

Teaching the Analysis of Translation Errors through Collaborative Work: The Case of 1st Year Master Students at the University of Mascara – Algeria

BENMOKHTARI Hicham^{1*} 

¹University of Oran 2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed, Algeria
benmokhtari.hicham@gmail.com

DJEFFAL Sofiane² 

²University of Mascara Mustapha Stambouli, Algeria
sofian.djefal@univ-mascara.dz

MOUSSEDEK Sara³ 

³University of Oran 2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed, Algeria
moussedek.sara@yahoo.co.uk

Received: 25/02/2023,

Accepted: 29/12/2023,

Published: 31/12/2023

ABSTRACT: *Given the gap noted in the Algerian official syllabus of the translation unit, and though both teachers and students are aware of the importance of translation errors, no lecture is dedicated to this concept. Hence, the present investigation attempts to testify the efficiency of collaborative work in teaching translation errors to M.A. students and thereby apply the theoretical background in real situations. It aims to train students to detect and correct errors, improve the final product, and minimise the different types of errors. The paper adopts a qualitative quantitative-mixed method to scrutinise the phenomenon under investigation. Whereas the theoretical part draws on Delisle's (1999) model of translation errors, the practical part relies on data collected via questionnaires, interviews, and document analysis. The paper's data were obtained from M.A. students' documents at Mascara University (Algeria) to examine the efficiency of collaborative work as a method of teaching translation errors. The study finds out that the error rate was reduced by 24% after adopting collaborative work, including the three types of texts (general, medical, and literary). The study also concludes that collaborative work enhances three central competencies competitiveness, autonomy, and motivation; hence, they acquire certain translation maturity and critical thinking.*

KEYWORDS: Collaborative work, Teaching, Translation, Errors, Syntactic, Semantic, Stylistic, Errors' minimizing

* Corresponding author: **BENMOKHTARI Hicham**, benmokhtari.hicham@gmail.com
ALTRALAG Journal / © 2023 The Authors. Published by the University of Oran 2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed, Algeria.
This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

1. INTRODUCTION

Translation error is important for translation teachers as many researchers consider it a key criterion for translation assessment. It is recognised as the resulting fault due to either ignorance or misuse of the translation principles. An error can be identified through linguistic, cultural, or systemic inaccuracy. Error-based learning flourishes in the academic world. It has been theoretically efficient but requires more studies to explore its insights and limitations. In this context, various models and typologies of translation errors have been developed, such as Hurtado Apmaro (1995), Nord (1997), and Delisle (1999), which have been adopted in this study since it is well detailed and widely adopted by Algerian trainers.

Collaborative translation has, on the other hand, received much concern. All the translation practices, including translating in the team, co-translation, volunteer translation, and crowd-sourcing where the translator works in a collaborative environment, enhance the professional competence significantly.

In light of the above, the present study applies this method in a translation classroom by adopting collaborative work. The current paper will explore the following main question: to what extent has teaching translation errors proven efficient if associated with collaborative work?

The rationale of this study is to shed light on a fact realised by the researchers through their experience in teaching translation in the Algerian university; the absence of translation errors from the official syllabus as well as the non-adoption of collaborative work by teachers may prevent us from saving time and improving students' motivation and competitiveness.

The present study adopts Delisle's typology of translation errors (1997) for two main reasons; the model distinguishes between language, methodological and translational errors, on the one hand, and it offers the opportunity for students to discover a wide range of errors and lacunae, on the other. The concept of translation error is defined by Delisle (1997) as the failure to apply the translation rule, translation principle, or translation procedure. Students must be aware of these different concepts and the difference between them. The fact that makes this model important to our study is that we aim to apply it through the adoption of collaborative work and the analysis of students' detection and correction of errors committed by their peers.

Before delving into the paper's details, it seems essential to present this study's context. The class is named "translation methods" (Translation Arabic English Arabic MA) at English Department, Mascara University (Algeria). Students need new and creative methods to deal with different translational phenomena at this level. Hence, collaborative work might be one of these insights. Notably, the official syllabus does not contain translation errors as a lesson from their license training nor collaborative work as a teaching method. Moreover, the linguistic pair (Arabic- English) represents another challenge in the sense that English is, in Algeria, a third language (C); however, it is a B language in their case.

The importance of such a study lies in enhancing team groups in discovering and correcting translation errors through the horizons offered by this method. Also, acquiring translation terminology and fundamental concepts, getting familiarised with collaborative work and role attribution, enhancing their critical thinking, which leads to a certain translation maturity, discovering students' errors through correcting their peers' ones and then developing students' competitiveness, autonomy, and motivation.

Furthermore, the present paper aims to answer the following questions: to what extent can students identify translation errors? Are they able to correct translation errors? And how can collaborative work help them detect and correct translation errors? Relying on these research questions, researchers suggest some hypotheses; 1) students may find difficulties in identifying translation errors since they have never tackled them before, 2) they may not be able to them, 3) collaborative work, if used systematically, may help students to detect and correct translation errors and thereby improve their translation maturity.

