

Translation Students' Perceptions about Pair Work across Different Language Majors in Saudi Arabia: An Exploratory Study.

تصورات طلاب الترجمة حول العمل في مجموعات ثنائية في تخصصات

لغوية مختلفة في المملكة العربية السعودية: دراسة استكشافية

* Dr.Abdulaziz A. Abanomey.

المستخلص

استكشفت الدراسة تأثير الجنس والخبرة السابقة وتخصصات اللغة على تصورات الطلاب نحو استخدام العمل في مجموعات ثنائية في قاعات تدريس الترجمة في عديد من كليات اللغات والترجمة في المملكة العربية السعودية. وطُبِّقت الدراسة على عينة من ٢٢٨ مشاركاً ، معظمهم من جامعة الملك سعود ، حيث استخدم الباحث الإحصاء الوصفي واختبارات t-test و ANOVA لتحليل استجابات المشاركين على مقياس ليكرت الذي يتناول الأبعاد التالية فيما يتعلق باستخدام العمل في مجموعات ثنائية: وجهات النظر الإيجابية ، ووجهات النظر السلبية ، والأبعاد الاجتماعية ، والديناميكيات المعنية. وأشارت النتائج إلى اختلافات كبيرة بين الجنسين إذ يؤمن الطلاب الذكور بجوانب أكثر إيجابية وأقل سلبية من الإناث. كما أثرت تجربة العمل السابقة في مجموعات ثنائية بشكل كبير على التصورات ، مما عزز الانطباعات الإيجابية ، وقللت من الانطباعات السلبية. وأثر التخصص اللغوي في التصورات بشكل واضح ، مع ملاحظة اختلافات كبيرة في كيفية إدراك المجموعات اللغوية المختلفة للأبعاد الاجتماعية

*Department of English Language and Translation, College of Languages Sciences, King Saud University, Saudi Arabia.

والسلبية للعمل في مجموعات ثنائية. وتسلط الدراسة الضوء على الحاجة إلى أخذ الأبعاد الثقافية واللغوية في استخدام المجموعات الثنائية في البيئات التعليمية. كما أنه يدعم الحاجة لتصميم أنشطة مجموعات ثنائية بطريقة تأخذ مخاوف الطلاب في الاعتبار .

الكلمات المفتاحية: تعليم الترجمة والتدريب عليها، العمل في مجموعات ثنائية، التعلم التعاوني، سوق العمل

ABSTRACT

The study explored the effect of gender, previous experience, and language majors on the perceptions of students towards the use of pair work (PW) in translation teaching classrooms at different colleges of languages and translation in Saudi Arabia. Using a sample of 228 participants, predominantly from King Saud University, the research utilized descriptive statistics, t-tests, and ANOVA to analyze participants' responses on a Likert scale that addresses the following dimensions in relation to the use of PW: positive views, negative views, social dimensions, and dynamics involved. Findings indicated significant gender differences with male students believing in more positive and fewer negative aspects of PW. Experience with PW also significantly influenced perceptions, enhancing positive perceptions, and reducing negative views. Language major affected perceptions distinctly, with significant differences noted in how various language groups perceived social and negative dimensions of PW. The study highlights the need for culturally and linguistically sensitive approaches in implementing PW in educational settings. It also supports the reported need to properly design PW activities in a way that takes students concerns into account.

Keywords: Translation Education and Training, Pair Work, Collaborative Learning, Job Market

Introduction

With the increased demand for translation as a tool to facilitate cross-cultural communication, global interaction and information exchange, the need for more effective and improved translation training and education grows. Conventional methods of teaching translation have been criticized for being instructor-centered that did not create an interactive context equally empowering students to actively participate in exchanging ideas and concepts while executing a translation task (Kiraly, R  th, Signer, Stederoth & Wiedmann, 2019). Such traditional, uncreative, and rigid methods focused

heavily on individual work and feedback mostly provided by instructors, denying students the opportunity to interact with other peers, present and defend ideas, exchange diverse perceptions, get exposed to varied viewpoints and question others' input. (Al-Hadithy, 2015; Colina, 2003; Kiraly, 1995, 2000; Stewart, 2010). Traditional translation education and training programs have also been criticized for not providing their graduates with technical and generic skills required for professional success in the translation market (Abu-Ghararah, 2017; Al-Batineh, & Bilali, 2017; Alenezi, 2015; Alshargabi & Al-Mekhlafi, 2019; Anderman & Rogers, 2000; Atari, 2012; King, 2017; Korol, 2019; Muñoz Martín, 2002; Petrova & Sdobnikov, 2021; & Salamah, 2022).

The field of translation education and training has undergone substantial changes within the last two decades (Pavlović, 2013), on top of which was the introduction of various translation competence models used as frameworks for understanding the complex nature of translation and for improving translation education and training quality (Albir, 2015; Campbell, 1998; Delisle 1992; Gile 1995; Hatim and Mason, 1997; Kelly, 2002, 2005; Kiral, 1995; Lesznyák, 2007; Nord 1991, 2005; Neubert, 2000; PACTE, 2003, 2011; Wilss 1989). Translation competence, as a concept, has evolved to include not only the ability to translate but also interpersonal and technical skills, acknowledging the multifaceted demands of the translation market. "Since the 1990s the most innovative approaches, which focus on students as the main agents of the learning process, have developed in the field of Translation Training" (Barros, 2011, p. 2000) in response to the emphasis the different proposed translation models assigned to the interpersonal competence. Other significant changes to the teaching of translation included the use of portfolios, task-based approaches, and project-based learning (Johnson, 2003; King, 2017; Li & He, 2015; Salamah, 2023).

