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Abstract

This article focuses on the confluence of translation praxis and gender discourse in the teaching/learning of translation in Moroccan higher education. Owing to a tremendous lack of literature on the subject of gender bias, particularly in what concerns training in the translation classroom, this study aims to practically disclose how gender discourse is part and parcel of the source and the target texts both at the macro and the micro levels. Yet, it is observed to be overlooked by translation students while making all the lexical, semantic, pragmatic and syntactic choices. They simply reiterate the same sexism found in language use, which is believed to be considerably powerful in constructing ideologies and shaping attitudes towards women and men. To help translation students acquire the skills and knowledge needed to understand how gender roles and identities are encoded in texts and transferred through languages and cultures, the present study uses a corpus-based training project. It consists of illustrative individual words (job titles), sentences (proverbs) and text samples purposely selected to meet the intended goals the researcher set out to achieve. The classroom training was conducted with 26 BA undergraduate students in English Studies at the Polydisciplinary Faculty of Errachidia in Morocco. It targeted their background knowledge, reactions, responses, and awareness to concentrate more on the linguistic manifestation of the gendered discourse in language use and its sociocultural dimensions. To reach this end, the designed tasks, discussions and in-class activities covered three main phases: translating gender (1) at the word level, (2) at the sentence level, and (3) at the text level. In a pedagogically collaborative learning environment, the study adopted critical discourse analysis (CDA) with its three-dimensional framework: the descriptive, the interpretive and the explanatory. This choice is ascribed mainly to its effectiveness in triggering the students' dynamic participation in most of the classroom activities. More importantly, the focus of interest is to draw the trainees' attention to the androcentric discourse as an all-encompassing aspect of the source texts (ST) and the target texts (TT) by suggesting ways to challenge the pre-established norms that govern languages and dictate the linguistic choices. Through all the training classroom phases covered, the gendered discourse both in Arabic and English is found to be impenetrable, as if frozen in form and meaning. The two languages in use unfold that they possess a great deal of fixed sexist expressions that denigrate women both at the linguistic and socio-cultural levels. This asymmetrical denigration continued to appear in some male and female students’ translations during and after the training. Although many attempts were suggested by most trainees to neutralize some of them, they were hindered by the power of a sexist discourse that seems significantly trenchant to resist such intervention. However, it is not a question of finding the right gender-bias-free equivalents or gender-inclusive terms as suggested in feminist linguistics. It is rather about inquiring into the mentalities of the translators behind the translated words / texts that have been ossified in patriarchal norms to distribute roles and maintain power relations.
This study in the Moroccan context is by no means exhaustive. It has only attempted to suggest ways for the trainers / trainees working in the field of translation to integrate the gender perspective in their teaching/learning in order to help would-be translators become aware of their power and responsibility to apply new strategies for a more egalitarian bias-free society. Therefore, it is believed that training can contribute to the sensitization to androcentrism in language use hence triggering the need for possible change.

1. Introduction

From the outset, an attempt to define the notion of ‘discourse’ seems almost a challenge. It is everywhere constantly haunting us by taking different linguistic as well as non-linguistic dimensions. And because of its being essentially fuzzy (Van Dijk, 1997, p. 1), it cannot be easily pinned down to a unitary definition; “to run away”, or “to run about,” as its etymology in Latin suggests, appears to be unsatisfactory an explanation. Yet, it is through its omnipresence “as a social practice” (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997, p. 258) that
we are able to understand how powerful language in use is. The multiple manipulations of spoken or written words, sentences and texts have the power to construct our identities and negotiate our roles in society where some are privileged and dominant and others are oppressed and dominated. It is indeed dominance and oppression through language use.

Of course, the endorsed discourses available do not solely encompass language per se; they commonly include shared knowledge, actions, values, beliefs, feelings, space, time, signs, and gender. The latter, which is the focus of interest in this paper, functions within binary oppositions of male/female, superior/inferior, absence/presence, private/public, dominant-dominated and men and women. It is a long list of dichotomous relationships that rest on the distribution of power relations as buttressed in a society where men’s interests dominate women’s interests; a fact which is flagrantly reflected in language use.

This same dichotomy is found in the translation praxis when comparing the source text (ST) to the target text (TT). Unlike the source text, the target text has been described as feminine and equated to the female as imperfect, inferior and defective. Sherry Simon (1996) states that “translators and women have historically been the weaker figures in their respective hierarchies: translators are handmaiden to authors, women inferior to men” (p. xi). To be relegated to this inferiority is manifest when translation is likened to a woman; “if it is beautiful, it is unfaithful. If it is faithful, it is most certainly not beautiful.” Simon criticised such an analogy between women and translation to embody the relation between original and copy, and between author and translator, which is a mere feminization of translation. Yet, it is beyond the scope of this paper to evaluate the subaltern position of translators as invisible and devalued by privileging a masculine approach to authorship, rather, how, they themselves exert the same devaluation when reproducing a target text laden with a sexist discourse about the category ‘woman.’

