

## PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: YAPI VE ANLAM ODAKLI ÇEVİRİ ÖĞRETİMİNİN İNGİLİZCE DİLİ EĞİTİMİ  
ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN OKUMA ALGILARINA KATKISI

AUTHORS: Serhan Köse,Abdullah Ertas

PAGES: 121-144

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/231649>

## THE CONTRIBUTION OF FORM AND MEANING FOCUSED TRANSLATION INSTRUCTION TO ELT STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION\*

### YAPI VE ANLAM ODAKLI ÇEVİRİ ÖĞRETİMİNİN İNGİLİZCE DİLİ EĞİTİMİ ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN OKUMA ALGILARINA KATKISI

Serhan KÖSE\*\*, Abdullah ERTAŞ\*\*\*

**Abstract:** Reading is a dominant skill in translating. This study investigates if the reading skills of the trainees influence translating and which of the instruction, form or meaning focused translation instruction, is more effective in improving the reading skills of ELT students. The subject pool for the study consisted of 75 undergraduate students who have taken the Translation (from English to Turkish) at the Department of English Language Teaching, Gazi University: 40 for the experimental group, and 35 for the control group. The subjects took the Translation course for 10 weeks in the first term of the 2009-2010 academic year. As a result of the study it can be said that both groups improved their reading skills but the trainees in the experimental group which received meaning focused translation instruction showed better improvement than the control group.

**Key words:** translation, reading, form, meaning

**Özet:** Okuma becerisi çeviride baskın bir beceridir. Bu araştırmada öğretmen adaylarının okuma becerisi seviyesi çeviri becerisini ne seviyede etkilediği ve yapı ve anlam odaklı çeviri öğretiminden hangisinin okuma becerisine katkısı daha fazla olduğu araştırılmıştır. Araştırmaya Gazi Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi A.B.D.'daki 75 öğrenci iştirak etmiştir: denek grubu 40, kontrol grubu 35 adaydan oluşmaktadır. Araştırma 2009-2010 akademik yılında 10 hafta sürmüştür. Araştırmanın sonucuna göre her iki gruptaki adaylar okuma becerilerini geliştirmiştir fakat anlam odaklı çeviri öğretimi alan denek grubundaki adaylar okuma becerilerini kontrol grubundaki adaylardan daha fazla geliştirmiştir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** çeviri, okuma, yapı, anlam

### Introduction

One of the most debated topics in Second Language Learning has been how language should be presented to the language learner in the classroom. Some language learning researchers as Schmidt (1993a, p. 32) claim that focus on the grammatical form of the second

---

\* This study is a part of the doctoral dissertation of writer 1 (Serhan KÖSE).

\*\* Asst. Prof. Dr., Kastamonu University, Education Faculty, serhankose@gmail.com

\*\*\* Asst. Prof Dr., Gazi University, Gazi Education Faculty, aertas@gazi.edu.tr

language is best. In contrast, Krashen (1982) claims that “there is no place for grammar in the classroom and it is the meaning that should be emphasised” (p. 48). This issue has recently been discussed in terms of focus-on-form vs. focus-on-meaning. Focus on form consists of drawing the learner’s attention on the linguistic features of the language. On the other hand, focus on meaning is concerned with getting the learner to concentrate only on understanding the message being conveyed. The question is which type of focus is most beneficial for language learners. Although research has been done in the classroom and the laboratory, in search of a resolution, the question remains unanswered” (Leeman, Arteagoitia, Fridman & Doughty, 1995, p. 217).

Schäffner (2004) states that since the students are at the same time improving their language skills, we often use source texts and authentic translations on the basis of which we comment on the translation strategies applied and their effectiveness in view of the purpose” (p. 121). El-Sheikh (1987) adds that a communicative approach to the teaching of translation might help the students to develop their skills systematically. One of the skill that is important in translation is reading. Reading is a complex information processing skill in which the reader interacts with text in order to (re)create meaningful discourse. From this perspective, reading is understood to be a complex cognitive process in which reader and text interact to (re)create meaningful discourse. (Klein, 1988, p. 12). In the investigation of the cognitive process in translating, reading involves nearly the same cognitive process.

Since meaning is not directly given by signs but has to be derived from signs, translation cognitive effort aimed at comprehending the meaning encoded in a foreign language text involves complex mental operations that are set off by reading and the ensuing processing of linguistic forms and information they carry. It is agreed among translation scholars interested in comprehension processes that reading for the purpose of translation aims at total comprehension which is more intense and deeper than in that of reading for information. Steiner (1975) puts forth that “comprehensive reading [is] in the heart of the interpretative process” (p. 5) and itself involves an act of manifold interpretation. Halliday and Ruqaiya (1976) states that the translator approaches the text with the aim of transferring its meaning and therefore has to account for every sign and determine its meaning with

respect to the linguistic and extra-linguistic context it is found in and in view of the way it contributes to the text as a whole.

Sinclair and Widdowson (1983) also state that although the reader/translator is not able to negotiate meanings by direct confrontation, the reader enters into an imaginary interaction between the author and himself/herself. House and Shoshana (1986) includes that “from the re-creation of such an interaction, the reader derives meanings, which are of course, always mere approximations as there can never be a one-to-one correspondence between any writer’s intention and any reader’s (or potential translator’s) interpretations” (p. 181). According to Boguslawski (2003), to achieve this aim the reader has to carry out an analysis on two levels:

- *a macro-level* constituting its broad context where the translator considers information like general idea/message of the text, topic or subject matter, the attitude and purpose of its author, potential addressees, time and place of writing, its implications and any other relevant facts; and

- *a micro-level* which will take into account the immediate neighbourhood of a text item being it a collocation, a phrase, a word group, a sentence or a paragraph.

