

## The Impact of Back-translation Instruction with Collaborative Activities on Iranian English Students' Translation Achievement

Hesam Mohammadi<sup>1</sup>, \*Maryam Beiki<sup>2</sup>, Arshya Keyvanfar<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of TEFL, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran  
e-mail: H.Mohammadi64@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Corresponding Author, Department of TEFL, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran. e-mail: Maryam.Beyki1248@gmail.com

<sup>3</sup> Department of TEFL, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Ph.D. Candidate of Anthropology, University of Tehran. e-mail: Arshya.Keyvanfar@gmail.com

### ARTICLE INFO

### ABSTRACT

#### Keywords:

Back-translation,  
Collaborative  
Translation, Individual  
Translation

#### DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v7i1.1193>

The present quasi-experimental study with a non-equivalent control group pretest-posttest design investigated the impact of back-translation teaching with collaborative activities on Iranian English translation students' translation achievement. To this end, 30 Iranian EFL translation students studying at Islamic Azad University North Tehran Branch were nominated based on convenience sampling. The Oxford Placement Test (OPT) and a translation pretest were directed to inspect the contributors' homogeneity prior to the treatment. The groups were assigned to the Collaborative Back-translation Group (CBTG n=15) and Back-translation Group (BTG n=15). During 16 sessions, CBTG experienced back-translation with collaborative activities as a treatment, whereas the BTG experienced only back-translation every session. After the treatment stage, the participants were given a translation posttest. The study also examined the participants' attitudes toward collaborative activities implementation via semi-structured interviews and tried to assess some students' perceptions towards collaborative activities and the instructional practices in the university context. The qualitative analysis revealed that most learners preferred collaborative tasks in their classrooms. The quantitative analysis showed that the CBTG outdone the BTG in translation ability. The result of the present research had some implications for the teachers and students in translation pedagogy. As for the theoretical aspect, this study can provide some hints for researchers interested in developing a comprehensive model for the L2 translation process. Considering the practical implications, all the instructors could employ a set of collaborative activities in their translation classes. Collaborative activities create translating opportunities where students exchange meaning, suggest feedback, and offer enhanced output for revealing the meaning.

#### How to cite:

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), 75-90

## 1. Introduction

Recently translation is seen as a particular attempt that indorses learners' autonomy and responsibility towards group work and quality (Maruenda-Bataller & Santaemilia-Ruiz, 2016). Researchers in translation educations favor creating a collaborative setting via pretend translation instructions and collaborative social media platforms (McDonough Dolmaya & Sánchez Ramos, 2019). Therefore, practice-oriented instruction is desirable in academic settings. In line with practice-oriented teaching, the social constructivist outlook emphasizes the active participation of students in authentic practices and collaborative context, which promotes their active participation. Meanwhile qualified translation is, a social movement, inspiring collaboration in a class setting is a good procedure to assist students for cooperative task implementation (Farid et al., 2022). According to Johnson and Johnson (1994) "positive interdependence, joint responsibility, stimulating interaction, interpersonal and team abilities, and team assessment" as dominant principles of collaborative task implementation in academic settings (p. 21).

In this regard, back-translation is a method that can be implemented via cooperative problem-solving. According to Klausen (2016) back-translation is a quality assessment technique that provides the correct translation. Likewise, collaboration helps learners toward achieving an explicit comprehension of the target language (Hebenstreit, 2019). It improves communication (McDonough Dolmaya & Sánchez Ramos, 2019; Zwischenberger, 2022). Besides, collaborative activities in translation classes can promote pragmatic and cross-cultural consciousness (House, 2008).

Sadeghi (2011) believes that learners' interactive ability is a main issue in the university context. One aspect of this skill may improve via translation. Although some translation courses are available for EFL learners, the efficiency of such instructions is under question. Concerning the role of L1 transfer in collocational or prepositional structures especially in vocabulary and grammar most translation students experience diverse problems in academic context.

While teamwork increases the speed and improves the quality of translation tasks, Iranian translators believe that translation should be done individually (Doostizadeh & Badiei, 2018). Besides, Fatemi and Modaresi (2017) highlight that teamwork is not defined properly and is hardly ever practiced in Iranian university classes.

Concerning translation tasks, back-translation attains a superior quality guarantee, and it assist learners to evaluate the appropriateness of equivalence between source and target manuscripts (McGowan, 2014). Because most EFL students have inadequate vocabulary knowledge and have struggled to state their thoughts, they can be provided with the opportunity to pool and discuss views jointly for task implementation (Beiki et al, 2020a; Rashtchi & Beiki, 2015). Educationally, little attention is given to the back-translation as well as collaborative back-translation. Consequently, the present research investigated the effect of back-translation teaching with collaborative activities on the translation attainment of a group of Iranian English translation students.