The use of PW (PW) as an instructional collaborative procedure to improve learning has been one of the main changes introduced to the field of translation education and training (Al-Hadithy, 2015; Barros 2011; Colina, 2003; King, 2017; Kiraly, 1995, 2000, 2003; Stewart, Orban, & Kornelius, 2010). PW involves students working together in pairs to complete translation tasks, fostering collaboration and mutual learning (Alhaj & Albahiri 2020; Gerding-Salas, 2000; Melnichuk and Osipova, 2017; Johnson & Johnson 2009; Olsen and Kagan (1992) and Paz Dennen, 2000). When using PW inside the classroom, teachers play the roles of facilitating, modeling, and coaching by providing the assistance that can take any form for the sake of enhancing social awareness, communication skills, and

language learning competence among learners (Namaziandost, Neisi, Kheryadi & Nasri, 2019; Rodger, Murray, & Cummings, 2012). The existing research on the application of PW, as a form of collaborative learning (CL), in translation education and training indicates that it substantially leads to enhanced performance in comparison to individual work (Alhaj & Albahiri, 2020; Melnichuk & Osipova, 2017). However, in order to maximize the benefits of utilizing PW, there is a need to establish the proper conditions and dynamics under which this approach can be best applied to translation teaching. Exploring the perceptions and views of students in relation to the use of PW in translation classrooms is crucial for translation educators to design an effective curriculum that responds to the actual needs of students.

Literature Review:

Recent shifts in translation pedagogy emphasize the benefits of using CL procedures, one of which is PW, where students work in pairs or groups to complete translation tasks (O'Brien, 2011; Palmer & Peter and Streetman, 2010; Zaindin, Neisi, Kheryadi & Nasri, 2019). PW is founded mainly on the idea of getting students to work collaboratively in groups of two to handle activities that are structured in a particular way so that they need each other to achieve their goals through mutual learning (Johnson & Johnson 2009; Olsen & Kagan, 1992; Paz Dennen, 2000). It accords with a social constructivist view of learning which argues that humans generate knowledge and meaning through interaction, debate and (Alhaj and Albahiri, 2021; Barros, 2011; Donato, 1994; Tsai, 2020). Learning is inherently a socially situated activity that "is rooted in a theory of learning that focuses on social interaction as a means of building knowledge" (Paz Dennen, 2000 p. 329). Exploiting PW involves students' interaction and active participation; an interaction that is an essential aspect of cognitive development of communicative capabilities (Kiraly et. al. 2019) an emerging line of research within translation education and training has focused on the potential that PW may have in improving the competence of translation of programs graduates.

The use of PW in translation training and education has been underscored by several studies to contribute to the development of effective, skilled translators who are capable of meeting the market demands (Li, Zhang, & He, 2015). A plethora of research reported that PW facilitates the sharing of diverse perspectives and strategies that enrich students' understanding by improving technical skills, fostering critical thinking, and developing

interpersonal competencies essential for professional success (Alhaj and Albahiri, 2021; Lee, Trisno & Anwar, 2019; Tsai 2020; Yuliasri, 2014). The consensus is that using PW in translation education can significantly enrich the learning experience through the valuable feedback students share, on which they elaborate and have deep discussions (Tsai, 2020). It is this type of mutual interchange that provides students working in pairs with a platform through which they recognize and rectify their mistakes, resulting in more precise and refined translations. What distinguishes PW from individual work is the exposure to diverse viewpoints from individuals with different backgrounds and the active participation that enable students to "assimilate, process and synthesize information rather than simply memorize and reproduce it" (Melnichuk and Osipova, 2017, p. 27).

Students state that PW contributes constructively to their learning as a result of interacting with partners which facilitates the exchange of knowledge and expertise, enhances problem-solving capabilities, and promotes the development of critical thinking skills (Alhaj & Albahiri, 2021; Melnichuk & Osipova, 2017; Mohammadi, Beiki, & Keyvanfar, 2022; Trisno & Anwar, 2019; Yuliasri 2014). The diverse perspectives and varied backgrounds students bring when completing translation tasks in pairs play a role in broadening their translation capabilities and skills. An essential component of PW is the process of collective scaffolding that results in peer mediation, meaning negotiation, and knowledge co-construction that are believed to facilitate learning (Kuo, 2011; Swain, Brooks, & Tocalli-Beller, 2002; Shin, Lidster, Sabraw, & Yager 2016; Storch, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 1998). A common outcome that emerges within the different studies examining the use of group work in translation classrooms is the substantial added value peers' feedback plays in improving students' learning experience (Cezero, 2018; Coit, 2004; Hatami, 2015; Trison & Adlan, 2020; Turiman et. al. 2023; Wang & Wang, 2021).

The reported improvement in translation quality as a result of PW can also be attributed to the increased levels of motivation and engagement that students typically experience when collaborating with a partner (Alhaj & Albahiri, 2021; Hatami, 2015; Wang and Wang, 2021). The interactive and dynamic characteristics of working in pairs enhance the social dimension of translation assignments, resulting in higher levels of enjoyment and reduced feelings of solitude. It is theorized that heightened student participation leads to enhanced satisfaction and better educational achievements (Cezero, 2018; Coit, 2004; Melnichuk & Osipova, 2017; Trison & Adlan, 2020; Turiman et. al. 2023; Wang & Wang, 2021). However, one of the under-researched areas

here is students' perceptions about PW, its perceived benefits, and the challenges associated with its application in translation education (Alhaj & Albahiri, 2021; Hatami, 2015; Wang and Wang, 2021). Within the Saudi context, Alhaj & Albahiri (2021) found out that their students "have spectra responses towards cooperative learning and the majority of them favored working alone" (P.100). In a similar fashion, Barros' (2011) work indicated that while the majority of students are aware of how important and beneficial collaboration is, they tend to favor working alone. Moreover, for the students to be able to work collaboratively, they "need to some training on how to work as a team as well as some support and follow-up by their teachers" (Barros, 2011, p. 55).

