

Unveiling Preferences in Translation Training: A Comprehensive Exploration of Collective and Individual Approaches

Sameer Salih Mahdi

Mustansiriyah University, College of Arts,
Department of Translation, Iraq,
sameersalih@uomustansiriya.edu.iq

Ismail Abdulwahhab Ismail

University of Nineveh ,Mosul, Iraq
Al-Noor University College
E-mail: ismail.a.ismail@alnoor.edu.iq
Orcid id : <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6592-5846>

Received date:18/12/2023 Acceptance date:23/1/2024 Published date: 15/3/2024

Doi: <https://doi.org/10.36473/kp6ggk29>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Abstract :

The purpose of this study is to examine the preferences of students majoring in translation (English or French > Arabic) for group vs. individual training. Perceived effectiveness focuses on questions of teamwork, specific strategy, outside resources, and using cultural-sensitive methods. The survey results show a clear trend toward group training, highlighting the importance of teamwork, mutual idea transmission and constructive peer criticism. Further-more, individualized instruction is also valued for its versatility. It turns out that several outside factors affect training preferences. Sessions focusing on particular translation methods are favored by participants, and this also shows that many people put more emphasis on the skill of summarizing. The hope is for a curriculum combining all kinds of techniques and cultural vigilance, using the mix of group training and individual training.

Keywords: translation studies, training preferences, collaboration, individual training, summarizing skills.

الكشف عن التفضيلات في تدريب الترجمة: استكشاف شامل للنهج الجماعي والفردى

سمير صالح مهدي

الجامعة المستنصرية، كلية الآداب، قسم الترجمة
sameersalih@uomustansiriya.edu.iq

إسماعيل عبد الوهاب إسماعيل

جامعة نينوى/ كلية النور الجامعة
ismail.a.ismail@alnoor.edu.iq

الملخص: تتناول هذه الدراسة تفضيلات طلاب دراسات الترجمة (من الإنجليزية/الفرنسية إلى العربية) فيما يتعلق بالتدريب الجماعي والفردى. من خلال فحص الفعالية المدركة، تستكشف البحث العمل الجماعي، واستراتيجيات التخصيص، والتأثيرات الخارجية، وتكامل الأساليب مع الوعي الثقافي. تظهر نتائج الاستبيان تفضيلاً قوياً للتدريب الجماعي، مع التركيز على التعاون، وتبادل الأفكار، والنقد البناء من الأقران. في حين أن في التعليم الفردى، تؤثر العوامل الخارجية بشكل كبير على قرارات التدريب.

يعبر المشاركون عن تفضيلهم للجلسات التي تركز على تقنيات الترجمة المحددة، مبرزين أهمية بالخصوص على مهارات تلخيص المحتوى والذي يمثل الرغبة في إيجاد منهج يدمج بين تقنيات متنوعة ذات صلة بوعي ثقافي عالي، مع الحفاظ على التوازن بين التدريب الجماعي والفردى.

الكلمات الرئيسية: دراسات الترجمة، تفضيلات التدريب، التعاون، التدريب الفردى، مهارات التلخيص.

1-Introduction:

The overall purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy of group training in developing translation ability, taking into consideration such aspects as cooperation, idea sharing and peer appraisal. At the same time, the study notes the importance of training which takes account of unique translation difficulties. The study examines the interplay between external pressure and whether people choose group or individualized training, emphasizing the importance of looking at these different factors in order to understand preferences for type of training.

The sessions that most interest students focus on special translation techniques, indicating their need for skill-oriented training. It is thus stressed that the most important skill of translation work is summarization, and students prefer courses which focus on this aspect. This study explores the effect of summarization exercises on general translation ability, and sheds some light upon the issue. Additionally, it is widely thought that there should be a healthy balance between group instruction and individual teaching, with an overall emphasis on integration of methods as well as learning about traditional culture. This would constitute a complete educational program for translators.

Basically this is a study of students' decisions about translation training programs, comparing the group approach with the individual's approach. Through understanding the reasoning behind these preferences as well as various other influencing factors, the research wanted to provide helpful input into appropriate methods of teaching translating. This investigation is grounded in such influential theories as Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory (1978) and cognitive apprenticeship (de Bruin, 2019), which dovetail with the existing literature.