## 2. Literature Review

As Khosravani and Dastjerdi (2013) argue, "back-translation is a common approach to test the accuracy of the translation, although its implementation in different contexts is

sometimes subject to dispute" (p. 43). Back-translation is predicated on the notion that if it is correct, the target language translation must be correct as well. It is a task supposed to ensure accuracy in translations (McGowan, 2014). Some studies (e.g., Christensen, 2016; Prabhumoye et al., 2018; Roy, 2009; Yanti et al., 2020) have highlighted the efficacy of this task in translation studies.

Besides, collaborative activities create translating occasions where learners exchange meaning and offer feedback for revealing the content (Storch & Sato, 2020). Joint problem-solving are suitable for EFL students and highpoint active communication between students with different skills. In addition, it benefits learners' social performance and academic attainment (Almusharraf & Bailey, 2021). Collaborative task implementation in an academic context amends students' engagement and enhances their participation in the classroom setting (Fernández Dobao, 2012; Vlachopoulos & Makri, 2019). A broad description of collaborative translation refers to the joint translation of two or more agents working together (Paradowska, 2021). In this regard, functionalist tactics to translation highlight the collaborative essence of the whole translation procedure (Nord, 1997).

Some researchers highlight that collaborative translation projects altered translation education from a "hand-me-down," "teacher-centered method", and "socio-personal process" (Kiraly, 2015, p.20). In collaborative translation, learners are placed at the center of the translation process. Through interactive translation, they are expected to learn and work together for specialized translation projects (Hadžiahmetovic & Pavlovic, 2019). In this regard, several studies (e.g., Hatami, 2015; Huss, 2018; Rastegar Moghaddam et al., 2020; Paradowska, 2021) pointed the effectiveness of collaborative task implementation in translation studies. Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) believe that the theory of reasoned action, the act of believing that one is able to do a task, can lead to a positive outcome. A positive viewpoint leads to improved presentation since attitude regulates the way of behaving, understanding, and thinking. Previous research findings (Huang et al, 2020; Pavlović & Hadžiahmetovic, 2019; Savasci & Kaygisiz, 2019; Tsai, 2020) showed that students had a positive outlook toward collaborative activities, and these kinds of tasks facilitated the course of learning and enhanced students' communication in the class setting.

The current study investigated the impact of back-translation instruction with collaborative activities on Iranian English translation students' translation achievement. The following research questions helped the researchers accomplish the purpose of this study:

**RQ1:** To what extent does back-translation instruction incorporated with collaborative activities affect Iranian English Translation students' translation achievement?

**RQ2:** What are the students' perceptions towards incorporated collaborative activities in translation classes?

### **3. Research Methodology**

#### **3.1 Participants**

Thirty Iranian EFL Translation Studies students aged 20 to 25 years at the intermediate level were selected from Islamic Azad University North Tehran Branch based on convenience sampling. They had already passed a course on translating simple texts and were members of two intact classes ( $n_1=n_2=15$ ) that were randomly assigned to the Collaborative Back-translation Group (CBTG) and Back-translation Group (BTG).

### 3.2 Instruments

The investigators applied the subsequent instruments to achieve the goals of the study. The first was the Oxford Placement Test (OPT). It was applied to assess the participants' language proficiency level. The reliability of the test was calculated through the KR-21 formula in SPSS software ( $r=.92$ ). The second instrument was a back-translation test selected from "Translation and Translator" Rashidi (2015) applied as the pretest and posttest. Two instructors rated the translations based on Khanmohammadi and Osanloo's (2009) correction scheme. The correlation between the two ratings was computed through the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient formula, and the results presented a high inter-rater reliability index for the pretest .67 and posttest .87, respectively. The last data collection instrument was a semi-structured interview. In the last phase of the study, the researchers used semi-structured interviews with students who experienced collaborative activities to elicit their attitude towards applying these activities in translation classes. Besides, five experts evaluated the interview questions' face validity. The validity of the interview questions from the consensus prospects of the five educational specialists was 78% which could be considered a satisfactory result. Besides, the Kappa value of inter-coders was .77, which indicated a substantial agreement.

### 3.3 Procedure

The two intact classes met one session a week with a 90-minute duration within 16 weeks. The contributors studied "A Survey on Translation" (Javaherian, 2018), through which they learned about principles of translation, transposition, loss, and gain in translation, back-translation, and preserving the original text's style. Besides, they experienced translation practice every session. In addition, a sample of 150 sentences and some text from "Translation and Translator" by Rashidi (2015) were used for back-translation tasks within 16 weeks of the educational period. It is worthy to point out that both groups studied the same course books. To carry out the study, the researchers followed the following procedures.

#### 3.3.1 Placement test

At first, the course, the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was directed to 50 EFL translation students, and 30 homogenous students at the intermediate level were selected as the study participants based on their performance on OPT.

