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Abstract

As universities internationalise, changes in student cohorts in tertiary language courses require creative rethinking of established pedagogical practices. This contribution presents a case study of the genesis, design, and implementation in a distance mode translation unit of ‘tandem translation’, a constructivist peer learning activity which pairs L1 Chinese speakers and L2 Chinese learners in collaborative and reflective tasks to produce joint translations of source texts in Chinese and English. Preliminary evaluation of student perceptions of the activity, as revealed by thematic analysis of 29 reflective student commentaries, suggests that it can enhance learning outcomes and language awareness, strengthen task engagement, and facilitate further linguistic and intercultural interchange. A model of the tandem translation process is proposed. The potential for connection between language departments and the multilingual resources of university communities is emphasised.

1. Universities as sites of multilingualism

As universities in Australia adapt to operating in the globalised world, campus communities become increasingly multilingual environments, developing a complex linguistic ecology (Preece 2011) which is fed from several directions. On the one hand, domestic students are ever more likely to come from multicultural backgrounds and have several languages, or language varieties, in their repertoire. On the other hand, the increase in international students also extends the cultural and linguistic diversity of university communities. However, research findings identify tendencies for “the diverse and rich linguistic resources that have been brought into the sector [to be] largely ignored or treated as problematic” (Preece 2011: 121). The mere existence of multilingual and multicultural diversity in a university community does not automatically engender culturally diverse encounters, and there is strong evidence of “relatively low and infrequent interactions with those outside of the speaker’s own language and cultural group in many and possibly even most universities in Australia and the UK” (Leask and Carroll 2011: 650; see also Trahar and Hyland 2011).

This situation has prompted Leask and Carroll (2011: 657) to urge that it is time to “get on with redesigning curricula and learning tasks to improve student experiences of inclusion and engagement”. ‘Internationalisation at Home’ (Clifford 2011; Trahar and Hyland 2011) is one strategy. Another is to introduce small scale
but carefully planned curricular adjustments, incorporating reflective practice (Leask and Carroll 2011: 653).

The distance education (DE) mode raises further questions. Can DE students participate in, contribute to, and benefit from the internationalised context of the university campus, and inclusion and engagement initiatives? Conversely, how can campus-based international students be enabled to make meaningful connections with members of the diverse DE student body?

The study presented here is one micro-example of a curricular adjustment in an advanced Chinese class, which links international and domestic students in a DE environment. After identifying some emerging pedagogical issues for Chinese classes, relevant approaches to peer learning are introduced. Then the general unit redesign requirements and the specific tandem translation task development details are presented. A thematic analysis of reflective student commentaries (N=29) is followed by evaluation and conclusions.

2. Chinese programs: changing student cohorts prompt adjustments to pedagogy

Many international students for whom Chinese is a first language (L1), enrol in Australian university programs in business and science. Numbers of those students choose to take an advanced level Chinese unit or subject¹ as an elective to lighten the load of English-medium instruction, when their degree program permits it (McLaren 2011). In larger university departments, resources may be sufficient to develop units specific to the needs of L1 students, and to stream the two distinct student cohorts. In smaller Chinese departments, however, structural and staffing constraints limit the extent to which native speakers (NS, or L1 students) and non-native speakers (NNS, or L2 students) can be streamed into separate classes. In such circumstances the L1 students may enrol in the advanced units taken by learners of Chinese as a second or additional language (L2AL) who have reached the higher levels of their Chinese major. Consequently the same class contains both students who are learning Chinese as a second or additional language (L2AL), and also students whose L1 (or dominant language) is Chinese. Since each group is differently motivated, significant challenges arise for pedagogy and management of learning from the educator’s perspective, principally:

- the integration of students into a class learning community can be inhibited by low levels of common purpose between the diverse student groups;
- the degree of student engagement with the subject varies significantly according to their motivation in taking the unit;
- it is difficult to design assessment tasks to be effective and equitable for students from both types of linguistic background.

The case study presented here explores the extent to which these challenges can in fact be taken as opportunities. The focus is the development and trial of a structured assessed paired learning activity for a unit in Chinese translation, taken
by international students from China as well as Australian learners of Chinese. The varied linguistic backgrounds of the students are viewed as overlapping and complementary strengths, and the task offers a means for fostering intercultural understanding between L1 and L2 students, as well as language awareness and translation skills.

