TURKISH EFL ACADEMICIANS' PROBLEMS CONCERNING TRANSLATION ACTIVITIES AND PRACTICES, ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE USE OF ONLINE AND PRINTED TRANSLATION TOOLS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR QUALITY TRANSLATION PRACTICE

Dr. Buğra ZENGİN
Namık Kemal University, Tekirdağ, Turkey
bzengin@rocketmail.com

Işıl Günseli KAÇAR
Middle East University
isil7guns@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT
This mixed method research study aimed to highlight the problems of EFL academicians concerning their current translation practices, their attitudes towards the use of various translation tools, and offer suggestions for more quality translation practices. Seventy-three EFL academicians from three Turkish universities participated in the study. The qualitative data was collected through semi-structured interviews and open-ended questionnaire items and analyzed with the content analysis while the quantitative data was obtained through Likert–scale items and analyzed with descriptive statistics. Based on the participants' ideas, the establishment of a translation center in the university, collaboration with professional translators with academic background and experience of professional translation in various disciplines, the organization of awareness-raising seminars, the introduction of minor and double major programs in translation and the integration of training programs facilitating the use of online translation tools and search engines were found beneficial in enhancing the quality of existing translation practices.
Keywords: computer-aided translation, ELT, terminology, online tools

INTRODUCTION
The communications revolution – computers, the internet, satellite communications – which was strategically deployed as central to the process of globalization, followed the lead of English-language teaching theory and accompanied the layout of theoretical and pedagogical grounds for Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Cubukcu, 2010). Therefore, English language teaching has had the opportunity to use such an advantage. However, as regards the translation's contribution to communication, it was still necessary to wait for the development of the search engines and user friendly online tools to have the instant and cost effective access to the corpora we can use to understand the language system and reach a stylistically and structurally accurate equivalence between languages. This kind of access to information also meant the collapse of cultural and linguistic barriers between countries.

The global market requires that industrial and commercial issues be negotiated on an international scale. Within this global landscape, nations maintain and strengthen their cross-cultural bonds. Nevertheless, they also wish to preserve their independence and cultural identity. According to Çubukçu (2010, p. 98), command of English, which has become a dominant global language of communication, business, industries, entertainment, diplomacy, politics, science and the Internet, empowers those who have already acquired this lingua franca. It is the opinion of the authors of this article that translation may serve to cover the gap between the empowered and those who are left behind as regards the command of such a dominant language, and may prevent the possible danger, which Cubukcu (2010) has mentioned, of loss of first languages, cultures and identities and devaluation of local knowledge and cultures. On the other hand it is a skill – the fifth skill, according to Köksal (2005) – that can be incorporated into ELT methods or approaches.

A rise has been noted recently in the popularity of the profession of translation, manifested through a subsequent increase in the number of academic institutions offering translation programs to train prospective translators (Sanchez, 2006). Sanchez also mentioned recent studies dealing not only with trainees' translation competence but also the market demands (e.g. Muñoz Martín, 2002; Pym, 2003; Reineke and Sánchez Muñoz, 2005; Rico Pérez, 2002; cited in Sanhez: 2006), which is likely to have some significant repercussions on the professional practices.

The importance of English can not be underestimated. Craciunescu, Gerdin-Salas, Stringer-O'Keeffe (2004) underlined its first place in the translation market with 48% as a source language and 45 % as a target language. Besides, Fletcher (2005) stated that the two thirds of the content indexed is English-language documents according to data from large search engines such as google, yahoo, msn, and teoma. Thomas (1996: cited in

Alptekin, 2002) emphasized that the storage was in English for the eighty percent of the computer data and the eighty five percent of all information. However, as Craciunescu et al. (2004) has emphasized, there is a lack of professional translators to meet the huge demand for translation in multifarious scientific disciplines.

Translation is a complicated process that requires a thorough command of the source and target language in terms of their syntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties, in addition to a great deal of creativity and imagination. Machine translation (MT) is regarded as inefficient, inaccurate and inappropriate, with its output capacity limited to simple texts and controlled language, especially in terms of the literary text translation. The issues such as polysemy, connotation and style remain to be addressed (Sanchez, 2006). MT fails to account for the higher order cognitive operations entailed in the translation process (Craciunescu et al., 2004). Technology cannot replace the human translator; nonetheless, using it wisely can facilitate translation.

As argued by Craciunescu et al (2004) it is widely acknowledged that the professional translator needs to acquire skills related to new technologies to keep his or her efficiency and competitiveness. In search for effective tools to assist the translators, online tools are reported to provide promising solutions (Sanchez, 2006). Biau, Gil and Pym (2006, cited in Sanchez, 2006) also emphasized the vital role of technology in translation in the present era. Korkas, Pavlides, Rogers (2005) argued that a well-trained translator has good research skills, and uses the internet as an extremely useful and powerful research tool, aware of the advantages of the regular update of online dictionaries and encyclopedias and the availability and quick access to the corpora of parallel texts in various domains. Translators or translation trainees use the online resources for terminology challenges presented by increasing specialisation.

Pym (2003) maintained that it is essential to reconsider translation training to meet the requirements of a variety of translation-related contexts in an epoch of whirlwinding technological changes and diversified domains of specialization. Köksal (1995) underscored the need to train translators in the field of technical translation but also conceding that it must be borne in mind that this kind of training only enables translators to specialize in certain areas. Köksal (1995) also put forward an idea that data banks can be formed, and technical terminology dictionaries can be compiled. However, there have not been adequate advances in this regard. The reason might stem from inadequate attention to online products, which are easily available and updated.

Theoretical knowledge of translation makes translators to think of the issues regarding translation in a multi-dimensional manner (Yazıcı, 2005). Translation competence can be defined as the underlying system of knowledge and skills needed to be able to translate. Its acquisition requires a process of restructuring and developing subcompetencies (communicative, extra-linguistic, professional-instrumental, transfer, strategic and psycho-physiological) the interaction (controlled by strategic competence) and hierarchy (related to transfer competence) of which vary according to directionality and language combinations, specialisation or translation context (Beeby, Berenguer, Ensinger, Fox, Albir, Mélis, Neunzig, Orozco, Presas, and Vega, 2000). Special subject knowledge is used depending on the type of text (Schäffner 1993; Dancette 1994: cited in Beeby et al, 2000) and different tools, such as dictionaries or databases (Fraser 1994: cited in Beeby et al, 2000).