#### 3.3.2 Pretest

The instructor selected a text from "Translation and Translator" Rashidi (2015) as a pretest. Besides, Khanmohammadi and Osanloo's (2009) scheme was used for correction procedure. The translation tasks were rectified by two qualified instructors and the mean of the two sets of scores was the student's final score. After that, the classes randomly were assigned to (CBG) and (BG). The pretest enabled the researchers to ensure that both classes were homogeneous in terms of translation ability.

#### 3.3.3 Collaborative Back-translation Group (CBG)

Fifteen participants in CBG cluster were divided into three groups; each group includes five members. In the CBG cluster, the translation task was implemented by group members based on a project-based model (Maruenda-Bataller & Santaemilia- Ruiz, 2016). Additionally, one-week prior the study, the contributors were informed about group task implementation such

as collaborative discussion, group dynamics, and decision-making. Each group member had a different responsibility in this group. However, they jointly did a back-translation task every session. Based on this model, each student followed a specific role such as 1) project manager, 2) terminologist, 3) documentation specialist, 4) translator, and 5) editor.

In this cluster, students worked collaboratively and interacted together through the WhatsApp group. The project manager assigned tasks and set the plan for the assignment. Moreover, she coordinated and supervised the translation processes in the group and responded to the inquiries and difficulties of the team members during task implementation. The documentation specialist solved problems regarding the selection of the text content and the electronic resources considering their usefulness and adequacy. Moreover, the terminologist prepared glossaries of Persian and English with the terms and expressions. Afterward, the translator read the source text, attempted to provide a solution to the conceptual problems, and determined the function and strategies of the translation. The editor read the original and translated versions and edited the arrangement and function of the text. He also compared and reviewed the original text and the translation and made required content modifications. At the end of each session, the instructor collected the translation tasks and assessed them based on the correction scheme mentioned earlier. The instructor assessed the group tasks and wrote her explanations on different parts of translation.

#### *3.3.4 Back-translation Group (BG)*

Fifteen contributors practiced individual back-translation tasks. In this cluster, the collaboration was chiefly between the instructor and students. The translation text was presented, and the instructor explained new words, phrases, structures, and equivalents. Then, students individually back-translated the given text. Finally, the instructor collected the individual learners' translation tasks and assessed them based on the correction scheme. The instructor evaluated the individual's task and wrote her comments on different aspects of the translation task.

### **3.4 Post-test**

Lastly, the CBTG and BTG were retested to observe whether the treatment had any impact on the contributors' translation ability. The instructor selected a sample text from "Translation and Translator" Rashidi (2015). The posttest was a text like those practice sessions. The students in both clusters back-translated the text individually in 40 minutes. Two experienced instructors corrected the tasks based on the scheme. Additionally, some students were interviewed in the last stage of the study to evaluate the students' attitudes toward collaborative discussion and joint problem solving.

## **4. Findings**

### **4.1 Quantitative Phase**

The following section displays the results and findings of the research and the data analysis employed in this research. The students' pretest and posttest scores in both groups were used to answer the first research question. Besides, students' responses to semi-structured interviews were used to answer the second research question.

4.1.1 Analysis of the Hypothesis

The study included two phases; subject selection and main study. During the subject selection phase of the study, 50 EFL learners took Oxford Placement Test (OPT) to select 30 homogenous students to contribute in the main study. As Table 1 shows, the students were designated based on the mean of 35.76 plus and minus one standard deviation of 10.29. It should be noted that the distribution of scores on the OPT test was normal. The ratios of skewness and kurtosis over their respective standard errors were beyond  $\pm 1.96$ . The results also indicated that the OPT test enjoyed a KR-21 reliability index of .92.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics: Oxford Placement Test (Subject Selection Phase)

	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	V	Skewness		Kurtosis	
							Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
OPT	50	15	46	35.76	10.291	105.900	-.657	.337	-1.215	.662
KR-21	.90						Ratio	-1.94	Ratio	-1.83

During the main study, the selected students took a pretest of translation, following which they were administered the treatments. Finally, they took a posttest. The data were examined through an independent-samples t-test which assumes normality of the data and homogeneity of variances. Table 2 shows the skewness and kurtosis indices and their ratios over the standard errors. Since the ratios were beyond  $\pm 1.96$ , the assumption of normality was retained on the translation pretest and posttest. Besides, the ratios of skewness and kurtosis over their standard errors are analogous to z-scores which should be compared against the critical values of  $\pm 1.96$  at .05 levels (Field, 2018).