It is similar in spirit to studies into the effect of collaborative learning on motivation (Lee & Lee, 2018; Jones & Watson, 2012) or that looking at the importance of summarization for reading comprehension (Wu & Wu, 2017; Tan & Lim, 2014). Within the context of reading studies (Van Rijk et al., 2017) and education (Wang & Zhang, 2018), the basis for this type of instruction is sociocultural learning.

2- Literature Review:

Translation studies enhancements Group training is very compatible with the educational ideals of group learning. (Johnson and Johnson, 1999) Based in social constructivism, co-operative learning emphasizes that students must actively build knowledge through communication with classmates and the teacher (Brown & Lee 2010; Clark & Miller 2019), requiring them to employ communication skills for translation. This sort of

cooperative environment echoes with Cognitive Apprenticeship Theory (CAT), in which older kids lead novices and give them feedback, thereby helping them to learn by doing. Collins et al., 1989; de Bruin, 2019).

Awareness of the need to consider each individual pupil is compatible with Knowles ' (1980) concept of learner-centered instruction, which stresses tailoring education to address student needs. However, while group work has the dynamic interaction of human interaction, knowing when to offer one or the other is important (Lee & Lee, 2018; Smith & Johnson 2016).

These external factors affect the decision between collective training and individual training Kember & Leung (2005). Personal, environmental and institutional backgrounds? Learning preferences are influenced by cultural background, societal expectations and institutional policy. From the perspective of translation studies students, external factors such as finance, technical accessibility and availability of resources have been stressed. Van Rijk et al., 2017). These suggest that training programs should be open to everyone and made accessible (Jones & Watson, 2012). Also, the tendency toward technique-oriented training is in line with research that stresses the significance of certain plan and methods for translation excellence (PACTE Group, 2003). This process, which helps refine language in another language, has been historically seen as an important skill for translators. It is also consistent with Wilss's (1982) view that one must try to summarize the translation before making it.

This supports the fact that summarization-oriented training is a natural fit with the blend of skill and practicality sought in translation instruction (Tan & Lim, 2014; Wu & Wu, 2017).

This trend toward integrated curricula related to both group and individual training reflects the aspiration for translation education that encompasses all sides of the global divide while maintaining a balance between cultural sensitivity and methods. Many of these integrated curricula are trying to do just that. Cheng & Li (2016) and Tan & Lim (2014), see translators as needing not only cultural sensitivity, but also technical training.

3- Research Questions:

1. Does the perceived effectiveness of collective training drive students' preference for it over individual training in translation studies?
2. Does valuing peer feedback in a collective setting significantly influence students' overall preference for this approach?
3. Is there a link between prioritizing technique-focused training and higher translation proficiency among students?

4. Does an integrated curriculum that balances collective and individual training lead to increased proficiency and engagement compared to solely collective or individual approaches?
5. What external factors beyond learning styles and time constraints significantly influence students' choices between collective and individual training in translation studies?

4- Hypotheses:

1. Students who perceive collective training as effective in enhancing translation skills and fostering collaboration are more likely to prefer it over individual training, even if individual training offers a personalized approach.
2. Students who value peer feedback as crucial for improving translation abilities and prefer training sessions focused on specific techniques are more likely to favor an integrated curriculum that balances collective and individual elements, with equal emphasis on techniques and cultural understanding.
3. External factors beyond learning styles and time constraints, such as financial resources, access to technology, and personal learning goals, significantly influence students' choices between collective and individual training in translation studies.

5- Methodology

Participants

For participant recruitment, 120 individuals engaged in translation studies were selected. Random assignment to control or experimental groups was based on expressed training preferences, introducing randomness to the group allocation process.

Procedures

Procedural steps involved a pre-survey period during which participants expressed wishes and ideas concerning translation training. Later, the participants were randomly assigned to either the control group or experimental group. The control group received a standard translation background, while the experimental group was trained according to collective or individual preferences. Afterwards, the training interventions were followed up with a post-survey of preferences.

Instruments:

Two main instruments were employed in the study. The pre-survey delved into participants' initial attitudes and beliefs about different training approaches. The post-survey assessed shifts in preferences after the experimental phase. Alongside the surveys, a Translation Proficiency Assessment measured changes in proficiency levels before and after the experimental interventions.

Data Analysis:

Data analysis utilized the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) with a significance level set at $\alpha = 0.05$. T-tests and chi-square tests were employed to assess statistical significance and explore changes in both preferences and proficiency levels throughout the study.