Translating into the L2 and translating into the L1 bring different issues to the teaching context. When students in the class group came from fairly homogeneous linguistic backgrounds with English as the first or dominant language, it could be assumed that while translating Chinese source texts, the whole class was working into their L1 or dominant language, and when the source texts were in English, all students were working into their L2 or additional language. This assumption of unidirectionality influenced the presentation of unit content and task discussion. With the participation of L1 Chinese students, however, the translation context becomes bidirectional. Whether the language of the source text is Chinese or English, some students in the class will be working into their L1 or dominant language, and some students will be working into their L2 or additional language, each encountering different issues as they do so. This shift to bidirectional capacity was an important factor which influenced the review of unit structure and pedagogy.

Translating between Chinese and English is associated with specific complexities relating to the typological distance between the two languages. Challenges arise both from the lack of cognate elements in the lexicon, and also from major structural differences, such as the paratactic–hypotactic distinction (Wang 1954; Tse 2010); and the fluidity of word classes in an isolating language (Branner and Meng 2009). Lack of awareness of issues like these can result in target texts which read like ‘Chinglish’ or ‘Englese’ even when the translator has apparently made appropriate equivalent lexical, syntactic and register choices. Two strategies which help address this difficulty are contrastive analysis, and consultation with a native speaker. The bidirectional context described above offers the opportunity to combine those two strategies in constructivist peer learning tasks. A constructivist pedagogy emphasises the importance of providing opportunities for learners to engage independently with new concepts in scaffolded constructive tasks which present affordances for active meaning-making. In this case, through collaborative work which requires sharing of insights from their respective L1s, students can bring their attention and awareness to differences between the source language and the target language, and develop strategies for handling them in translation. Such a learning design draws on principles of peer, collaborative, and tandem learning, and combines them in an innovative way. These three approaches are discussed below.

3. Peer learning, collaborative learning and tandem learning

A brief sampling of research which engages with concepts of collaborative work, and peer and tandem learning in L2 and translation pedagogy will serve to contextualise
here the framing of the task design which will be described subsequently. The first part of the discussion will consider situations where the members of learner dyads have the same L1, and the second part will focus on cross-matched learner dyads in which each participant is learning the other’s L1.

3.1 Shared L1

Learners who share the same L1 can productively collaborate in L2 learning activities. Swain (2006) defines using a shared L1 to mediate learning the L2 as ‘languaging’. Languaging raises levels of noticing (Kuiken and Vedder 2002; Schmidt 2001), and of understanding of grammatical concepts (Knouzi, Swain, Lapkin and Brooks 2010; Swain, Lapkin, Knouzi, Suzuki and Brooks 2009), and of attention to vocabulary and expressions in translation tasks (Källkvist 2013). Faced with the task of raising learner awareness of the differences in the ways in which two languages encode and express meaning, therefore, collaborative small group or pair tasks involving discussion and peer feedback appear likely to be an effective option. In professional translator training, reflective small group learning among students of the same L1 has been found to promote greater awareness, critical reflection, and autonomy (Chen 2010). In TESOL peer-response writing activities, learners act as sources of information and interactants for each other, providing feedback through active engagement with each other’s progress over multiple drafts (Liu and Hansen 2002).

When learners’ proficiency levels in the L2 differ, that can also be a source of learning. For example, Kowal and Swain (1994) found that collaborative language production tasks which paired intermediate and advanced learners of French helped to promote students’ language awareness. Vygotskian sociocultural approaches to language learning emphasise the role of novice-peer interaction in the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) as a mechanism for individual development: “in the presence of a more capable participant, the novice is drawn into, and operates within, the space of the expert’s strategic processes for problem solving” (Donato 1994: 37). The ZPD is context-dependent. It is “created in the interaction between the student and the co-participants in an activity, including the available tools and the selected practices”, and depends upon the extent to which the interaction is meaningful and relevant to students at the time (Wells 1999: 318). From a different conceptual perspective, language socialization research also emphasises the central role of expert-novice engagement. The reciprocal nature of the process is important; it is “a two-way street, in that more and less experienced members learn from each other by creatively deploying linguistic resources” (Ochs 2000: 232).

3.2 Cross-matched L1-L2 learners

Both collaborative learning and tandem learning models are relevant.