Hence, the main objectives of the present paper are to minimise students' errors rate in the translational process and thereby improve students' outcome quality.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Translation error represents one of the significant issues related to translation teaching. Numerous studies focused on the importance of including translation errors as a criterion for translation assessment. A translation error is defined by Delisle (1999) as any fault that results from the ignorance or misuse of translation principles, translation rules, or translation procedures. Palumbo (2009) reckons errors happen when ST content is inaccurately transmitted into T.L. He puts to the fore that this concept is mainly concerned with two major translation issues, translation competence, and translator training. From a functional perspective, translation error must be defined regarding the translation purpose or Skopos (Nord: 2018). According to this view, errors are classified into four groups: pragmatic errors (related to context and receivers' expectations), cultural errors (result from inadequate solutions to transmit cultural specific concepts), linguistic errors (related to inadequacies in translating ST structure), and text-specific errors (mistranslating some textual features such as coherence, cohesion.) (Nord 1991). Wilss (1982) reckons that translation error is any transgression against a norm when transmitting a message from one language into another. Wilss focuses on the concept of norms tackled by Toury (1995) and Chasterman (1997). In addition, Sigrid Kupsch-Losereit defines translation error as an alteration of: "1. The function of the translation, 2. the coherence of the text, 3. the text type or text form, 4. linguistic conventions, 5. culture- and situation-specific conventions and conditions, 6. the language system" (1985: P.172). Hence, the concept of error in translation does not refer to merely linguistic lacunae; cultural and systemic considerations are also of paramount importance.

Zanettin (2016) discusses the impact of translation errors on shaping international relations and news media. He highlights the invisibility of translators and interpreters in this sphere by analysing two texts; the Japanese prime minister's statement after the Potsdam ultimatum in 1945 and the Iranian President's Speech "A World without Zionism" in 2005. The paper finds out that journalists and correspondents who perform translation commit errors that alter the original meaning and promote a specific ideology. However, the paper does not focus on error types; it portrays the repercussions of such errors on the reception of the translation. Daemset al (2017) analyse the impact of machine translation (M.T.) errors on post-editing efforts. They conducted their research on professional translators as well as translation students. Errors were classified based on the following norms: adequacy, grammar and syntax, coherence, lexicon, spelling, and style (Daems et al. 2017: P.6). One of the study's main findings is that M.T. quality affects the product and process of post-editing effort indicators. Putri (2019) sheds light on the causes of translation errors. The study finds that most translation errors are related to surface structure (semantic, lexical, morphological, and grammatical). The leading cause of these errors is the need for more target language knowledge. Vardaro et al. (2019) tackle translation quality and error recognition in neural machine translation post-editing. They aim to discover how translation experts (translators, post-editors, and revisors) identify and correct errors. The study takes place at European Commission's Directorate-General for Translation. The study suggests three errors: mistranslations, terminology, and stylistic errors. Vardado et al. reveal that all translation experts recognise all error categories simultaneously early. Also, the experts do not give much importance to an error at the expense of the other; they do not prioritise certain types of errors.

2. 1. COLLABORATIVE TRANSLATION

Translation scholars have recently tackled the concept of collaborative translation to refer to diverse translation practices; translating in a team, translating and having one's translation reviewed, fan translation, co-translating, volunteer translation, and crowd-sourcing. Collaborative translation means any translation process where the translator is not alone in the production and publication of the translation. O'Brian offers two perspectives in her definition of collaborative translation; in its general sense, the concept refers to situations where the translator is working with other agents having an impact on the final product, while,

in its narrow sense, collaborative translation refers to the process in which a translator collaborates with another translator in the translation of a document (O'Brian 2011). Jiménez-Crespo (2017) claims that collaborative translation falls into two main categories (1) crowd-sourcing and (2) online collaborative translation. The former refers to the translation of a product by a large community in response to a call made by any institution or company. At the same time, the latter is used for a community that collaborates to translate a given product. The main difference between the two types is that crowd-sourcing is top-down, whereas online collaborative translation is a down-top operation (Jiménez-Crespo: 2017). In their edited volume "Collaborative Translation: from the Renaissance to the Digital Age" (2017), Cordingley and Manning put forward the basis of this "new" trend in translation studies research. They advanced that translators had always been working in groups, whether in literary or pragmatic fields: "From Antiquity to the Renaissance, translation was frequently practised by groups comprised of specialists of different languages and with varied skills. At the centre of translation teams, experts from various cultures came together to find solutions to translation problems. The acts of reading and rewriting were often separated and multiplied between participants." (2017: P.01). Moreover, translators are obliged to accept the fact that they have a "provisional authority" over the text they are translating since their work is generally revised, reviewed, and published by other agents (Cordingley and Manning 2017). Bistué (2013) distinguishes between (1) translation teams, translators collaborating to produce a translation, and (2) multilingual translation, translators collaborating with the reviewers, printers, publishers, copyists, etc., to produce multiple versions of the source text. In the didactic context, Chang & Hsu (2011) explore the investment of mobile-assisted collaborative translation in EFL reading comprehension. Learners manifest satisfaction and ease in the use of such devices. Prieto-Velasco and Fuentes-Luque (2016) study the role of the collaborative multimodal working environment in enhancing learners' professional competence.