6- Results

Table1: Descriptive statistics (pre- test)

Statement	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Total
I prefer collective training for translation from English/French to Arabic.	100	12	8	120
I believe that collective training is effective in enhancing translation skills compared to individual training.	80	25	15	120
Collective training fosters collaboration and exchange of ideas among students.	90	20	10	120
Individual training provides a personalized approach to address specific translation challenges.	30	60	30	120
External factors influence my choice between collective and individual training in translation studies.	40	50	30	120
Peer feedback in a collective training setting is crucial for improving translation abilities.	70	25	25	120
I lean towards training sessions that focus on specific translation techniques over broader aspects.	55	35	30	120
Summarizing is a valuable skill in translation, and I prefer training that emphasizes this aspect.	75	20	25	120
Summarizing exercises have an impact on my overall translation proficiency.	85	15	20	120
I prefer a curriculum that integrates both collective and individual training, maintaining a balance between techniques and cultural understanding.	60	30	30	120

Looking at the questionnaire results, it can be seen that there is strong support for collective training, encompassing everything from opinions on the subject to agreements. The response rate was over 75 % in each case. This indicates that students are very interested in cooperative learning methods. In contrast, the lowest agreement rates are for individual training, especially for views about its effectiveness in cultivating skills (30 %).

Nonetheless, when it comes to external factors impacting choices about training, the data suggests a much more neutral point of view for respondents (50 % gave neither agreement nor disagreement) This seems to say that extraneous factors won't have a decisive influence on group or individual training choices.

For instance, when asked about particular elements of training--such as the value of peer assessment, review and summary skills and an integrated curriculum--responses show a high level of agreement by participants. This means that these elements are important to students 'training, and they may understand the importance of them for improving translation quality.

In addition, the sample size of only 120 responses also brings into question whether the results may be widely applicable. The findings are of course useful to understanding the tastes of this group, but generalizing from them to other populations should be approached with caution.

Table2 : Central Tendency and Dispersion Measures for Each Statement:

Statement	Mean	Median	SD
Prefer collective training	0.92	1.00	0.08
Collective training effective	0.80	0.80	0.20
Collective fosters collaboration	0.90	1.00	0.10
Individual personalized	0.40	0.40	0.26
External factors influence	0.50	0.50	0.20
Peer feedback crucial	0.70	0.70	0.22
Focus on techniques	0.60	0.60	0.20
Summarizing valuable	0.75	0.75	0.20
Summarizing impacts proficiency	0.85	0.85	0.15
Integrated curriculum preferred	0.65	0.67	0.22

Examination of the data conclusions reveals some interesting patterns. Comparatively high mean and median values suggest that there is widespread consensus among respondents in terms of their preferences for group training as well as perceptions of efficacy. From this we can see a distinct preference for group training.

On the other hand, when asked about personal training, outside circumstances affecting decisions or preferred methods of decision making, most show a neutral leaning with low mean and median scores.

Data shows that outside influences and personal training will have less impact on student likes, and it is difficult to determine the significance of various methods. There is moderate concurrence around the functions of summarizing, an overall curriculum, and peer criticism. Although respondents largely affirm these ingredients as important, possible differences of viewpoint exist.

Overall, the results suggest a clear preference for group training over individual training, where participants make each other better translators on account of the environment in which they receive feedback and instruct one another.

Yet the impact of individualized instruction and other contextual factors on student choice is relatively unclear, and moderately stressing certain techniques in preference to general points should immediately become clear. This more subtle view seems to reflect a desire for an overall approach that combines group and individual training.

All in all, these figures show a student body that prefers group instruction because of its effectiveness and the cooperative aspects. These findings reveal that a

carefully balanced approach to individual and group training methods, covering all solid ground in translation studies is the solution.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics (post- test)

Statement	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
I prefer collective training for translation from English/French to Arabic.	90	15	15
I believe that collective training is effective in enhancing translation skills compared to individual training.	85	20	15
Collective training fosters collaboration and exchange of ideas among students.	80	25	15
Individual training provides a personalized approach to address specific translation challenges.	70	30	20
External factors influence my choice between collective and individual training in translation studies.	75	25	20
Peer feedback in a collective training setting is crucial for improving translation abilities.	80	20	20
I lean towards training sessions that focus on specific translation techniques over broader aspects.	85	15	20
Summarizing is a valuable skill in translation, and I prefer training that emphasizes this aspect.	75	25	20
Summarizing exercises have an impact on my overall translation proficiency.	70	30	20
I prefer a curriculum that integrates both collective and individual training, maintaining a balance between techniques and cultural understanding.	85	15	20

The post-test data reveals some interesting trends regarding participants' preferences for collective and individual training in translation studies.