First, collaborative learning occurs when a group of learners pool resources to complete learning tasks that none of them could do alone (Bruffee 1984). For example, collaborative writing exercises for cross-matched L1-L2 dyads in a dual-language
school have been shown to facilitate language learning in terms of the interplay of two languages as academic tools; the recognition of learners’ expertise and their distinct linguistic funds of knowledge; and the opportunities for co-construction of text (Martin-Beltran 2009). Culhane and Umeda (2004) reported a trial in which learners and speakers of English and Japanese met weekly for structured immersive interclass exchanges (teacher-facilitated). Students in one language group would take the role of learners immersed in the L2 for the first hour, during which the L1 class group acted as language models, partners and tutors; then in the second hour, the two groups would switch roles. Results showed a stronger motivation to use the L2, to engage in L2-based friendships, and to develop positive intercultural attitudes.

Secondly, online tandem learning (‘e-tandem’ or ‘telecollaboration’) is based on mutual language exchange between two individuals, each a native speaker of the language the other is learning. The relationship between the partners is one of interdependence and reciprocity as they alternate between the roles of L2 learner and ‘expert informant’ on their own language and culture (Stickler and Lewis 2008: 238). Widely used in European self-access language centres, the tandem situation encourages learners to take responsibility for their own learning. Tandem learning is also used at an institutional level in online classroom exchanges, linking a group of students in Country A studying Language B with an equivalent counterpart group in Country B studying Language A; and tandem can also be integrated into formal course structures.

Language activities commonly undertaken in e-tandem include conversational exchange, email exchange, writing and peer response, and cultural discussion. Although these activities frequently generate linguistic and intercultural comparison of equivalent forms of expression in the two languages, which is clearly relevant to the development of translation capabilities, there are, however, few reported studies of the use of tandem learning techniques with a central focus on bidirectional translation.2

In the following section I will describe the design and implementation of such an activity, for which I propose the term ‘tandem translation’.

4. The tandem translation task

4.1 Context: unit redesign

The unit in question is at third/fourth year level in the Chinese major, offered at a regional university with a tradition of dual-mode on-campus and DE delivery. It is a dedicated translation unit which serves the joint purposes of both raising language proficiency and also developing awareness of issues in translating between Chinese and English, and strategies for addressing them. The contribution that pedagogic translation tasks can make to the development of language proficiency has been reassessed and is increasingly well attested (Cook 2010; Laviosa 2014). The unit redevelopment was prompted by the practical exigencies of a university ‘academic
renewal’ process of unit reduction, and the switch to a new Learning Management System (LMS), Moodle, as well as the aforementioned changes in enrolment patterns which required adjustments to pedagogy.

The redesign process had an action research flavour, in that it was based on scholarly and practitioner reflection of the effectiveness of the previous design, and it incorporated cycles of reflection and adaptation for future offerings. The author of this study had developed the original unit and taught it for about ten years prior to undertaking the rewrite, so had rich experience to reflect upon. The redevelopment aimed to increase the relevance of the unit to L1 Chinese participants, and to address the issues of integration, engagement, and equity identified in Section 2 above. A bilingual Chinese L1 colleague collaborated in the redesign and delivery, which thus itself became an experience of working in tandem.³

The content of the unit was organised around three foci. The first was an introduction to core issues and techniques, addressing a different aspect of translating between Chinese and English each week through readings, supported by practice exercises (mainly at the sentence level) on the online asynchronous discussion forum. The second focus was on applying the techniques learned to the translation of longer authentic texts, both in individually submitted formal written assessments as well as in the online tandem translation task which is the focus of this study. A reflective commentary was required with each completed written translation. The third focus was research into current translation resources.

Having outlined the context, the following section will describe the tandem translation task itself in detail.

4.2 Task design and implementation

The learning activity devised draws on the features of tandem learning and collaborative learning, and applies them to two-way translation tasks for this diverse student cohort. The focus is on the complementary skills and linguistic proficiency of learners from different L1 groups, and the task involves working together to create joint translations from Chinese to English and from English to Chinese.

Three factors recommended by Schwienhorst (2003: 441) to maximise the success of tandem learning projects were borne in mind: first, that tandem projects should be embedded in and linked to offline coursework; secondly, that task-based tandem learning requires a clearly defined goal, such as an artefact to be submitted to the class or the teacher; and third, that guidance in critical reflection may be necessary.

