛なるサンタ、 [Google, Bing, Yandex, Excite] (B) __ディアサンタ。 [Baidu]

2 Thank you for your kindness to so many kids around the world each year.

- (A) __毎年世界中の多くの子供たちへの親切に感謝します。 [Google]
(B) __毎年、世界中の多くの子供たちにご親切にありがとうございました。 [Bing]
(C) __毎年世界中の子供たちに親切にしてくれてありがとう。 [Baidu]
(D) __毎年世界中の非常に多くの子供たちにあなたの優しさをありがとう。 [Yandex]
(E) __1年ごとに世界中のそんなに多くの子供についてのあなたの思いやりをあなたに感謝する。 [Excite]

3 You might not remember me, but I am Kei Suzuki - a 19 year old student at a school in Tokyo.

- (A) __覚えていないかもしれませんが、私は東京の学校の 19 歳の鈴木 student です。 [Google]
(B) __あなたは私を覚えていないかもしれませんが、私は鈴木圭です - 東京の学校の 19 歳の学生です。 [Bing]
(C) __あなたは私を覚えていないかもしれませんが、私は東京の学校で 19 歳の学生ケイ・ケイです。 [Baidu]
(D) __あなたは私を覚えていないかもしれませんが、私は東京の学校の 19 歳の学生です。 [Yandex]
(E) __あなたは私を覚えてはならないけれども、私は鈴木慶である-東京の学校の 19 歳学生。 [Excite]

4 Last Dec. 25th you gave my family some delicious chocolates.

- (A) __去年の 12 月 25 日、あなたは私の家族に美味しいチョコレートをくれました。 [Google]
(B) __昨年 of 12 月 25 日、あなたは私の家族にいくつかのおいしいチョコレートを与えました。 [Bing]
(C) __月 25 日、あなたは私の家族においしいチョコレートをあげました。 [Baidu]
(D) __最後の Dec. 25 日あなたは私の家族に美味しいチョコレートをくれた [Yandex]
(E) __この前の 12 月 25 日に、あなたは私の家族にいくつかの旨いチョコレートを与えた。 [Excite]

5 I'm grateful for those gifts and this year I've tried to make my folks happy.

- (A) __私はそれらの贈り物に感謝し、今年は私の人々を幸せにしようと思いました。 [Google, Bing]
(B) __私はそれらの贈り物に感謝します、そして、今年、私は私の人々を幸せにしようと思いました。 [Baidu]
(C) __私はそれらの贈り物に感謝しています、そして今年私は私の人々を幸せにしようと思いました。 [Yandex]
(D) __私はそれらの贈り物を感謝し、今年、私は私の人々を幸福にしようとした。 [Excite]

6 I've helped them with many household chores and also studied hard at school.

- (A) __私は多くの家事で彼らを助け、また学校で一生懸命勉強しました。 [Google]
- (B) __私は彼らの家事を手伝い、学校で一生懸命勉強しました。 [Bing]
- (C) __私は多くの家庭の雑用で彼らを助けて、学校で一生懸命勉強しました。 [Baidu]
- (D) __私は多くの家事で彼らを助け、また学校で一生懸命勉強しました。 [Yandex]
- (E) __私は多くの家庭の雑用についてそれらを援助し、また、学校で熱心に勉強した。 [Excite]

7 This year I'd like to humbly request the following Christmas gift:

- (A) __今年は、次のクリスマスプレゼントを謙虚にリクエストしたいと思います。 [Google, Bing]
- (B) __今年は、次のクリスマスプレゼントをお礼申し上げます。 [Baidu]
- (C) __今年私は謙虚に次のクリスマスプレゼントを要求したいと思います。 [Yandex]
- (D) __今年、私は以下のクリスマスギフトを控えめに要求したい。 [Excite]

8 Could you kindly give me a one-day passport to Tokyo Disneyland?

- (A) __東京ディズニーランドへの1日パスポートをください。 [Google]
- (B) __東京ディズニーランドへの1日のパスポートをください。 [Bing]
- (C) __東京ディズニーランドまで一日パスポートをお願いします。 [Baidu]
- (D) __東京ディズニーランドにパスポートをお渡しくください。 [Yandex]
- (E) __どうか、親切に、東京ディズニーランドに私に1日パスポートを与えなさい。 [Excite]