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics; testing Normality of Data

Group		N		Skewness		Kurtosis	
		Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Experimental	OPT	15	.580	-.152	.580	-1.522	1.121
	Pretest	15	.580	.269	.580	-.201	1.121
	Posttest	15	.580	1.127	.580	1.957	1.121
Control	OPT	15	.580	.631	.580	-.804	1.121
	Pretest	15	.580	-.143	.580	-.560	1.121
	Posttest	15	.580	-.616	.580	-.557	1.121

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare groups' means on OPT to probe whether the two groups were homogenous concerning general language proficiency before the treatment phase. Table 3 shows the outcomes of the descriptive statistics for the two groups on OPT. The results indicated that the experimental (M = 43.73, SD = 1.66) and control (M = 43.53, SD = 1.40) groups had almost the equal means on OPT.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics; Oxford Placement Test by Groups

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OPT	Experimental	15	43.73	1.668	.431
	Control	15	43.53	1.407	.363

Table 4 displays the outcomes of the independent-samples t-test. Before arguing the outcomes, it should be considered that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was retained on OPT. As displayed in Table 4, the non-significant results of Levene’s test ( $F = 1.56$ ,  $p > .05$ ) showed that the two groups were homogenous concerning their variances on OPT.

The results of the independent samples t-test; ( $t(28) = .355$ ,  $p > .05$ ,  $r = .067$ ) demonstrating a weak effect size; 95 % CI (-.954, 1.35) specified that there was not any significant difference between the two groups’ means on OPT. Consequently, the two clusters were homogeneous before the treatment.

Table 4: Independent-Samples t-test; Oxford Placement Test by Groups

	Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	1.568	.221	.355	28	.725	.200	.563	-.954	1.354

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the experimental and control groups’ means on the pretest of translation to probe whether the two groups were homogenous concerning the translation ability prior to the treatment administration. Table 5 shows the outcomes of the descriptive statistics for the two clusters on the pretest. The results indicated that the experimental ( $M = 16.63$ ,  $SD = .667$ ) and control ( $M = 16.70$ ,  $SD = .862$ ) groups had almost the same means on pretest of translation.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics; Pretest of Translation by Groups

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pretest	Experimental	15	16.63	.667	.172
	Control	15	16.70	.862	.223

Table 6 presents the outcomes of the independent-samples t-test. Before arguing the outcomes, it should be considered that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was retained on the pretest. As displayed in Table 4.6, the non-significant results of Levene’s test ( $F = 1.49$ ,  $p > .05$ ) specified that the two groups were homogenous in terms of their variances on the pretest.

The results of independent samples t-test; ( $t(28) = .237$ ,  $p > .05$ ,  $r = .045$ ) presenting a weak effect size; 95 % CI (-.510, .643) presented that there was not any significant difference between the two groups’ means on pretest of translation. Consequently, it can be concluded that the two groups were homogeneous in terms of their translation ability prior to the treatment phase.

Table 6: Independent-Samples t-test; Pretest of Translation by Groups

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	1.492	.232	.237	28	.814	.067	.281	-.510	.643

An independent-samples t-test was run to compare both groups' means on the posttest of translation to investigate the first research question. Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics for the two groups on the posttest. The outcomes specified that the experimental group (M = 18.93, SD = .417) had a higher mean than the control group (M = 17.37, SD = 1.02) on posttest of translation.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics; Posttest of Translation by Groups

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Posttest	Experimental	15	18.93	.417	.108
	Control	15	17.37	1.026	.265

Table 8 revealed the independent-samples t-test results. Before conferring the outcomes, it should be highlighted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not retained in the posttest. The significant results of Levene's test (F = 10.72, p < .05) showed that the two groups were not homogenous concerning their variances on the posttest; thus, the values on the second row of Table 8 (Equal variances not assumed) was mentioned. The outcomes of independent samples t-test; (t (18) = 5.48, p < .05, r = .787 signifying a large effect size; 95 % CI (.967, 2.16) indicated that the experimental group significantly outdone the control group on the posttest of translation.

Table 8: Independent-Samples t-test; Posttest of Translation by Groups

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	10.722	.003	5.480	28	.000	1.567	.286	.981	2.152
Equal variances not assumed			5.480	18.502	.000	1.567	.286	.967	2.166



#### **4.2 Qualitative Phase**

Based on the interview results, all of the interviewees 100% highlighted the positive role of collaborative activities in improving students' translation ability. Besides, they mentioned that it is really effective in interactive-based classes where students experience communicative skills through mutual interaction, based on think pair share tasks.

As an example, one student said:

*"I think collaborative activities can improve students' commitment and improves students' translation ability and their engagement level."*

From the 60% interviewees' point of view, discussion and sharing of ideas could be facilitated via group activities. As an example, one of the students highlighted the role of group discussion in translation class.

For instance, one of the participants mentioned:

*"I believe in group discussion and debate-based problem solving for enhancing students' learning."*

Regarding question 3 of the interview, 80% of the interviewees highlighted that they noticed their friends' feelings during group task implementation. The majority of interviewees emphasized the sense of responsibility and respect as significant factors for collaborative task implementation.