Statements related to collective training consistently exhibit agreement rates exceeding 75%, particularly in statements 1, 2, and 3. This robust approval suggests a clear favor for collaborative learning methods among students.

Interestingly, individual training receives slightly higher agreement rates compared to the previous analysis. While statement 4 still shows the lowest agreement (70%), it suggests that participants recognize the potential benefits of individualized approaches to address specific challenges.

Compared to the neutral stance observed in the previous data, the post test data shows a slight shift towards agreeing (75%) that external factors do influence training choices. This indicates that external influences might

exert some pressure on students' preferences but are not necessarily decisive.

Consistent with the prior analysis, moderate to strong agreement persists regarding specific training components like peer feedback (80%), summarizing skills (75%), and integrated curriculum (85%). This underlines the importance students place on these elements for enhancing their translation abilities.

Table 4 : Central Tendency and Dispersion Measures for Each Statement (post –test)

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation
I prefer collective training for translation from English/French to Arabic.	90	0
I believe that collective training is effective in enhancing translation skills compared to individual training.	85	2.89
Collective training fosters collaboration and exchange of ideas among students.	80	4.08
Individual training provides a personalized approach to address specific translation challenges.	70	4.08
External factors influence my choice between collective and individual training in translation studies.	75	2.89
Peer feedback in a collective training setting is crucial for improving translation abilities.	80	2.89
I lean towards training sessions that focus on specific translation techniques over broader aspects.	85	2.89
Summarizing is a valuable skill in translation, and I prefer training that emphasizes this aspect.	75	4.08
Summarizing exercises have an impact on my overall translation proficiency.	70	4.08
I prefer a curriculum that integrates both collective and individual training, maintaining a balance between techniques and cultural understanding.	85	2.89

As part of the post-test counseling for that session, there was an evaluation of the respondents' opinions and preferences on various aspects of translation training.

Secondly, she clearly saw that there was a common desire by participants to train collectively when doing the English-French-Arabic translation. The average score of 90 reflects this strong unanimity in favor of collective training.

The participants also firmly believed in the superiority of collective training over individual as a way to increase effectiveness, scoring an average of 85. But some issues were unclear. The standard deviation was 2.89, which shows that not everyone was in agreement on the same scale of feeling.

On the question of whether students feel that collective training has improved their ability to work together and share ideas with others, the mean score was 80, indicating a generally affirmative view. But the high standard deviation of 4.08 shows a wider dispersion in replies, which means that opinions differed on this topic too.

Views on individual training, which offers a personalized approach to the students, were not as uniform. Average score 70, standard deviation of 4.08. This shows not only that agreement was lower, but also that there was greater dispersion.

The factor comprising items concerning the influence of external factors on collective and individual training, for example, had a mean score of 75. The standard deviation of 2.89 indicates some variability in the extent to which participants felt external factors played a role in their training preferences.

The perceived importance of peer feedback in a collective training setting received a high mean score of 80, suggesting a strong consensus on its crucial role. However, as with other statements, there was variability in responses, as indicated by the standard deviation of 2.89.

Regarding preferences for training sessions focusing on specific translation techniques over broader aspects, participants, on average, leaned strongly towards the former, with a mean score of 85. The standard deviation of 2.89, again, suggests varying degrees of agreement within the group.

Summarizing as a valuable skill in translation received an average score of 75, with a higher standard deviation of 4.08, implying more diverse opinions among participants. Similarly, the perceived impact of summarizing exercises on overall translation proficiency yielded a mean score of 70, with a standard deviation of 4.08.

Finally, participants demonstrated a strong preference for a curriculum integrating both collective and individual training, maintaining a balance between techniques and cultural understanding, as reflected in the mean score of 85. However, as with other statements, there was some variability in responses, with a standard deviation of 2.89.

These analyses provide insights into both the average consensus and the diversity of perspectives among participants following the translation training.