3. METHODOLOGY

To test the effectiveness of collaborative work in teaching translation errors and improve the students' final product, the researchers used a set of texts programmed for first-year master translation students at the Department of English-Mascara University (Algeria) for the first semester of the academic year 2021-2022. They also designed a questionnaire for students' and teachers' interviews for more reliable findings. The reason why collaborative, not individual, work has been chosen is that the participants are novice translators, and working in groups eases the task significantly since it is considered a time-saving and motivating technique that is recently taking much academic concern.

Descriptive research was used to examine the usefulness of collaborative work in detecting the students' translation errors and thereby treating them. The researchers suggest a case study through qualitative and quantitative research instruments to test the hypotheses.

The data collected for interpretation and analysis was obtained during one semester of sixteen (16) sessions from September to December 2021. The research sample is a sum of forty (40) first-year master translation students at the Department of English – Mascara University who were questioned and observed, and nine (09) teachers from the same setting were interviewed.

As for the students, they age from 20 to 26. Most of them are females (35). 87% of the whole came from the English department, who had translation as an unessential module for two (02) years, while the rest (13%) graduated from translation departments from other universities because there is no translation department at Mascara University. They represent the minority who had special training in translation.

The participants were selected for these reasons: The most crucial motive is that most are beginners in this area of interest. It is time to get acquainted with collaborative translation when assessing and detecting their mates' errors. Likewise, they save time, develop critical thinking, make decisions, and select several possibilities at different levels, mainly the terminological, semantic, and stylistic. Another feature of the sampling is that some had accomplished four (04) years of training. A final reason for this choice is

that this master's training allows them to enter the workplace as freelancers or teachers who have to use collaborative work and the assessment of translation errors as a tool when translating or proofreading procedures.

Three research tools were employed, mainly quantitative (questionnaire) and qualitative (document analysis and an interview)

The students' questionnaire, which was distributed in the second session to be filled in one (01) hour, includes eighteen (18) questions divided into an introductory section to obtain information related to the participants' gender, age, and original department, a first part intended for translation evaluation to find out how they assessed a translated text, a second part devoted to translation errors and whether they had a theoretical background in this area. A third division is dedicated to using collaborative work in courses to identify errors and improve translation.

The interview consists of eight (08) questions to analyse teachers' perceptions of teaching translation errors through collaborative work. Nine (09) teachers were interviewed for two weeks through planned sessions. It took around half an hour for each teacher. The respondents were chosen for mainly two reasons. First, they are teaching Master's students who represent the sample. Second, they teach translation as a module in the other departments (English, French, and Arabic).

Three English texts were selected according to two measures: type (general, specialised, and literary) and degree of difficulty to translate into Arabic. The first text was obtained from the U.N.O. website and tackled the significant role of the United Nations Information Centers (U.N.I.C.s) worldwide. The second passage, which was adopted from the World Health Organization website, dealt with global leaders' call for cervical cancer elimination on the day of action. The last one was taken from Dickens' "A Tale of Two Cities."

Three sessions were devoted to each text. The procedure is to assemble the students into ten (10) groups and choose the leader for each one. The first text is general. It contains around ninety (90) words. The second one is a specialised medical text comprising eighty (80) words. The third text is literary and composed of one hundred and ten (110) words.

4. DISCUSSION

This section will be concerned with stating the results and then discussing them. It will be divided into three parts: students' perception of using collaboration in learning translation errors, teachers' attitudes, and the analysis of the students' translations and their assessment.

4.1. The Students' Perceptions

4.1.1. To Translation Evaluation

When asked about the procedure used when assessing a translated text, 30% of the participants read, understood, and finally translated the source text (S.T.). 20% focus on the meaning to translate. 13% compare both texts to find out the errors. 13% have yet to respond. 19% state they use borrowing, word-by-word, adaptation, modulation, and equivalence. 5% believe that the understandability of the text is a sign of a good translation.

The obtained data show that the minority of the respondents mentioned translation errors as a criterion to evaluate a translated text which is a crucial feature of the whole study. Nevertheless, most students are unaware of the primary procedure for translation assessment since 93% of the total had translation as an unessential course for only two years. Another critical factor that explains their unawareness is that they graduated from the English department, and only 7% came from the translation department.

70% declare that they did not tackle translation assessment approaches before, while the remaining to confirm that they know the different assessment models. 67% of the latter reckon that the contextual approach is practical, and 33% prefer the cultural one.

The majority do not know the main approaches because they are not programmed in the official schedule. Even those who think they know the assessment approaches ignore them, for they afford wrong answers since translation assessment has no cultural or contextual approaches.

48% think that lack of errors is the most important criterion to assess the translated text. 27% believe that style is the main one, while 25% suggest that the quality of the translated text is the most reliable criterion.

The above results show that they know the importance of error analysis in assessing translations. This fact represents a positive sign that teaching through errors is primordial. Needless to say, even the other criteria (style and quality) are implicitly included in error analysis. Hence, students have a particular attitude toward using the present study's assessment approach.