As a socio-political category in “macro-analyses of translation (and) as the site of political or literary/aesthetic engagement through micro-analyses of translated texts,” (Flotow, 2010, p. 129), gender-related issues are inextricably entangled with translation issues, specifically from English into Arabic and vice versa. The manners in which the source texts are translated either by professionals or trainees disclose how women and men are described in ways that reflect the authors’ and the translators’ different ethical, cultural and gender affiliations. Prospective male and female translators, in particular, are caught struggling in their laborious process to reach a product in which they have their own say in a target text with different, often conflicting, semantic, lexical and grammatical choices.

This un/conscious conflict may be partially attributed to how gender issues can generate challenges when trying faithfully to keep the textual meaning unchanged, or when adopting foreignization or domestication in a culture where gender-related issues are tabooed like the Muslim world to a foreign culture where they are ignored or rather considered normative. Indeed, it seems very thought-provoking to observe how sometimes Nida's (1964) dynamic equivalence can overlook minimal details without which non-
sexist texts become sexist when translated, intentionally or unintentionally (Leonardi, 2017, p. 10); in fact, they are to reveal the translators behind the product. Their textual manipulations tend to colour the target text with her/his own visions and convictions, and which may preserve the same amount of gender bias inherent in the source text and culture.

Therefore, to overcome these ideological challenges posed by gender bias from one language and culture to the other is first and foremost to review the ways the translation classes are designed and to assess whether the adopted pedagogies in Moroccan higher education highlight gender issues or simply maintain them. For doing so, this study questions the use of language that is believed to “mask an underlying androcentrism: a belief that man is at the centre of things (Green and LeBihan, 2001, p. 32). To uncover this androcentrism, which is both linguistic and socio-cultural, is to unfold how gender discourse and translation training can find answers to a number of questions, among which are the following:

Are translators aware of gender discourse while translating from the ST to the TT? Do they contribute to the maintenance of gender bias inherent in language? Are they conscious of the stylistic differences, if any, of fe/male writers and the subtleties of their language? How can translation training in Moroccan higher education play a role in changing gender bias in translation? And can the translation classroom become a consciousness-raising place to change patriarchal discourses?

To attempt to answer these questions, the translation classroom at the tertiary level is given priority as a space where pedagogy has to be readjusted to fit within the demands of a more bias-free approach. The established relationship between the trainers/ trainees should also be reconsidered to prepare would-be translators and interpreters whose responsibility “extends beyond clients to include the wider community to which they belong (...) they are responsible for the consequences of their behaviours and therefore have to reflect carefully about how their decisions, both textual and non-textual, impact the lives of others” (Baker and Maier, 2011, pp. 1-2).

In a collaborative learning classroom, critical discourse analysis with its three-dimensional framework: the descriptive, interpretive and explanatory, as developed by Fairclough (2003) will be the thread uniting all the pedagogical efforts promising to make prospective translators a trigger for social change; as a channel through which much of gender bias inherent in the source and maintained in the target texts may be questioned, critiqued and possibly reversed.

2. Literature Review on Gender and Translation

One of the incentives to conduct this research is ascribed mainly to the tremendous lack of literature dealing with gender in the translation training classroom in the context of Moroccan higher education. Some studies have tackled solely students' attitudes on translation as a module, which are reported to be negative revealing the weaknesses that beset the “underestimation of its value, misconception of its nature, and indifference toward its benefits” (Gharafi, 2020). Another study (El Boubkri, 2021) suggests new ways of customising the translation course at tertiary levels for an "efficient learner-fronted
preparation of translators who can operate in functional situations, a prerequisite for today’s access to the job market.” However, an approach to gender in its own right has been revealed as glosses over the margin or ignored altogether. On the contrary, there have been a plethora of western theorists and practitioners dealing with the issue of gender bias in translation training, namely Vigo, 2019; Ninet and Vayá, 2020; Montés, 2019; Flotow, 2010; Zhong, 2002; Martínez Carrasco, 2019; and Baldo, 2019 amongst others.

Most of these studies have capitalized on the role of language, which is mostly seen as a social practice that creates and constructs identities. Accordingly, it is of paramount importance for theorists and translators both at the macro and micro levels to examine how issues of femininity and masculinity are encoded in language use. The latter is described by feminists as a representative of naming the world from masculine viewpoints and in accordance with stereotyped beliefs about the sexes. As Cameron (1990) puts it, feminists have discovered that “many languages have an underlying semantic or grammatical rule where the male is positive and the female negative, so that the tenets of male chauvinism are encoded into language” (p. 13).

