Online vs. Traditional Teaching Methods of Translation

Lect. Dr. Samah Mahmood Al-Ramli
Asst. Lect. Mahmood Ahmed Mahmood Al-Huraithi
Department of Translation/ College of Arts/ University of Mosul-Iraq
Phone No. 07740853638

الاساليب الالكترونية ازاء الأساليب التقليدية في تدريس الترجمة

م.د. سماح محمود الرملي
م.م.محمود احمد محمودالحريثي
جامعة الموصل/ كلية الاداب/ قسم الترجمة
رقم الهاتف: ٠٧٧٤٠٨٥٣٦٣٨

Abstract

The present work targets examining the effect of the e-learning ways of teaching translation from English into Arabic and vice versa. The sample of this study comprises (50) professors of translation who have shown their perspectives, in a questionnaire of (20) multiple choice questions, towards this way of teaching translation and its consequences on the translation trainees. The results show that the majority of the translation instructors, from various universities in Iraq and abroad, favour the traditional ways of teaching translation.

The research also reveals the statistical differences, via a questionnaire, existing between both the traditional and electronic teaching and learning methods. In this research, there will be, first, a survey of e-learning strategies with regard to translation, then a comparison between the e-methods and the traditional methods of teaching and learning translation, about which method is approved, is made. Finally, a questionnaire is conducted to some translation

instructors in Iraq and abroad who showed their disapproval of the e-methods in favour of the traditional ones. In this research, adopting the electronic translation teaching methods, despite their advantages, has been proved to be a method undergoing certain flaws and gaps that hampers and hinders the translation process.

Keywords: Electronic translation teaching methods, traditional translation teaching methods, advantages of e-learning and teaching, disadvantages of e-learning and teaching.

المستخلص

يعد مفهوم التعليم الالكتروني من المفاهيم السائدة في مختلف مجالات الدراسة و قد اصبح في الوقت الراهن محط اهتمام بالغ نظرا لتفشي فايروس كورونا منذ عام ٢٠١٩ و المفهوم معتمد أيضا في مجالات أخرى من التعليم كالتدريب المشترك و كذلك في التطوير الذاتي.

يهدف البحث الى الوقوف على تاثير الأساليب الالكترونية في تدريس و تعلم الترجمة من الإنجليزية الى العربية و بالعكس. و يبحث أيضا في محاسن و مساوئ هذه الأساليب التي تلقي بظلالها على عملية الترجمة ككل. تتالف عينة هذه الدراسة من (٥٠) تدريسي مختص في مجال تدريس الترجمة و الذين عبروا عن آرائهم في استطلاع مؤلف من (٢٠) سؤال يحتوي كل منها على عدد من الخيارات بخصوص هذا النوع من الطرائق في تدريس الترجمة و عواقب ذلك على متعلمي الترجمة. و تشير النتائج الى ان غالبية مدرسي الترجمة، و هم من عدة جامعات عراقية فضلا عن آخرين من جامعات خارج البلد، يفضلون الأساليب التقليدية الحضورية في تدريس الترجمة.

كما تكشف الدراسة عن وجود اختلافات احصائية بين الأساليب الالكترونية في تدريس الترجمة و نظيرتها التقليدية. و في مستهل البحث هنالك عرض عام للتعليم الالكتروني المتعلق بالترجمة، ثم مقارنة أساليب تعلم و تدريس الترجمة الكترونيا و حضوريا. و يختتم البحث اعماله باستطلاع تبين فيه ان غالبية تدريسي الترجمة سواء من هم داخل البلد و خارجه المجيبين على الاستطلاع يعزفون عن اعتماد الأساليب الالكترونية لمصلحة الأساليب الحضورية التقليدية. و

لقد أُثبت عمليا ان استخدام الأساليب الالكترونية ، على الرغم من محاسنها، من شانه تثبيط و عرقلة عملية الترجمة لما تعاني منه هذه الأساليب من نقوصات و ثغرات.

1. Introduction

In general, some argue that using e-learning in teaching translation permits learners to have a better understanding of the translation material.