The online tandem translation task was scheduled in the second half of the semester-long unit, against the background of the continuing ongoing weekly readings and online discussion. By this point the students were already familiar with study requirements and with using the Moodle LMS. The task was presented to students as a series of steps.
Step 1: Students completed an online choice activity to self-identify as L1 native speaker of Chinese, or L2AL learner of Chinese. Using this information, they then formed into pairs of L2AL Chinese and L1 Chinese (recognised by the LMS as ‘groups’).

Step 2: Each pair selected one themed text ‘set’ (from a choice of ten), and then indicated it in a dedicated online choice activity. Each set consisted of one text in each language, loosely comparable in terms of topic area and genre, up to 275 characters or 150 words in length, sourced mainly from journalism websites. The themes were: Traditions and customs; Environment; Cities and transport; Health and diet; Education; Report and survey; Cultural exchanges; Travel and book promotion; Book and film reviews; and Lifestyle and health.

Step 3: Students worked together in pairs over several weeks to produce one joint translation of each text in their chosen set. In planning and collaborating on their translations, they were required to use the private online spaces set up in the LMS (both synchronous text chat mode, and asynchronous discussion forum mode were available). These modes have the advantage of leaving a textual record of the collaborative discussion which can be referred to during task assessment (Kelly, Baxter and Anderson 2010).

Each pair of students posted their two completed translations on the unit webpage. After the due date, the completed translations were visible to all class members and open for comments.

Step 4: Individual reflective commentary on the tandem translation task. Each student individually submitted a 300 word reflective report on their experience of the joint task. This was submitted directly to the lecturer, and was NOT visible to their pair partner or other students. Guiding questions were provided to assist students in framing their reflections (see Appendix).

The issues involved in the assessment of collaborative online tasks have been widely discussed (e.g. Boud, Cohen and Sampson 1999; Macdonald 2003). In this case, the assessment was guided by two principles: to be performative, by implementing constructive alignment of task, learning outcomes and goals in such a way that by completing the task students fulfill the learning goals; and also to be process-oriented rather than product-oriented, focusing on the individual reflective commentary rather than the joint translation for grading. Accordingly, for task assessment, completion of three items was required: joint translations published in the database; discussion and collaboration within each pair recorded in the chat rooms or discussion forum spaces; and reflective commentary submitted. The reflective commentary was then graded according to four criteria: compliance with requirements; evidence of conscientious participation in the discussion and collaboration; evidence of reflection on collaborative and intercultural aspects of the translation process; and reference, where appropriate, to concepts and issues studied in the unit. (As previously mentioned, at other phases of the semester students worked on individual written translations to be submitted for assessment.)
5. Data and discussion

This is an exploratory study, and the analysis reported here centres on student perceptions of the e-tandem process. Descriptive and interpretive thematic analysis of the data set of 29 reflective retrospective commentaries, presented below, offers insights into learners’ experience of the task and their evaluation of its effectiveness. Thereafter a conceptual model of the process is presented.

A heterogeneous group (N=29) were the first to complete the redesigned unit. Twelve were native L1 speakers of Chinese who were international students in their early 20s, based on campus and mainly majoring in business-related degrees. They had learned English throughout their schooling in China, achieving International English Language Testing System (IELTS) scores of at least 6 to meet Australian university entrance requirements. Their motivations for enrolling in the unit ranged from seeking an easy option to being interested in translation as a means to improve English proficiency, and/or as a skill in its own right. Another twelve students were L1 English speakers who had been studying Chinese for between 3 and 10 years. Aged from their mid-20s to 60s, they were located around Australia and overseas. For some the principal goal was to improve language proficiency, and for others, to develop translation skills. A further 5 off-campus students originated from multilingual backgrounds in South-East Asia and had bilingual competence in the advanced use of a variety of Chinese, and English, to varying degrees.