As a result, Rose (cited in Boguslawski, 2003) states that some SL text items are immediately spotted as likely to cause transfer problems, some attract quick solutions and some are overlooked even if they later turn out to cause comprehension problems. After the first reading, which is believed to be a standard approach among translators, the process of comprehension has not been completed but in fact has just started.

When translating a text, students come into contact with all the main ideas and specific details of a reading passage. Translation necessitates the close reading of the entire passage, which provides valuable information for the instructor. Translation can improve comprehension since it encourages the students to read a passage carefully and precisely at the word, sentence, and text levels (Van Els et al. 1984). This study aims to investigate if translation instruction improves reading skill and which kind of translation instruction improves reading better.

### **The Importance of Reading in Translation**

Dealing with unfamiliar words in a text or a reading passage Grellet (1987, p. 14) contends the following statement that inferring means making use of syntactic, logical and cultural clues to discover the meaning of unknown elements. If these are words, then word-formation and derivation will also play an important part. When dealing with a new text, it is better not to explain the difficult words to the learners beforehand. They would only get used to being given ‘pre-processed’ texts and would never make the effort to cope with a difficult passage on their own. On the contrary, students should be encouraged to make a guess at the meaning of the words they do not know rather than look them up in a dictionary. If they need to look at the dictionary to get a precise meaning – which is an important and necessary activity – they should only do so after having tried to work out a solution on their own.

The reader’s task is to activate background and linguistic knowledge to recreate the writer’s intended meaning (Chastain, 1988b, p. 222). But, all scholars do not agree with the statement that translation will improve reading or vice versa and include that such a procedure as translation will have no contribution in terms of developing reading comprehension skills. Knapp (1980) agrees with this argument and states that:

...the two activities that we spend most time on in a reading lesson are introduction, particularly the introduction of new words and phrases, and later the comprehension checking questions deal primarily with the understanding of that passage and the remembering of its content in detail as if these were the main purpose of our reading lesson. They do not directly deal with skill development, with helping the student develop more effective reading practises, with the skills that would help the student deal well with any other reading selections. Instead, they are focused on helping the reader learn and retain the information in that particular selection (p. 350).

On the other hand, Basnett (1998) points out that “translation offers a crucial lesson in how to read since it is a critical way into the text” (p. 111). Coady (1980) adds that “the

benefit of such reading will be twofold: confidence in oneself and exposure to the very syntactic patterns which must be learned” (p. 12).

Macizo and Bajo (2004) in their study, done two experiments, they examined reading comprehension processes when professional translators were instructed to read for understanding or to read for translation. Their findings have put forth interesting results. In their research Macizo and Bajo have come to a result that reading and translation has the same comprehension process and have included that:

Language comprehension includes a set of processes going from speech processing (segmentation and classification of the incoming input), lexical access (recognition of isolated words and access to information associated with them), and sentential processing (extraction and combination of syntactic information to obtain a sentence interpretation), to discourse processing (integration and interpretation of successive sentences to arrive at a global mental representation). All of these comprehension processes are involved during both normal reading and translation (p. 181).

Macizo and Bajo (2004) also put forth that “hence, according to the horizontal view of translation, although normal reading and reading for translation would involve similar comprehension processes, parallel code-switching processes would increase WM (working memory) requirements when reading for translation” (p. 186). Macizo and Bajo, in the same research, have come up to a point that translating needed more of the working memory and stated their findings as follows: “When translators knew that they had to read and translate the sentences, their reading times slowed down compared to the condition where they had to read and repeat them. This pattern of results supports a horizontal view of translation. In addition to the cognitive demands imposed by normal reading, when reading was oriented to translation there was an increase in WM requirements. These additional demands had the effect of slowing on-line comprehension suggesting that processes other than understanding were being performed in parallel. Probably, when participants were reading for translation they engaged in additional processes needed for translation. In translation, beside the capacity

required for comprehension of the input, WM capacity is needed for activating and switching the two languages involved” (p. 193).

Macizo and Bajo (2004) again emphasise that “thus, although translation seems to increase the time required for sentence processing, the meaning of the sentences is extracted as completely in translation as in normal reading” (p. 198). Macizo and Bajo come to a result that “differences between normal reading and reading for translation are particularly large in the critical area where larger WM demands are imposed, the end of the relative clause. But, why do instructions to translate slow down on-line sentence processing compared to normal reading? What additional processes are taking place when reading for translation? We think that when reading for translation, participants engaged in code-switching processes” (p. 199).

Mahmoud (2006) puts forth that “a particular way to use translation is as a post-reading procedure to evaluate students’ comprehension of a text. By its very nature, translation offers many opportunities to emphasize the specific details and main ideas of a translated text, especially those that may not have been correctly understood by students” (p. 31). In the same vein, Van Els et al. (cited in Mahmoud, 2006, p. 31) also states that when translating a text, students come into contact with all the main ideas and specific details of a reading passage. Translation necessitates the close reading of the entire passage, which provides valuable information for the instructor. Translation can improve comprehension since it encourages the students to read a passage carefully and precisely at the word, sentence, and text levels.

The translator given the text reads it with the aim of thorough detailed comprehension which, however, is subordinate to the general purpose of meaning transfer. Doyle (1991) calls the task of reading comprehension ‘an act of applied, inevitably idiosyncratic critical reading’. “It is inter-idiomatic reading of and between two languages, a decoding of a given discourse, with the goal of active and felicitous recoding in a target or second language, the desired cross-idiomatic result. Thus one arrives at the strabismus so characteristic of the translator at work: one eye focused on the text-that-is, the other on the text-to-be” (p. 13).