9 My classmates and I are hoping to visit there during the winter holiday.

- (A) __私のクラスメートと私は、冬休みにそこを訪れたいと思っています。 [Google]
- (B) __私のクラスメートと私は冬休みにそこに行きたいと思っています。 [Bing]
- (C) __私のクラスメートと私は冬の休暇中にそこに行きたいと思っています。 [Baidu]
- (D) __東京ディズニーランドにパスポートをお渡しくください。 [Yandex]
- (E) __私の級友と私は、冬の休日の間にそこに訪問することを望んでいる。 [Excite]

10 I've never experienced winter at Disneyland before, so I would be very grateful for the chance.

- (A) __ディズニーランドで冬を経験したことがないので、その機会にとっても感謝しています。 [Google]
- (B) __ディズニーランドで冬を経験したことがないので、そのチャンスにとっても感謝しています。 [Bing]
- (C) __ディズニーランドのの休日を経験したことはありません。 [Baidu]
- (D) __私は前にディズニーランドで冬を経験したことがないので、私はチャンスのために非常に感謝されます。 [Yandex]
- (E) __私は前にディズニーランドで冬を一度も経験したことがない。従って、私はチャンスを非常に感謝している。 [Excite]

11 I promise to be a good boy/girl during the upcoming year.

- (A) ___来年は良い男の子/女の子になることを約束します。 [Google]
(B) ___私は来年の間に良い男の子/女の子になることを約束します。 [Bing, Yandex]
(C) ___私は、良い年の間、良い男の子/女の子であると約束します。 [Baidu]
(D) ___私は、近く発表される年の間によい少年/女の子であると約束する。 [Excite]

12 If you aren't too tired, why not join us in Urayasu sometime between Dec. 26th and Jan. 1st?

- (A) ___疲れていなければ、12月26日から1月1日の間にいつか浦安に参加してみませんか？ [Google]
(B) ___あまり疲れていない方は、12月26日から1月1日の間に浦安にご参加ください。 [Bing]
(C) ___私のクラスメートと私は冬の休暇中にそこに行きたいと思っています。 [Baidu]
(D) ___あまりにも疲れていない場合は、いつかDecの間に浦安にご参加ください。26日と月。1st? [Yandex]
(E) ___もしあなたが非常に疲れていないならば12月26日と1月1日の間にウラヤスにおいてそのうち私達に参加する？ [Excite]

13 Respectfully looking forward to your favorable reply.

- (A) ___好意的な返事を心から楽しみにしています。 [Google]
(B) ___ご好意的なご返事をお待ちしております。 [Bing]
(C) ___あなたの好意的な返事を楽しみにしています。 [Baidu]
(D) ___丁重にあなたの好ましい応答に先に見ること。 [Yandex]
(E) ___うやうやしく、あなたの好意的な返答を楽しみにする。 [Excite]

15 Affectionately yours,

- (A) ___愛情深くあなたのもの、 [Google] (B) ___愛情を込めて、 [Bing] (C) ___愛情深いあなたの [Baidu]
(D) ___敬具、 [Excite] (E) ___親しお、 [Yandex]

16 Kei

- (A) ___けい [Google] (B) ___圭 [Bing] (C) ___ケイ [Baidu, Yandex] (D) ___Kei [Excite]

Discussion Points

以下の質問についてグループで英語で話し合ってください。

1. Did you notice any problems with the computer translations?
2. Did any of the computer translations seem impolite?
3. Which of the five translation services above seems best to you?
4. *Agree or Disagree*: English-Japanese computer translations are basically accurate.
5. *Agree or Disagree*: It is better not to use computer translation services.

Common Online Translation Sites

Google (translate.google.com) Bing (www.bing.com/Translator) Baidu (fanyi.baidu.com) Tradukka (tradukka.com)

Reverso (www.reverso.net) Yandex (translate.yandex.com) Excite (www.excite.co.jp/world/)

Appendix E

Translation Exercise 5: Comparing Japanese-English Machine Translations

日英機械翻訳の比較

NOTE: If you wish to streamline this activity, the items in shaded gray can be deleted.