On the other hand, it is also true that overexpansion of the number of subcomponents may not give a practical picture. Defending a minimalist approach, Pym (2003) underline the high degree of mismatch between what translation students are learning and what they should be asked to do. He pointed out that his more critical students considered the invariable hard core of a translation class as lists of false friends, modulation strategies, all the linguistic tricks, plus some practice on a few really specialized texts. Pym (2003) argued for a minimalist approach to translation competence "based on the production then elimination of alternatives, which he considered, can help orient translator training in times of rapid technological and professional change" while criticising the general trend among theorists of multicomponential expansions of competence that it is partly grounded in institutional interests, and leads to staying one or two steps behind market demands due to its conceptual flaw.

Taking into consideration the wide range of contexts where translation is utilized and the purposes which it serves in the academic circles, as well as the caveats involved in the efficient use of printed versus online translation sources, this research study set out to investigate the problems reported by various members of the academia concerning the conduct of translation practices and possible solutions they have generated in this regard that they may have consensus on and the attitudes toward the use of printed versus online translation tools among the academia in ELT, English philology and school of foreign languages. The responses are important given the inadequate number of the professional translators, the huge demand for translations (especially special fields), and the problems regarding structure and style, lack of the target language and culture, and terminologies of the special field.

This study did not adopt a view which geared translation to language teaching and learning, a view which was held by academicians who considered it of a secondary status, a view Munday (2001) argued against. Nevertheless, it had implications on teaching or learning English as a foreign language for the purpose of communication, which is also an important aim in translation as well. A contemporary view to translation as an autonomous interdisciplinary field may reflect positively to language teaching and learning. Köksal (2005) argued for the benefit of translation in ELT adding it to four skills (reading, listening, speaking, writing) as a fifth skill. Criticizing those who limited it to grammar translation method, Köksal (2005) argued that many ELT methods or approaches can be used in ways that include translation. According to Köksal (1996: cited in Köksal, 2005), translation contributes to error analysis as well which is important in determining teaching strategies. House (1986: 182, cited in Pym, 2003) suggested acquiring communicative competence is not only the aim of the language class but also that of the teaching of translation. Regarding the overlaps, Nord (1991: 165-166, cited in Pym, 2003) argued that translation practice is likely to develop in the language class the awareness of contrastive structures, and skills like the effective use of dictionaries. In the context of the general bilingual dictionary known as a translation dictionary, translation can be seen as a traditional exercise in second/foreign language teaching and learning (Kirkness, 2004). Contrastive analysis together with translation has also been found to have significant effect on L2 students' lexical storage of English (Laufer and Girsai, 2008).

METHODOLOGY
Participants
A total of 73 participants with various academic positions from Atatürk University, which is located in Erzurum (AU), Namık Kemal University, which is in Tekirdağ (NKU), and Yıldız Technical University (YTU). Only at the YTU there is a translation department but it is a French department. The distribution of the participants from AU is as follows: 21 university lecturers, 7 research assistants and 10 assistant professors. On the other hand, from the School of Foreign Languages of NKU, 21 university lecturers participated in the research. The number of respondents from YTU was 14 lectureres from the school of foreign languages.

Five of the research assistants were engaged in doctoral studies and the two in MA studies at AU. Five of the AU lecturers were engaged in doctoral studies, and seven of them either had MA or on their way to graduation. The others had BA in ELT or English language and literature. There were two respondents from NKU who had MA, one was engaged in MA study, and the other had quitted an MA program after courses. Most of the others had BA in English language and literature or ELT, but the two were graduates of translation studies. Emails from YTU revealed one PhD,, 8 MAs, and five undergraduate degrees.

Research Design
The mixed method research design was used with the triangulation of the qualitative and quantitative data. A Turkish semi-structured interview was conducted in AU. The interview process helped detect specific issues. Based on the feedback, a quantitative Likert scale (1-5) questionnaire was constructed in Turkish to gain further insights. The questionnaire also included two open-ended items probing into the translation strategies of the academicians. The questionnaire was conducted in NKU and YTU the latter accessed through email distributed by the vice manager of the school of foreign languages. The rationale for using a mixed design was complementarity, which "seeks elaboration, enhancement, illustration, the clarification of the results from one method with the results from the other method" (Greene, Caracelli, and Graham, 1989; cited in Johnson and Christensen, 2004, p. 423). The qualitative data was analyzed through the content analysis, as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), which involves the coding for themes, looking for patterns, and making interpretations. The quantitative data was analyzed vith SPSS. Data triangulation helped understanding the phenomenon from different perspectives of participants who worked in different departments. The researcher's interpretations and conclusions were discussed with the actual participants, other members of the participant community and peers for verification and insight.

FINDINGS
This section aims to report the results of the qualitative and quantitative data analysis respectively. As to the qualitative data analysis, the interview results overlapped with those of the questionnaire to a considerable extent. In fact, most of the common themes that emerged in the interviews reappeared in the questionnaire for purposes of quantitizing. Apart from the common concerns raised in both types of data concerning the respondents' attitudes towards translation and the challenges they are currently facing in their translation practices, and the frequencies of and preferences for their online and printed source use, the following themes concerning the solutions to the academicians' translation-related problems emerged only in the interviews: the organization of translation training programs or workshops for graduate students and academicians with a particular emphasis on the improvement of translation skills and written language proficiency, which is in line

with the suggestions of Craciunescu et al. (2004), the instruction on domain-specific terminology and the development of language awareness, discourse and sociolinguistic competence, the establishment of university-based academic writing centers and the recruitment of voluntary lecturers to work there, offering minor or (double) major programs in translation studies at undergraduate or graduate level, enhancing the quality and content of the already existing translation courses at universities by extending the range of texts covered so as to offer students an opportunity to be familiar with the domain-specific terminology, which reinforces Pym's (1993) study revealing the shortcomings of the translation studies, and the collaboration between experienced professional translators with expertise in different fields (e.g., law or medicine) and academicians in translation classes, which is also indicated in Köksal (1995), the awareness-raising workshops at universities for the academic and non-academic circles as to the laborious, and time-consuming nature of the translation process and the steps involved to make people more conscious of the fact that translation is an academic discipline.