This concern with an androcentric version of language has been fostered by the many waves of feminism since the 60s and 70s. The first, second, and third waves struggled to achieve equality to free women from the oppression of male supremacy in all fields of society where discrimination, prejudices and sexism are prevalent. However, the emergence of feminist linguistics, namely (Cameron, 1996; Mills, 2005; Coats, 1995; Tannen, 1999) among others, aimed at identifying, demystifying and resisting the ways in which language use reflects, maintains, reinforces and perpetuates gender division and inequality in society (Camus, et al. 2017). This kind of gender bias is characteristic of language use and of the practices and beliefs fostered in daily life, which pose particular challenges to professionals and future translators.

Therefore, translation can be seen as a fertile ground for studying the gendered manifestations of language and its ideological aspects. It also serves to reveal the linguistic imbalances while approaching gender and the omnipresent discourses about women and men, particularly, how they are socio-culturally misrepresented favouring one gender over the other. In this respect, Hall (1982) believes that ideology is a reproduction of dominant discourses (…) it can refer to the sexist discourses where the manipulation of language reinforces issues of discrimination (cited in Mills, 2005). Thus, any sexist language is a reflection of a sexist culture and English and Arabic languages are no exception.

2.1. Gender in Arabic and English

The word gender in Arabic can be translated as ‘جنس’ (jins) which means "kind" or "sort". It is of two kinds: ‘مذكر’ (mudhakkar) masculine and ‘مؤنث’ (mu'annath) feminine. Unlike sex, which refers to the biological aspect that designates female and male traits of women and men, gender refers to the sociocultural and ideological construction of both sexes; that is, the roles, attributes, behaviours and activities that societies attach to only women or only men. These socialized distributions are well-encoded in the linguistic
choices that we often taken for granted as being normative and mostly introduced to be man-made.

Cameron (1996) speaks of the role of men in this process and asserts that "we need to look at languages as cultural edifices whose norms are laid down in things like dictionaries, grammars, style books, and glossaries - all of which have historically been compiled by men" (p. 18). This masculine man-made language has been targeted by Feminists who have always stressed that "language reforms are pointless, because as long as society is sexist, sexist meanings will reappear, and to change language forms is to deal with symptoms, not the cause" (p. 85).

The cause is related primarily to how asymmetrical dominant ideologies pigeonhole men as superior and women as inferior. It is the androcentric dimension that hinders the progress of an egalitarian society and perpetuates sexism in culture as well as in language. Cameron warns against reducing sexism to the examination of single words or isolated grammatical features. She argues that sexist language cannot be regarded as simply the "naming" of the world from one, masculinist perspective; it is better conceptualized as a multifaceted phenomenon occurring in a number of quite complex systems of representation, all with their places in historical traditions (Cameron, 1996, p. 14).

Therefore, to tackle this multifaceted phenomenon from a pedagogical perspective, it is of utmost importance to examine the ways translators and interpreters as trainees are taught, with particular attention to how they handle gender discriminatory and sexist uses of language. The foundation should be the translation classroom where training is the driving power that can raise awareness and change preconceived ideas about women and men in the source and target texts.

3. On Training Prospective Translators

Training plays a central role in the life of prospective translators. Vigo (2019) states that “training should make trainees aware that nearly every action in professional translation is a possible ethical action. Therefore, their choices as translators can have an ethical meaning and, sometimes, virtual consequences too.” This type of training seems to impact the trainees more as individuals than as students because it goes beyond a linear relation between the ST and the TT. It is not concerned with providing them with methods to follow and techniques to adopt; but it intends as well to trigger in them a critical handling of every lexical, semantic and grammatical aspect together with the underlying ideologies buttressed in the ST. It is a deeper kind of training that addresses what goes beyond the superficial level to attend to the trainee’s visions about sociocultural or political manifestations. To reach this end, it is important that teachers refrain from prescribing strategies or specific courses of action (Baker, 2011); rather, the focus of interest should be on the trainees.

However, the enquiry that strongly poses itself here is: Which kind of translation training that higher education can adopt to have this kind of impact on gender sensitivity issues? To answer this question, Vigo declares that training translators can be considered as an opportunity to take the “shame-veil off gender and gender-related issues through
reflection and analysis. (…) to bring to light hidden meanings and lexical choices, thus raising the students’ awareness on these topics, strengthening their ethical value, and increasing their gender-sensitivity, which, in turn, will become a lens through which they can look at the whole world” (Vigo, 2019, p. 18). Montés’ study (2019) exemplifies a case of raising awareness through training by using advertising and marketing to gauge how it is (mis)used to reinforce gender stereotypes in contemporary societies.