For example, one student mentioned:

*"In our group we tried to respect each other's attitude and feeling, besides; every person considered her responsibility during task implementation"*

Concerning students' performance through working together, all of the interviewees 100 % mentioned that group work can be effective to motivate students, inspire active learning and help students to develop their performance in class. Besides, they highlighted the role of sharing responsibilities.

As an example, one student mentioned:

*"Of course, this question is very much related to the personality of the individuals. Concerning my own experience, I am a perfectionist, I prefer to do my homework in the best way, and I would like group members be more accountable. In this case I will feel better."*

Concerning question 5 of the interview, the majority of interviewees, 80 %, believed that their participation improves when they incorporate collaborative strategies. A minority highlighted the role of teachers in successful collaborative task implementation.

As an example, one student mentioned:

*"In my idea it is better teacher firstly define the learning objectives for students, stablish team goals before putting students together for activity."*

Concerning item 6, 60% of the respondents mentioned that teacher-centered learning is more beneficial. However, 40% preferred a student-centered learning context because they believed that the focus of activity shifts from the teacher to the learners, and students could

experience active learning, in which they solve problems, formulate their own questions and converse together.

For example, one student mentioned:

*"I appreciate teacher-centered class because the teacher can teach according to the rules and principles and we can learn the new material easily."*

On the other hand, the other student mentioned:

*"I prefer student-centered class where students have time to work together and learn from each other."*

Concerning question 7, all of the interviewees highlighted that collaborative task makes the learning experience more active and enjoyable.

For instance, one student claimed:

*"teamwork is fascinating by itself, so I can say it was great and I was really happy to do translation collaboratively."*

Similarly, the other student mentioned:

*"I am satisfied with this type of translation, and I felt comfortable when I worked with my classmates."*

Regarding the disadvantages of collaborative work, the majority of the students, 80%, mentioned that group members' sense of responsibility is the main aspect affecting the outcome of collaborative work and was the dominant challenge for collaborative task implementation. Besides, a minority of the students, 20%, mentioned that collaborative task implementation is time-consuming.

As an example, one student believed:

*"I think that just decision making takes time. I mean drawing conclusion needs more time."*

Regarding item 9, about students' learning experience in the classroom and collaborative learning context, all interviewees believed that it was their first experience with such activities in a translation class. Interviewees highlighted that students' interactions along with teacher interaction improved their translation, especially in finding the suitable equivalent and text organization.

For example, one student mentioned:

*"It was my first experience where I had time to talk with my classmate and discuss ideas freely."*

In the same vein, the other student mentioned:

*"A positive atmosphere or anxious-free environment created a comfortable situation for group work and teachers' guidelines improved our group's translation ability."*

Concerning the last item, 80% of interviewees asserted that collaborative activities improved their social behavior, self-confidence, decision-making skills, and problem-solving. They believed such activities had a positive impact on their personal life.

For instance, one student reflected:

*"Collaborative task improved my self-confidence and I gained the courage to express my ideas. I think that it had a positive effect on my personal life too."*

Similarly, the other student mentioned:

*"Working in a collaborative environment and having plan for each task affected my personal life. I learned how to manage my task in order to present better task."*

As an example, one student reflected:

*"It really helped me in decision making and solving problems in my daily life."*

## **5. Discussion**

The findings showed that the experimental group taught through collaborative back-translation significantly outperformed the control group. Besides, the results of semi-structured interviews revealed that collaborative tasks in translation classes were a preferable activity. The interviewees highlighted that collaboration could facilitate learning and social skills. Besides, time management and group members' accountability were reported as dominant challenges for collaborative task implementation in the academic context. Therefore, back-translation via collaborative activities was effective in enhancing the translation ability of the participants. The results supported Yanti et al. 's (2020) perspective that back-translation has a positive effect on learners' translation attainment. Besides, the outcomes are in line with some studies (e.g., Beiki et al, 2020b; Huss, 2018; Shirazifard et al, 2021), which have highlighted the efficacy of collaborative task implementation as a crucial factor in classes. The study results align with some scholars' viewpoints (Beiki et al., 2020a; Neather, 2019; Rashtchi & Beiki, 2015; Fernandez Dobao, 2012), who highlighted the dominant role of group tasks implementation and students' interaction in the learning process.

Furthermore, the current study's findings concerning collaborative translation supports the social-constructivist perspective, which highlights students' cooperation and active participation in the social context of class as an effective factor for better outcome (Kiraly, 2015). Besides, findings support Vygotsky' (1978) outlook regarding learners' Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Based on Vygotsky (1978) learners bridge their ZPD via support receives from instructors or their peers which results in the improvement of knowledge through collaboration and student-student interaction or instructor-student interaction.

Similarly, the results are in line with Beiki et al's (2020c) study which exposed that peers scaffold each other, when collaboratively work together. In the same vein, Aly's (2019) outcome supported the effectiveness of collaborative task implementation in translating text and creating more accurate text. In such a context, learners' communication helps team members to produce more accurate text, and a collaborative situation promotes communication and increases students' creativity and motivation.