For many of the L1 Chinese students in particular, a significant outcome was enhanced awareness of the range of translation choices in register and lexis:

“I learned the importance of choosing the most suitable interpretation to the vocabularies in different conditions.” [L1]

“I have become more aware of the formalness of words and their appropriate meaning related to context.” [L1]

Exchanges of views about variation in expression between different Chinese-speaking communities were also considered valuable:

“I learned that there are different terms of the same thing said by the Chinese according to different region.” [ML]

Raised awareness of syntax was also noted:

“[as] I’m writing, I’m thinking about the syntax and the phrasing” [L2]

“I [had] unwittingly imposed English syntax on Chinese text.” [L2]

Some students commented upon the interchange zone between the two languages:

“Swinging between English and Chinese is a very ‘strange’ (as in interesting) place to be....” [L2]

“The need for the understanding and ebb and flow between the languages was clear, it’s a dynamic process.” [L2]
and the mutuality of the exercise of jointly constructing target texts, and exchanging novice and expert roles was recognised as productive:

“The fact that we could both help each other with concepts from our first language was really interesting.” [L2]

“We might have different opinions about translating the same paragraph, discussion would lead us to an acceptable result for both of us.” [L1]

“I prefer to translate word by word, but he likes to translate a whole sentence, and I learned a lot from that way because that way can express meaning better sometimes.” [L1]

“I consider teaching is also a great way to learn. When I was explaining some problems to my partner, I studied them again.” [L1]

Having begun with an expectation that translating into the L1 would be a relatively simple matter, several students commented that working in tandem led them to revise that view:

“Surprised that it was equally difficult for my partner.” [L2]

“In my ignorance, I thought [my L1 Chinese partner], as a native Chinese speaker, would automatically create an ‘accurate’ Chinese target text.” [L2]

“Some differences take place in English speaker and Chinese speaker in the way of understanding and paraphrasing and it’s still need time to work on it.” [L1]

Opportunities arising from the task for enhanced intercultural understanding, and greater integration between L1 and L2 students were observed:

“Communication in discussion [brought] interesting views and further understanding of another culture.” [L1]

“I think it helps to bridge the gap between the Chinese speaking students and the second language learners as well as teach a lot about translation.” [L2]

“I have made a new friend.” [L1]

Comments also reflected anticipated impact upon future practice:

“... opened my eyes to the relationship between Chinese and English. It will provide food for thought for a long time to come.” [L2]

“I learned many ways of expression in English and I will use these in my writing. Moreover, I will try to use Australian thinking to write [my] assignment[s].” [L1]

To conceptualise what is taking place at each stage of the paired task, the tandem translation process is visualised in Figures 1-3. Each partner in the dyad is represented by a circle. In Figure 1, the overlap zone represents the area of initial shared expertise in the two languages at the outset of the activity. Working together from this space on the joint task, each individual brings in knowledge and insights from their own L1 repertoire that are new to the other partner, thereby expanding the area of shared knowledge (Figure 2). Such contributions are made with varying degrees of
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intentionality, depending on the extent to which the contributor is aware at the time whether they are part of the other partner’s repertoire. Ensuing on-task discussion brings them into focus. Figure 3 shows how, as a result of the collaborative activity, the area of shared knowledge and common understanding has expanded for each participant on completion of the task.

This model has clear parallels with Vygotskian ZPD frameworks, but there is a distinction to be made. As observed by Wells (1999: 322), the ZPD affords a perspective...
on the simultaneous “reciprocity with which the participants adjust their manner of participation to take account of each other’s current levels of knowledge and skill in carrying out the activity, and... the transformation that takes place, in the process, in their individual potential for participation”. What is distinctive about the tandem translation activity model, however, is that reciprocity extends to the assumption of the roles of novice and expert, and is integral to the activity. The focus is on the two-way nature of the tandem translation activity. Since there are two experts and two complementary areas of expertise in the collaborative bidirectional translation task, the area of shared knowledge is extended bilaterally, rather than just unilaterally. I use the term ‘complementary learning’ to capture this bilateral interdependent process. Each student fills in gaps in the other’s knowledge, and together they create something that neither could have produced alone.

The evidence arising from this preliminary analysis of the first iteration of the tandem translation task suggests that it offers a promising direction for addressing the three challenges (identified in section 2) arising from the changing pedagogical and institutional setting, which prompted the redesign of the unit.

The issue of integration is addressed at the level of the individual rather than the group: working in L1/L2 tandem dyads gave each student the chance of developing a personal study relationship and enhanced mutual understanding with one of their peers from the opposite language background. It also assisted in integrating students based off-campus and on-campus.