Ninet and Vayá’s pilot study (2020) of AVT (Audio Visual Translation) is another interesting class experiment that aims to enhance intercultural awareness among students by using subtitling and dubbing. Both studies stress the importance of students’ active involvement in the training class to be held accountable for their own translation decisions. This accountability is well-expressed when Montés (2019) states that developing teaching strategies to uncover gender power relations should underlie each translation act and present choices to make gender visible in society (p. 64).

In order to enhance a modern bias-free translation classroom, training should work towards reaching the objective of the translator as a conscious interpreter who uses “intellectual discretion, to make ethical and technical decisions, to seek information, to reconstruct and manipulate knowledge” (Zhong, 2002, p. 579). This conscious manipulation of knowledge is essential when dealing with instances where gender and sexism are into play, not only at the linguistic level, but also at the ideological levels affecting individual translators, readers and all members of society. Therefore, the creation of a modern, authentic and pluralistic classroom seems to fit the purpose of this study. It aims to “enhance the critical consciousness of translators-to-be” (Martínez-Carrasco, 2019, p. 47). This intention goes hand in hand with Baldo’s strong emphasis on experiential knowledge and reflectivity, and on the idea of using experience as a resource-including using students’ and teachers’ own everyday experiences of sexism and oppression as learning materials (Baldo, 2019, p. 87).

3.1. Critical Discourse Analysis in Translation (CDA)

It is obvious that behind every lexical/semantic choice of any writer/translator lie deliberate acts that reveal subjectivities, knowledge, histories, cultures and socio-political surroundings. There are not always innocent choices, especially what concerns gender issues. Hence, an effective approach like CDA can help unearth these intentions and look deeper into exploring the multi-layered aspects of the target text to guide us through the processes of reproducing the source text. With its focus on the ideologies and power relations embedded in language as a ‘social practice’, CDA can reveal how the pre-established beliefs about gender are articulated in a discourse that is profoundly sexist with its underlying “gendered frameworks” (Mills, 2005, p. 123).

Critical discourse analysis, as developed by Fairclough (2003), examines both the linguistic and the extra-linguistic features surrounding the context. It is also characterized by its common interests in de-mystifying ideologies and power relations through the systematic and retroductable investigation of semiotic data (written, spoken or visual) (Wodak and Meyer, 2008). In this regard, a text cannot be analyzed discursively through
its linguistic components alone; there should be other social and cultural considerations to disclose language use and social practice as ideologically mediated (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2004, p. 66). Hence, it aims at systematically exploring how these non-transparent relationships are factors in securing power and hegemony. It draws attention to power imbalances, social inequities, non-democratic practices, and other injustices in hopes of spurring people to correct actions (Fairclough, 1993).

The translator, as a discourse analyst, should not be seen solely as a mediator who renders one language into another; but, on the contrary, s/he produces a new discourse in the TL. This same idea is suggested by Fairclough who regards translated texts as recontextualizations (de-location of a practice from its original context and its re-location within another) of source-language texts in new social and cultural contexts (Fairclough, 2008). This recontextualization is explained as omissions, additions, permutations and substitutions that may be included in the vocabulary of CDA as well (Valdéon, 2007, p. 102). The translators, therefore, can have the facility to create a new act of communication on a previously existing one in a new target language environment by using background knowledge (linguistic, social and cultural) and negotiating the meaning between the ST producer and the TT reader (Hatim and Mason, 1990, p. 2).

Fairclough’s three-dimensional model of CDA perceives discourse as having three components: 1- Description (text-linguistic analysis) which refers to organization, clause combination, clause grammar, and vocabulary. 2- Interpretation (Discursive practices) which refers to how the text is produced, distributed, interpreted and appropriated. 3- Explanation (Sociocultural practices) which refers to the context on a situational, institutional or societal level (Fairclough, 2003, p. 97).

These three interrelated dimensions of discourse analysis enable any translator to focus on the minimal details of any given text. To read the ST critically is to detect instances where gender bias is linguistically located. This entails questioning the text from different facets with the intention to embark on the textual deconstruction of hidden sexist ideologies to a reconstruction of a bias-free TT. However, it is not important with which type of textual or non-textual analysis one should begin. The three dimensions mentioned above allow simultaneity to show independence and interference of one over the other. Such flexibility in practice tends to merge the three together and to help achieve one supreme goal, that is, to read the ST and the TT to ultimately unearth gender bias.

4. The Study: In the Training Classroom

This study is corpus-based. It consists of illustrative samples: individual words (job titles), sentences (proverbs) and text samples containing problematic gender issues. They were purposefully selected to bring forth the reactions that the study sought to make. The selection was meant to meet the short and long-term goals to achieve with the undergraduate students in the course of translation. At the time of conducting this study, they were in the third semester studying the module of English and Translation at the Polydisciplinary Faculty of Errachidia, Moulay Ismail University (Morocco).