Many are familiar the kind of learning known as classroom-based learning, that is, face-to-face learning monitored by an instructor. In the e-learning context, however, Jara and Mellar (2007) believe that learners can be in contact with one another via network technologies and their instructors. This would also enable them to interact with other learners elsewhere at different times. They (ibid) maintain that online learning, in particular, is a kind of enhancement factor regarding openness, cooperation, and the building of communities for both teachers and learners alike.

As for the international level, e-learning constitutes one of the most important issues of research in higher learning aspects (James 2008). E-learning is seen as the act of employing information and communication technologies towards creating learning experiences to be formulated, arranged, and established with a lot of freedom without any limits (Horton,

2006). It is viewed by (Paulsen, 2003) as a process whereby a collection of pedagogical lessons is supported by electronic devices such as the computer or any mobile device supporting learning.

2. The Evolution of E-Learning

Electronic learning, referred to as e-learning, is regarded as computer-aided learning, existing since the 1960s of the twentieth century. However, its usage and utilization has primarily begun after the spread of the internet among people; it is believed that the term is possibly originated in the 1980s (Moore, et al, 2011). Since its popularization until the present time, e-learning has advanced quickly as to the technology and the learning methods/devices used (Bezhovski & Poorani, 2016: 50). E-learning has progressed considerably from its traditional style (Tai, 2008); the tools are arranged to make the content easier and delivered simultaneously to the Web with increased integrated vital collaborations, towards a "more organic" future e-learning. Tai (ibid) sees that e-learning has been adopted in many fields of life such as technical expertise, professional capability, training compliance preparation, etc.

According to Kukulska-Hulme (2005), the advancement in mobile technology has brought about a new stage in learning called "e-learning". Mobile learning, in a nut shell, is the

portable platform whereby learners can be engaged in any learning activity without having any sort of constraints. Devices such as mobile phones, smartphones and laptops are helpful in this respect.

3. Definition

E-learning means employment of technologies related to information and communication to permit access to online translation pedagogy.

E-learning, or what is called electronic learning, is illustrated in various ways. Generally speaking, E-learning is the notion widely employed to express the instructional account or learning know-how released via electronic facilities (Wagner, Hassanein & Head 2008).

For Steeples et al (2002), the expression e-learning holds an extensive range of applications and operations, such as learning based on the computer, online classrooms, and digital cooperation. It (ibid) maintains delivering content through a variety of means such as the Internet, intranet/extranet (LAN/WAN), audio- and videotape satellite.

According to Abbad et al (2009), e-learning, in its general sense, is any kind of learning which is enabled digitally. They (ibid) further limit this sense even to refer to the kind of learning that is generated by using electronic technologies.

Such illustration is ever restricted by other scholars as that sort of learning which is enabled online (Keller and Cernerud, 2002).

Some researchers, furthermore, argue that it is an up-t-date methodology (Jennex, 2005; Twigg,2002) enabling a workforce with the help of the knowledge and capabilities required to convert turning into advantage (Jennex, 2005). For example, Twigg (2002), views that the e-learning process is learner-centered in addition to its outlook as holding a system which is said to be interactive, self-paced, and adjusted. Welsh et al. (2003), on their part, mention that the term refers to using computer network technologies, namely via the internet, to offer information as well as instructions to people.

As for Liaw and Huang (2003), they define e-learning depending on the number of its features; in the first place, they suggest a multimedia context. Then, they (ibid.) merge some sorts of information. In the third place, e-learning systems enhance cooperative communication, so that users can have complete control on their learning situations. In the fourth place, e-learning enhances networks for information access. Finally, e-learning permits the systems to be initiated easily on different sorts of computers.

4. Advantages and Disadvantages of E-Learning

Scholars differ in their views concerning the advantages and disadvantages of e-learning and teaching translation methods; some believe that such methods are beneficial for the translation process, however, the majority argues that the resulting troubles and problems arising from the reliance on these methods in translation teaching and learning urge instructors and learners alike to neglect these methods in favor of the traditional methods of teaching translation.