4.1.2. To Translation Errors

Concerning students' background vis-à-vis translation errors, 27 subjects (93%) declare that they have not previously studied translation errors, whereas three subjects (7%) assert that they have a fundamental prerequisite in this field.

There needs to be more syllabus concerning using translation errors to enhance learners' competence, which may alter their learning process. The answer is logical given that they come from the English department except for the three subjects from translation one.

As for the answer to the question related to the meaning of translation error, 34 subjects (85%) ignore the definition of this concept, while just six subjects (15%) think they know sufficiently what the term means. It has been proven through students' answers that even those who declared they knew the concept, four subjects (67%) did not grasp the real meaning, and two subjects (33%) gave approximate answers. This fact underlines that students do not make personal efforts to search for fundamental knowledge in their field, and it became necessary to include translation errors within the syllabus.

Thirty-one subjects (78%) believe learning translation errors is paramount to avoiding them and enhancing their final product. Five subjects (12%) declare that it depends on contextual factors. Four subjects (10%) decline the efficiency of learning translation errors.

By analysing the above findings, it is essential to underline students' awareness of the importance of learning translation errors by detecting and correcting the different types of errors. Hence, students confirm their readiness to learn about these errors and the application of the translation analysis. As a result of the findings mentioned above (absence of students' efforts and lacunae in the syllabus), the respondents need to learn about translation error approaches.

4.1.3. To Collaborative Work

Most (90%) of the informants did not experience collaborative learning, whereas four subjects (10%) declared using this technique when translating texts. This reveals that only those from the translation department are familiar with the main techniques used to overcome the obstacles and improve the motivation to translate accurately. The subjects having experienced collaborative translation agree that it is functional.

Twenty subjects (50%) did not answer the question concerning the main constraints of adopting collaborative work as a method in a translation course, while 12 subjects (30%) think that the main hurdle is the misunderstanding between the group members. Eight subjects (20%) reckon that this exercise is time-consuming.

It is worth mentioning that since the majority did not experience collaborative work before, they still needed to answer this question. As for the others (misunderstanding and time-consuming), their answers show they need a strategy to work in groups though they did experience collaborative work previously. One of the primary purposes of collaborative work in the translation process is to negotiate and find the best solutions together and save time and energy.

Collaborative work is a valuable technique to identify translation errors for most 24 subjects (60%). There is no need for such a method. 35% still need to provide an answer. Unfortunately, all of them did not justify their answers as expected. The results concluded that collaboration eases the task, especially for translators to detect and correct the errors they commit. It further helps them exchange constructive ideas to overcome the constraints, namely translation errors.

Students must learn how to correct translation errors once detected. In this context, students were asked about improving the translated text through collaborative work. Thirty-two subjects (80%) did not suggest any answers, whereas the others provided humble answers. This item unveils that the respondents need a strategy to practically and systematically employ collaborative work despite their awareness of the importance of collaborative work in enhancing translation quality.

4.2. The Teachers' Perception of the use of collaborative work in teaching translation errors

All the teachers agree that employing translation errors to students may help them deal with different translation problems and constraints. They confirm that confronting students with possible translation errors can help them enhance their translation competence. Both teachers and students' awareness reveal the necessity to include the marginalised translation errors lesson in the syllabus. When it comes to teaching translation errors to their students, 5 of them declare that they did not teach this issue before, whereas two teachers did it almost in every session implicitly, i.e., they do not devote a whole lesson to explain translation errors, their models and types, but only when they encounter errors.

The majority of teachers did not include translation errors because they preferred respecting the syllabus given to them. Others suggest teaching it without personal effort, which is not enough since it is optional. Even the two teachers who taught translation errors declared that they followed no precise model. This can be justified because they want to give their students only a few theoretical issues to avoid confusion. Another reason behind this phenomenon might be the time factor, given that they have merely one session per week (1h30).

The majority (6) declare that they use collaborative work as a translational technique, and they think involving several people in the same task increases their awareness and stimulates their intellect. One teacher asserts that he never uses this technique. This consensus on adopting collaborative work reflects its practical and pragmatic aspects despite some constraints related to its application and students' behaviour. As for the importance of collaborative work in analysing translation errors, all teachers gave approximately the same answer, enabling students to detect each others' errors and, therefore, teaching them how to avoid them.

Teachers suggest no right or wrong technique; the key is to know how to adapt teaching to students' needs to optimise the results and insist on devoting whole lessons to using collaborative translation to detect and correct students' errors.

4.3. Analysing Students' Performance

The researchers noticed the striking difference between students' individual translations and their performance when exercising collaborative work. On average, the quality of their translations improves by about 12% at all levels (syntactic, semantic, and stylistic). Before delving into the analysis of students'

performance in detecting and correcting errors through collaborative work, we wanted to glance at the quality of their translations when they work in groups. As mentioned before, students were put in ten groups (four students per group). Broadly, syntactic errors were committed in the general text as lexis and terminology were approachable, but the structure needed to be revised. Semantic errors were frequent in the specialised text since students need to become more familiar with this type of text significantly full of terms and specialised means of expression. Finally, literary text knew a set of aesthetic and stylistic errors.