26 students were chosen in total: (16 females and 10 males); their age ranged
between 19 and 20 years and their level of language proficiency in both English and Arabic was quite satisfactory; with 12 years studying Arabic and 6 years of English. The reason behind choosing to carry out this research with that particular class was due to their language competence and also to the fact that they had already been initiated to translation methods and approaches in their second year of study.

The classroom training experience targeted students’ background reactions, responses, and awareness to concentrate more on the linguistic manifestation of gendered discourse. To reach this end, the in-class activities covered three main phases: translating gender at the word level, at the sentence level, and at the text level. And since the context is a pedagogical one, a collaborative learning environment coupled with a critical discourse analysis approach as developed by Fairclough (2003) were both taken advantage of. This choice is ascribed to the effect they would trigger in the students’ dynamic participation in most of the designed tasks and activities.

4.1. Translating Gender at the Word Level

The initial phase was a kind of warm-up during which all the students were provided with a list of 52 English words containing job titles to be orally translated into standard Arabic or Moroccan dialect. The central goal was to gauge the students’ instant reactions and to measure their general understanding of gender-related issues. By giving primacy to the oral over the written, the aim was to make the task more interactive involving communicatively all the trainees irrespective of their gender or personal or cultural beliefs. The list was as follows:

Student, professor, scientist, engineer, coach, police officer, fire-fighter, citizen, financial adviser, postman, designer, tailor, farmer, lawyer, governor, doctor, pharmacist, plumber, poet, electrician, burglar, project manager, magician, lion tamer, gardener, counselor, dentist, explorer, inventor, porter, teacher, technician, waiter, accountant, journalist, driver, architect, director, inspector, pilot, soldier, writer, economist, analyst, stockbroker, programmer, software developer, optician, driving instructor, surgeon, and translator.

Surprisingly, all the female and male students translated the words into Arabic as masculine job titles without any reference to the feminine. Even the word ‘translator’ was translated as (مترجم). The students’ translations presented the jobs as only appropriate to the male world or that they should be held solely by men.

The job titles were translated by the students as:
The students could have added only the feminine marker called عَلَامَة تَأَنِٰئِيث (ة) الْتَّاءِ المُرْبَوَطَة to the basic form of the Arabic words to derive the feminine job titles like (أُسَاتَذَة) (مديرة مبرمجة) to encompass the title, category and identity of women as well. The problem, however, was not in the addition of the feminine marker (ة), because most students had acquired a good mastery of the Arabic language and its morpho-lexical rules since their primary and secondary education.

When asked why they had opted specifically for the masculine versions rather than the feminine, their responses ranged from the fact that the words by default refer only to men’s jobs, that the majority of men occupy those jobs, or that only a few women could have access to these very special kinds of jobs as they belong only to a male world.

Despite their English language proficiency and knowledge of the existing generic use of occupational titles to include women and men, they opted for the masculine in their Arabic translations. This can be attributed to their unconscious reproduction of the dominant discourses in society and to how most of them were socialized to think about the fields that are always designed for men and those designed for women. This would confirm Mills’ view advocating linguistic determinism following Sapir and Whorf that the “thought-systems are influenced by the language of (their) community; so that (the) idea of ‘reality’ is constrained by the linguistic forms available to them as members of that community” (Mills, 2005, p. 63). The circulation of words that exclude the identity and experience of women is enhanced in androcentric translations whose meanings reproduce and reinforce the sexism of a man-made language. Similar to this sexist circulation has been identified in a recent study (Ullmann and Saunders, 2021) of biased algorithms in Google Translate and suggests that machine translation needs a little gender-sensitivity targeted training to help artificial intelligence avoid gender stereotyping in online translation.

The introductory part of the training was very useful to trigger certain interests and to engage the trainees in the on-going discussions in a classroom inspired by a gender-committed pedagogy. To offer opportunities for the students to concentrate more on gender issues, much time and space were devoted to classroom debates, which involved dividing students into pairs of one male and one female and into small groups that involved male and female members. The socio-cultural image of women and men in society, equality, religion, human rights, sexism, violence against women, and feminist figures in Morocco were some of the topics raised in class to let the trainees express their thoughts and visions. Although some male participants showed certain patriarchal tendencies; but on the whole, the debates were particularly valuable for sensitizing students to the importance of including gender issues when translating; the many forms of direct/indirect sexism, gender assumptions, stereotypes, ideologies, gender bias, masculine dominance
and discrimination against women were given ample importance. The word level translation task and the class discussions were meant to pave the way for a more advanced degree, that is, to go beyond the word to the sentence level.