The level of engagement with the learning in the tandem task was significant. The collaborative nature of the task required students to be responsible to each other for organising and managing the learning. Additionally the L1 Chinese students, accustomed to having to operate in their L2 in their on-campus studies, found the chance to have turns at being the L1 expert in their tandem pairs was empowering.

The third challenge was to achieve equity of assessment tasks in a group where the levels of language proficiency vary greatly. It was addressed to some degree by first designing the task to include texts in both source languages so that each partner has the chance to work into and out of their L1, and then taking a ‘performative’ view of assessment and basing it on task completion. The only part of the task which was graded was the reflection, which was not based on language proficiency. Many of the challenges inherent in grading personal reflections can be addressed by providing a clear marking rubric.

6. Evaluation and conclusions

As a practical response to changing enrolment patterns in advanced Chinese classes, this tandem translation method appears to have value. Harnessing the benefits of peer learning, collaborative learning, and e-tandem, it is compatible with a constructivist pedagogy. It encourages active reciprocal connections between categories of students who might otherwise remain distanced from each other: L1 speakers and L2 learners of the same language; international students from China
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and local domestic students; and students based on campus and those based off-campus. Since each member of the cross-matched language dyads acts as both novice and expert by turns, tandem translation is also equitable and empowering. The focus on explicit comparison between the two languages through collaborative dialogue develops language awareness, and in undertaking bidirectional translation starting from a basis of shared knowledge, each partner helps the other to extend their knowledge and skills, in a process of complementary learning where the whole is more than the sum of the parts. The value of sending students outward to study in Asia is well attested; this activity, on the other hand, works to create a pedagogical framework for local and international students, located on and off campus, to engage with ‘Asia within Australia’.

This is a preliminary case study and its limitations present directions for further development and research. First, the data is drawn from a relatively small number of participants in a single iteration of the task, and is restricted to student perceptions of the task in reflective post-hoc self-reports. As a further step, analysis of on-task discussions is required to investigate how the reciprocal novice-expert relationship plays out in each direction of translation (Chinese-English and English-Chinese) in the different L1 / L2 dyads. Secondly, completing the task, like riding a tandem bicycle, calls for cooperation, balance, communication and a shared direction: qualities transferable to other group work learning situations. A question for further research is the likelihood of subsequent transference of these qualities and skills, in terms of participants’ more positive predisposition to intercultural communication and group work in other contexts. Third, from a practical perspective, the current task design is vulnerable to unpredictable fluctuations in the balance of numbers of L1 Chinese and L2 Chinese student enrolments in any one year, and to ensure sustainability, alternative adaptations need formulating and evaluating for use in differently constituted student groups. In terms of extension, the tandem translation method could also be adapted for use across class groups in universities where students are streamed into L2, background/heritage, and native speaker cohorts.

Finally, languages and cultures departments are repositories of expertise in the promotion and practice of intercultural and language awareness, and have a role to play in the increasingly complex linguistic ecology of universities. Adapting language curricula to meet the needs of international L1 students studying together with domestic L2 learners is one way in which language departments can contribute to the development of connections and enhanced understanding among students; but in addition, promotion and advocacy at institutional level for such initiatives is desirable to draw attention to the valuable two-way connections between languages and cultures departments and the multilingual campus communities within which we are situated.
Notes

1. A subject, or unit of study, is normally equivalent to one quarter of an undergraduate’s full-time study load in one semester or trimester. Terminology varies between universities; the term ‘unit’ will be used here.

2. Wang and Chen (2012) investigate collaborative language learning in a synchronous online Chinese interpreting course, but their focus is on the relative value of interactional features of the LMS.

3. I am indebted to Ms Wang Chunxia for her valued collaboration.

4. A follow-up analysis will focus on student interactions as they complete the activity.
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**Appendix**

Guiding questions given to students to assist them in framing their reflection:

1. In what ways did working together increase your understanding of the source texts?
2. In what ways did it increase your understanding of the target language?
3. What were you able to contribute to the pairwork?
4. What were you able to learn from your partner’s contribution?
5. In what ways were your final translations joint efforts?
6. How would your final translations have been different if you had done them alone?
7. Would you work with a partner again to do translation? Please say why or why not. If you would, would you do anything differently?
8. After participating in this task, will the way you approach translation in the future change in any way?
9. What are the two most important things you have gained from the experience of doing this task?
Section 4

Models of teaching and learning