For years, the application of collaboration has been examined within the context of research focused on the translation process, emphasizing the fundamental characteristics of the translation process (Melnichuk & Osipova, 2017). While the focus of inquiry has been relatively recently directed at the participants themselves and the dynamics they bring to the interaction taking place within the groups (Pavlovic 2013; Pavlović, & Jurida, 2019), there is still a dearth of investigation into students' perspectives and accounts on the personal practices and preferences of PW. Such an examination will help develop the essential criteria on the basis of which PW groups can be effectively constructed. The current study, to the knowledge of the researcher, is the only research work that examined such perceptions among translation students majoring in different languages, namely: English, French, Spanish, Persian, and Turkish.

Methodology

A two-part online questionnaire was administered to collect pursued information on the perceptions of students at different colleges of Languages and Translation. Part 1 of the questionnaire was constructed to elicit some demographic data on gender, language major, and affiliated university. In addition, this part of the questionnaire included a question on whether the participant had previous experience with PW their translation courses or not. Part two comprised closed-ended items seeking response on a five-point Likert scale that included 32 PW-related statements on the following four dimensions: the positive perceptions about PW, the negative perceptions about PW, the perceptions about the social outcomes of using PW, and the perceptions about the dynamics involved in PW activities in translation classrooms.

The questionnaire was based on the available literature in this field in addition to the feedback the researcher collected from the focus groups with some of the students at the college of Languages and its Sciences, King Saud University. The first draft of the questionnaire was piloted by three faculty members from the College of Languages and its Sciences, King Saud University. The final version of the questionnaire was administered online to a large group of students in various colleges of Languages and Translation in Saudi Arabia. The researcher employed different channels to invite them to participate in the survey, including formal and informal communication through email, Twitter, WhatsApp groups, and personal contact. Additionally, prior to the questionnaire, the research objectives were explained to the subjects from whom consent to participate was obtained. The cross-sectional nature of the study provided a snapshot of students' perceptions at a single point in time, enabling the analysis of variances based on demographic and experiential factors (Nunnally, 1978). Table 1 summarizes the perceptions dimensions:

Hypotheses

The current study aimed to test the following research hypotheses:

H1: Male participants will report higher perceptions about the social influence and positive aspects of PW, and lower perceptions about its negative aspects, compared to female participants.

H2: Participants with prior experience in PW will report higher perceptions about its social and positive aspects, and lower perceptions about its negative aspects, compared to those without prior experience.

H3: There will be significant differences in the perceptions of PW 's social influence, dynamics, positive aspects, and negative aspects among participants of different language majors.

Table 1 *Perceptions dimensions*

Dimension n	Statement
Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I believe that working in pairs increases my motivation to execute the translation task as perfectly as possible. • Using the PW method in teaching translation contributes to better comprehension and understanding of the text to be translated. • Using the PW method in teaching translation contributes to creating useful, meaningful and significant learning. • Using the PW method in teaching translation is a positive thing because it means that there is more linguistic input and linguistic output than the linguistic input and linguistic output of the person who carries out the translation task alone. • Using the PW method in teaching translation contributes to saving time, not wasting it, and completing the task in a short period of time. • Using the PW method in teaching translation means that the two team members help each other overcome the weakness that one of them may suffer from in a certain linguistic aspect, such as weakness in finding meanings, grammatical rules, or writing style. • I prefer to work in pairs to complete translation tasks. • Working in pairs encourages translation students to discuss each other clearly and express their opinions out loud. • I prefer to work collaboratively in pairs because it gives me the opportunity to edit and review my colleague's translations. • Using the PW method in teaching translation creates a positive learning environment within the classroom. • I believe that the advantages of Using the PW method in teaching translation are greater than its disadvantages.

Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the PW method in teaching translation is useless because it is not used in Mid-term and Final exams to evaluate students. • Working collectively in pairs is difficult and exhausting. • Using the PW method in teaching translation may lead to conflicting opinions and participants. • Using the PW method in teaching translation may lead to bizarre and inconsistent translations due to the interference of two different translation styles. • I believe that the disadvantages of Using the pair-group method in teaching translation are greater than its advantages. • I prefer to work alone on translation tasks. • Using the PW method in teaching translation is ineffective because each team member works on the part he is good at and does not put effort into the part he is not good at, and thus learning opportunities are rare.
Dynamics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the PW method in teaching translation means that one team member performs most or all of the work. • The PW method of teaching translation is difficult to manage by the teacher and to ensure everyone's effective participation. • One of the problems of using the PW method in teaching translation is the great disturbance it causes inside the classroom due to the interference of sounds. • Not everyone actively participates in pairs when applying the PW method in translation teaching. • Using the PW in teaching translation can be more effective as long as the two students know each other well. • Using the PW method in teaching translation increases the level of dependency among some students who depend on their partners in the group to complete the entire translation task. • Using the PW method in teaching translation means that the student with the weakest proficiency level depends on the more proficient student in completing the required translation task.

Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I believe that working in pairs while studying translation will help me a lot when working in jobs that require the skill of participating within a multi-person team. • The student must have the skill of teamwork within a duo team in order to guarantee promising job opportunities in the future • I believe that being able to work in pairs increases my level of responsibility. • Using the PW method in teaching translation contributes to acquiring the skill of solving problems similar to those that professional translators encounter in their jobs. • Working in pairs contributes to creating close relationships between translation students. • I believe that the ability to work in pairs is a skill that is in demand in the job market. • Using the PW method in teaching translation reflects positively on my personal skills in social communication and creating a network of social relationships.
--------	---

Participants characteristics

Table 2 lists the demographic characteristics of the participants obtained in part 1 of the survey. A total of 228 students from various universities in Saudi Arabia participated in the study with the majority of them (75.0%) coming from King Saud University. The sample was predominantly male (85.1%) with a smaller representation of female students (14.5%). One participant's gender data was missing. Most of the participants (79.4%) reported having previous experience with PW, while 20.6% had no such experience. When it came to the language major, English language represented (61.8%), followed by French (18.0%), Spanish (8.3%), Turkish (5.3%), and Persian (4.4%). There were five missing responses concerning the major language.