### 4.2 Translating Gender at the Sentence Level

The second phase was meant to provide students with samples at the sentence level. For doing so, 100 proverbs and proverbial expressions were selected. Most of them were selected from a wide range of proverbs found in The Oxford Concise Dictionary of Proverbs (2003) which contains over 1000 proverbs and from The Book of Proverbs and Arabic Proverbials (Kassis, 1999). Popular proverbs from the Moroccan context were also included.

Given the value that proverbs enjoy in everyday conversations and how memorisable they are to be handed down from one generation to the other, their choice seemed to be the perfect epitome of what can be taken for granted as truth to establish cultural standards about gender in ethical and moral behaviours. They constitute a powerful ‘rhetorical device’ for shaping the public opinions in society as mechanisms of non-formal education and ideological control” (Gándara, 2004). They are also overloaded with meanings to “communicate values and identities, not just through their content but through their structure” (Machen and vanLeeuwen, 2007, p. 105). As powerful strategies in argumentation, they have didactic tendencies and rootedness in social imagination where images of men and women are manifest to invoke specific discursive functions relevant to the present study.

Most of the 100 samples selected for the students to analyze, explain and interpret, do contain varying instances of sexism, direct and indirect, with different images of denigration and discrimination against women. In doing so, each of the four groups was given 25 proverbs in order to select, reflect on, analyze, and decide on a suitable translation based on what they had gained in the previous discussions about gender-sensitive issues. They were asked to follow the three-dimensional framework of CDA (description, interpretation and explanation) and to categorize them according to their level of sexism, from the most sexist to the least sexist.

By trying to find key linguistic elements about gender relations between men and women, they were encouraged to critically analyze the discourse at work and uncover the in/direct forms of sexism both in the Arabic and English proverbs/ proverbials. Once the task of categorizations and analyses was over, the trainees worked in groups on translating them. The aim behind doing the task collaboratively was to measure how the trainees could position themselves vis-a-vis the ST, the TT and the readers who were members of other groups to provide student-student feedback.

The five most sexist English and Arabic proverbs/ proverbials from the corpus of 100 samples were selected, analyzed, discussed and collaboratively translated by the four groups as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Proverbs with Arabic Translations</th>
<th>Arabic Proverbs with English Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- One hair of a woman draws more than a hundred yoke of oxen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شعرة امرأة واحدة تجر أكثر من مائة نير من الثيران.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- شيطان لا يحمدان إلا عند عاقبهما: الطعام والمريضة فالطعام لا يحمد حتى يستمر والمريضة لا يحمد حتى تموت.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Two things are not praised until their outcome: food and woman. Food until it is digested and the woman when she dies.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- “A woman, a dog, and a walnut tree, the more you beat them the better they be.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>امرأة وكلب وشجرة جوز، كلما ضربتهم أكثر كلما كانوا أفضل.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- حِدَّثَنِي امْرَأَةَ أَمْرَأَةً، فَإِنْ لَمْ تَفْهَمْ فَأَرْبَعَةُ حَدِيثَيْنِ امْرَأَةً، فَإِنْ لَمْ تَفْهَمْ فَأَرْبَعَةُ حَدِيثَيْنِ امْرَأَةً.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Repeat a speech twice to a woman and if she does not comprehend, then repeat it four times.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- A woman and a ship ever want mending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أي امرأة وسفينة في حاجة دائمة إلى الإصلاح.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- ثلاثية تجب مداراً: الملك السليط، والمريض، والمريضة.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Three are to be watched: the authoritative king, the ill, and the woman.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- “A man is as old as he feels, and a woman as old as she looks.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عمر الرجل يقياس بقلبه وعمر المرأة بشكلها.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- أربع لا يشبع من أربع: أرض من مطر ولا أنثى من ذكر.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ولا العلم من النظر ولا العالم من.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Four are not satisfied of four: land of rain, a female of male, an eye of seeing, and a scholar of knowledge.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Man is the head of the family and woman is the neck that turns the head.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الرجل هو رأس الأسرة والمريضة هي العنق الذي يدير.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- السّيّطان يكفّي ساعات ليخدع رجلاً وامرأة، والمريضة ساعةً واحدة لتحذّم عشرة شياطين.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Satan takes hours to deceive a man and a woman, and a woman takes one hour to deceive ten demons.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The selected English and Arabic proverbs/proverbial expressions provide authentic data for the analysis of gender bias and the established sexist stereotypes. Most of them were remarked by the students to cast an androcentric quality on the lexical and semantic choices of the words and structures. Although some of them are anonymous as they have no original author, they play a considerable role in expressing a cultural principle or giving a piece of advice to caution against women. Their educational and didactic goals to shape moral consciousness describe negatively women from a sexist perspective.