指示：以下はサンタクロースへの短い手紙の異なる機械翻訳です。あなたは、どの翻訳が適していると思いますか？それらの和訳文の前に「○」を付けてください。あなたは、以下の機械翻訳に問題があることに気付きましたか？翻訳が自然でなければ、文の前に「X」を付けて、誤訳を修正してください。

1 スミス先生

(A) ___ Mr. Smith [Google, Excite] (B) ___ Dr. Smith [Bing, Baidu, Tradukka, Yandex] (C) ___ MR Smith [Reverso]

2 年賀状をいただき、ありがとうございました。

- (A) ___ Thank you for your New Year's card. [Google, Bing, Tradukka]
(B) ___ Thank you for the *nengajo*. [Baidu]
(C) ___ Thank you very much for your New Year's cards. [Reverso]
(D) ___ We have a lot of New Year's cards, thank you. [Yandex]
(E) ___ I receive a New Year's card and thank you very much. [Excite]

3 先生は、良い冬休みを過ごされましたか。

- (A) ___ Did your teacher have a good winter vacation? [Google, Bing, Tradukka]
(B) ___ Did the teacher spend a good winter vacation? [Baidu]
(C) ___ Did the teacher spend a good winter break? [Reverso]
(D) ___ Did the teacher have a good winter break? [Yandex]
(E) ___ Did a teacher spend the good winter holidays? [Excite]

4 冬休みの数日間、私は長野で家族と過ごしました。

- (A) ___ For a few days during winter vacation, I spent time with my family in Nagano. [Google]
(B) ___ I spent a few days in Nagano with my family during the winter vacation. [Bing, Tradukka]
(C) ___ I spent my winter vacation with my family in Nagano. [Baidu]
(D) ___ I spent a few days in Nagano with my family during my winter break. [Reverso]
(E) ___ I spent a few days with my family in Nagano during the winter holidays. [Yandex]
(F) ___ A few days in the winter holidays, I spent with the family in Nagano. [Excite]

5 また、大学の同じサークルに所属する友達とスノーボードもしました。

- (A) ___ I also snowboarded with friends from the same college circle. [Google]
(B) ___ I also snowboarded with a friend who belonged to the same circle at the university. [Bing, Tradukka]
(C) ___ I also snowboarding with my friends who belong to the same circle. [Baidu]
(D) ___ We also snowboarding with friends from the same circle at the university. [Reverso]

- (E) ___ I also went snowboarding with friends who belonged to the same circle of the University. [Yandex]
(F) ___ The snowboard was also made the friend who belongs to the same club of a university. [Excite]

6 今年度は、あと数週間しか残っていません。

- (A) ___ This school year has only a few weeks left. [Google]
(B) ___ There are only a few more weeks left in this school year. [Bing, Tradukka]
(C) ___ There are only a few weeks left this year. [Baidu]
(D) ___ The current year is only a few weeks away. [Reverso]
(E) ___ This school year has only been around for a few more weeks. [Yandex]
(F) ___ The grade is left for only several weeks more now. [Excite]

7 クラス担任をしていただいた事に感謝します。

- (A) ___ Thanks for being a classroom teacher. [Google]
(B) ___ Thank you for taking charge of the class. [Bing, Tradukka]
(C) ___ I would like to thank you for your class. [Baidu]
(D) ___ Thank you for your class. [Reverso]
(E) ___ Thank you for being a class teacher. [Yandex]
(F) ___ I'm thankful that you were a class homeroom teacher. [Excite]

8 春休みを楽しんでいただければ幸いです。

- (A) ___ I hope you enjoy the spring break. [Google]
(B) ___ I hope you enjoy spring break. [Bing, Baidu, Tradukka, Yandex]
(C) ___ We hope you enjoy spring break. [Reverso]
(F) ___ I should be very much obliged if you can enjoy the spring holidays. [Excite]

Discussion Points

以下の質問についてグループで英語で話し合ってください。

1. What problems did you notice with these computer translations?
2. If you were actually writing to a teacher in English, what would the best way to do that be ?
3. *Agree or Disagree*: Computer translations are only useful for getting a rough gist of a foreign language text.
4. *Agree or Disagree*: Computer translations are frequently misleading.

Online Translation Used

Google (translate.google.com) **Bing** (www.bing.com/Translator) **Baidu** (fanyi.baidu.com) **Tradukka** (tradukka.com)
Reverso (www.reverso.net) **Yandex** (translate.yandex.com) **Excite** (www.excite.co.jp/world/)

Appendix F

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

NOTE: *Since the English proficiency level of the respondents varied and both interviewers were fluent in Japanese, if the informants had difficulty understanding or responding to a question in English, Japanese was used. Also, prior to the interview an informed consent statement was given verbally to all informants and their consent was sought.*