In addition to these themes, an increase in the share from the working capital to be allocated to the academicians involved in translation projects with industrial and commercial organizations or in the academic writing centers or the translation centers was offered as an incentive to promote the involvement of the academic staff to realize the university–industry cooperation. Regarding the participants' self-reported use of translation strategies, the following strategies were also considered: consulting non-native speakers who are thought to be experienced translators or good at translation or native speakers for proofreading purposes, relying on one's own intuition as an experienced EFL teacher or their own judgement in choosing the collocation or fixed expression that reflects the naturalistic, authentic use of the language. In the open-ended questionnaire items, which also formed part of the qualitative data in the study, the patterns emerged are the necessity of considering the context where the lexical items are used and the structural and discoursal constraints related to their meaning and use, the caution against the exclusive reliance on the use of one type of source (online or printed), and the need for creativity and imagination in the translation to enhance the quality of the translation practice.

With respect to the results of the quantitative data (the Likert-scale items), the results indicated a great deal of parallelism to ideas expressed in the interviews as mentioned above. As for the reliability of the likert scale questions, the cronbach a reliability scale is .86 (high reliability) for AU, .772 (moderate reliability) for NKU, and .81 (high reliability) for YTU. Considering translation as an important aim in teaching English is very common among AU respondents with the mean of 3.974 compared to NKU and YTU respondents (the means (of 3.4762 and 3.3571 respectively – little below 3.5) who seem to be undecided. This is understandable given their priorities. However, as for whether they think translation activities contribute, the mean scores of both AU, NKU, and YTU are much above 3.5 (4.1579, 3.9524, and 4.00 respectively) – for convenience, the first means belong to AU, the second to NKU, and the third to YTU). AU and NKU respondents think that the time and energy they need to devote to their own work, in other words, the work they are employed for, is consumed by the demands of the academicians of the departments other than their own (Qa3: 4.3947 and 4.2381), but the demand at YTU are lower (3.1429). Nevertheless, as regards the attitudes of colleagues from other departments, the picture reflects lack of awareness of the fact that translation is demanding and time consuming (Qa4: 4.2895, 4.3333, and 4.0714).

The recruitment of professional translators are believed to reverberate in the translation activities of their universities considerably (Qa5: 4.5263, 4.7619, and 4.2143). They believe that the ones experienced in both academic settings and professional market of translation should be preferred (Qa6: 4.3158, 4.4286, and 4.2857). The diversity of experience should cover academic writings, commerce, industry, etc. Working interactively with these translators would contribute positively to the improvement of the quality of their translations (Qa7: 4.1316, 4.3333, and 4.1429). It is useful to establish a translation center where these translators work together with volunteering academicians (Qa8: 4.2632, 4.3333, and 4.0714). It is possible to carry out translation activities in a systematic organisation in a manner which contributes to the economy (Qa9: 4.1316, 4.3810, and 3.9229). There is not as much agreements among YTU respondents as among AU and NKU respondents to accept the idea of such a translation center run and supervised by professional translators (AU: 4.1053, NKU: 4.5238, and YTU: 3.2143)

The academicians who want to work in this center should be paid in proportion to their contribution (Qa11: 4.2895, 4.4286, and 4.50). The share they get form the working capital should be increased (Qa12: 4.00, 4.3333, and 4.0714). If talented students also work in the center, their practice would help improve their translation quality, and decrease the workload of the center (Qa13: 3.8684, 4.2381, and 4.4286). Their participation can be certified additionally along with their graduation documents (Qa14: 3.5526, 3.8571, and 4.2857 – the mean of YTU is much higher at this liberal item). The quality of the translations improves with the recruited professional translators checking the texts (Qa15: 3.8158, 4.1429, and 4.3571). This center can function as an academic writing center contributing to the acceptance of the number of articles to be submitted by the academic staff

(Qa16: 4.0263, 4.5238, and 4.00). This center can also contribute to translation needs of other universities (Qa17: 3.7368, 3.9048, 3.7857), of the firms engaged in industry or commerce (Qa18: 3.7632, 4.0952, and 3.5386); however, the priority should be on the academicians working in the university where the center is located (Qa19: 4.00, 4.1429, and 4.1429).

Terminology problems along with their solutions can be recorded and used to construct a database (Qa20: 4.2632, 4.7143, and 4.3571). Producing solutions to the problems related to collocations is important for the naturalistic use of the language (Qa21: 4.1053, 4.5238, and 4.00). It is useful if the content of the database is classified into subfields (Qa22: 4.2368, 4.6190, and 4.2857). It is also useful if frequently occuring translation problems and their solutions are accessed online (Qa23: 4.2105, 4.6667, and 4.6429). As for questions b1 and b2, most of the respondents in AU and NKU have the tendency to use online tools rather than the printed with 68 % and 71.4 % respectively selecting the fourth item (I tend to use online sources more often.). There is similar attitude in half of the YTU respondents selecting the fourth item, and almost one third always using online sources. This echoes Sanchez' (2006) views of online tools as promising solutions to the translation problems. In AU and NKU, the percentage of respondents agreeing that there should be a tendency to use more online sources is highest: 68.4 and 57 % respectively. YTU respondents present similarity with 42.9 % in addition to 14.3 % for the related 4th and 5th items.