4.3.1. Using Collaborative Work to Detect and Correct Translation Errors

4.3.1.1. Syntactic Level.

Students showed flexibility in detecting translation errors when they analysed their friends' outcomes. This fact indicates that they grasped the concept. Besides, the detection of errors was more grueling for them than correcting these errors. The general percentage of errors detection is 77%, from which they corrected 72%. In the following, results are portrayed first, and then each group's performance will be discussed in more detail:

1. Group one: they detected 67% of the total committed errors: one omission and one over-translation in the general text, one addition in the medical text, and one omission in the literary one. They corrected 60% of the errors they detected.

2. Group two: they detected 88% of the total committed errors: one omission and two over-translations in the general text, two additions in the medical text, and two additions in the literary one. They corrected 85% of the errors they detected.

3. Group three: they detected 78% of the total committed errors: one omission and one transcoding in the general text, two additions and one omission in the medical text, and two additions in the literary one. They corrected 72% of the errors they detected.

4. Group four: they detected 50% of the total committed errors: one transcoding and one under-translation in the general text, one under-translation addition in the medical text, and one under-translation in the literary one. They corrected 100% of the errors they detected.

5. Group five: they detected 60% of the total committed errors: one omission in the general text, two under-translations in the medical text, and three additions in the literary one. They corrected 67% of the errors they detected.

6. Group six: they detected 80% of the total committed errors: two omissions and one addition in the general text, three additions and two omissions in the medical text. They corrected 50% of the errors they detected.

7. Group seven: they detected 90% of the total committed errors: two over-translation and three omissions in the general text, two omissions in the medical text, and two omissions in the literary one. They corrected 78% of the errors they detected.

8. Group eight: they detected 63% of the total committed errors: two over-translations in the general text, two additions, and one omission in the medical text, and no error has been detected in the literary one. They corrected 100% of the errors they detected.

9. Group nine: they detected 100% of the total committed errors: two omissions and two additions in the general text, one addition and one omission in the medical text, and one omission in the literary one. They corrected 43% of the errors they detected.

10. Group ten: they detected 92% of the total committed errors: three over-translation and two additions in the general text, two additions and two omissions in the medical text, and two under-translations in the literary one. They corrected 73% of the errors they detected.

For most of the omission errors, students were able to detect and name them, except group 03, who considered non-translation as omission. That is not right since omission means avoiding translating

information to the target language. Group 06, for example, considered under-translation as an omission in the following translation of the medical text:

"As with Covid-19, access to lifesaving tools is constrained, with women and adolescent girls in the poorest countries deprived of clinical screening facilities, human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccines, and treatments which those in affluent places take for granted."

"كما في وضع كوفيد 19، وسائل البقاء على الحياة أصبحت مقيدة مع النساء والمراهقات"

Kamā fi waḍ' Covid-19, wasā'l el baka' 'aláqaydi el hayatiasbahatmoqaayyadatanmā' al- nnisā' wa al-murāhiqat.

Students considered under-translation as an omission because the two errors are approximately the same. Under-translation is, in fact, a result of the overuse of omission in translation. Hence, learners need clarification about this similarity. Though their assessment was wrong, the error correction was adequate since both errors refer to avoiding translating passages from the original text. They suggested the following translation:

فيما يخص كوفيد 19، فإن فرص الحصول على وسائل الحماية ضئيلة على غرار النساء والفتيات اللاتي تفتقرن إلى تسهيلات العلاج واللقاح والأدوية في الدول الفقيرة، وهي الأمور التي تعتبر متاحة بوفرة في الدول الغنية.

Fīmayakhussucovid 19, fa'innaforsa al-ḥosula'lawasā'ili al-himayaḍa'ilatona'laghira al- nnisā' walfatayet al-llā'ītaftaqirna'latashilāt al-ī'ilajwa al-lliqahwa al-addwiya fi al-duwali al-faqrati, wahiyya al-'um'ūr al-llatito'tabarumotahatanbiwafrafi al-duwali el ghaniyyati.

As for over-translation, students were accurate in finding and naming them. Over-translation, needless to say, refers to the fact of using explicitation of information that is in the original text implicit. However, there are some exceptions. Group one and five get confused between over-translation and addition since both refer to adding elements in the target text (TT), but like under-translation, over-translation is the result of the overuse of addition. The following example is taken from group four:

Educational outreach

الجانب ذو البعد التعليمي في العملية التربوية

Al-jānibḍūalbu'a ḍ al-tta'limi fi al-a'amaliyya al-ttarbawiya

Hence, they added Al-janib (الجانب), « the dimension » which is a useless addition in this context. The error is present, but the type given by students is wrong. Also, the addition of العملية التربوية al-'amaliyya al-ttarbawiya (learning process) is unjustified in the presence of education. The main reason behind this confusion is that students tend to use familiar concepts (addition) instead of the new ones (hyper-translation), but also they follow the group majority suggestion though one of them suggested the correct answer indeed. Instead, students suggest an acceptable translation:

البعد التعليمي

albu'a ḍ al-tta'limi

Concerning transcoding, which is the fact of using literal translation in the bad situation, most groups succeeded in detecting them. However, group 4, for example, when dealing with the literary passage, suggested the following translation:

It was the age of wisdom

كان سن الحكمة

Kānasinni al ḥikma

The word "age" can refer to a person's age and the epoch of time in Arabic. Students said it was a transcoding error, which is wrong since the error committed here is an incorrect meaning. After reviewing this translation, students suggested an acceptable translation:

كان عصر الحكمة

Kāna 'asri al ḥikma

4.3.1.2. Semantic Level

Detection of semantic errors was less frequent than syntactic ones. This is due to the fact that students did not commit many errors at this level unless in the medical text, which is full of terminology and specialised features. In the following, results are presented first and then discussed later. The general average of errors detection is 68%, and they successfully corrected 74% of the errors they detected.

a-Group one: 67% of semantic errors were successfully detected by students. The main errors are two misinterpretations in the general text, one loss in the medical text, and one incorrect meaning in the literary one. Besides, they corrected 50% of the errors they detected.

b-Group two: they detected 50% of the committed errors: One misinterpretation, one incorrect meaning in the general text, one loss in the medical text, and no errors detected in the literary one. Group two corrected 100% of errors.

a.Group three: they succeeded in detecting 100% of the semantic errors committed by their peers: one misinterpretation in the general text and one incorrect meaning in the literary one. They corrected 50% of the errors.

b.Group four: they detected 25% of the errors: two accuracy errors in the medical one. They succeeded in correcting 100% of the errors.

c.Group five detected 42% of the errors: one incorrect meaning and two losses in the general text. They corrected 67% of the errors they detected.

d.Group six: they detected 67% of the errors: one incorrect meaning in the general text and one accuracy error in the medical text. They corrected in correcting 100%

e.Group seven: they detected 60% of the errors: one incorrect meaning in the general text and two incorrect meanings in the medical one. No error was detected in the literary one. They corrected 67% of the detected errors.

f.Group eight: they detected 80% of errors: one incorrect meaning in the general text, one incorrect meaning, one nonsense error in the medical text, and one incorrect meaning in the literary one. Group eight corrected 50% of the errors.

g.Group nine: they detected 80% of the errors: one misinterpretation, one nonsense error in the general text, and one loss and one incorrect meaning in the literary one. They corrected 75% of the errors they detected.

h.Group ten: they detected 100% of the committed errors: one misinterpretation in the general text, one misinterpretation and one accuracy error in the medical text, and one loss in the literary one. They corrected 75% of the overall errors.

Generally speaking, the error detection rate is acceptable because students were not aware of these errors before. Similarly, the rate of errors correction is high. Students showed improvement in avoiding errors when translating. Notably, semantic errors were less frequent than syntactic ones, which is another factor that explains this rate.

The most accessible errors to detect are misinterpretation, incorrect meaning, and accuracy of terms. This can be explained by the fact that they are evident at the surface structure, and their consequences affect the quality of the whole passage. It is to be underlined that these errors were also the easiest to correct. It has been noticed that two semantic errors, faux amis, and interference, were not detected by students. Not all errors detected by students were correct. In the following, some examples are discussed:

Dealing with the general text, group 1 considered the following translation as nonsense though it is a loss of meaning:

U.N.I.C.s also work with educators to help develop U.N. related curricula for classroom use.

تعمل هذه المنظمة مع المدرسين للمساهمة في تطوير المناهج المتعلقة بالأمم المتحدة لأهداف تعليمية.

Ta'amaluhadihi al-monaḍamama'a al-moḍarrisinlilmosahama fi taṭwīr al-manāhij al- mota'alliqa bi al-umami al muttaḥida li ahdāfinta'alimiyya.

The translation of the acronym (U.N.I.C.) stands for « United Nations Information Centers ». Students know about it since it is mentioned at the beginning of the text. In the above translation, they rendered it by (المنظمة) « the organisation» which is usually a loss of information and not nonsense. UNIC is a part of the United Nations and not a whole organisation.

4.3.1.3. Stylistic level

Though stylistic errors (language level, lack of fluency, lack of creativity, and wrong tone) are more frequent in literary text, they are also found in the general and medical ones. Students' relied on the literary text since they have a misconception about stylistic issues in specialised and general ones. This affects their analysis, as will be discussed below. The total error detection rate is 61%, and 80% for error correction. Here are the main results:

1. Group one: 60% of stylistic errors were successfully detected by students. The main errors are one language-level error in the general text, one in the medical text, and lack of creativity and a wrong tone in the literary one. They corrected 60% of the errors they detected.

2. Group two: 57% of errors were detected: one language level error in the general text, two fluency errors and one wrong tone in the literary text. Group two corrected 75% of errors.

3. Group three: they succeeded in detecting 100% of the stylistic errors committed by their peers: one fluency error, two incorrect meanings, two lack of creativity, and one language level error in the literary text. They corrected 75% of the errors.

4. Group four: they detected 34% of the errors: lack of creativity in the literary text. They succeeded in correcting 100% of the errors.

5. Group five: they detected 34% of the errors: lack fluency in the literary text. They corrected 100% of the errors they detected.