The following is an overview of the most prominent merits and demerits of the e-learning and teaching translation methods:

4.1   Advantages

According to Pym (2014), some of the advantages of e-learning are:

1-time for grasping content and responding,

2- supported communication among learners,

3- knowledge being received and spread among the learners,

4- the capability to administrate a free discussion,

5- easier access to information and discussion ability, &

6- answers can be obtained at any time without any restrictions and greater motivation and engagement in the activity on the part of the learners.

In their study, Welsh et al. (2003) believe that companies may get countless benefits out of conducting e-learning programmes, such as training consistency and learning, time saving, improved tracking abilities, besides low costs.

Hjeltnes et al.(2004) mention some of the merits of e- learning of such as cost efficiency as well as cost effectiveness, permanent education and smoothness of learning, less geographical barriers and more control and administration.

In the course of a study by González (2010), it is argued that a discovery of four qualitatively various methods of grasping e-learning has been made: (1) providing students with information; (2) enabling sporadic communication between contributors; (3) making trainees engaged in online interaction as well as discussions; and finally (4) enhancing knowledge-building missions.

A number of education instructors have noticed that courses via the net are much more interactive compared with the traditional courses (Mangan, 2001; Rosenbaum, 2001). The explanation these researchers have provided is that such kind of education has paved the way for slow learners especially

those who are in need of much more response time to take part (Smith, 2001).

4.2 Disadvantages

The major noticeable condemnation of e-learning is the total absence of vital interaction between participants, not only learners and instructors, but among colleague learners as well (Young, 1997; Burdman, 1998). The drawbacks of e-learning presented by researchers may be the following:

1. It is a style of education that force the learners, in the translation domain, pass through mediation, isolation, in addition to lack of interaction or relations. E-learning, for this reason, demands a very strong and tiring inspiration besides skills related to management and exploitation of time to decrease such negative impacts.

2. As to clarifications, in addition to illustrations, the e-learning process could be less active than the common method of teaching and learning. The teaching-learning process is definitely very much smoother with the help of the face-to-face encounters and interactions with instructors.

3. Concerning improvement and follow-up in the communication skills of translation trainees, e-learning, as a means, could have some unfavorable effects. The translation learners, though could possess considerable experience in

academics, might not have the required skills to communicate their knowledge to other participants.

4. As for tests and e-learning assessments, they are probably conducted with the use of proxy, which is difficult, if not impossible to control bad behaviour such as cheating during exams.

5. E-learning can be misguided to piracy and plagiarism, predisposed by inadequate

selection skills, besides the ease of copying and pasting.

6. Another issue is that not all fields or disciplines can use the e-learning technique in education. For example, the purely scientific specializations that require practice cannot be properly studied through e-learning. (Collins et al. 1997; Klein and Ware, 2003; Hameed et al, 2008; Scott et al. 1999; Marc, 2002)

Oppenheimer (1997), Kraut et al., (1998) are doubtful of the merits of computer and online learning when compared to traditional classroom learning methodologies. Concerning the former methodology, they believe it does not aid trainees to think and hampers their creative thinking.

Phipps and Merisotis (1999) argue that although e-learning enjoys several merits, the drawback measures are very high if compared against traditional classroom learning methods.

Addressing the numerous issues students encounter in online e-learning, Larsen et al., noticed that online students cannot satisfy their academic requirements, concerns, and further aspects of education related to pedagogy. Added to that (ibid) is the fact that those people who enjoy delivering to receiving face-to-face lectures see it is more difficult with the online learning process.

Some scholars, as Hildebrandt and Teschler (2006) go further to state that the "e" in e-learning doesn't turn the process of learning smoother, simpler, clearer, or more cost-active than conventional ways of learning.

Other disadvantages retailed by Ghaffari and Emami (2011) are that there is no face-to-face interaction between both the teacher on the one hand and the student on the other. They (ibid) elaborate that the online material is not as available as the traditional material; in certain conditions, considering that no laboratories are available for practicing besides there is no alternative for traditional laboratories in e-learning.