Table 1. Responses of AU and NKU for questionnaire items b1 and b2

Choices	1	2	3	4	5
Number (percent.) AU for B1	1 (2.6 %)	7 (18.4 %)	2 (5.3 %)	26 (68.4 %)	2 (5.3 %)
Number (percent.) NKU for B1	-	4 (19 %)	-	15 (71.4 %)	2 (9.5 %)
Number (percent.) YTU for B1	-	2 (14.3 %)	1 (7.1 %)	7 (50 %)	4 (28.6 %)
Number (percent.) AU for B2	-	5 (13.2 %)	7 (18.4 %)	26 (68.4 %)	-
Number (percent.) NKU for B2	-	2 (9.5 %)	7 (33.3 %)	12 (57.1 %)	-
Number (percent.) YTU for B2	-	2 (14.3 %)	4 (28.6 %)	6 (42.9 %)	2 (14.3 %)

The mean scores do not indicate are below 3.5 on whether they use bilingual or monolingual dictionaries, or whether they translate from English to Turkish, or from Turkish to English. (Qb3: 2.9737, 2.7143, and 2.9286; b5: 2.9211, 3.1905, and 3.2857; b6: 3.1842, 2.9048, and 2.7857; b7: 3.1053, 2.6190, and 2.9286). The mean scores for the questions to do with printed dictionaries are low among which the highest of the low scores belong to the monolingual printed dictionary use (Qb4 3.4737, 3.1905, and 3.2857). The least difference between online and printed dictionaries is in the category of monolingual dictionaries.

Participants reported using online dictionaries frequently (Qb8: 3.9474, 4.1905, and 4.00). NKU respondents' mean is little below 3.5 as regards monolingual online dictionaries compared to others, which are high (Qb9: 3.6379, 3.4286, and 3.8571). There is such a difference among the universities in popularity of bilingual online dictionaries (Qb10: 3.6579, 3.8571, and 3.8571). There is no big difference in the direction of the translation.

When asked about their frequency of using search engines in translation their response was positive (Qb13: 3.5789, 3.6190, and 4.2857). The AU, NKU, and YTU respondents responded more positively to using search engine alternately with a dictionary if it is an online one (3.5789, 3.9048, and 4.00). The means are lower when asked about using printed (2.8421, 2.2381, and 3.1429).

In AU, NKU, and YTU, the participants' mean score is low as regards their experience of having worked with the expert of a field (on which translation is done). The reason they report as being terminological differences (Qb18) is 4.0952 in NKU whereas it is lower in AU (3.3947) and YTU (3.1429), the difference possibly due to more experience. Participants have not been able to find opportunity to co-work with experts of a field who have terminological familiarity (Qb19: 2.4737, 1.8095, and 2.2857). Many AU and NKU respondents report that they have not used database (Qb20: 3.0263, 2.9524), as frequently as YTU respondents (3.7143).

All the questions related to use of machine translation have low means (even much below 2 for some questions) in the three universities, which is quite in line with the comments of Sanchez (2006) and Craciunescu et al. (2004) concerning the inefficiency of machine translation. There is a similar picture regarding whether they trust machine translation. It did not matter whether English is source or target language in both the frequency of use and the trust issue.

The participants all believed that it is important that the translation should be close to natural English as regards style and structure (Qb26: 3.8684, 4.0476, and 4.00), and full check for this kind of accuracy of style and structure should be necessary when a nonnative speaker of English translates from Turkish to English (Qb28:

4.2632, 4.3810, and 4.4286). However, they donot frequently check parallel texts as frequently as they think they should (Qb27: 3.1053, 3.0952, and 3.3571). AU and NKU respondents could not check the parallel texts as much as they want to due to the inadequacy of time (Qb29: 3.5263 and 3.5714), for YTU respondents, the limited time was not the reason (2.7143). The means of AU and YTU participants who thought that it would be effective to use English – Turkish parallel texts alongside were not equal to but not much below 3.5 (Qb25: 3.2368 and 3.2857), whereas it surpassed that number in NKU (Qb25: 3.7143).

They all want to be informed about the technological means which would save time for the closeness of the translation to natural English use regarding style and structure (Q30: 4.0789, 4.5238, 4.1429), which indicates that the participants match the ideal translator profile described by Korkas, Pavlides, and Rogers (2005), Pym (2003), (Craciunescu et al, 2004), and Biau, Gil and Pym (2006, cited in Sanchez, 2006). The respondents also underline the need for the high number and quality of databases. The number of databases should be increased, which is important whether they translate from English to Turkish (Qb31: 4.00, 4.1905, 4.2143), or from Turkish to English (Qb32: 4.2105, 4.3333, and 4.2857).

According to AU and NKU respondents, using both the dictionary and search engine is likely to solve the problems of accuracy of style and structure in translations (Qc3: 2.5526 and 2.8095), in contrast to many more YTU respondents who believed that it is much more likely (4.1429). The difference between the former and YTU respondents is that the latter assumed that their knowledge on using search engines for this aim was adequate to solve many problems practically (Qc4: 2.7895, 2.8571, and 4.00). As regards the comparison of the frequency with which they use dictionary and search engine, the total percentages of respondents selecting 3 and 4 suggest that in their actual practice they tend to be closer and more oriented to the search engine end of the continuum: the alternate use of both dictionary and search engine. In fact they believed that they should do so more than they actually do. These suggest that they think their practice should be more oriented towards using search engines more frequently in their alternate use with dictionaries.

Table 2. Responses of AU and NKU for questionnaire items C3 and C4

Choices	1	2	3	4	5
Number (percent.) AU for C3	7 (18.4 %)	13 (34.2 %)	8 (21.1 %)	10 (26.3 %)	-
Number (percent.) NKU for C3	1 (4.8 %)	9 (42.9 %)	4 (19 %)	7 (33.3 %)	-
Number (percent.) YTU for C3	-	-	1 (7.1 %)	10 (71.4 %)	3 (21.4 %)
Number (percent.) AU for C4	3 (7.9 %)	13 (34.2 %)	11 (28.9 %)	11 (28.9 %)	-
Number (percent.) NKU for C4	-	8 (38.1 %)	8 (38.1 %)	5 (23.8 %)	-
Number (percent.) YTU for C4	-	-	5 (35.7 %)	4 (28.6 %)	5 (35.7 %)

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings revealed that the academicians working in English language and literature, ELT, or school of foreign languages had positive attitudes toward improving their applications of online tools. Most of them used search engine and online dictionaries in turns. The search engine indexes large corpora. The corpora include parallel texts we can benefit from to make our translation sound naturalistic. According to Stubbs (2004), corpora provide the association patterns relating item and context (lexico-grammatical units, and style and register). In terms of accuracy, AU and NKU respondents indicated the need to make the most of alternate use of dictionaries and search engines. It was more common among the YTU respondents to believe that they can use these both to solve problems of style and structure. We need both accuracy and fluency while translating. In terms of fluency, respondents from all the three universities underline the need to work fast with their open attitude to be informed of timesaving technological know-how. Therefore, it is possible to argue that the demand for translation workshops or in-service trainings may be high and they can raise the level of sophistication and efficiency they used the technological means. The respondents in this study believed that they can develop their online skills with professional translators' know-how.