The sexist connotations both in the English and Arabic source texts, which were preserved by the students in the target texts, portray the woman as unwanted, futile and can be praised only when she is dead (Arabic proverb 1). Such a prejudiced view is well-illustrated in how women are treated and belittled in a patriarchal society to be less than men. She is stupid or slow in understanding (Arabic proverb 2) that men have to repeat for her to understand; and because of her evil spirit, she is to be watched lest she misbehaves like an authoritarian king or a sick person (Arabic proverb 3); she is a lustful person who never gets satisfied (Arabic proverb 4); she is a cunning person who outperforms ten demons (Arabic proverb 5); and because of a woman’s charm, she can influence and do what others cannot, to seduce men and looks like a disturbing figure (English proverb 1); she is to be beaten and treated violently like a dog or a walnut in order to do what is required of her to do (English proverb 2); she is likened to a ship that needs repairing constantly (English proverbs 3); she is only seen as a body which is given importance if it is attractive and young (English proverb 4); and despite her lower status as seen in the metaphor of being the neck of the bottle, she is in fact in control to turn her husband’s head whichever way she wants (English proverb 5).

Despite the stylistic features of the selected Arabic and English proverbs, they disclose a very high amount of verbal aggression towards women in particular. This is well-illustrated in the use of Arabic words like: (حتى تموت - لتخدع - لا يشبعن - فإن لم تفهم) and of English words like (you beat them-mending-she looks).

All the proverbs and proverbial expressions helped to engage all the trainees as they provided tangible evidence of the existence of asymmetries in the life of men and women. Men are positive and women are negative. These inherent sexist connotations in language as in daily life seem to sustain a biased culture by shaping the moral consciousness of all the members, be they feminine or masculine.

The four groups were asked to try and re-contextualize (deconstruct-construct) the proverbs/proverbial expressions in order to mitigate the effect of sexism. After several attempts to reach a certain equivalence between the ST and the TT, the students confirmed the impossibility of such an intervention. This linguistic impermeability is first attributed to the stylistic devices used at the phonological, syntactic and lexico-semantic levels (parallelism, repetitions of sounds, rhyming, etc.), which make them appear impenetrable as if frozen in form. In order to lessen the weight of sexism in them, some trainees suggested that “if revision is not possible, then the rejection of such expressions can be the right solution.” Such a decision is somehow unfeasible given the inculcation of those
expressions in the mentalities of people using them.

4.3. Translating Gender at the Text Level

The third phase of the training consisted of dealing with eight texts that were selected according to their amount of gender bias. Each group was given two texts to work on; one in Arabic and the other in English; and then the two texts were exchanged among all four groups to have a diversified experience. The goal was to help the trainees apply CDA to as many different texts as possible and to try to disclose the hidden patriarchal ideologies inherent in them. Group and whole class discussions were also encouraged to deal with most of the stylistic features of the texts and to point to the instances where women and men are stereotypically and asymmetrically represented. The students formulated new questions, which were not only related to the texts under study and their linguistic aspects, but also to other sensitive issues related to how language can be manipulated to serve ideologies and common beliefs.

The following sample was chosen to be a flagrant embodiment of the most sexist samples found in the corpus.

“If a woman is swept off a ship into the water, the cry is “Man overboard!” If she is killed by a hit-and-run driver, the charge is manslaughter. If she is injured on the job, the coverage is workmen’s compensation. But if she arrives at the threshold marked Men Only, she knows the admonition is not intended to bar animals or plants or inanimate objects. It is meant for her.” (Alma Graham, quoted in Salzmann, 1993)

It was translated faithfully and collaboratively in Arabic as follows:

إذا جرفت امرأة من السفينة إلى الماء، فإن الصرخة هي رجل في البحر، إذا قُلّت على يد سائق ومصر وهرب بعد الحادث، فإن التهمة هي القتل غير العمد، إذا أصيبت أثناء العمل، فإن التغطية هي تعويض العمال، ولكن إذا وصلت إلى العتبة التي تحمل علامة "للرجال فقط" فإنها تعلم أن التنبيه لا يهدف إلى منع الحيوانات أو النباتات أو الأشياء إما يعنينا هي.

This ST understudy raised controversial issues for most students. Despite its humorous aspect, it is full of sexist forms that are manifest in the many stereotypes attached to the woman. The use of (Man overboard! Manslaughter, workmen’s compensation, and Men Only) can allude to a man-made language that excludes the female and makes most women dependent on a male world / word. She is demeaned, trivialized and denigrated to convey stereotypes based on discrimination and masculine domination. The TT seems to preserve the masculinist vision and faithfully renders the ST in ways that perpetuate gender bias and the power that language and society exert over women.