12 Saudi universities have. The demographic characteristics comprised gender, university affiliation, and language major.

Table 2 Demographic characteristics of participants

Tait		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	194	85.5%
	Female	33	14.5%
Previous experience with PW	No	47	20.6%
	Yes	181	79.4%
Language major	English	141	63.2%
	French	41	18.4%
	Spanish	19	8.5%
	Persian	10	4.5%
	Turkish	12	5.4%

Data analysis

Data analysis for the study was conducted using SPSS 28, which allowed for robust and comprehensive statistical evaluations consistent with social sciences research standards. Descriptive statistics provided insights into central tendencies, dispersion, and distributions of the dataset, establishing a foundational understanding of the variables (Nunnally, 1978). Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, confirming the internal consistency of the scales with values above .70 considered acceptable for preliminary research. Independent samples t-tests were employed to investigate gender differences and the impact of previous experience on perceptions about PW, while one-way ANOVA tested the influence of language major, supplemented by post hoc comparisons using the LSD method to pinpoint specific group differences. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to explore relationships between different subscales of perceptions about PW, aiding in understanding the interconnections among various perceptions.

Reliability and validity

Cronbach's alpha for the reliability of the Likert scales used in the study is above .70, which is good.

Table 3 Reliability of the Likert scales

#	Dimension	Number of items	Cronbach alpha reliability
1	Social	07	$\alpha = .838$
2	Dynamics	07	$\alpha = .712$
3	Positive	11	$\alpha = .933$

4	Negative	07	$\alpha = .859$
5	*Total score	32	$\alpha = .723$

Note. For total score, neg6 item has been reverse coded to improve reliability

The "Social" dimension, consisting of 7 items, demonstrated good reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of .838. The "Dynamics" dimension, also with 7 items, showed acceptable reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of .712. The "Positive" dimension, which included 11 items, exhibited excellent reliability, evidenced by Cronbach's alpha of .933. Similarly, the "Negative" dimension, with 7 items, indicated good reliability with Cronbach's alpha of .859. The total score, computed from all 32 items and including a reverse-coded item (neg6) to improve reliability, resulted in a lower but still acceptable Cronbach's alpha of .723.

Results

PW by Gender

Table 4 indicates that not all the descriptive statistics and T-test results for perceptions about PW by gender support the research hypotheses. The data include responses from 194 male students and 33 female students on a scale examining various aspects of perceptions about PW.

Table 4 *Descriptive Statistics and T-test Results for Perceptions of PW by Gender*

Dimension	Gender	N	M	SD	t-value	df	P-value (2-tailed)
Social Influence of PW	Male	194	4.05	0.6	1.94	225	0.027
	Female	33	3.81	0.93			
Dynamics of PW	Male	194	3.49	0.61	0.65	225	0.518
	Female	33	3.41	0.68			
Positive Perceptions about PW	Male	194	3.95	0.81	1.92	225	0.056
	Female	33	3.65	0.94			
Negative Perceptions about PW	Male	194	2.73	0.87	-2.4	225	0.017
	Female	33	3.12	0.81			

For the *Social Influence of PW*, male students reported a higher mean ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 0.60$) compared to female students ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.93$). The difference was statistically significant ($t(225) = 1.94$, $p = .027$), suggesting that male students perceived a greater social influence of PW than female students. In the *Dynamics of PW*, both genders showed similar perceptions, with male students reporting a mean of 3.49 ($SD = 0.61$) and female students a mean of 3.41 ($SD = 0.68$). The difference was not statistically significant ($t(225) = 0.65$, $p = .518$), indicating no significant gender difference in the perception about the dynamics involved in PW.

When it comes to the *Positive Sides of PW*, male students again reported a higher mean ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 0.81$) compared to female students ($M = 3.65$, $SD = 0.94$). The difference approached statistical significance ($t(225) = 1.92$, $p = .056$), suggesting a trend where male students might perceive more positive aspects about PW than female male students. Regarding the *Negative Sides of PW*, male students reported a lower mean ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 0.87$) compared to female students ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 0.81$). This difference was statistically significant ($t(225) = -2.40$, $p = .017$), indicating that male students had fewer negative attitudes towards PW than female students.

These findings suggest gender differences in the perception about PW, with male students generally perceiving more positive and less negative aspects than female students. This finding could be valuable for designing and implementing PW approach in translation educational settings, taking into account the different perspectives of male students and female students.

PW by Previous Exposure

An interesting outcome of the study is the observation that previous experience with PW can influence individuals' perceptions, particularly in recognizing the positive aspects and reducing the negative perceptions associated with PW. The finding underscores the importance of experience in shaping how individuals perceive and benefit from collaboratively working with other colleagues. Students' feedback can be a valuable tool in properly designing and implementing PW.