A similar study has been found in relevant literature that hypothesizes that a course specially geared towards translating as a communicative activity will diminish differences between translations of university language students and those of professional translators (e.g., Dimitrova's project, 1996-1997). Secondly, setting up multilingual parallel texts is percieved in Europe as a good investment not in the short term but in the midterm or long term for teaching translation and doing contrastive linguistic analysis, which can also reflect on teaching languages (Bernardini, 2003). The level of awareness should be raised on this issue as the responses to a related question did not indicate very high.

The results can contribute to translation projects if they are shared with the university presidents. The universities can recruit professional translators who can run translation centers where they can guide, work

interactively with and supervise the volunteering academicians and maybe students. They can also coordinate colloborations with the experts of the fields of translations. Databases can be constructed. According to Kirkness (2004), professional translators can be expert informants for practicing lexicographers.

With all the contributions, academicians in universities can develop the command of academic English, and increase the quality and number of their articles published internationally. The project can have lasting effect on academicians' promotion as well as advances in international colloborations between the institutions outside the academia including cultural, commercial and industrial organisations. Stating that if institutions do not match the rapid change of our world, they do not survive, Hayakawa and Hayakawa (1990) emphasize the importance of the technology. An interesting example from Turkey is worth to mention. An accredited translation company in Turkey, DIYE held its third translation technologies workshop in collaboration with Doğuş University with participation of students of five universities and professors from Marmara, Yıldız Technical and Beykent universities and Mr. Sabri Gürses, founder of the online translation studies magazine "Çeviribilim". They all gave positive feedback on the up-to-date information provided "on the language technologies field as well as fundamental knowledge on project management, translation memories and terminology use with translation memories" (DIYE, n.d.). However, the duration of this workshop was not very long, but it was the courtesy of the private company after all which gave this service for free.

Turning back to our study, although it was conducted in three different university contexts in Turkey, the findings obtained from both universities revealed several similarities, which may imply the the challenges, problematic issues, and suggestions for solutions that are likely to reflect those experienced yet articulated by academicians in many other settings in Turkey. Solutions can be found to the benefit of all stakeholders. In fact, a recent speech of Prof. Dr. Yusuf Özcan, the head of the Higher Education Council, delivered at Ataturk University in the first semester of the 2009 and 2010 academic year can be regarded as reinforcing some of the findings. He argued that relations between university and society should be stronger. He pointed out the negative impact on the development of society of the lack of cooperation between the industry and the university. The recruitment of professional translators who are experts in their fields can contribute to the enhancement of translation competencies of academicians and/or students. Academicians or students having benefited from their work can perform better at their translation classes. Student involvement can be encouraged through extracurricular translation projects at the end of which their work can be accredited on their graduation documents.

There is also an issue of unsatisfactory share from working capital, Prof. Dr. İsmail Yüksek (the Rector of Yıldız University, İstanbul) stated that an increase in the allocation of shares in the working capital was considered in related commissions (universitemedya,tv, 27 February 2010). Prof Dr. Özcan's speech in his visit to Namık Kemal University corroborated this when he mentioned about raising the percentage of working capital can result in even 85 % to the favor of those who served in institutions running with working capital. If this is realized, it may encourage the realization of a university-based translation centers, and support the academicians' suggestions as to the provision of a financial incentive to increase the involvement of academicians in the joint translation-related projects with the industrial organizations. Without such incentive, the projects may probably fail. An associate professor at the department of translation at Yıldız Technical University, Karadağ (A. B. Karadağ, personal communication, 29 June 2010) informed that a translation center founded in Istanbul University hired services of assistants of the translation department. There was a huge demand from many departments of the university, and the assistants started to work extra hours. Before long, the assistants resigned and the system fell apart. Asked whether a translation unit may serve to the benefit of the university academic personnel, several academicians interviewed informally at Namık Kemal University stated that lecturers with improved translation skills can help those academicians who are – should be – active in the process of writing their articles if they counsel them occasionally for the problems of style and terminology.

The fact that our sample of respondents was not large limited the possibility of generalization. YTU respondents were reached by email sent to them by their administrator. 14 respondents replied, how well this low participation represented the YTU context is a question. Another limitation of the small size was that attitudinal differences or differences of frequency in using tools in terms of professional, age and educational level groups could not be compared. According to Lexis Nexis technology gap survey, American white-collar workers all agreed that technology made it easier to get up-to-the-minute information (95 percent agree), perform research (94 percent agree), improve productivity (90 percent) and manage information (87 percent). However, as to whether they actually applied technology, in other words, when asked specifically on the frequency of their use of technology, the picture differed depending on their age. The most junior workers (aged under 28) had highest averages; the most senior workers (aged 44 to 60) had the low averages, whereas those aged 29 to 43 applied technologies in moderation. Although the report had respondents working in education sector, whether a similar

pattern may emerge in universities regarding the use of technological tools in translation tends to be much less probable assuming the universities are competitive.

In future, studies can be conducted with larger population of respondents. It is also important to consider that the study cannot be generalized to several age groups since mainly their ages range from between mid twenties to mid thirties. Further longitudinal studies into the translation-related problems, the current translation practices and the suggestions for the improvement of existing practices in other Turkish contexts may prove to be beneficial for the improvement of the quality of the existing translation practices and translated works, and contribute to the academic excellence of Turkish universities.

REFERENCES

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *English Language Teaching Journal, 56*/1, 57-63.