6. Group six: they detected 60% of the errors: language level error in the general text and two fluency errors in the literary text. They corrected in correcting 100%

7. Group seven: they detected 86% of the errors: two fluency errors in the medical text, three fluency errors, and a wrong tone in the literary one. They corrected 72% of the detected errors.

8. Group eight: they detected 50% of errors: one fluency error. Group eight corrected 100% of the errors.

9. Group nine: they detected 60% of the errors: a wrong tone and two fluency errors in the literary one. They corrected 67% of the errors they detected.

10. Group ten: they detected 67% of the committed errors: one language level error in the medical text and one fluency error in the literary one. They corrected 50% of the overall errors.

As expected, literary text saw the majority of stylistic errors. Students focused their analysis on this text. They detected more errors than the other ones. However, they must know that even the other texts have stylistic features. The most striking result in this part of the study is that all the errors were rightly detected. All the groups knew how to name the different errors they discovered.

In response to the hypotheses stated in the introduction, we confirm that students find some difficulties identifying translation errors, especially when it comes to semantic and stylistic errors, as shown in the previous results. Most students could correct the errors they detected; the collaborative work is effective and promising in teaching translation errors. Besides, this method helps students detect and correct errors, improving their translation maturity. It also enhances their skills of autonomy and competitiveness.

Finally, to testify to the efficiency of collaborative work in minimising translation errors and improving its quality, the researchers started by giving students an individual entry test in the three text types (general, medical, and literary). The study revealed that their errors rate was 58% in the general text, 62% in the medical, and 64% in the literary. After exercising collaborative work for 16 sessions (24 hours), students were given another test to see the difference. The quality of their individual translations was considerably

improved; 33% of errors in the general text, 39% in the medical text, and 41% in the literary one, i.e., the errors rate was reduced to 25% in the general text, 23% in the medical text and 23% in the literary one.

5. CONCLUSION

Collaborative work in teaching translation errors is a promising method that practically proved its efficiency. By applying the theoretical background in real situations, teachers and students showed awareness about the importance of this method, as highlighted by the questionnaire and interview conducted for the present research. Broadly, the main finding of the present study consists in the fact that teaching translation errors via collaborative work, aimed to detect and correct translation errors, reduced the errors rate in the three texts (general, medical, and literary) by 24%, which seems to be a satisfying rate regarding students' outcome quality before conducting this experiment and the allocated time (16 sessions). As expected, syntactic errors were more frequent in the general text (committed, detected, and corrected), semantic errors were more in the specialised text (medical), and stylistic errors were more in the literary one. The last test revealed that students' translation quality has significantly improved. Students further acquired a certain translation maturity that contributed to developing an important skill, self-assessment. Among the significant features of this study, it brought an answer to the research question that researchers raised at the beginning of the present paper and checked the validity of the hypotheses. As for research questions, students could identify and correct translation errors to some extent. Also, collaborative work facilitates the teaching process since students work in groups and get more motivated. Researchers' hypotheses were testified, and, effectively, students found difficulties detecting errors but overcame them through collaborative work.

In light of the above, the main recommendations consist of adopting collaborative work as a teaching method in the Algerian University, even in primary cycles, since students have yet to experience this method in their careers. The researchers solicited the National Pedagogical Commission of Languages Field, the official organ charged with conceiving programs to include translation errors within the official syllabus in L2, L3, and M.A. classes. In addition, the study recommends elaborating an electronic textbook of common errors inspired by teachers' experience; the textbook may serve as a reference for students. Further studies may tackle various related issues, such as the role of collaborative work in enhancing students' autonomy or the importance of collaborative work in interpreting. The researchers are currently testing the applicability and efficiency of collaborative work in teaching translation techniques through machine translation.

REFERENCES

- Bistué, B. 2013. Collaborative Translation and Multi-Version Texts in Early Modern Europe. London and New York. Routledge.
- Chang, C & Hsu, C. 2011. “A mobile-assisted synchronously collaborative translation–annotation system for English as a foreign language (EFL) reading comprehension, Computer Assisted”. *Language Learning*, 24(2): 155-180. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2010.536952
- Chasterman, A. 1997. *Memes of Translation*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cordingley, A. & Frigau Manning, C. (Eds.). (2017). *Collaborative translation: From the Renaissance to the digital age*. London/New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Daems J, Vandepitte S, Hartsuiker RJ and Macken L. 2017. “Identifying the Machine Translation Error Types with the Greatest Impact on Post-editing Effort”. *Front. Psychol.* 8:1282. doi 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01282
- Delisle, J. et al. 1999. *Terminologie de la traduction*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jiménez-Crespo, M, A. 2017. *Translation and Web Localisation*. London and New York. Routledge.
- Kupsch-Losereit, Sigrid. 1985. The problem of translation error evaluation. *Translation in Foreign Language Learning and Testing* ed. by Christopher Tiftford & A. E. Hiecke. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Nord, C. 1991. *Text Analysis in Translation. Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*, Translated from German by Christiane Nord and Penelope Sparrow, Amsterdam/Atlanta, Rodopi.
- Nord, C. 2018. *Translation as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*. 2nd Edition. London and New York. Routledge.
- Palumbo, G. 2009. *Key Terms in Translation Studies*. London and New York. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Prieto-Velasco, J, A & Fuentes-Luque, A. 2016. “A collaborative multimodal working environment for the development of instrumental and professional competences of student translators: an innovative teaching experience”. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, doi: 10.1080/1750399X.2016.1154344
- Pym, A. 2010. *Translation and text transfer*. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group.
- Toury, G. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia . John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Vardaro , J. Schaeer, M. and Hansen-Schirra, S. 2019. “Translation Quality and Error Recognition in Professional Neural Machine Translation Post-Editing”. *Informatics* 2019, 6, 41; doi:10.3390/informatics6030041
- Wills, W. 1982. *The Science of Translation : Problems and Methods*. Tubingen:Gunter.
- Zanettin, F. 2016. “The deadliest error: translation, international relations and the news media”. *The Translator*, doi: 10.1080/13556509.2016.1149754