### Form Focused Translation Instruction

Form-focused instruction has first been introduced as one of the approaches to teaching grammar in second language education field and become an important topic of recent discussions and research. White, Spada, Lightbown & Ranta, (cited in Ellis, 2006) indicate that form-focused grammar instruction resulted in attaining higher proficiency in SLA within a shorter time, compared to conditions in which meaning-focused grammar instruction took place. In the light of this, some conclusions for the inclusion of explicit grammar instruction can be drawn. For instance, Long (cited in Ellis, 2006) argues that emphasising form-focused instruction is useful as long as it is in keeping with the natural processes of acquisition. As a way of further response to this ongoing dispute concerning the efficiency of grammar instruction, Genesee (cited in Ellis, 2006) and Harley (1998) stress that the evidence obtained from the immersion programs and naturalistic acquisition research demonstrates that emphasising only meaning in classroom teaching results in an inadequate development of certain linguistic features. There have been different labels used to address focusing on form, as opposed to teaching which is entirely focused on meaning.

The difference between explicit and implicit focus-on-formS is the awareness of what is being learned. Stern (1992) adds that “advocates of an explicit teaching strategy assume that second language learning is, for many people, a cognitive process leading to an explicit knowledge of the language. Such learners focus on the characteristic features of the language, (...) make an effort to acquire a conscious and conceptual knowledge, (...) want to know how the language functions, how it hangs together, what words mean, how meaning is conveyed and so on” (p. 334). In other words, explicit instruction mainly aims at the development of declarative knowledge, or the knowledge about language rules. Spada (1997) defines form focused instruction as “any pedagogical effort which is used to draw the learners’ attention to language form either implicitly or explicitly” (p. 4).

As above mentioned, studies on classroom instruction have shown that explicit grammar instruction has a positive effect on second language learning and performance. Colina (2002) emphasises that second language acquisition research is highly relevant to translation studies. Relatively unaddressed in the literature to date is the question of whether such instruction can have a direct effect on the quality of translations into English, especially



for those structures that cause particular difficulty. Although translation students may be aware of L2 grammatical rules at the sentence level, much of natural usage is actually pragmatically and contextually driven. Transfer from L2 grammar language instruction may be quite limited in translation tasks, where L1 language structures sometimes compete as tempting but inappropriate alternatives to English structures. Students must become aware of the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic information content of proper choices in various textual contexts.

Translation is of great value in sensitising students to contrasts and comparisons between the grammars of their own language and the source language (Gill, 1998). Translation is an activity that raises the students' awareness in terms of similarities and differences between learners' L1 and L2 grammatical structures. For Catford (1969), the translation process is a search for the formal or functional equivalents for source language linguistic elements like morphemes, words, clauses, and sentences. In fact, the largest translation element for Catford is the sentence rather than the text. Besides studies on translation, some translation teachers use form focused translation instruction in their translation courses. Lörcher (1992b), in teaching translation, states that "in my corpus of translations produced by foreign language learners, a large number of indicators of sign-oriented translation can be detected. In sign- or form-oriented translating, subjects transfer source-language text segments by focusing on their form and by replacing them with target language forms. This transfer of forms/signs is brought about without recourse to the sense of the two segments involved" (p. 111).

The aim in adapting a form-focused translation instruction (explicit grammar instruction) is that grammatical forms may also express different meanings such as the English possessive phrase "my house" which might mean, "the house I own", or "the house I rent" depending on the context. Grammatical markers have primary and secondary functions, for example rhetorical questions and prepositions. Further, a single meaning might be expressed in different forms such as "the cat is black", "the black cat", and "the cat, which is black" (Larson, 1984, p. 8). Also Larson adds that grammatical structures vary among languages. The order may be changed completely. Turkish, for instance, has a different word order from English, which means that the place and significance of emphasis on words are

different. Passive constructions may be translated with an active construction or vice versa (Larson, 1984). Grammatical choices should, therefore, be based on the function of the TL grammatical constructions not on the literal rendition of a SL form (Larson, 1984, p. 20).

The translation practice classes focusing on form reflects an underlying grammatical model of translation teaching as identified by Chau (1984). According to Chau, a grammatical model of translation teaching is based on a microlinguistic view of translation itself, in which the translation process is identified with syntactic and lexical transfer. In Chau's view, the grammatical model is historically the best established model and apparently allows only instructional techniques based on a search for the correct target language elements via comparative grammar. Similarly, Perez (2005) states that some pedagogues focus on discrete linguistic units - preferably below sentence level - on contrastive or comparative practices, and on translation procedures. One of the trends that he introduces in Translation Studies is a focus on ('discrete' units of) languages (Jakobson, 2000, Vinay & Darbelnet, 1977) (p. 2).

Although, even our second year translation students are highly competent in English and may be aware of L2 grammatical rules at the sentence level, they may simply lack the experience to judge which form is appropriate since much of natural usage is pragmatically and contextually driven. Transfer from L2 grammar instruction may be quite limited in translation tasks, where L1 language structures sometimes compete as tempting but inappropriate alternatives to English structures. Students must become aware of the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic information content of proper choices in various textual contexts. This study would include issues such as the kind of tasks and techniques to be used in focusing on formS (explicit grammar instruction) that pose difficulties to learners and to focus-on-formS in an explicit manner. Whether incorporation of explicit instruction of specific features of English grammar into regular translation classes at the university level has a positive effect on students' productions is the basis of the study.

### **Meaning Focused Translation Instruction**

According to Stern (1992), implicit teaching techniques "encourage the learner to approach the new language globally and intuitively rather than through a process of conscious

reflection and problem solving” (p. 339), the rationale being that language is too complex to be fully described and that conscious knowledge cannot provide a sufficient basis for efficient learning. Stern (1992) specifies focus on meaning as which “invites the learner to use the language for a purpose and to focus on the message rather than any specific aspect of the code” (p. 301).