Part I. Introductory Questions

1. To protect your privacy no real names will be used in this research. Can you choose a *nickname* that we can use?

プライバシーを保護するため、本調査では本名を使用しません。本調査で使用するニックネームを教えてください。

2. What languages do you speak? 普段使用する言語は何ですか。(複数回答可)

3. How old are you now? 現時点での年齢を教えてください。

4. What was your most recent TOEIC score? 最後に受けた TOEIC のスコアを教えてください。

5. Can you briefly summarize your English language learning history? これまでの英語学習歴を簡単に教えてください。

6. What foreign countries have you visited so far? (And for how long?)

これまで訪れたことのある外国はどこですか。またどのくらいの期間滞在していましたか。

7. Do you have a cellphone? 携帯電話を持っていますか。

8. On your cellphone, do you have any electronic dictionaries? (If so, which ones?)

あなたの携帯電話には電子辞書が搭載されていますか。(その場合、何という辞書ですか)(複数回答可)

9. On your cellphone, do you have any translation apps? (If so, which ones?)

あなたの携帯電話には翻訳アプリが搭載されていますか。(その場合、何というアプリですか)(複数回答可)

If respondents answered "yes" then ask - 答えが「はい」場合、次の質問に教えてください。

(a) When did you last use that(those) cellphone translation app(apps)?

携帯電話の翻訳アプリを最後に使用したのはいつですか。

(b) How often do you use that(those) cellphone translation app(apps)?

どのくらいの頻度で携帯電話の翻訳アプリを使用しますか。

10. Do you have a computer? パソコンを持っていますか。

11. Which online translation sites do you use, and how often?

次のうちどの翻訳サイトを使用しますか。またどのくらいの頻度で使用しますか。

__ Baidu __Bing __Excite __Google __Reverso __Sogou __Tradukka __Yandex __Other: _____

12. How would you rate the quality of each of the translation services you have used?

これまで使用した翻訳サービスの質に関してどのように評価しますか。

13. What materials have you translated from Japanese into English?

どのような文(章)を日本語から英語に翻訳したことがありますか。

14. What materials have you translated from English into Japanese?

どのような文(章)を英語から日本語に翻訳したことがありますか。

15. In your view, what is a "good translation"? あなたの考えでは、よい翻訳とはどのようなものですか。
16. When have to write a paper in English for school, do you prefer to write part of that paper in your native language first, and then translate it into English – or do you prefer to work directly in English? 英語で文を書かなくてはならない場合、母国語で書いた後にその文章を英語に翻訳しますか。あるいは最初から英語を使いますか?
17. What do you think is the most important thing to do when translating a document?
文書を翻訳するときにいちばん大切なことは何だと思えますか。
18. How would you describe your preferred translation style? あなたの好みの翻訳スタイルはどのようなものですか。
19. Generally speaking, do you enjoy translating? 概して翻訳することは好きですか。
20. In your view, how important is it to be able to translate between two or more foreign languages?
あなたの考えでは、2か国語以上の言語間の翻訳ができることはどのくらい重要なことですか。

Part II. Questions about Classroom Materials

Now let's take a look at the classroom handouts that we distributed in December and January.

[Showing students Translation Exercise #1]

1. About how long did it take you to translate that post card? そのほかぎを翻訳するのにどのくらい時間がかかりましたか。
2. Did you use any apps to check your translation? (If so, which ones?) そのとき、何かアプリを使用しましたか。
(使用した場合、どのアプリを使用しましたか)
3. Were there any words or phrases you felt unsure how to translate? (If so, which ones?) どのように翻訳したらよいかよく分からない単語や語句はありましたか。(ある場合、どの単語や語句ですか)

[Showing students Translation Exercise #2]

4. How did you feel when doing this exercise? この練習問題に取り組んでどのように感じましたか。
5. How closely did the Japanese and English sentences match in this exercise match?
この練習問題で日本語と英語の文(章)はどのくらい一致しましたか。
6. What words or phrases were especially difficult for you? 特に難しい単語や語句はどれでしたか。

[Showing students Translation Exercise #3]

7. How did you feel about this exercise? この練習問題についてどのように感じましたか。
8. What do you think the goal of this activity was? この活動の目標は何だと思えますか。
9. How would you recommend changing this activity? この活動を変えたとしたらどのようにしたらよいと思えますか。

[Showing students Translation Exercise #4]

10. In your view, how accurate were these computer translations of the Japanese text?
あなたの考えでは、このコンピューターによる日本語のテキストの翻訳はどのくらい正確だと思えますか。
11. What problems did you notice about the computer translations? コンピューター翻訳についての問題点が気が付きましたか。
12. Did this activity have any clear goal or purpose? あなたにとって、この活動ははっきりした目標や目的がありましたか。

[Showing students Translation Exercise #5]

13. Was it easy or difficult for you to judge which of the computer translations seemed "best"?
どのコンピューター翻訳がもっともよいと思えるかを判断するのは、あなたにとって簡単でしたか、難しかったですか。

14. What problems did you notice about these computer translations?

これらのコンピューター翻訳についての問題点に気が付きましたか。

15. Did you learn anything by doing this activity? (If so, what?)

この活動を行うことで、何か得られたものはありますか。(ある場合、それは何ですか)

Part III. Agree or Disagree

Now I would like you to either *agree* or *disagree* with each of the following statements.