Table 5 Group Statistics and Independent Samples T-test Results for Perceptions of PW by Previous Experience

Dimension	Experience	N	Mean	SD	t-value	df	p-value (2-tailed)																																
Social Influence of PW	No	47	3.87	0.65	-1.62	226	0.053																																
	Yes	181	4.05	0.66				Dynamics of PW	No	47	3.48	0.64	0	226	0.999	Yes	181	3.48	0.62	Positive Perceptions about PW	No	47	3.63	0.71	-2.64	226	0.004	Yes	181	3.99	0.85	Negative Perceptions about PW	No	47	3.02	0.74	2.12	226	0.017
Dynamics of PW	No	47	3.48	0.64	0	226	0.999																																
	Yes	181	3.48	0.62				Positive Perceptions about PW	No	47	3.63	0.71	-2.64	226	0.004	Yes	181	3.99	0.85	Negative Perceptions about PW	No	47	3.02	0.74	2.12	226	0.017	Yes	181	2.72	0.88								
Positive Perceptions about PW	No	47	3.63	0.71	-2.64	226	0.004																																
	Yes	181	3.99	0.85				Negative Perceptions about PW	No	47	3.02	0.74	2.12	226	0.017	Yes	181	2.72	0.88																				
Negative Perceptions about PW	No	47	3.02	0.74	2.12	226	0.017																																
	Yes	181	2.72	0.88																																			

For the *Social Influence of PW*, participants without previous experience ($N = 47$) reported a lower mean ($M = 3.87$, $SD = 0.65$) compared to those with experience ($N = 181$, $M = 4.05$, $SD = 0.66$). The difference was not statistically significant, but it approached significance ($t(226) = -1.62$, $p = .053$), suggesting a trend where previous experience might enhance perceived social benefits of PW.

In the *Dynamics of PW*, there was no observed difference in mean scores between participants without ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.64$) and with experience ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.62$); the t -test confirmed no significant difference ($t(226) = 0$, $p = .999$). This indicates that prior experience with PW did not affect students' perceptions about the dynamics of PW.

Perceptions about the *Positive Sides of PW* showed a significant difference between groups. Participants without previous experience reported a significantly lower mean ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 0.71$) compared to those with experience ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 0.85$), with a t -value of -2.64 ($p = .004$). This suggests that previous experience with PW was associated with recognizing more positive aspects.

For the Perceptions about the *Negative Sides of PW*, participants without previous experience perceived more negative aspects ($M = 3.02$, $SD = 0.74$)

than those with experience ($M = 2.72$, $SD = 0.88$), with the difference being statistically significant ($t(226) = 2.12$, $p = .017$). This indicates that students who never had been exposed to PW might encounter more challenges or have more negative perceptions compared to the students who participated in this type of CL procedure.

PW by language major

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) conducted to investigate perceptions of PW across different language majors revealed significant differences, particularly in the manner in which the participants felt about the social influence and the positive and negative aspects of PW. These variations highlight the influence of language major on team dynamics and individual experiences in collaborative settings.

Table 6 Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA Results for Perceptions of PW by Language

Dimensions	Language	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Social Influence of PW	English	141	3.92	0.77	4.292	0.002
	French	41	4.26	0.12		
	Spanish	19	4.27	0.09		
	Persian	10	3.66	0.72		
	Turkish	12	4.26	0.43		
Dynamics of PW	English	141	3.47	0.7	1.343	0.255
	French	41	3.39	0.32		
	Spanish	19	3.5	0.2		
	Persian	10	3.86	0.66		
	Turkish	12	3.63	0.7		
Positive Perceptions about PW	English	141	3.74	0.91	7.864	<.001
	French	41	4.38	0.27		
	Spanish	19	4.43	0.09		
	Persian	10	3.51	1		
	Turkish	12	3.95	0.89		
Negative Perceptions about PW	English	141	3.02	0.85	18.334	<.001
	French	41	2.06	0.32		
	Spanish	19	2.08	0.4		
	Persian	10	3.27	0.99		
	Turkish	12	3.11	0.93		

Note: *SD* = Standard Deviation, *F* = *F*-statistic from ANOVA, *Sig.* = Significance level. *Eta-squared* for Social Influence of PW = .073, Dynamics of PW = .024, Positive Sides of PW = .126, Negative Sides of PW = .252.

For the Social Influence of PW, the ANOVA indicated significant differences among the language groups, $F(4, 218) = 4.292, p = .002$. Post hoc tests using the Least Significant Difference (LSD) method showed that English major students reported a significantly lower perceived social influence compared to French major students (M difference = $-.35, SE = .11, p = .003$) and Spanish major students (M difference = $-.35, SE = .16, p = .026$). However, there was no significant difference in perceived social influence between English and Persian major students, suggesting variability in how social aspects of PW were valued across language majors.

In contrast, the Dynamics of PW did not show any significant differences across the groups, $F(4, 218) = 1.343, p = .255$, indicating a general consensus on the dynamics of PW regardless of language majors. This suggests that the fundamental mechanics of collaborative work may transcend language differences to some extent.

Significant differences were found in the Positive perceptions about PW, with an *F*-statistic of 7.864 and $p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons revealed that English major students perceived fewer positive aspects of PW than both French major students (M difference = $-.64, SE = .14, p < .001$) and Spanish major students (M difference = $-.69, SE = .19, p < .001$). This indicates that cultural factors might influence the perceived benefits of collaborative efforts, with some cultures possibly valuing collaborative gains more.

For the Negative perceptions about PW, the differences were highly significant, $F(4, 218) = 18.334, p < .001$. French major students reported significantly fewer negative aspects than English, Persian, and Turkish major students, with particularly notable differences between French and English major students (M difference = $.96, SE = .13, p < .001$) and between French and Persian major students (M difference = $1.21, SE = .27, p < .001$). These findings suggest that perceptions about the disadvantages of PW were strongly influenced by linguistic contexts.

The effect sizes, indicated by eta-squared, were substantial, especially for the negative perception about PW (.252), suggesting that the impact of language on the perceptions about PW's disadvantages is robust and significant. This underscores the importance of considering linguistic

differences in translation education and training settings where collaborative work forms a central component of activities.