Roberts (1982) describes three basic contemporary approaches to foreign language teaching methodology: a) traditional, b) communicative, and c) humanistic psychological. Communicative and humanistic psychological approaches are accepted as non-traditional. Kiralay (1995, p. 27) puts forth that these non-traditional approaches to second language teaching are grounded in significant research into the nature of language use and the relationship of language use to the learning of communicative language skills. Because translation is motivated by language use, some of the important language and language learning concepts that have involved within the communicative approaches to second language education can serve as a point of departure for developing a systematic translation pedagogy. Kiraly also states that communicative approach to second language teaching has important implications for translation training (p. 34). Kiraly (1990) includes that “the other type of translation is ‘communicative’ translation, which attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original. He assumes the right to make improvements on the original text and he adapts his text as much as possible to TL norms. Certain types of texts, that is those that are bound up in the source language culture, would require semantic translation while others would require a communicative translation” (p. 87). He adds that “new ideas in translation classrooms include using methods such as role-play and simulation that create a greater sense of realism - and thereby generate enthusiasm and overcome passivity, teach translation as a realistic communicative activity” (p. 33).

Each language has its own grammatical structure, that is, the division of the lexicon into word classes; whereas, the semantic structure is common to all languages, in those types of units, the features, and the relationships are essentially the same. In other words, grammatical form is different from language to language yet meaning is universal. Therefore translation is possible, as anything that can be said in one language can be said in another.

Translation must aim primarily, as Nida and Taber (1969) put it: at reproducing the message (the total meaning or content of a discourse) of the source language to the receptor audience by way of using the closest equivalent of the source message, in terms of meaning and style. Also, grammatical structures vary among languages. The order may be changed completely. Turkish, for instance, has a different word order from English, which means that the place and significance of emphasis on words are different. Passive constructions may be translated with an active construction or vice versa (Larson, 1984). Grammatical choices should, therefore, be based on the function of the TL grammatical constructions not on the literal rendition of a SL form (Larson, 1984, p. 20).

To translate the form of one language literally (without changing) according to the corresponding form in another language would often change the meaning, or at least result in a form which is unnatural in the second language. Meaning must, therefore, have priority over form in translation. It is the meaning, not the form, which is to be retained and carried over from the source language to the receptor language. Kiraly (1990) puts forth that “a view of an act of translation as the replacement of linguistic material in one language by linguistic material in another language presupposes a relationship of linguistic equivalence between elements of different languages. However, despite the existence of bilingual dictionaries and their implicit claim to the contrary, equivalence in potential meaning of elements in two languages (on the level of langue) is much more the exception than the rule. When speaking of language in use (parole), one might say that the communicative function or communicative effect of utterances in different languages can be equivalent. The recognition of this distinction suggests that the translator, who is using language for communicative purposes, is, (or should be) much more concerned with striving for an equivalent effect on an interlocutor than on retrieving equivalent linguistic elements during the translation process” (pp. 76-78). Although grammars based on corpus research (Biber et al., 1999) have made substantial contributions to addressing the question of what ‘real’ English is, they are ultimately only a description of what forms are most frequently used in what contexts and not what native speakers know can be used (Newmeyer, 2003). As such, they may be of limited aid to translators of complex, high-level texts. Some structures in English similar to Turkish may be grammatically possible, but

unusual or of questionable acceptability to native speakers. That is why explicit grammar instruction should not be given in translation courses.

Atkinson (cited in Erer, 2006, pp. 12-13) claims that translation makes learners concentrate on meaning, as opposed to mechanical grammar exercises, which only focus-on-form. Translation activities can be used to encourage students to take risks rather than avoid them. Translation rules out avoidance strategies as students have to take even the most difficult parts of a text into consideration while translating. And, finally, through translation students become aware of the fact that an exact equivalence should not always be expected. Jakobson (1959) agrees that translation must deal “not with separate code-units, but with entire messages” (p. 233). Also, Nord (1994) states that in translation classes, instruction should allow for the incomplete nature of the translation student’s foreign language competence. For the need for active student participation in the translation class Newmark (1988) emphasises that “clearly the future of profitable teaching lies in some kind of role-playing, simulation exercises, real or imaginary situations” (p. 130).

Carreres (2006) gives some reasons of using meaning focused instruction within task based approach in translation course and adds that it is easy to see why the task-based approach appears to lend itself particularly well to the teaching of translation and to the use of translation in language teaching. Here are some of the reasons why:

1. The focus is on using language that is pragmatically appropriate to a certain situation or communicative purpose. Much of the literature in translation pedagogy also emphasizes the need to present translation as a communicative activity.
2. A corollary of the above is that, in order to complete the task, learners need to focus primarily on meaning rather than on form.
3. Nevertheless, the task can be formulated in such a way as to predispose the learner to use certain linguistic forms. This will be particularly the case at the focus-on-form end of the continuum, especially in the initial stages of learning.
4. The task is designed to resemble the way language is used in the real world. In the case of translation tasks, this will mean bringing classroom work closer to the professional practice.

5. A task may engage a variety of language skills and cognitive processes.

Therefore, the aim of the present study is to compare meaning-focused translation instruction (communicative translation) with form-focused translation instruction (explicit grammar instruction) in the translation course in order to understand which of the instruction type has a more positive effect in improving the translation skills and the reading skills of the students.

## **Methodology**

### **Research Questions**

The research was conducted in order to answer the following questions:

1. Will there be a difference in the translation and reading scores of the students in the experimental and control group?
2. Does translation improve the reading skill of the students?