Please feel free to comment as much as possible on each statement.

16. *Agree or Disagree*: Today most English-Japanese computer translations are basically accurate.

賛成あるいは不賛成 「今日、ほとんどの英日コンピューター翻訳は基本的に正確だ。」

17. *Agree or Disagree*: It is better not to use machine translation services.

賛成あるいは不賛成 「機械翻訳サービスを使用しないほうがよい。」

18. *Agree or Disagree*: The classroom activities didn't really change my ideas about machine translation.

賛成あるいは不賛成 「教室での活動は機械翻訳に関する私の考えをあまり買えるものではなかった。」

19. *Agree or Disagree*: When I read a document, I can usually tell whether it is the result of
a machine translation or a human translation.

賛成あるいは不賛成 「文書を読んだ際、それが機械翻訳によるものか人間の翻訳によるものかをだいたい区別をすることができる。」

20. I understand the difference between a *direct translation* and an *adapted (or free) translation*. *

賛成あるいは不賛成 「直訳」と「意識」や「自由訳」の違いを理解します。

21. I understand the difference between a *mistranslation* and a *transliteration*. *

賛成あるいは不賛成 「誤訳」と「音訳」の違いを理解します。

* These were added after the first interview to ascertain how much informants knew about translation.

Appendix G Worksheet A

In a sense, there *three* basic types of translations. One type, known as a 「直訳」 in Japanese or a “direct translation” in English, tries to maintain the source text as faithfully (忠実, closely) as possible. Another type, known as a 「意訳」 in Japanese or a “free translation” or “applied translation” in English, changes the source text so that it sounds as naturally as possible in the target language. A third type, known as a 「機械訳」 in Japanese or a “machine translation” in English, renders a source text quickly into a target language. To illustrate the differences, here are three different translations of the previous text in English:

原文 *Source Text*:

① 明けましておめでとうございます ② 去年はいろいろと心づかいをいただきありがとうございます。③ 今年も変わらぬお付き合いのほどよろしく願いいたします。④ 仕事もプライベートも充実した日々を送っています ⑤ 今年には再会を果たしたいですね。⑥ お互い健康に気をつけてがんばっていきましょう。

一つの直訳 *One Possible Direct Translation*:

① New Year Congratulations! ② Last year thank you for various <heartful> caring. ③ This year too, without change please <humbly> socialize [with me]. ④ Work and private life are <spent in> fulfilling <days>. ⑤ This year [let's] carry out a reunion, <right?> ⑥ Let's try to take care of each other's health.

人間による編集後の一つの自由訳 *One Possible Free Translation with Human Post-Editing*:

① Happy New Year. ② Thanks for your kindness last year. ③ I look forward to meeting you further this year. ④ These days work continues to be fulfilling. ⑤ Let's get together sometime later this year, huh? ⑥ Please take care of your health.

一つの可能な機械翻訳 *One Possible Machine Translation*:

① Happy New Year. ② Thank you for all the considerations we had last year. ③ Thank you so much for your continued relationship this year. ④ I have a fulfilling life in my work and private life. ⑤ I want to see you again this year. ⑥ Let's take care of each other's health and do our best.

Source: Bing Translate (www.bing.com/Translator)

Discussion Questions

NOTE: If you wish to streamline this activity, the items in shaded gray can be deleted.

Instructions: *Discuss these questions in small groups, then the class as a whole.*

1. How do the direct and applied translations usually differ?
2. Did you notice any cultural inappropriate direct translation of the source texts in this paper?
3. When are direct translations sometimes be **useful**?
4. When should direct translations be **avoided**?
5. When are applied translations sometimes **useful**?
6. When should applied translations be **avoided**?
7. When do you feel machine translations are **useful**?
8. When should machine translations be **avoided**?
9. Can you guess what the **angle brackets** (e.g. <heartful>) mean?
10. What do you think the **square brackets**(e.g. [with me]) mean?