There is further the question of logistical problems encountered in e-learning. Learning on the Internet, for instance, demands more of the teacher's time to organize the lesson than is required in the case of traditional teaching. Other important aspects of e-learning ought to be taken into

consideration such as the question of trust, authorization, confidentiality, and individual responsibilities. Internet nowadays is a growing challenge namely because of public access to the world of network (Monika: 2013).

5. E-Learning and Translation

Today's understanding of the network helps finding up-to-date means in modeling translation processes in the environment of nowadays communications, experienced learners, interaction technologies for translation and translators in various fields of life. Nowadays, translation teaching and learning are not possible amongst a society of adept translators, which is available in the environment of communications smoothness, masterful collaborations and sites, interaction technologies for translation organizations and companies. (O'Hagan, 2011; Pérez-González & Susam-Saraeva, 2012). Such flows ought to be indulged in the learning and teaching domain for instructing translators in a professional setting. O'Hagan (2009) says that the Open Source (OS) movement, the increase in user-generated context, and globalization have considerably increased the demands for translation. In the same vein, various computer tools have evolved and opened the door for virtual collaboration and cooperation among participants.

In this regard, Collaborative Translation (CT) and virtual groupings via the Internet have been established. To get a clearer idea of the impact of e-Learning practices on translation, scholars have harmonized their viewpoints and methodologies. Laurillard (2002) leads a cognitive/constructivist approach to learning. He lays emphasis on the interaction and collaboration between the two parties-instructors and individual students. Laurillard (ibid) views that learning technologies may help them meet the necessities for academic learning in the context of the conversational framework. E-learning, however, involves awareness that electronic means are being used in teaching and translating at all levels; even in the case of face-to-face interaction courses, instructors and interlocutors contact with students using email, and materials are progressively made accessible on websites (Pym, 2014).

6. E-Learning Translation vs. Traditional Translation Learning Methods:

In translation pedagogy, (Kiraly, 2003; Pym, 2011) argue that there are debates and discussions taking place among instructors and learners concerning the teaching-learning methodologies and assessment schemes. The acquisition of translation know-how and competence, by contrast, needs a

subtle mixing of teaching, together with learning besides evaluation. This, mixing, integration (ibid) matches the notion of social constructivism that enhances learning enrollment plus learning independence.

Additionally, however, Pym, 1992, 2011), states that there is the question of self and reliability of evaluation and grading processes, particularly when instructors mark students' examination papers for translation competence is not easily judged just by using traditional examinations. Traditional judgment in translation classrooms, on the other hand, tests the main constituents in translation, as the students' knowledge and translation theory, translation skills and capability, in addition to the capacity to criticize a translation. Test tasks that are used differ from translating a whole text, translating parts of a text, or full sentences. Some of these tests need students to specify a better translated text or errors and provide clarifications. Others are in the form of multiple-choice questions. A formal evaluation of this kind in the conventional paradigm is widely used, yet has not been proved to be convincing among translation instructors (Johnson, 2003). Therefore, activities in the translation classroom ought to be integrated with the activities of teaching, learning and evaluation; besides, the nature of portfolios employment as a

part of the learning method and assessment plans can be another choice to solve these problems in the pedagogy of translation.

Previously conducted researches, in translation training, have specified two types of classroom activities that have to do with translation. Both Willigen-Sinemus (1988); and Stewart (2008), classify classroom translation according to the teaching methods used which includes two kinds of classrooms as follows:

a) Translation for the sake of language learning used according to Pym (1992: 73) "as a didactic means in foreign language teaching". It is termed as "school translation" (Gile, 1995, p.22) and as "pedagogical translation" (Stewart, 2008).

b) Translation for the sake of translation-learning. This kind of translation, which is called by Stewart (2008) as "professionally-oriented" translation or "vocational translation", is meant to prepare trainees for the translation market. (Willigen-Sinemus, 1988: 472) mentions that students in this type of translation classroom "already have a high standard of proficiency in target and source language.

The traditional translation classroom has been strongly criticized for being instructor-centered, uncreative, rigid, and old-fashioned (Kiraly, 1995, 2000; Colina, 2003). Knowledge

transmission shapes the traditional translation classroom. Traditional translation teaching and learning is limited to and exceedingly focuses on the accuracy and clarity of the translation outcome. Zhong (2002), emphasizes the profound implications of the teaching of translation.