APPENDIX

Questionnaire

We are investigating the Teaching of Translation Errors Through Collaborative Work and would be extremely grateful if you could help us by completing this questionnaire based on your experience of learning translation here at the university. It should take around 10 minutes to complete. It is totally anonymous and the information provided will only be used in the research project.

Thank you for your collaboration.

1. You are :

Male

Female

2. How old are you ?

3. From which department do you come?

Arabic

French

English

Translation

4. For how long have you studied translation as a module?

2 years

4 years

more: ...

Part 01: Translation Evaluation

5. Which procedure do you follow when assessing a translated text?

.....
.....
.....

6. Have you ever tackled translation assessment approaches before?

Yes

No

7. If yes, which approach or model do you find the most suitable?

.....
.....

8. Which criteria do you think are the most important when assessing a translated text?

a. Quality

b. Style

c. Lack of errors

Part 02: Translation Errors

9. Have you ever studied translation errors previously?

Yes

No

10. Do you know what is meant by translation error?

Yes

No

11. If yes, give a definition?

.....
.....
.....

12. Learning translation error helps avoiding them

No

not really

it depends

Yes

13. What are the approaches of translation errors that you know?

.....
.....

Part 03: Collaborative work

14. Have you experienced collaborative work in translation courses previously?

Yes

No

15. If yes, do you find it useful?

No

not really

it depends

Yes

16. What are the main constraints of adopting collaborative work in translation course?
.....
.....
.....

17. Do you find collaborative work useful for identifying translation errors? Justify your answer?

Yes No

18. In collaborative works, how do you proceed to improve the translated text?
.....
.....
.....

Interview about Teaching Translation Errors

Questions

1. For how long have you been teaching translation?
2. Do you think that teaching translation errors to students may help them dealing with different translation problems and constraints?
3. Have you ever taught your students translation errors?
4. Which model of translation errors have you adopted? Why?
5. Have you ever used collaborative work as translational technique? Why?
6. Is it a practical technique?
7. To what extent is collaborative work important in analyzing translation errors?
8. Any further comments?

Thank you for your collaboration

Document Analysis

In group of 4, translate the following passages into Arabic, then, assess your friends' translation following "translation errors" model.

1.General Text

"United Nations Information Centres (UNICs) worldwide

What We Do

Engage with the public

Inspire action and engage audiences on UN priority issues by connecting with the public in their local language. Whether on social media, websites, printed information or radio programmes, customized content and translations by UNICs provide a local flavour to global issues.

Educational Outreach

Hold regular briefings for students on the issues that will impact their futures, in schools and universities. UNICs also work with educators to help develop UN related curricula for classroom use, and organise and conduct Model UN conferences."

.....
.....
.....

2.Medical Text

Global leaders call for cervical cancer elimination on Day of Action

Today WHO joins advocates around the world to commemorate a landmark Day of Action for Cervical Cancer Elimination and welcome groundbreaking new initiatives to end this devastating disease, which claims the lives of over 300 000 women each year.

As with COVID-19, access to lifesaving tools is constrained, with women and adolescent girls in the poorest countries deprived of clinical screening facilities, human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccines and treatments which those in affluent places take for granted.

.....
.....
.....

3.Literary Text

“It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to Heaven, we were all going direct the other way - in short, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only.”

Dickens, A Tale of Two Cities

Authors' biographies

Hicham BENMOKHTARI, Ph.D. He had got his doctorate degree in translation studies 2014-2018 from the University of Tlemcen. Algeria. BENMOKHTARI is now a lecturer at Oran 2 university. He teaches a wide variety of courses including introduction to translation studies and specialized translation.

Sofiane DJEFFAL, Ph.D. He had got his doctorate degree in translation studies 2015-2019 from the University of Oran 1-Translation Institute. Algeria. He is now a lecturer at Mascara university. He teaches a wide variety of courses including introduction to translation, specialized translation and didactics.

Sara MOUSSEDEK, Ph.D. She had got his doctorate degree in translation studies 2013-2017 from the University of Sidi BELABES. Algeria. MOUSSEDEK is now a lecturer at Oran 2 university. She teaches a wide variety of courses including Didactics and written expression.