Bernardini, S. (2003). Designing a corpus for translation and language teaching: the CEXI experience. *Tesol Quarterly, 37*(3), 528-537.

Cariunescu, O., Gerding-Salas, G.,Stringer-O'Keeffe, S. (2004). Machine translation and computer-assisted translation. *Translators and Computers, 8*(3).
[Retrieved from http://accurapid.com/journal/29bias.htm]

Christensen, L., & Johnson, B. (2004). *Educational research: quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Çubukçu, F. (2010). Empowerment or disempowerment: that is the question in (English as an international language) EIL. *IOJES, 2*(1), 98-109.

Dimitrova, E. Translation ability and translatorial competence. Project conducted at TÖI, Institute for Interpretation and Translation Studies, Stockholm University, (1996-1997).
Retrieved February 17, 2010 from http://www.translation.su.se/Translation_Ability.html

DIYE Global Communications (n.d.) *diye GC – Doğuş University translation memory solutions workshops.* Retrieved from http://www.diye.com.tr/?page_id=140.

Fletcher, W. H. (2005). Concordancing the Web: Promise and problems, tools and techniques. [Electronic version]. In M. Hundt, N. Nesselhauf & C. Biewer (Eds.) *Corpus Linguistics and the Web.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Hayakawa, S. I. & Hayakawa, A. R. (1990). *Language in Thought and Action* (5th ed.), Orlando: Harcourt Brace and Company.

Kavrazlı, ,Ü. & Cantürk İ. (Producers). (2010, February 27). *Universite medya* [Television broadcast]. İstanbul: Haberturk. Retrieved from http://www.universitemedya.tv/umtv/?cat=104

Kirkness, A. (2004). Lexicography. In A. Davies and C. Elder (Eds.) *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 54-82). Blackwell Publishing Limited.

Korkas, V.*Teaching terminology in postgraduate translation programmes: an integrated approach* (with Dr Pantelis Pavlides and Dr Margaret Rogers) 5th Conference "Hellenic Language and Terminology", organised by ELETO at the University of Cyprus (October 2005). Retrieved from http://www.eleto.gr/download/Conferences/5th%20Conference/5th_28-29-KorkasPavlidesRogersPaper.pdf

Köksal, D. (1995). *Çeviri Kuramları*. Ankara: Neyir Yayıncılık

Köksal, D. (2005). *Çeviri Eğitim..* Ankara: Nobel

Laufer, B., &, Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning: a case for contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(4), 694-716. doi:10.1093/applin/amn018

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies*. London: Routledge.

Özcan, Y.Z. (2009). Açılış konuşması [Atatürk University 2009-2010 academic year opening ceremony].

Özcan, Y.Z. (2010). Namık Kemal Üniversitesi ziyareti vesilesiyle yaptığı konuşma [Speech delivered at his visit at Namık Kemal University].

PACTE (2000). "Acquiring Translation Competence: Hypotheses and Methodological Problems in a Research Project". In: Beeby, A.; Ensinger, D.; Presas, M. (eds.) *Investigating Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 99-106. Retrieved from www.fti.uab.es/pacte/publicacions/Benjamins2000.pdf

Pym, A. (2003). Redefining Translation Competence in an Electronic Age. In Defence of a Minimalist Approach, Vol. 48(4), December 2003, 481-497.
http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2003/v48/n4/008533ar.html

Sanchez, P. M. (October, 2006). Electronic tools for translators in the 21st century. *Translation Journal, 10*(4).
Retrieved from http://accurapid.com/Journal/38tools.htm

Stubbs, M. (2004). Language corpora. In A. Davies and C. Elder (Eds.) *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 54-82). Blackwell Publishing Limited.

WorldOne Research (April, 2009). LexisNexis Technology Gap Survey (Online)

Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com/media/pdfs/LexisNexis-Technology-Gap-Survey-4-09.pdf

Yazıcı, M. (2005). *Çeviribilimin temel kavram ve kuramları*. Çemberlitaş, İstanbul: Multilingual.

QUESTIONNAIRE
a) I strongly disagree   b) I disagree   c) I am not sure d) I agree e) I strongly agree

PART A. Translation activities

1. Translation is one of the important targets in English Language Teaching (ELT).
>   AU: 3.9474 (.95712)   NKU: 3.4762 (1.03049)   YTU: 3.3571 (1.33631)

2. Translation activities have a beneficial impact on learning English.
>   AU: 4.1579 (.59395)   NKU: 3.9524 (.86465)   YTU: 4,00 (.39223)

3. The translation demands that are made by academicians other than the ELT departments take my time and energy that I prefer to devote to my career.
>   AU: 4.3947 (.82329)   NKU: 4.2381 (.99523)   YTU: 3.1429 (.86444)

4. The translation demands tend to reflect the attitude that indicates a lack of awareness towards the time-consuming and painstaking nature of translation.
>   AU: 4.2895 (.89768)   NKU: 4.3333 (.79582)   YTU: 4.0714 (.82874)

5. The recruitment of experienced professional translators at university generally makes a substantial contribution to the translation activities.
>   AU: 4.5263 (.68721)   NKU: 4.7619 (.43644)   YTU: 4.2143 (.89258)

6. A translator's academic experience as well as professional experience in the translation market is a reason for choice.
>   AU: 4.3158 (.61973)   NKU: 4.4286 (.67612)   YTU: 4.2857 (.46881)

7. Working with the translators recruited by the university interactively is likely to make a valuable contribution to the improvement of academicians' translations.
>   AU: 4.1316 (.70408)   NKU: 4.3333 (.65828)   YTU: 4.1429 (.86444)

8. It is a good idea to establish a translation center where experienced translators and volunteer academicians are able to work together.
>   AU: 4.2632 (.97770)   NKU: 4.3333 (.65828)   YTU: 4.0714 (.99725)

9. It is possible to conduct translation activities in a center within the framework of a systematic organization in such a way to contribute to economy.
>   AU: 4.1316 (.57756)   NKU: 4.3810 (.58959)   YTU: 3.9229 (.72976)