### **Subjects**

The subject pool for the study consisted of 75 undergraduate students who have taken the Translation (from English to Turkish) at the Department of English Language Teaching, Gazi University: 40 for the experimental group, and 35 for the control group. The translation course given in the second grade as two semesters, first semester from English to Turkish and the second semester from Turkish to English. The subjects took the translation course two hours per week. Four of the classes in the ELT program at this university were chosen for this current study. Two of them were assigned to the experimental group for the study, and the other two served as the control group.

### **Materials and Procedures**

In the experimental design of the study, the academic achievement in translation and reading are the dependent variable. The experimental treatments that affect this dependent variable are form and meaning focused translation instruction.

All subjects in the experimental and control groups received the same amount of treatment with two different types of instructional methods from two different teachers in their regular classes: the meaning focused instruction for the experimental group and the form focused instruction for the control group. The treatment was limited to instructional materials as Alan Duff's book titled "Translation" for the experimental group and Denis Chamberlin and Gillian White's book titled "Advanced English for Translation" for the control group. The books were designed for form and meaning focused instruction, therefore no additional material was used. The study extended over a period of 10 weeks. The subjects took the Translation course for 10 weeks in the first term of the 2009-2010 academic year.

**Reading Comprehension Test:** The reading comprehension questions were taken from the internet address of ÖSYM (Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi – Student Selection and Placement Centre), [www.osym.gov.tr](http://www.osym.gov.tr).

Details of the questions are given below:

1-15 questions were taken from 2006 MAY KPDS EXAM  
(Questions 76-85, 96-100).

16-20 questions were taken from 2007 MAY KPDS EXAM  
(Questions 76-80).

**Evaluation and Scoring of the Reading Test:** The reading test was prepared by the ÖSYM and had 20 questions, five in each of the four paragraphs. The items were evaluated according to the given right answers from the total of the questions. The pre-test and post-test of the Reading Test were evaluated and scored the same way. The statistical evaluation was done in accordance with the scoring.

### Data Analysis

The data gained from the data collection tools were analysed with the SPSS 15.0 programme.

## Results and Discussion

### The Comparison of the Groups' Reading Comprehension Test

In this part, the findings and interpretation of the experimental and control groups students' pre-post test scores in reading comprehension test are stated in tables.

**Table 1**

**The Independent T-Test Results for the Scores of the Experimental and Control Group Students' Reading Comprehension Pre-Test**

| Group        | N  | $\bar{x}$ | S     | sd | t     | p    |
|--------------|----|-----------|-------|----|-------|------|
| Experimental | 40 | 12.500    | 2.562 | 73 | 1.023 | .310 |
| Control      | 35 | 13.114    | 2.632 |    |       |      |

In order to check if there is a statistically significant difference in the reading comprehension of the experimental and control group students' pre-tests the Independent Sample t Test has been conducted. When the figures are examined in Table 1, it is seen that the difference between the arithmetic means of the groups' pre-test scores in the reading comprehension is not statistically significant ( $t_{(73)}=1.023$ ,  $p>.05$ ). According to the data, the mean scores of the pre-test of the experimental group which was treated with meaning focused translation instruction was ( $\bar{x}=12.500$ ), and the mean scores of the pre-test of the control group which was treated with form focused translation instruction was ( $\bar{x}=13.114$ ). Therefore, the groups can be said to be equal in terms of reading comprehension skill before the treatment.

**Table 2**

**The Independent T-Test Results for the Scores of the Experimental and Control Group Students' Reading Comprehension Post-Test**

| Group        | N  | $\bar{x}$ | S     | sd | t     | p    |
|--------------|----|-----------|-------|----|-------|------|
| Experimental | 40 | 13,225    | 2,626 | 73 | 3.887 | .000 |
| Control      | 35 | 10,742    | 2,903 |    |       |      |



As seen in Table 2, the Independent Sample t Test conducted to check if there is a statistically significant difference in the reading comprehension of the experimental and control group students' post-tests show that there is a significant difference between the groups ( $t_{(73)}=3.887$ ,  $p<.05$ ). According to the data, the mean scores of the post-test of the experimental group which was treated with meaning focused translation instruction was ( $\bar{x}=13.225$ ), and the mean scores of the post-test of the control group which was treated with form focused translation instruction was ( $\bar{x}=10.742$ ). These results show that there is a significant meaningful difference in the post-test scores and the difference is in the favour of the experimental group.

### The Effect of Form Focused and Meaning Focused Translation Instruction to the Reading Comprehension

**Table 3**

**The Result of the Two-Way Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test according to the Experimental and Control Groups Students' Reading Comprehension Pre-Post Test Scores**

| Source of Variance              | Sum of Squares | sd       | Square Mean   | F            | p           |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| Between Groups                  | 1568.62        | 74       |               | 16.149       | .000        |
| Group<br>(Experimental/Control) | 334.137        | 1        | 334.137       |              |             |
| Error                           | 1234.483       | 73       | 17.891        |              |             |
| Within Groups                   | 1856.291       | 75       |               |              |             |
| Measurement<br>(pre-post test)  | 1252.855       | 1        | 1252.855      | 155.799      | .000        |
| <b>Group*Measurement</b>        | <b>48.573</b>  | <b>1</b> | <b>47.512</b> | <b>7.038</b> | <b>.016</b> |
| Error                           | 554.863        | 73       | 7.041         |              |             |
| Total                           | 3424.911       | 149      |               |              |             |

As scores in Table 3 indicate, a significant difference has been observed in the scores of the reading comprehension pre-post tests of the experimental and control groups who have been treated with two different instructional types. Significant difference has been viewed in the combined scores of the groups treated with different instructional types and the repeated

measure factors between the reading comprehension pre-tests and post-tests scores [ $F_{(1-73)} = 7.038, p < .05$ ]]. This finding shows that in the treatment of form and meaning focused translation instruction the students have shown difference in the increase in their reading comprehension test scores. The experimental group students which were treated with meaning focused translation instruction showed that they have achieved more success in the scores of the reading comprehension test.