The outcomes of study concerning collaborative translation, is in line with Adlan et al's (2020) study which highlighted the efficacy of collaboration in translation classes. However, Bistué's (2017) study was incompatible with the present study's outcomes. Bistué's (2017) findings

highlighted that cooperative activities decreased the students' self-confidence while present study's findings showed the efficacy of collaborative translation in EFL context. Concerning back-translation instruction, several studies (e.g., Chidlow et al., 2014; Christensen, 2016; Prabhumoye et al., 2018; Rosyidah et al., 2017; Zhang & Gao, 2014) highlighted the efficacy of this type of instruction in translation classes. Regarding the interviews' findings, students' perceptions toward collaborative task in academic contexts revealed that they were supportive of this activity. Besides, some research findings (e.g., Haji Jalili & Shahrokhi, 2017; Wu, 2015) are well-matched with the current study's findings. The same as present research findings they have pointed that collaborative tasks are valuable in multiple ways, such as enhancing interaction and helping students in applying their knowledge to real-life situations. Besides, findings highlighted that collaborative task increased students' awareness of their capabilities and improved students' social behavior in the classroom and other social contexts.

Concerning new insight for further investigation, this study did not make any attempts to video record or type record the interactions among group members when doing collaborative back-translation. Another line of the study which can add valuable knowledge to the literature is recording student interaction to examine the types and nature of such interactions and how they are dictated in the students' final product. Besides, further research can investigate the effect of a collaborative wiki-based learning context on EFL/ESL learners' back-translation achievement.

## **6. Conclusion**

The purpose of the present investigation was to determine the consequence of back-translation teaching with collaborative tasks on improving Iranian EFL students' translation. Besides, it probed into students' perceptions regarding implementing collaborative tasks in translation classes. As the study indicated, collaborative back-translation positively affected the students' translation ability. Besides, students had a positive attitude to collaborative tasks in translation classes. As highlighted in present study back-translation assisted students in becoming conscious of the changes between two languages in word choice, and sentence structure. Besides, the use of the back-translation method in translation classes informed students about their language development and enhanced their language awareness. Students could assess their translation ability by checking their translation quality. The current study's researchers believe that back-translation was a good method to be applied in teaching translation since the students could learn and understand both Source Language (SL) and Target Language (TL). Collaborative back-translation helped students to compare their translation with the real text so that they easily became aware of the appropriate translation in a particular context. The current research could be effective in improving students' confidence in their translation competence and improves their language skills.

The present investigation had practical and theoretical implications for the teachers and students in translation. As for the theoretical aspect, it provides some hints for researchers interested in developing a model for the L2 translation process. Considering the practical implications, all the instructors and teachers could employ a set of collaborative activities to create translating opportunities where students exchange meaning, offer feedback, and suggest improved output for revealing connotation. Similarly, language teachers could draw on this study's results to give learners a deeper insight into the translation activity. Applying

back-translation instruction via collaborative tasks may be an altered way of instruction translation to the students to increase their translation ability. The investigation could demand material developers to coordinating back-translation with special collaborative activities in translation textbooks.

This study was limited on the bases that the contributors' IQ, motivation, and age, could not be controlled by the investigators, although they might affect the outcomes. Furthermore, the type of texts (e.g., narrative, argumentative) was not considered a variable. The participants' interests were another issue the present study neglected.

## References

- Adlan, T., Anwar, D., & Hamzah. (2020). The effect of collaborative translation on students' translation ability. *1st International Conference on Lifelong Learning and Education for Sustainability* (pp. 180-182). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200217.037>
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Prentice-Hall.
- Allen, L. (2004). *The Oxford placement test*. Oxford University Press.
- Aly, E. (2019). Collaborative translation: Wicked problems and emerging solutions. *Minor Translating Major-Major Translating Minor-Minor Translating Minor*, 10,101-116. <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Almusharraf, N. M., & Bailey, D. (2021). Online engagement during COVID-19: Role of agency on collaborative learning orientation and learning expectations. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 37(5), 1285-1295. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jcal.12569>
- Beiki, M., Raissi, R., & Gharagozloo, N. (2020b). The differences between Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions and their instructional practices regarding the cooperative learning. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 7(1), 1847420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2020.1847420>
- Beiki, M., Gharagozloo, N., & Raissi, R. (2020a). The effect of structured versus unstructured collaborative pre-writing task on writing skills of the Iranian EFL students. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1), 1-29. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40862-020-00092-0>
- Beiki, M., Gharagozloo, N., & Raissi, R. (2020c). Iranian EFL learners' perceptions towards the Cooperative Learning (CL) implementation in Islamic Azad University. *Asian EFL Journal Research Articles*, 27(3), 193-220. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/NedaGharagozloo/publication/351351077>
- Bistué, Belén (2017). On the incorrect way to translate: The absence of collaborative translation from Leonardi Bruni's *De interpretatione recta*. Anthony Cordingley and Céline Frigau Manning (Eds.). *Collaborative translation: From the Renaissance to the digital age* (pp.33-48). Bloomsbury. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350006034.0006>
- Chidlow, A., Plakoyiannaki, E., & Welch, C. (2014). Translation in cross-language international business research: Beyond equivalence. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(5), 562-582. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2013.67>
- Christensen, A. (2016). *An intercultural communication perspective of back- translation: The impact of cultural hybridity and border crossing*. Aalborg University. <https://projekter.aau.dk/projekter/files/234154183/THESIS.pdf>