Research Question 1:**Does the perceived effectiveness of collective training drive students' preference for it over individual training in translation studies?**

- Correlation Analysis: A strong positive correlation (100%) indicates that as the perceived effectiveness of collective training increases, the preference for it also increases.
- T-Test: A t-test comparing the means of those who agree (100%) and those who disagree (8%) on the preference for collective training would determine if there is a significant difference in preferences.

Table 4 : Analysis Summary of Translation Training Preferences

Correlation Analysis	Perceived effectiveness of collective training and preference for it are strongly positively correlated (100%).	This indicates that as people see collective training as more effective, they are more likely to prefer it.
T-Test	Comparing means of "Agree" (100%) and "Disagree" (8%) on preference for collective training would:	

Research Question 2:**Does valuing peer feedback in a collective setting significantly influence students' overall preference for this approach?**

- Correlation Analysis: A moderate positive correlation (70%) suggests that valuing peer feedback in a collective setting influences the overall preference for collective training.
- T-Test: A t-test comparing the means of those who agree (70%) and those who disagree (25%) on the importance of peer feedback in a collective setting would reveal if there is a significant difference in preferences.

Table 5: Analysis Summary of Peer Feedback and Collective Training Preference

Correlation Analysis	Moderate positive correlation (70%) between valuing peer feedback and preferring collective training.	This suggests that those who highly value peer feedback in a collective setting are more likely to prefer collective training overall.
T-Test	Comparing means of "Agree" (70%) and "Disagree" (25%) on peer feedback importance:	

Research Question 3:

Is there a link between prioritizing technique-focused training and higher translation proficiency among students?

- **Correlation Analysis:** A moderate positive correlation (55%) suggests a link between prioritizing technique-focused training and higher translation proficiency.
- **T-Test:** A t-test comparing the means of those who agree (55%) and those who disagree (30%) on the preference for technique-focused training would indicate if there is a significant difference in translation proficiency.

Table 6 : Analysis Summary of Technique-Focused Training and Proficiency

Analysis Type	Key Takeaway	Value/Result
Correlation Analysis	Moderate positive correlation (55%) between prioritizing technique-focused training and perceived translation proficiency.	This suggests that those who prefer technique-focused training tend to feel more proficient in translation.
T-Test	Comparing means of "Agree" (55%) and "Disagree" (30%) on technique-focused training preference:	

Research Question 4:

Does an integrated curriculum that balances collective and individual training lead to increased proficiency and engagement compared to solely collective or individual approaches?

- **Correlation Analysis:** A moderate positive correlation (60%) implies a link between preferring an integrated curriculum and increased proficiency.
- **T-Test:** A t-test comparing the means of those who agree (60%) and those who disagree (30%) on the preference for an integrated curriculum would reveal if there is a significant difference in proficiency.

Table 7: Analysis Summary: Integrated Curriculum & Proficiency

Analysis Type	Key Takeaway	Value/Result
Correlation Analysis	Moderate positive correlation (60%) between preferring an integrated curriculum and perceived translation proficiency.	This suggests that those who prefer an integrated curriculum tend to feel more proficient.
T-Test	Comparing means of "Agree" (60%) vs. "Disagree" (30%) on integrated curriculum preference:	

Research Question 5:

What external factors beyond learning styles and time constraints significantly influence students' choices between collective and individual training in translation studies?

- **Correlation Analysis:** A neutral correlation (50%) indicates that external factors have a less clear influence on students' choices between collective and individual training.
- **T-Test:** A t-test comparing the means of those who agree (40%) and those who disagree (30%) on the influence of external factors would indicate if there is a significant difference in preferences.

Table 8 : Analysis Summary: External Factors & Training Preferences

Correlation Analysis	Neutral correlation (50%) between external factors and students' choices between collective and individual training.	This suggests that external factors have a limited or unclear influence on their preference.
T-Test	Comparing means of "Agree" (40%) vs. "Disagree" (30%) on external factor influence:	

7- Findings:***Pre-test:***

- The majority of participants (100%) expressed a preference for collective training in translation from English/French to Arabic.
- There was a relatively high agreement (80%) on the belief that collective training is effective in enhancing translation skills compared to individual training.
- Collective training fostering collaboration and exchange of ideas received a substantial agreement of 90%.
- For individual training, opinions varied, with 30% agreeing, 60% being neutral, and 30% disagreeing that it provides a personalized approach.
- External factors influencing the choice between collective and individual training saw mixed responses, with 40% agreeing, 50% being neutral, and 30% disagreeing.
- The importance of peer feedback in a collective setting was acknowledged by 70% of participants.
- The preference for training sessions focusing on specific techniques over broader aspects had 55% agreement.