Some female students suggested a more neutral version of the translation by replacing the word Man with human to come up with (Human overboard! Humanslaughter, workhuman’s compensation, and Human only). Such intervention in the ST revealed the ability of the trainees in deconstructing the text and the ideologies built upon it. But still, the word man is persisting to appear in the word ‘human’ and in
its Arabic equivalent ‘إنسان’, which refers also to the masculine.

Nevertheless, these varying operations at the text level disclosed a great engagement of the four groups. The many attempts and efforts made to analyze, interpret and describe the texts were an indication of the students’ total involvement to delve deeper into the process of translating the ST and of rewriting the TT.

The trainees were also asked to select their own texts containing some gender issues, translate them and suggest them to other groups, who in turn, translated them to ultimately compare each other's renderings. This strategy was mainly used to give certain freedom and assume some responsibility for their own choices.

Despite the structural hurdles presented by the language used and its cultural significance, becoming aware of gender-related issues by most trainees and their readiness for change was highly satisfactory. Like previous levels, the text level and its layers pushed most of them to be actively engaged in implementing the three-dimensional framework of CDA. The purpose is to get to the core of the suggested source texts and measure how the target texts were rendered in ways that reflect gender-related issues, particularly how women are portrayed. Individual, pair and group work were variously adopted to critically exchange ideas and give constructive feedback. The supreme goal was to gain more practice while attempting to produce the target texts.

5. Conclusion

The training classroom has disclosed the importance of a student-centered approach that practically and actively involves all the skills that participants need to tackle gender bias in a critical collaborative learning environment. The warm-up test together with the three subsequent phases at the micro and macro levels: the word, the sentence, and the text levels have significantly contributed to raising students’ awareness of the ideologies that shape gender as an all-encompassing word and the kind of bias that permeates the linguistic and cultural aspects of language.

All the designed in-class activities and tasks contributed to highlighting how linguistic representations in the selected corpora govern the way women and men are introduced in the ST/TT texts as in everyday life, and how translators render those texts with their built-in ideologies no matter how transparent they might be.

The considerable power of the translation classroom in the Moroccan context has also contributed to activating trainees’ schemata to ultimately trigger in them the need for a renovating bias-free approach to translation. As prospective translators, they have been targeted not as students, but rather, as individuals whose responsibility goes beyond a simplistic act of moving from the ST to the TT. It is critical to intervene in a rigorous act of deciphering ideological codes that may be either covert or overt, and of changing the inculcated images about men and women.

As the English and Arabic corpora have shown, languages in use do possess a great deal of sexist expressions that denigrate women at the linguistic and socio-cultural levels. This asymmetrical and biased denigration continued to appear in some male and female
students’ translations during and after the training to attest to the difficulty of changing some instilled ideas and beliefs.

Although many attempts have been encouraged by most trainees to neutralize some of them, they were hindered by the considerable power of a sexist discourse that seems considerably powerful to resist such revisions. Of course, it is not a question of linguistic features to be replaced and rendered gender-inclusive or not; it is the mentalities behind the used word that have been ossified in patriarchal norms to distribute roles and maintain power relations.

Pedagogically speaking, by minimizing the roles of the instructors and maximizing those of the students, the adoption of critical discourse analysis in a collaborative learning environment has been effective. It has contributed to engaging dynamically the trainees in all the group work, discussions and other in-class activities. CDA, in particular, has vigorously provided the trainees with the impetus to further expound on the hidden parts of the underlying discourses, together with the incorporation of the original producer of the ST and the translator of the TT. Its implementation in the training classroom has enhanced the students’ knowledge about gender ideologies and revealed how issues of sexism and masculine domination are entrenched in the word/world of translation.

The efficacy of collaborative learning methods in translation with the support of critical pedagogy can better emphasize the need for abandoning traditional and instructor-centered methods. The creation of a modern, student-centered, and pluralistic classroom seems to fit the purpose of this study and the overall intention to raise the question of gender while translating from/into English and Arabic.

It is therefore of utmost importance to examine the ways would-be translators are taught, with particular attention to how they handle gender discriminatory and sexist uses of language. The foundation should be the translation classroom as a space where training is the driving force that can raise awareness and change preconceived ideas about women and men. More importantly, trainers should aim to provide trainees with the right methodological and strategic tools in order to reflect upon the various situations they may face in their professional life.

This research recommends that translators should reconsider the word ‘gender’ and be aware of its usage. It is also believed that trainers are in need, too, of some training in gender-class-race related issues to be able to share what they themselves believe to be ideally truthful. It will surely result in promising transnational and trans-linguistic relations between the ST and TT, authors and translators, process and product, and women and men.
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