These results provided valuable insights into how multicultural settings can influence collaborative processes and outcomes. They highlight the necessity for culturally adaptive strategies to harness the full potential of diverse teams, ensuring that all members can contribute effectively and feel valued within their collaborative environments.

PW Correlations

Descriptive and correlational analysis of the Likert scales were performed. The four subscales of PW are rated on a 5-point Likert scale, that range from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The sample consisted of 228 participants.

Table 7 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Subscales of PW on 5-Point Likert Scale from Strongly Disagree 1 to Strongly Agree 5

Dimensions	N	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
Social Influence of PW	228	4.01	0.66	--			
Dynamics of PW	228	3.47	0.61	-.341**	--		
Positive perceptions about PW	228	3.91	0.83	.787**	-.486**	--	
Negative perceptions about PW	228	2.78	0.86	-.493**	.683**	-.714**	-

Note. ** indicates significance at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The mean scores indicate varying levels of agreement with the different aspects of PW. The mean for *Social Influence of PW* was 4.01 ($SD = 0.66$), which suggests a high level of agreement that PW influenced social interactions. *Dynamics of PW* had a lower mean of 3.47 ($SD = 0.61$), which indicates a moderate agreement on the dynamics involved in PW. The same is true of the *positive perceptions about PW*. However, the *negative perceptions about PW* received more disagreement.

Correlation analysis revealed significant relationships between the subscales. *Social Influence of PW* was negatively correlated with *Dynamics of PW* ($r = -.341$, $p < .01$), which suggest that those who perceived higher social influence attributed to PW reported lower mean with the dynamics of PW. Conversely, there was a strong positive correlation between *Social Influence of PW* and *Positive perceptions about PW* ($r = .787$, $p < .01$), indicating that perceptions of social benefits are associated with recognizing positive aspects of PW. *Social Influence* was negatively correlated with

Negative perceptions about PW ($r = -.493, p < .01$), which show that those who believed in greater social influence also expressed fewer negative perceptions about PW .

Discussion

The in-depth investigation of the various facets of students' perceptions about the utilization of PW across different language majors has been of considerable significance. The promising benefits of PW in translation education could be maximized had the students' concerns been considered.

The study findings indicated the way in which gender differences may impact the perceptions of students about PW. Male students perceived a higher social influence associated with PW ($M = 4.05, SD = 0.60$) compared to female students ($M = 3.81, SD = 0.93$), with the difference being statistically significant ($t(225) = 1.94, p = .027$). This suggests that male students might feel more influenced by their peers in collaborative settings than female students. However, no significant differences were found in the dynamics of PW between genders ($t(225) = 0.65, p = .518$), indicating a uniform perception of the collaborative process irrespective of gender.

Male students also reported more positive perception about PW ($M = 3.95, SD = 0.81$) compared to female students ($M = 3.65, SD = 0.94$), although this difference was not statistically significant ($p = .056$). Conversely, male students perceived fewer negative aspects ($M = 2.73, SD = 0.87$) than female students ($M = 3.12, SD = 0.81$), with this difference being significant ($t(225) = -2.40, p = .017$). These findings suggest that while both genders perceive PW dynamics similarly, their experiences with the positive and negative aspects differ, potentially influencing their overall engagement and satisfaction with PW.

Previous research indicates that gender can significantly influence perceptions and outcomes in collaborative learning environments (Webb, Troper, & Fall, 1995). This still in line with the study findings where male students reported a more positive perception of PW compared to female students.

Experience with PW appeared to significantly affect participants' perceptions, particularly in recognizing the positive aspects. Those with prior experience perceived more positive aspects of PW ($M = 3.99, SD = 0.85$) compared to those without ($M = 3.63, SD = 0.71$), and this was statistically significant ($t(226) = -2.64, p = .004$). This indicates that familiarity and comfort with PW can enhance perceptions of its benefits. No significant

difference was observed in the dynamics of PW between those with and without prior experience, suggesting that the basic understanding of PW remains consistent regardless of previous exposure. Previous experience with collaborative tasks has been shown to enhance students' engagement and positive perceptions of group work (Gillies & Boyle, 2010). This is consistent with our findings where prior experience was associated with more positive evaluations of PW.

Significant variations were found in the perceptions of PW across different language majors, highlighting the influence of the cultural facets related to the language learned. For instance, French and Spanish major students perceived greater social and positive dimensions of PW compared to English and Persian major students. The ANOVA results were particularly revealing for the negative aspects of PW, with French major students perceiving significantly fewer negative aspects compared to other language groups. These differences underscore the role of language major and its associated culture in shaping the way in which individuals engage with and perceive collaborative tasks such as PW. Such a variable significantly affected the PW learning dynamics, as demonstrated in various studies (Hofstede, 1986; Stahl, 2006). The differences in perceptions among language groups in our study reflect the broader cultural variations that can influence collaboration effectiveness.

Implications

These findings have practical implications for translation educational and training settings where collaborative learning such as PW is used. Understanding that perceptions of PW vary based on gender, previous experience, and cultural background can help in designing more inclusive and effective collaborative processes. For instance, recognizing that male students may perceive more positive aspects of PW could lead to strategies that enhance the positive perceptions among female students, potentially increasing their engagement and satisfaction. Similarly, integrating experiences that highlight the benefits of collaboration might reduce negative perceptions, especially among those new to PW. The researcher agrees with Barros' (2011) statement that "in order to achieve good teamwork performance, all the team members must participate and be involved actively and responsibly in every task they must fulfill, having at their disposal their teacher's supervision" (p. 45).