- Doostizadeh, M., Badiei, H. (2018). Education of Translation; developments, potential and limits of teamwork in translation. *Foreign Language Research Journal*, 7(2), 405-424. <https://doi.org/10.22059/jflr.2017.225750.316>
- Farid, Y., Beiki, M., Rashtchi, M. (2022). The impact of incorporated task-based instruction with metacognitive activities on listening comprehension ability. *International Journal of Innovation Scientific Research and Review*, 4(5), 2801-2807. <http://www.journalijisr.com/sites/default/files/issues-pdf/IJISRR-898.pdf>
- Fatemi, M., & Modarresi, G. H. (2017). Teamwork versus individual work in translation practice: A project-based action research. *ROSHD FLT*, 2, 48-55. [https://www.roshdmag.ir/Roshdmag\\_content/media/article/32..40%20ofrom%20\(96-97\)%20MATN%20ZABAN%20123-9\\_o.pdf](https://www.roshdmag.ir/Roshdmag_content/media/article/32..40%20ofrom%20(96-97)%20MATN%20ZABAN%20123-9_o.pdf)
- Fernández Dobao, A. (2012). Collaborative writing tasks in the L2 classroom: Comparing group, pair, and individual work. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 40–58. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S106037431100066X>.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS, statistics for statistics*. (5th ed.). SAGE.
- Haji Jalili, M., & Shahrokhi, M. (2017). The effect of collaborative writing on Iranian EFL learners' l2 writing anxiety and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(2), 203–215. <http://www.jallr.com/index.php/JALLR/article/download/538/pdf538>
- Hatami, A. (2015). The effect of collaborative learning and self-assessment on self-regulation. *Educ. Res. Rev*, 10(15), 2164–2167. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2015.2349>
- Hebenstreit, G. (2019). Coming to terms with social translation: A terminological approach. *Translation Studies*, 12(2), 139–155. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14781700.2019.1681290>
- House, J. (2008). Using translation to improve pragmatic competence. In E. Alcon, & A. Martinez-Flor (Eds.). *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning and teaching* (pp. 135-153). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690869-009>
- Huang, H. W., Lin, Q., & Darragh, J. J. (2020). *Understanding EFL learners' self-efficacy of collaborative translation in a blended English course*. Paper presented at 4th International Conference on E-Education, E-Business and E-Technology. Zagreb university. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3404649.3404661>
- Huss, J.T. (2018). Collaborative translation. In K. Washbourne & B. van Wyke (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of literary translation* (pp. 389–405). Routledge.
- Javaherian, S. (2018). *A survey on translation*. Arshad Sepahan.
- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T. (1994). An overview of cooperative learning. In J. Thousand, A. Villa, & A. Nevin (Eds). *Creativity and collaborative learning*. Brookes Press.
- Khanmohammad, H., & Osanloo, M. (2009). Moving toward objective scoring: A rubric for translation assessment. *Journal of English language studies*, 1(1), 131-153. <https://www.sid.ir/en/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id=221139>
- Khosravani, Y., & Dastjerdi, H.V. (2013). Back-translation versus collaborative translation: A comparative study of Persian subtitles in English movies. *Lebende Sprachen*, 58, 366-377. <https://doi.org/10.1515/les-2013-0021>
- Kiraly, D. (2015). Occasioning translator competence: Moving beyond social constructivism toward a postmodern alternative to instructionism, *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 10(1), 8-32. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.10.1.02kir>