10. It would be more useful if the work in a translation center is to be run and supervised by professional translators experienced in translations which are related to the academia and other fields (e.g., commerce and industry).
>   AU: 4.1053 (.83146)   NKU: 4.5238 (.51177)   YTU: 3.2143 (.89258)

11. It would be nice to get paid in proportion to their contribution to the translation process for those academic personnel who wish to work in the translation center.
>   AU: 4.2895 (.65380)   NKU: 4.4286 (.59761)   YTU: 4.50 (.51887)

12. It would be a good idea to increase the shares of those doing translation in the working capital.
>   AU: 4.00 (.92998)   NKU: 4.3333   (.57735)   YTU: 4.0714 (.47463)

13. If talented students too are to work in the translation center, these students may be able to improve their translation skills and contribute to the translation activities.
>   AU: 3.8684 (1.01798)   NKU: 4.2381 (.88909)   YTU: 4.4286 (.51355)

14. The contributions of the students in the translation center to the translation projects can be credited in their graduation documents under a separate title.
>   AU: 3.5526 (1.17858)   NKU: 3.8571 (1.06234)   YTU: 4.2857 (.46881)

15. The supervision of the students' work by professional translators in turns would improve the quality of the translations.
>   AU: 3.8158 (.89610)   NKU: 4.1429 (1.01419)   YTU: 4.3571 (.49725)

16. The translation center where experienced translators are employed can function as an academic writing center, thereby contributing to an increase in the number of articles accepted to the academic journals.
>   AU: 4.0263 (.75290)   NKU: 4.5238   (.60159)   YTU: 4.00 (.87706)

17. The translation center can also contribute to the translation activities of the academic personnel in other universities.   AU: 3.7368 (1.10733)   NKU: 3.9048 (1.09109)   YTU: 3.7857 (.80178)

18. The translation centers can contribute to the industrial and commercial institutions in the city.
>   AU: 3.7632 (.81983)   NKU: 4.0952 (.88909)   YTU: 3.5386 (.84265)

19. It is necessary for the translation center to give priority to meeting the demands from the local academic personnel.   AU: 4.00 (.81983)   NKU: 4.0952 (.88909)   YTU: 4.1429 (.53452)

20. It would be good for such a translation center to form a database by which they demonstrate terminological problems along with their solutions.
>   AU: 4.2632 (.60109)   NKU: 4.7143 (.46291)   YTU: 4.3571 (.49725)

21. It is important for the naturalistic use of language if the translation center solves problems of collocations (for instance, using the phrase 'see a dream' although it is necessary to prefer the phrase 'have a dream'.)

AU: 4.1053 (.83146)   NKU: 4.5238 (.67964)   YTU: 4.00 (.87706)

22. It would be good to classify the content in the database according to fields.

AU: 4.2368 (.63392)   NKU: 4.6190 (.49761)   YTU: 4.2857 (.61125)

23. It would be good to have online access to the commonly-faced translation problems and their solutions.

AU: 4.2105 (.70358)   NKU: 4.6667 (.48305)   YTU: 4.6429 (.49725)

PART B.
Printed versus online source use in translation
Directions: Circle the choice that best applies to you. (You need to circle only one choice.)

   1. If you compare your use of printed and online sources in doing translation:
      1. I always use printed source
      2. I have a tendency to use printed sources more.
      3. I do not tend to prefer printed sources to online sources or vice versa.
      4. I tend to use online sources more often.
      5. I always use online sources.

   2. In order to do translation most effectively:
      1. Printed sources must always be used
      2. There should be a tendency to use more printed sources.
      3. There should not be a tendency to use more printed or online sources.
      4. There should be a tendency to use more online sources.
      5. Online sources must always be used.

   a) never   b) rarely   c) sometimes   d) often   e) always

Printed dictionary use
3. I ------------------ use printed dictionaries while doing translation.

AU: 2.9737 (.85383)   NKU: 2.7143 (.84515)   YTU: 2.9286 (1.07161)

4. I ------------------ use monolingual printed dictionaries (e.g., English-English) while doing translation?

AU: 3.4737 (.97916)   NKU: 3.1905 (1.03049)   YTU: 3.0714 (1.14114)

5. I -------------------- use bilingual dictionaries (i.g., English-Turkish or Turkish-English)?

AU: 2.9211 (.81809)   NKU: 3.1905 (1.07792)   YTU: 3.2857 (1.32599)

6. I -------------- do translation from English to Turkish using printed bilingual dictionaries?

AU: 3.1842 (.83359)   NKU: 2.9048 (1. 4426)   YTU: 2.7857 (.89258)

7. I ------------ do translation from Turkish to English using printed bilingual dictionaries?

AU: 3.1053 (.86335)   NKU: 2.6190 (1.02353)   YTU: 2.9286 (.91687)

Online dictionary use
8. I -------------- use online dictionaries while doing translation.

AU: 3.9474 (.83.658)   NKU: 4.1905 (.60159)   YTU: 4.00 (.67937)

9. I -------------- use online monolingual dictionaries (e.g., English-English) while doing translation?

AU: 3.6379 (.99786)   NKU: 3.4286 (.74642)   YTU: 3.8571 (.66299)

10. I ------------ use bilingual online dictionaries (e.g., English-Turkish or Turkish- English) while doing translation.   AU: 3.6579 (.87846)   NKU: 3.8571 (.79282)   YTU: 3.8571 (.77033)

11. I ---------------use bilingual online dictionaries while doing translation from English to Turkish.

AU: 3.4474 (.89132)   NKU: 3.2857 (.64365)   YTU: 3.7143 (.82542)

12. I -------------- use online bilingual dictionaries while doing translation from Turkish to English.

AU: 3.3158 (.93304)   NKU: 3.1905 (.67964)   YTU: 3.7857 (.80178)

Use of the search engine
13. I -------------- use the search engine while doing translation.