### Conclusion

This study attempted to investigate whether form or meaning focused translation instruction is effective in improving the reading skills of the trainees. We hoped to shed a little more light on the role of reading comprehension to the translation skills in a translation class for the students of the English Language Teaching Department. The related research comparing form and meaning focused translation instruction in the translation course (from English into Turkish) came to a conclusion that meaning focused translation instruction was more effective in improving the reading skills of the trainees. As the findings in this study indicated, the use of translation could be a valuable resource or tool that can contribute to the development of various language skills. For example, the strategic use of translation would be helpful in developing learners' reading efficiency and maintaining the flow of their conversation and writing tasks. Also, in the investigation of the cognitive process in translating, reading involves nearly the same cognitive process. Clarke and Silberstein (1977) state that reading is only incidentally visual. "More information is contributed by the reader than by the print on the page. That is, readers understand what they read because they are able to take the stimulus beyond its graphic representation and assign it membership to an appropriate group of concepts already stored in their memories. ... Skill in reading depends on the efficient interaction between linguistic knowledge and knowledge of the world" (pp. 136-137).

Another point is "the lack of the specification of the situation and the purpose of the translation for the students." It is important to identify the situation for the students because "when the prospective communicative situation is clearly defined, linguistic errors are committed less frequently" (Nord, 1994, p. 65). When translating a text, students come into

contact with all the main ideas and specific details of a reading passage. Translation necessitates the close reading of the entire passage, which provides valuable information for the instructor. Translation can improve comprehension since it encourages the students to read a passage carefully and precisely at the word, sentence, and text levels (Van Els et al. 1984).

As this view puts forth, the use of translation can be a tool to improve the language skills, mostly the reading skill. Students use different reading strategies as scanning a text for specific details and skimming for main ideas. Yet, research in this field is not sufficient enough to come to a certain decision.

### References

- Basnett-McGuire, S. (1998). Researching Translation Studies. In P. Bush & K. Malmkjaer (Eds.), *Rimbaud's Rainbow: Literary Translation in Higher Education* (pp. 105-118). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow.
- Boguslaw, W. (2003). *Reading for Translation: Investigating the Process of Foreign Language Text Comprehension from an Information Processing Perspective*. Studia Anglica Posnaniensia: International Review of English Studies. Retrieved 13 January 2010, <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Reading+for+translation%3a+investigating+the+process+of+foreign...-a0116930311>.
- Carreres, A. (2006). "Strange Bedfellows: Translation and Language Teaching. The Teaching of Translation into L2 in Modern Languages Degrees: Uses and Limitations". In *Sixth Symposium on Translation, Terminology and Interpretation in Cuba and Canada*. La Habana, December 2006. Canadian Translators, Terminologists and Interpreters Council (online).
- Catford, J. C. (1969). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chastain, K. (1988b). *Developing Second Language Skills. Theory to Practice*. 219, 222, 224, 25, 31, ( 3rd ed. ). U.S.A.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.

- Chau, S. C. (1984). How to translate “This is a red rose”.The grammatical, cultural and interpretive aspects of translation teaching. In W. Wilss & G. Thome (Eds.), *Die Theorie des Übersetzens und ihr Aufschlugwert für die Übersetzungs- und Dolmetschdidaktik [Translation theory and its relevance for the teaching of translation and interpretation]* (pp. 124-133). Tübingen, F.R.G.: Gunter Narr.
- Clarke, M., & Silberstein, S. (1977). Toward a Realization of Psycholinguistic Principles in the ESL Reading Class. *Language Learning*, 27(1), 135-154.
- Coady, J. (1980). A Psycholinguistic Model of the ESL Reader. In *Reading in a Second Language: Hypotheses, Organization, and Practice*. 12. Eds. R. McKay & Barkman, R.R. Jordan. Rowley / Mass.: Newbury House Publishers Inc.
- Colina, S. (2002). Second language acquisition, language teaching and translation studies. *The Translator*, 8, 1-24.
- Doyle, M. (1991). *Translation and the space between: Operative parameters of an enterprise*. In Mildred Larson (ed.), 13-26.
- Ellis, R.(2006). *Current issues in the teaching of grammar*. TESOL Quarterly,40(1) 83-107.
- El-Sheikh, Ahmed Abdel-Azeem (1987): A Register Approach to the Teaching of Translation. Proceedings of the 7<sup>th</sup> National Symposium of English Teaching in Egypt, March 24-26, entitled: “*Appropriate Methodologies*”. Cairo: CEDLT, Ain Shams University.
- Erer, N. G. (2006). *Translation as an Integrated Approach in ELT*. Microfilmed M.A. Dissertation. Graduate School of Education, Bilkent University.
- Gill, S. (1998). Culture matters: Invisible, insane, translating the untranslatable? *Modern English Teacher*, 7 (3), 63-65.
- Grellet, F. (1987) *Developing Reading Skills: Practical Guide to Reading Comprehension Exercises*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M. & Ruqaiya H. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman. Hickey, Raymond & Stanislaw Puppel (eds.).
- House, J. & Shoshana, B. K. (1986). (eds.). *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