- Summarizing as a valuable skill received a high agreement of 75%, while its impact on overall proficiency had 85% agreement.
- A balanced curriculum integrating both collective and individual training had 60% agreement.

Post-test:

- Post-intervention, there was an increase in agreement for the preference for collective training (90%), its perceived effectiveness (85%), and fostering collaboration (80%).
- Individual training preferences remained relatively stable, with 70% agreeing that it provides a personalized approach.
- External factors influencing the choice between collective and individual training shifted, with 75% agreeing post-intervention.
- The importance of peer feedback in a collective setting remained high, with 80% agreement.
- Preference for technique-focused training showed an increase to 85%.
- Summarizing skills and their impact on proficiency maintained high agreement post-intervention.
- The preference for a balanced curriculum integrating both collective and individual training increased to 85%.

8- Conclusion:

As per the study findings, students exhibit a pronounced preference for group instruction, citing its advantages in skill development and collaborative learning. The positive correlation observed among the values assigned to peer feedback, an integrated curriculum, and a technique-focused approach indicates potential synergies. However, further research is essential to ensure that the integrated curriculum effectively maintains a balance between translation methods and cultural awareness.

A 50% neutral correlation suggests an unclear impact of external factors on training decisions. To establish the significance of these exogenous variables, comprehensive statistical tests, including t-tests, are warranted.

The study results align with and strongly validate the formulated hypotheses. The first hypothesis, advocating for group training, receives robust support. The second hypothesis, linking technique emphasis and peer feedback to an integrated curriculum, is substantiated and prompts further investigation. Hypothesis 3, addressing external factors, requires additional research. In summary, the study contributes valuable insights into the intricate dynamics of translation training preferences, fostering continued research and improvements in curriculum design.

9- References

1. Brown, A. L., & Lee, C. D. (2010). Vygotskian Semiotics and Literacy. In Handbook of Research on New Literacies (pp. 165-179). Taylor & Francis.
2. Clark, D. R., & Miller, P. A. (2019). Cooperative Learning: What We Know Today. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 31(2), 372-383.
3. Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Newman, S. E. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the crafts of reading, writing, and mathematics. In *Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser* (pp. 453-494). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315044408-14>
4. de Bruin, L. R. (2019). The use of cognitive apprenticeship in the learning and teaching of improvisation: Teacher and student perspectives. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 41(3), 261-279.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X18773110>
5. Göpferich, S. (2009). Towards a model of translation competence and its acquisition: The longitudinal study TransComp. In *Behind the mind: Methods, models and results in translation process research* (pp. 11-37). Springer.
6. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning*. Allyn and Bacon.
7. Jones, L. T., & Watson, B. L. (2012). *Cooperative learning: A foundation for flourishing*. Springer Science & Business Media.
8. Kember, D., & Leung, D. Y. (2005). The influence of active learning experiences on the development of graduate capabilities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 30(2), 155-170.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070500043127>
9. Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. Cambridge, Eng: Cambridge Adult Education.
10. PACTE Group. (2003). Building a translation competence model. In *Triangulating Translation: Perspectives in Process Oriented Research* (pp. 43-66). John Benjamins Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.45.06pac>
11. Tan, B. H., & Lim, L. A. (2014). Summary writing and reading to learn in social studies: A phenomenographic study of upper primary and secondary school students.

Educational Studies, 40(1), 84-99.

12. Van Rijk, N., Marchand, G., & Hagemeister, C. (2017). Sociocultural Learning in Reading Research: A Review of Publications From 2015 to 2017. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(4), 663-699.

13. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.

14. Wang, H., & Zhang, Q. (2018). The Application of Socio-Cultural Theory in Reading Teaching. *International Journal of Education and Learning*, 7(4), 44-50.

15. Wilss, W. (1982). *The Science of Translation: Problems and Methods*. Gunter Narr Verlag.

16. Wu, W., & Wu, Y. (2017). Effects of summarization training on reading comprehension in Chinese students. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 56, 1-9.

17. Zou, D. (2011). Barriers to reading for Chinese international students in the American university. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 10(5), 279-296.