AU: 3.5789 (.97625)   NKU: 3.6190 (.97346)   YTU: 4.2857 (.61125)

14. I -------------- use both the search engine and dictionary in turns while doing translation.

AU: 3.2895 (.86705)   NKU: 3.2381 (.99523)   YTU: 4.2143 (.80178)

15. The dictionary which I use with the search engine in turns is -------------- a printed one.

AU: 2.8421 (.94515)   NKU: 2.2381 (.94365)   YTU: 3.1429 (.94926)

16. The dictionary which I use with the search engine in turns is -------------- an online one.

AU: 3.5789 (.97625)   NKU: 3.9048 (.76842)   YTU: 4.00 (.55470)

Working with an expert, and special field
17. In translations outside the scope of my specialization, I have ------------- worked with the expert of the special field.

AU: 2.6579 (.99394) NKU: 2.4286 (.97834)   YTU: 2.7857 (.97496)
18. The reason of the frequency I am referring to in the response to the 17th question is -------------- the prospect of having terminology problems.

AU: 3.3947 (1.12801) NKU: 4.0952 (.94365)   YTU: 3.1429 (.94926)
19. I have ------------- had opportunities to work with an expert who is familiar with the terms and the English equivalents of the special field beyond the scope of my area of specialization.

AU: 2.4737 (1.03289) NKU: 1.8095 (.81358) YTU: 2.2857 (1.06904)
20. I -------------- use terminology databases while doing translation.

AU: 3.0263 (.94402) NKU: 2.9524 (1.07127) YTU: 3.7143 (.61125)

Machine translation
21. I ------------- make use of machine translation while doing translation from Turkish to English (translations done via online or offline translation programs).

AU: 1.8684 (.99107) NKU: 1.0476 (. 21822) YTU: 1.0714 (.26726)
22. I ------------- make use of machine translation while doing translation from English to Turkish (translations done via online or offline translation programs).

AU: 1.7105 (.95600) NKU: 1.0476 (.21822) YTU: 1.0714 (.26726)
23. Machine translation is ---------------- reliable in translations from Turkish to English (translations done via online or offline translation programs).

AU: 1.9211 (1.04962) NKU: 1.3810 (.66904) YTU: 1.7857 (.69929)
24. Machine translation is --------------- reliable in translations from English to Turkish (translations done via online or offline translation programs).

AU: 1.9211 (1.02355) NKU: 1.3810 (.66904) YTU: 1.7857 (.69929)

Parallel Texts
25. Using sources where the translated equivalents of the texts (bilingual parallel texts) in translations are presented next to one another (together) is an effective method.

AU: 3.2368 (.78617) NKU: 3.7143 (.64365) YTU: 3.2857 (.82542)
26. It is important to make use of parallel texts in English to check whether the translation is a close approximation of natural English in terms of style and structure.

AU: 3.8684 (.70408) NKU: 4.0476 (.58959) YTU: 4.00 (.55470)
27. I --------------------- refer to parallel texts in English to check whether my translation is a close approximation of natural English in terms of style and structure.

AU: 3.1053 (.89411) NKU: 3.0952 (.94365) YTU: 3.3571 (1.08182)
28. It is necessary for a non-native speaker to check the accuracy of the language he/she has used in his/her translations from Turkish to English in terms of style and structure to the maximum.

AU: 4.2632 (.55431) NKU: 4.3810 (.49761) YTU: 4.4286 (.51355)
29. I cannot look at parallel texts as often as I would like to as my time is limited.

AU: 3.5263 (1.17948) NKU: 3.5714 (.87014) YTU: 2.7143 (1.06904)
30. If there are timesaving technological possibilities to enable my translation to approximate to natural English in terms of style and structure. I would like to be informed of how to use them.

AU: 4.0789 (.67310) NKU: 4.5238 (.60159) YTU: 4.1429 (.86444)
31. It is necessary to increase the number of databases for translations from Turkish to English.

AU: 4.00 (.83827) NKU: 4.1905 (.81358) YTU: 4.2143 (.57893)
32. It is necessary to increase the quality of databases for translations from Turkish to English.

AU: 4.2105 (.66405) NKU: 4.3333 (.65828) YTU: 4.2857 (.46881)

PART C
Parallel expressions and formulaic expressions
1. (open ended question) Suppose that you would like to describe a person who smokes a lot and you are in a dilemma between 'heavy smoker' and 'much smoker'. Please briefly explain below the strategy that you employ to use expressions as natural as native speakers use:

2. (open ended question) For example, if we accept that you would like to determine the more-frequently-used one (i.e.,'expansive access' or 'widespread access'), could you briefly explain below the practical strategies you employ to solve this problem:

3. Using both the dictionary and the search engine to ensure the accuracy of the translations in terms of style and structure is likely to solve the problem.
a) I strongly disagree   b) I disagree   c) I am not sure d) I agree e) I strongly agree
          AU: 2.5526 (1.08297)   NKU: 2.8095 (.96304)   YTU: 4.1429 (.53452)
4. I have a high level of technical knowledge related to how to use the search engine to ensure the accuracy of the translations in terms of style and structure.
a) I strongly disagree   b) I disagree   c) I am not sure d) I agree e) I strongly agree
          AU: 2.7895 (.98077)   NKU: 2.8571 (.79282)   YTU: 4.00 (.87706)

If you are using the dictionary or the search engine, please choose one of the following alternatives (ONLY ONE) that best describes your situation)
C5:
1. I only use the dictionary.
2. I use the search engine (except for looking for a dictionary in the search engine) and the dictionary in turns (I use the dictionary more often than the search engine)
3. I use both the dictionary and the search engine (except for looking for a dictionary in the search engine) in turns, but I do not have a tendency to use one more than the other.
4. I use the search engine (except for looking for a dictionary in it) more but I use the dictionary and the search engine in turns.
5. I only use the search engine (except for looking for a dictionary in it)

C6:
1. Only the dictionary should be used.
2. The search engine should be used in turns with the dictionary (but the dictionary should be preferred more often).
3. Both the dictionary and the search engine should be used in turns but there should not be a tendency to use one more than the other.
4. Both the dictionary and the search engine should be used in turns but the search engine should be used more often.
5. Only the search engine should be used.

xx-This article is the extended version of the paper which was presented at IETC (International Educational Technology Conference) 2010 and published in IETC 2010 Proceedings Book.