- Jakobson R. (1959). On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In A. R. Brower (Ed.), *On Translation* (pp. 232-39). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jakobson, R. (2000) [original 1959]. On linguistic Aspects of Translation. In Lawrence Venuti (Ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London & New York: Routledge, 113-118.
- Kiraly, C. D. (1995) Models for change. In Kiraly, C., D. (Ed.) *Pathways to Translation: Pedagogy and Process*. pp.20-35. Ohio: The Kent State University Press.
- Kiraly, D. C. (1990). A role for communicative competence and the acquisition learning distinction in translator training. In B. Van Patten and J. Lee, (Eds.). *Second Language Acquisition /Foreign Language Learning*. Bristol, PA and Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters. 207-215. In S. Colina. (2003). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Klein, M. L. (1988). *Teaching Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary: A Guide for Teachers*. UK: Prentice Hall Publication.
- Knapp, D. (1980). Developing Reading Comprehension Skills. In Kenneth Croft (Ed.) *Readings on English as a Second Language for Teachers and Teacher Trainees*. 2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Larson, M. L. (1984). *Meaning-based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. Lanham, MD, University Press of America.
- Leeman, J., Arteagoitia I., Fridman, B. & Doughty, C. (1995). Integrating Attention to Form with Meaning: Focus on Form in Content based Spanish Instruction. In Richard W. Schmidt (Eds.) *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning*, 217-258. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Centre.
- Long, M. 1991. 'Focus on Form: A design feature in language teaching methodology' in K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, and C. Kramsch (eds): *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 39-52.
- Lörscher, W. (1992b). Process-Oriented Research into Translation and its Implications for Translation Teaching. *Interface, Journal for Applied Linguistics*, 6 (2), 105-117.

- Macizo, P. & Bajo M. T. (2004). When Translation Makes the Difference: Sentence Processing in Reading and Translation. *Psicológica* (2004), 25, 181-205.
- Mahmoud A. (2006) Translation and Foreign Language Reading Comprehension: A Neglected Didactic Procedure. *English Teaching Forum*, 44 (4).
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Newmeyer, F. (2003). Grammar is Grammar and Usage is Usage. *Language* 79: 682-707.
- Nida, E. A. & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nord, C. (1994). Translation as a Process of Linguistic and Cultural Adaptation. In C. Dollerup & A. Lindegaard (Eds.), *Teaching translation and interpreting 2: Insights, aims, visions. Papers from the second language international conference* (pp. 59-68). Ellsinore: John Benjamins.
- Norris, J. & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50, 417-528.
- Pérez, M. C. (2005). Applying Translation Theory in Teaching. *New Voices in Translation Studies 1* (2005), 1-11.
- Roberts, J. T. (1982). Recent Developments in ELT-Part II. *Language Teaching*, 15, 174-187.
- Schäffner, C. (2004). Developing Professional Translation Competence. In Kirsten Malmkjær (Ed.) *Translation in Undergraduate Degree Programmes*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Spada, N. (1997). Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Acquisition: A Review of Classroom and Laboratory Research. *Language Teaching*, 30, 73-87.
- Steiner, T. R. (1975). *English Translation Theory 1650-1800*. Assen; Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.
- Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Els, T., Bongaerts, T., Extra, G., Van Os, C., & Janssen-van Dieten, A. (1984). *Applied Linguistics and the Learning and Teaching of Foreign Languages*. London: Edward Arnold.

Vinay, J. P. & Darbelnet, J. (1977) [originally 1958]. Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais. Méthode de traduction. [Com-parative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation]. Nouvelle édition revure et corrige. Montreal: Beauchemin.

Widdowson, H. G. (1983). Teaching Language as Communication. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

**Kapsam ve Önemi:** Uzun yıllardır yabancı dil öğretiminde yapı ve anlam odaklı öğretimin karşılaştırılması yapılmış ve halen hangi öğretimin daha etkin olduğu konusunda fikir birliğine varılamamıştır. Farklı öğretim yöntemleri geliştirilmiş ve kendi döneminde popüler olan yöntem öğretmenler tarafından benimsenmiştir. Çeviri öğretimi de dil öğretiminden etkilenerek dil öğretiminde kullanılan yöntemler uyarlanarak çeviri öğretimi yapılmaya çalışılmıştır. Çeviri dersinde hem yapı odaklı öğretim hem de anlam odaklı öğretim kolaylıkla uygulanabilmesine rağmen ve yine de hangi yöntemin daha etkili olduğu konusu tartışmalıdır. Çevirinin ayrıca kültürel boyutu da bulunduğundan çeviri yapanların dil becerilerinin, kültürlerarası bilgi ve becerilerinin gelişmiş olması gerekmektedir. Çeviride, yabancı dil öğretiminin yapıldığı sınıflardaki uygulamalarda dil becerileri içerisinde okuma becerisi en önemlisi sayılmaktadır. Okuma ve çeviri becerileri benzer bilişsel özellikleri içermektedir. Bu çalışmada okuma becerisinin çeviri becerisine etkisi olup olmadığı ve okuma düzeylerinin çeviri becerilerini şekillendirip şekillendirmediği araştırılmıştır. Bu çalışmada yapı odaklı çeviri öğretimi (İngilizceden Türkçeye) ile anlam odaklı çeviri öğretiminin (İngilizceden Türkçeye) öğrencilerin okuma becerisi ve algısına olan katkısı araştırılmıştır.