Agree or Disagree

Instructions: *Agree or disagree these statements in pairs, then discuss them with the whole class.*

1. Generally, direct translations are “bad.”
2. Usually, free or so-called “applied” translations are “good.”
3. The applied translation on the previous page differs a lot from the Japanese text.
4. Most computer translations are **handy** (便利, convenient).
5. Most computer translations are **faithful** (very close to the source text).

Appendix H

(Revised) Translation Exercise 2

NOTE: This Informed Consent Statement is in English, but the Japanese Informed Consent Statement in Appendix 2 can be used instead.

We are doing research how students translate Japanese and English. This questionnaire will be collected at the end of class and there is no need to write your name on this questionnaire. However, we do request that you indicate your gender, native language, and digital translation apps you used to complete this activity at the bottom of this paper. Participation in this activity will have no impact on your grades and you have the right to opt out without penalty. If you have further questions, please feel to contact the researchers below. If you wish to opt out of this research, please raise your hand at this time.

Timothy Newfields (email address*) Ivan Botev (email address*)

Instructions: *Imagine that you own a small shop in Tokyo and that you are writing a new year's card to a foreign client. If the translations below seem to fit the Japanese text reasonably well and also seem natural in English, write a 「○」 before that sentence. If none of the translations seem natural; to you, please write out your own translation in each blank space.*

指示：次の文が自然であると思われる場合には文の前に「○」を記入しなさい。自然に見えない場合は、その文の前に「X」を記入し、

(1) 去年はいろいろと心づかいをいただきありがとうございます。

- ___ (A) Many thanks for your kindness last year. ___ (C) Thank you for considering last year.
___ (B) I received many considerations last year; thank you very much. ___ (D) Thank you for all the considerations last year.

Other: _____

(2) 今年も変わらぬお付き合いのほどよろしくお願いいたします。

- ___ (A) Thank you for your continued relationship this year. ___ (C) Thank you for your ongoing good will.
___ (B) Thank you so much for continuing our relationship. ___ (D) I look forward to working with you this year.

Other: _____

(3) 仕事もプライベートも充実した日々を送っています。

- ___ (A) I am fulfilling my work and my private days. ___ (C) Work has been fulfilling these days.
___ (B) Work and the private life are full. ___ (D) I have a lot of work and personal life every day.

Other: _____

(4) 今年は再会を果たしたいですね。

- ___ (A) This year, I want to see a reunion. ___ (C) I hope to see you again this year.
___ (B) I want to meet again this year. ___ (D) You'd like to achieve a reunion this year, right?

Other: _____

(5) お互い健康に気をつけてがんばっていきましょう。

- ___ (A) Let's be careful of each other's health and work hard. ___ (C) Let's do our best with good health.
___ (B) Take care of each other's health and do our best, right? ___ (D) Please take care of yourself and do well.

Other: _____

* To reduce spam, the email addresses do not appear in this online version.

使用したオンライン翻訳サイト / Online Translation Sites Used: _____ 性別 / Gender: ___ 母語 / Native Language: _____

Appendix I

Worksheet B: Translator Training Resources

(1) Online bilingual concordances

A concordance is list of words appearing in a passage. It shows you how words are used in actual situations.

Here are three useful online concordance tools. They are available as iOS/Android apps as well as websites.

Linguee	(www.linguee.com)	25 languages
Reverso-Context	(context.reverso.net/translation/)	13 languages
Weblio	(ejje.weblio.jp)	11 languages

(2) Online peer translation services

HiNative	(hinative.com)	17 languages	<i>a useful resource for receiving sentence-level corrections</i>
Lang-8	(lang-8.com)	90 languages	<i>often useful when working with longer passages</i>
Language Exchange	(ja.language.exchange)	13 languages	<i>one of the many places for peer-to-peer linguistic exchanges</i>
Tandem	(tandemexchange.com)	20 languages	<i>another option for linking with language learners</i>

(3) peer translation groups in Tokyo

Marco Polo Project

(www.meetup.com/Japanese-and-English-All-You-Can-Translate)

usually holds weekly meetings in Yotsuya

Tokyo Translator Study Group

(www.meetup.com/Tokyo-Translator-Study-Group)

periodically meets in South Shinjuku

Japan Association of Translators / 日本翻訳者協会 (<https://jat.org>)

a good resource for those interested in careers in translating or interpreting

Discussion Questions

Instructions: *Discuss these questions in small groups, then the class as a whole.*

1. What are the pros and cons of using a bilingual concordance?
2. Which of the online peer translation services seem most interesting to you?
3. What precautions should you take when using online forums?
4. Are you interested in attending a peer translation groups in Tokyo?