Conclusion

Overall, the study contributes to the broader discourse on collaborative work by highlighting the nuanced ways in which certain demographic variables may influence perceptions about PW. By acknowledging these differences, educators and curriculum designers can foster more positive and productive collaborative environments that cater to the diverse needs of their participants. Nevertheless, the study is constrained by factors such as the small sample size of female participants in the study. Additional research is needed to examine the possibilities of applying PW to students' translation quality assessment

References:

- O'Brien, S. (2011). Collaborative translation. In Y. Gambier & L. V. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies*, Vol. 2, 17-20. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Abu-Ghararah, B. (2017). The gap between translator training and the translation industry in Saudi Arabia. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies*, 1(4), 107-118.
- Al-Batineh, M., & Bilali, L. (2017). Translator training in the Arab world: Are curricula aligned with the language industry? *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 11(2-3), 187-203.
- Albir, A. H. (2007). Competence-based Curriculum Design for Training Translators. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 1(2): 163-195.
- Albir, A. H. (2015). The Acquisition of Translation Competence. Competences, Tasks, and Assessment in Translator Training. *META Journal*, 60(2). 256-280
- Alenezi, A. (2015). *Development of translation curricula at undergraduate translation courses in Saudi universities: Exploring student needs and market demands*, (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Leicester.
- Al-Hadithy, T. M. (2015). The traditional vs. the modern translation classroom: A need for new directions in the UAE undergraduate translation programs. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 180-187.
- Alhaj, A. A. M., & Albahiri, M. H. (2021). The Effectiveness of Cooperative Work Procedure in Enhancing Translation Skills among Saudi Students of Translation at King Khalid University. *International Journal of Higher Education* 10(3), 100-106.
- Alkathery, E. R.; Salamah, D. A.; & Al-Otaibi, G. M. (2024). Investigating the Professional Needs of Undergraduate Translation Students at the College of Language Sciences, King Saud University. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 15, (1). 182-213
- Alshargabi, E., & Al-Mekhlafi, M. (2019). A survey of the Yemeni translation market needs. *Journal of Social Studies*, 25(1), 103-121. <https://doi.org/10.20428/JSS.25.1.5>.
- Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Anderman, G., & Rogers, M. (2000). Translator training between academia and profession: A European perspective. In C. Schäffner & B. Adab (Eds.), *Developing translation competence* (pp. 63-73). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

- Atari, O. F. (2012). Impediments to translator training at Arab universities: Proposal for change. *Arab World English Journal*, 3(1), 103-127.
- Barros, E. H. (2011). Collaborative learning in the translation classroom: preliminary survey results. *The Journal of Specialized Translation*, 16, 42-60.
- Campbell, S. (1998). *Translation into the Second Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Colina, S. (2003). *Translation teaching from research to the classroom: A handbook for teachers*. USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches second language research* (pp. 33-56). Ablex.
- Gerding-Salas, C. (2000). Teaching Translation: Problems and solutions. *Translation Journal*, 4(3) (vol. 4 n. 3, pp. 1-11
- Gile, D. (1995). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gillies, R. M., & Boyle, M. (2010). Teachers' reflections on cooperative learning: Issues of implementation. *Teaching and teacher Education*, 26(4), 933-940.
- Hatami, A. (2015) "The Effect of Collaborative Learning and Self-Assessment on Self-Regulation," *Educ. Res. Rev.*, vol. 10, no. 15, pp. 2164–2167.
- Hatim, B. & Mason. I (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.
- Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of intercultural relations*, 10(3), 301-320.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2015.1010357>
https://textbookequity.org/Textbooks/Orey_Emergin_Perspectives_Learning.pdf
- Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), 365-379.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09339057>
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1994). *Together and alone. Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Learning* (5th edition). Pearson. ISBN-13 9780205287710 KHOTABA

- Johnson, J. E. (2003). Learning through portfolios in the translation classroom. In B. J. Baer & G. Kelly, D. (2002). "Un modelo de competencia traductora: bases para el diseño curricular." *Puentes. Hacia nuevas investigaciones en la mediación intercultural 1*, 9-20.
- Kelly, D.. (2005). *A Handbook for Translator Trainers: A Guide to Reflective Practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- King, H. (2017). Translator Education Programs & the Translation Labor Market: linear career progression or a touch of chaos? *T&I Review*. 17. 133-151.
- Kiraly, D. (2000). *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education: Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Manchester, UK & Northampton MA, St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kiraly, D. (2003). Summary of discussion on collaboration, teamwork and group work. In A. Pym et al. (E.ds), *Innovation and e-Learning in Translation Training: Reports on Online Symposia* (pp. 51-57). Tarragona: Universitat Rovira I
- Kiraly, D. C. (1995). *Pathways to translation: Pedagogy and process*. USA: The Kent State University Press.
- Kiraly, D., R uth, L., Signer, S., Stederoth, K., & Wiedmann, M. (2019). Enhancing Translation Course Design and Didactic Interventions with E-Learning: Moodle and Beyond. In D. Kiraly & G. Massey (Eds.). *Towards authentic experiential learning in translator education* (pp. 101-127). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Korol, T. (2019). Translation project as an assessment tool: Ukrainian context. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 7(1), 115-123.
- Kuo, I. V. (2011). Student perceptions of student interaction in a British EFL setting. *ELT Journal*, 65(8), 281-90.
- Lee, E. T. (2102). Collaborative Learning in Translating: a Travel Guide: A Case Study. *Translation Journal* 16(3). <http://translationjournal.net/journal/61travel.htm>
- Leszny ak, M. (2007). Conceptualizing translation competence. *Across Languages and Cultures* 8(2):167-194.
- Li, D. C. & He, Y. (2015). Project-based learning in teaching translation: students' perceptions. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 9(1), 1-19.
- Li, D., Zhang, C., & He, Y. (2015). Project-based learning in teaching translation: Students' perceptions. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 9(1), 1-19.