**Yöntem:** Bu çalışmada Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim dalındaki öğrencilerden seçkisiz oluşturulan deney ve kontrol gruplu desen kullanılmıştır. Deney grubu 40, kontrol grubu 35 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. Araştırma 2009-2010 güz döneminde on hafta boyunca uygulanmıştır. Deney ikinci sınıf öğrencilerine uygulanmıştır. Deney sadece İngilizceden Türkçeye çeviriyi içermektedir. Ölçme aracı olarak ÖSYM'nin [www.osym.gov.tr](http://www.osym.gov.tr) internet adresinden alınan 20 soru kullanılmıştır. 1 ile 15. sorular 2006 KPDS Mayıs Dönemi soruları (76-85, 96-100 sorular) ve 16-20. sorular da 2007 KPDS Mayıs



Dönemi sorularından (76-80 sorular) oluşmaktadır. Toplamda 20 sorudan oluşan okuma ölçeği 4 paragraftan ve her paragrafın 5 sorusundan oluşmaktadır. Kontrol grubundaki uygulamada her metnin incelenmesi esnasında metnin içeriği ile ilgili dilbilgisi verilmiş ve karşılaştırma yapılarak cümle yapıları üzerinde durulmuştur. Yapılan çeviriler cümle yapısına uygun olacak biçimde yapılmasına özen gösterilmiştir. Denek grubunda ise hiçbir şekilde dilbilgisi üzerinde durulmamış ve metnin anlamı vurgulanarak anlamlı çeviri yapılması sağlanmıştır. Deney öncesinde ve sonrasında okuma soruları öğrencilerin seviyelerini belirlemek amacıyla öğrencilere verilmiş ve sonuçlar ölçeklendirilmiştir. Sonuçlar SPSS 15.0 programı ile istatistik olarak değerlendirilmiştir.

**Bulgular:** Uygulama öncesinde yapılan ön-test sonucuna göre kontrol ve denek grubu arasında anlamlı bir farkın olmadığı görülmektedir ( $t_{(73)}=1.023$ ,  $p>.05$ ). Anlam odaklı çeviri eğitim gören denek grubu öğrencilerinin ön-test ortalama değeri ( $\bar{x}=12.500$ ) olarak gerçekleşmiş ve yapı odaklı çeviri eğitim gören kontrol grubu öğrencilerinin ön-test ortalama değeri de ( $\bar{x}=13.114$ ) olarak gerçekleşmiştir. Bu sonuç her iki grubun uygulama öncesi eşit olduğunu göstermektedir. Buna karşın uygulama sonrasında yapılan son-test sonuçlarına göre gruplar arasında anlamlı fark olduğu gözlemlenmiştir ( $t_{(73)}=3.887$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Uygulama sonucunda denek grubu öğrencilerinin (anlam odaklı çeviri öğretimi gören öğrenciler) son-test ortalama değeri ( $\bar{x}=13.225$ ) olarak gerçekleşmiş ve kontrol grubu öğrencilerinin (yapı odaklı çeviri öğretimi gören öğrenciler) son-test ortalama değeri de ( $\bar{x}=10.742$ ) olarak gerçekleşmiştir. Bu sonuç bize her iki öğretim yönteminin öğrencilerin okuma becerilerine ve algılamalarına katkı sağladığını göstermektedir. Ayrıca denek grubunda anlam odaklı çeviri yöntemiyle öğrenim gören öğrencilerin yapı odaklı çeviri öğretimi gören kontrol grubu öğrencilerine göre okumalarını algılamada daha başarılı olduklarını göstermektedir.

**Tartışma ve Sonuç:** Yabancı dil öğretiminde birçok yöntem olmasına karşın on yıllar boyunca anlam odaklı öğretimin daha etkin bir biçimde yabancı dil eğitime katkı sağlayacağı bazı bilim adamlarınca savunulmuştur. Fakat son yıllarda anlam odaklı öğretimin yetersiz olduğu ve öğrenilen dilin dilbilgisi kurallarına tam olarak uymadığı tespit edilmiştir. Böylece sırf anlam üzerinde durarak dilin öğrenilemeyeceği belirtilmiş ve yapı odaklı öğretime de tekrar önem vermeye başlanmıştır. Bunun yanında çeviri yaparken kullanılan en önemli beceri olarak okumanın çok önemli olduğu aşikârdır. Bu çalışmada anlam ve yapı odaklı öğretimi çeviri derslerine uyarlanmış ve bu öğretim yönteminden hangisinin okuma becerisine ve algısına daha çok katkı sağladığı araştırılmıştır. Deneyde ön-test son-test deseni kullanılarak uygulama öncesi ve sonrası gelişimleri incelenmiştir. Deneyde



kullanılan okuma soruları KPDS sınavından alınmış ve 20 sorudan oluşmaktadır. Uygulama öncesi yapılan ön-test sonuçlarında deneklerin homojen olduğu tespit edilmiş ve 10 haftalık uygulama yapılmıştır. Deney sonunda ortaya çıkan sonuçlara göre hem anlam odaklı çeviri öğretimi hem de yapı odaklı çeviri öğretiminin öğrencilerin okuma becerilerine ve algılamalarına katkı sağladığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca, kontrol ve denek grubu öğrencilerinin çeviri ölçeği sonuçları karşılaştırıldığında anlam odaklı çeviri öğretiminin yapı odaklı çeviri öğretime göre okuma becerisini ve algısını geliştirmede daha etkili bir öğretim yöntemi olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu sonuç bize her ne kadar yapı odaklı çeviri öğretimi okuma becerisinin geliştirilmesinde etkili olsa da yapılan uygulamanın İngilizceden Türkçeye çeviri olması sebebiyle anlam odaklı çeviri öğretiminin daha etkili olduğu sonucuna ulaştırmıştır. Kısacası, bu sonuçlar ışığında denebilir ki çeviri dersinde uygulanan öğretim yönteminin öğrencilerin okuma becerilerine etki ettiği ve anlam odaklı öğretimin yapı odaklı öğretime göre daha etkili olduğunu söylenebilir Her iki öğretim yönteminin karşılaştırılmasında ise anlam odaklı öğretimin yapı odaklı öğretime göre daha yararlı olduğunu belirtilebilir.