E-learning, on the other hand, is seen as using electronic devices in training programmes, so, it is intended for the training of translators. The notion is closer to what is in other contests labelled as 'open and distance learning' (ODL). E-learning, on the other hand, involves knowing that electronic devices are employed in training at various stages. E-learning programmes may thus encompass both face-to-face and distance translation modes. (Pym, 2014).

7. Body Language in Translation Teaching

Body language is a very important factor in translation teaching. It facilitates the flow of transformation exchange between the instructor on the one hand and the students on the other. This can be better achieved in traditional classroom translation teaching than in e-learning ways of translation teaching.

Body language is illustrated in Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics (2006) as "expressive movements of the body" (p. 137). In the Longman Dictionary, it is expressed

as "the use of facial expressions, body movements, etc. to communicate meaning from one person to another" (p. 56).

It is one kind of non-verbal communication, that is, the transmission of a verbal act by means other than words or sounds, but with using different organs of our bodies. This type of language is created whether consciously or subconsciously to express ourselves clearly to the receiver. Body language includes several non-verbal

behavior such as eye contact, facial expressions, hand gestures, body movement, and others.

Body language has a considerable effect when it concerns understanding namely in FL classrooms. Accordingly, this kind of language has a lot of characteristics or forms. The features below are suggested in an article entitled "Learning to body language" in (2006) by the British council.

a- Eye Contact

Eye contact is of great importance, in turn, in the course of a conversation. The professor, with his eyes, selects who would talk after who. In addition, from students' eye contact the professor can notice who is interested in the topic in question and who is not and check whether or not they understand

because all people know that "The eye is the window to the soul".

b-Facial Expressions

These expressions are of the forms of non-verbal communication that could subconsciously express mood, attitude, understanding, confusion, etc. In a real classroom, these means might be employed to issue orders that deepen understanding in general.

c- Gestures

Gestures comprise nods of the head, movements of the hands, pointing. It is believed that successful narrators and speakers use hand movements to clarify subtly what they wish to convey. These gestures, if used vividly, aid students reinforce their comprehension all in all. Therefore, teachers should select adequate gestures and avoid confusing ones, for the objective is to communicate what is in the mind so to speak.

d-Proximity and Distance

Another type of body language is to keep a short or long distance between the professor and the student. The degree of control of the teacher can be noticed from the different positions in the classroom.

e-Postures

The different positions the body takes are called postures. Postures are also referred to as body movements. They convey varying degrees of respect as well as interest. So, whenever s/he introduces a new word, the teacher using his/her body can act it out for the learners to have a better understanding. For example, when the teacher says " jump", s/he could act the jumping process before the learners. Very often, learners, especially younger ones, are more observant of what the teacher acts than to what s/he utters.

From the discussion above, it can be noticed that there are close relationships between the movement of the body and learning, and in fact, many researchers and scholars stress on the indispensable role of body language in the process of translation teaching.

It can be easily noticed that all the aforementioned body language features and forms are true only for the traditional teaching and learning methods and do not apply to the electronic methods of teaching and learning.

8. The Practical Part

In the light of what has been introduced and surveyed, the practical part of this research includes the translation instructors' attitudes towards electronic and traditional

translation teaching methods and the related issues. This can be best illustrated by a questionnaire that encompasses lots of details related to the subject as a whole. The questionnaire includes twenty (20) questions, each of which includes a collection of choices to be selected by the (50) respondents. After the completion of the responses, the results are gathered, analyzed and ordered in a table showing the respondents' attitudes.

9. Data and Population

The questionnaire below is prepared to discover instructors' opinions and barriers, in an effort to describe what is going on rather than why something is happening to translation teaching and learning nowadays especially after the breakout of covid-19. Hence, this questionnaire consists of 20 items comprising the data of the study. As described by Robson (2002), it works best with standardized questions that you can be confident that all the questions will be interpreted the same way by all respondents (cited in Saunders, Levis and Thornhill, 2007). The questionnaire has been distributed to fifty (50) lecturers and professors of translation in various universities and they have been asked about their perspectives concerning the traditional and electronic methods of teaching translation.