- Melnichuk, M. V. & Osipova, V. M. (2017). Cooperative Learning as a Valuable Approach to Teaching Translation. *XLinguae Journal*, 10 (1), 25-33.
- Mohammadi, H., Beiki, M., & Keyvanfar. A. (2022). The Impact of Back-translation Instruction with Collaborative Activities on Iranian English Students' Translation Achievement. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 7(1):75-75. doi: 10.21093/ijeltal.7i1.1193
- Muñoz Martín, R. (2002). Parameters in the teaching of translation. *Proceedings of the papers · de · tradumàtica, Actes del Primer Simposi sobre l'Ensenyament a distància i semipresencial de la Tradumàtica*, 1-9. Barcelona, Spain.
- Namazandost, E., Neisi, L., Kheryadi, & Nasri, M. (2019). Enhancing oral proficiency through cooperative learning among intermediate EFL learners: English learning motivation in focus. *Cogent Education*, 6(1), 1-15.
- Neubert, Albrecht (2000). "Competence in language, in languages, and in translation." Christina Schäffner and Beverly Adab (Eds.) (2000). *Developing Translation Competence*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 3-18.
- Nord, C. (1991). Skopos, loyalty and translational conventions. *Target*, 3(1), 91-109.
- Nord, C. (2005). Toward profession-based learner-centered approaches. In D. Kelly (Ed.), *A handbook for translator trainers* (pp. 12-13. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Olsen, R. E. B., & Kagan, S. (1992). About cooperative learning. In Kessler, C. (Ed.), *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book* (pp. 1-30). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- PACTE. (2003). Building a Translation Competence Model. In F. A. d. Santos (Ed.),
- PACTE. (2011). Results of the Validation of the PACTE Translation Competence Model: Translation Project and Dynamic Translation Index. In S. O'Brien (Ed.), *Cognitive Explorations of Translation*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Palmer, G., Peters R., & Streetman, R. (2010) Emerging Perspectives on Learning, Teaching, and Technology, Global Text, Michael Orey. (Chapter 29). Retrieved from

- Pavlović, T. & Hadžiahmetović Jurida, S. (2019). Collaborative Translation: Student Translators' Perspective. *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E*, 6, 4 – 28.
- Pavlović, T. & Hadžiahmetović Jurida, S. (2019). Collaborative Translation: Student Translators' Perspective. *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E*, 6, 4 – 28.
- Pavlović, T. (2013). The role of collaborative translation protocols (CTPs) in translation studies. *Jezikoslovlje*, 14(2-3), 549-563.
- Paz Dennen, V. (2000). Task structuring for online problem-based learning: A case study. *Educational Technology & Society*, 3 (3), 329-336.
- Petrova, O., & Sdobnikov, V. (2021). How can and should translation teachers be trained? *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 9(2), 267-277.
- Rodger, S., Murray, H. G., & Cummings, A. L. (2012). Gender differences in cooperative learning with university students. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 53(2), 157-173.
- Salamah, D. (2022). Translation competence and the translation job market in Saudi Arabia: Investigating recruitment practices and job-market readiness. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, 2(4), 236-258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SJLS-08-2022-0064>.
- Salamah, D. (2023). Cooperative Training of Undergraduate Translation Students: Trainee Perceptions and Job Market Alignment. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 7, (3). 69-86.
- Shin, S., Lidster, R., Sabraw, S., and Yager, R. (2016). The Effect of L2 proficiency Differences in Pairs on Idea Units in a Collaborative Text Reconstruction Task. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(3) 366 –386.
- Stahl, G. (2006). *Group cognition: Computer support for building collaborative knowledge (acting with technology)*. The MIT Press.
- Stewart, J., Orban, W., & Kornelius, J. (2010). Cooperative translation in the paradigm of problem-based learning. In. Bilic, V., Holderbaum, A., Kimnes, A. Kornelius, J, Stewart, J., & Stoll, C. (Eds.). *T2 In-Translation*. Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier: German.
- Storch, N. (2003). Relationships formed in dyadic interaction and opportunity for learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(34), 305-322.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 320-337.

- Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002) Peer-Peer Dialogue as a Means of Second Language Learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 171-185.
- Triangulating Translation: Perspectives in Process Oriented Research*, 43-66. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Triangulating translation: perspectives in process oriented research* 45, 43-66. Amsterdam; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Trisno, A. H., & Anwar, D. (2020). The Effect of Collaborative Translation on Students' Translation Ability. In B. Sumintono et al. (Eds.). *1st International Conference on Lifelong Learning and Education for Sustainability*, 180-182. Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200217.037>
- Tsai, Y. (2020). Collaborative Translation in the Digital Age. *Research in Language*, 18(2), 119–135.
- Turiman1, S., Suppiah, P. C., Tazijan, F. N., Nath, P. R. & Bahrn, F. F. S. (2023). Online Collaborative Translation in Translation Classrooms: Students' Perceptions and Attitudes. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 7, (3). 1-18.
- Wang, L. & Wang, X. (2021). Building virtual communities of practice in post-editing training: A mixed-method quasi-experimental study. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 36b (Special Issue), 193 – 219.
- Webb, N. M., Troper, J. D., & Fall, R. (1995). Constructive activity and learning in collaborative small groups. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(3), 406–423. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.87.3.406>
- Wills, W. (1982). *The science of translation*. Stuttgart: Gunetr Narr verlag Tubingen.
- Yuliasri, I. (2014). Cooperative learning techniques to improve students' translation. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 8, (2). 107-114.

Acknowledgments

This research received grant no. (104/203) from the Arab Observatory for Translation (an affiliation of ALESCO), which is supported by the Literature, Publishing & Translation Commission in Saudi Arabia.