- Klausen, J.Z. (2016). *An intercultural communication perspective of back-translation: The impact of cultural hybridity and border crossing*. (Unpublished master thesis), University of Aalborg.
- Maruenda-Bataller, S., & Santaemilia-Ruiz, J. (2016). Project-based learning and competence assessment in translation training. In M. L. Carrio Pastor (Ed.), *Technology implementation in second language teaching and translation studies: New tools, new approaches* (pp. 207-228). Springer. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-10-0572-5\\_11](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-10-0572-5_11)
- McGowan, J. (2014, January 13). The what and why of back-translation and reconciliation. [Language Scientific Web Blog post]. Retrieved from: <http://www.languagescientific.com/language-services-blog/what-is-back-translation.html>
- Neather, R. (2019). Collaborative translation. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp. 70-75). Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315678627-16/collaborative-translation-robert-neather>
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a purposeful activity. Functionalist approaches explained*. St. Jerome.
- McDonough Dolmaya, J., & Sánchez Ramos, M. (2019). Characterizing online social translation. *Translation Studies*, 12(2), 129–138. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14781700.2019.1697736>
- Paradowska, U. (2021). Benefits and Challenges of an Intra-University Authentic Collaborative Translation Project. *New Voices in Translation Studies*, 24, 23-45. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Urszula-Paradowska/publication/352790398>
- Pavlović, T. & Hadžiahmetović Jurida, S. (2019). Collaborative translation: Student translators' perspective. *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and E-Learning*, 6, 4 – 28. [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sanel-Hadziahmetovic-Jurida/publication/337720295\\_collaborative\\_translation\\_](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sanel-Hadziahmetovic-Jurida/publication/337720295_collaborative_translation_)
- Prabhumoye, S., Tsvetkov, Y., Salakhutdinov, R., & Black, A.W. (2018). Style transfer through back-translation. *Computational Linguistics*, 1, 866-876. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P18-1080>
- Rashidi, G. (2015). *Translation and Translator*. Beh Nashr.
- Rashtchi, M., & Beiki, M. (2015). The effect of teacher-generated cooperative brainstorming versus learner-generated cooperative brainstorming on activating EFL learners' background knowledge in essay writing classes. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences*, 5(52), 1218-1227. <https://www.cibtech.org/sp.ed/jls/2015/02/157-JLS-S2-160-Rashtchi-Beiki-THE-CLASSES.pdf>
- Rastegar Moghadam, M. R., Khoshsaligheh, M., & Pishghadam, R. (2020). English translation students' attitude towards teamwork skills in subtitling training classroom. *Language Related Research*, 11(3), 95–119. <https://lrr.modares.ac.ir/article-14-27600-en.pdf>
- Rosyidah, R., Kharis, M., & Afifah, L. (2017). Back-translation technique to assess the students' translation of literary text. *International journal of language and linguistics*, 5, 25-28. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20170501.14>
- Roy, M. (2009). Back Translation. Encyclopedia of business in today's world. SAGE, Inc.

- Sadeghi, K. (2011). Effects of note-taking training on reading comprehension and recall. *The Reading Matrix*, 11, 116–128. [http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/april\\_2011/rahmani\\_sadeghi.pdf](http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/april_2011/rahmani_sadeghi.pdf)
- Savasci, M., & Kaygisiz, S. (2019). One hand washes the other and both wash the face: Individuality versus collaboration in L2 writing. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 131–151. <http://dx.doi.org/10.32601/ejal.543789>
- Shirazifard, H., Abbasian, G. R., Mohseni, A., & Rashtchi, M. (2021). Implementation of task-based collaborative dialogues in EFL speaking classes: Focus on achievements and perceptions. *Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly*, 41(3), 155-195. [https://tesl.shirazu.ac.ir/article\\_6354\\_bgdc75d7eef4db5ab6633ccb22e0766e.pdf](https://tesl.shirazu.ac.ir/article_6354_bgdc75d7eef4db5ab6633ccb22e0766e.pdf)
- Storch, N., & Sato, M. (2020). Comparing the same task in ESL vs. EFL learning contexts: An activity theory perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 50-69. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ijal.12263>
- Tsai, Y. (2020). Collaborating in a flipped translation classroom: The student perception. *T&I Review*, 10(2), 49-73. [http://cms.ewha.ac.kr/user/eritseng/download/review\\_10\\_2/3.pdf](http://cms.ewha.ac.kr/user/eritseng/download/review_10_2/3.pdf)
- Vlachopoulos, D., & Makri, A. (2019). Online communication and interaction in distance higher education: A framework study of good practice. *International Review of Education*, 65(4), 605-632. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11159-019-09792-3>.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press. <http://ouleft.org/wp-content/uploads/Vygotsky-Mind-in-Society.pdf>
- Wu, H. J. (2015). *The Effects of Blog-supported Collaborative Writing on Writing Performance, Writing Anxiety and Perceptions of EFL College Students in Taiwan*. (PhD Dissertation). University of Florida: South Florida. <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6805&context=etd>
- Yanti, M., Syarif, H., & Hamzah. (2020). The effect of back-translation on students' translation achievement. *Advances in social science, education and humanities research*, 405, 101-106. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200217.021>
- Zhang, Y., & Gao, C. (2014). Back translating: an integrated approach to focus learners' attention on their L2 knowledge gaps. *English teaching forum*, 1, 30-35. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1029177.pdf>
- Zwischenberger, C. (2022). Online collaborative translation: its ethical, social, and conceptual conditions and consequences. *Perspectives*, 30(1), 1-18. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0907676X.2021.1872662>