The following is a detailed list of their affiliations:

Department	College	University	Country
Translation	College of Arts	Mosul	Iraq
English Language	College of Arts	Mosul	Iraq
Translation	College of Arts	Tikrit	Iraq
Translation	College of Arts	Al-Mutansirya	Iraq
English Language	College of Education	Tikrit	Iraq
Translation	College of Arts	Al-Basrah	Iraq
Translation	College of Arts	Al-Iraqia	Iraq
Translation	College of Arts	Trablis	Libya
Translation	College of Arts	Khalifa bin Hamad	Qatar
English Language	College of Al-Noor	Al-Noor	Iraq
English Language	College of Education	Al-Shirqaat	Iraq

The following questionnaire helps understanding the university environment regarding online translation teaching and traditional translation teaching methods with the help of the vision and opinions of the translation teaching staff.

The questionnaire, which is part of this paper, is a follow-up study which has started with the outburst of covid-19.

Thank you for your cooperation!

Questionnaire

1- Exams done in e-learning vs. Traditional exams:

In e-learning, exams lack reliability on the part of the student.

Traditional exams in the classroom are more authentic, more transparent and more convincing to the teacher.

E-learning encourages cheating.

Traditional exams encourage cheating.

Students prefer e-exams to real ones because instructor's monitoring is absent.

2- In your opinion, which are the barriers that hinder the teaching of translation during the courses of the last two years. Please tick all that apply.

Lack of knowledge about technology

Lack of economic incentives for teachers

Lack of appreciation of the effort

Lack of technical support staff

Lack of student engagement or motivation

Technical problems

Lack of strategies or leadership

3- In e-translation learning, the teacher may notice that some students are: (Please tick all that apply..)

Dissatisfied with the learning process.

Uncomfortable with the learning process.

Unconfident with the learning process.

Afraid that the teacher cannot distinguish between prominent students from less prominent ones.

4- Which of the following may hinder the flow of translation learning and teaching alike via electronic means: (Please tick all that apply..)

Cost of the internet

Access to the internet

Technical problems

Familiarity with using the software.

5- On which of the following statements about the online education development in your department do you agree? Strategies

There is a strategy for future online education developments

The Department is in the process of developing a strategy

I am unsure about future developments

There is currently no further development underway

6- Which of the following can be fulfilled in traditional translation teaching better than in E- translation teaching?

The acquaintance between the teacher and the student.

Evaluating the students by the teacher.

Views sharing between students.

Clarifications of queries of the students by the teacher.

Continuous and sustainable interaction between the teacher and the student.

7- Traditional translation teaching may seem preferable than e-translation teaching in:

Presentation of ideas by the students.

Group discussions.

Arguments and other forms of conveying information.

Accumulating knowledge.

8- As a translation teacher, which would be more preferable:

A teacher- centered approach as in traditional translation teaching and learning.

A student - centered approach as in electronic translation teaching and learning.

9- In e- translation learning the students are seen to be:

Less motivated.

Showing less interaction.

Less adherent to lecture time.

Less engaged with the teacher.

10- E- translation learning compared with traditional translation learning may be considered:

In its infancy.

In its growth phase.

Less potential in the developing countries.

Claiming more finance.

Claiming more human resources input.

11- Body language is an important factor in translation teaching which includes gestures and facial expressions, this can be achieved in:

Electronic translation teaching.

Traditional translation teaching.

Both of the two.

None of the two.

12- E- learning in translation makes translation learning undergo:

Contemplation.

Remoteness.

Lack of interaction.

Sense lack of relation.

13- E-translation learning methods might be less effective than the traditional translation learning methods in:

Clarifications.

Offering explanations.

Providing interpretations.

Face-to-face encountering between the teacher on the one hand and the student on the other.

14- As far as tests are concerned, there is a great possibility that students cheat in:

E-translation learning.

Traditional translation learning.

Both.

15- Traditional translation learning and teaching compared to e- translation learning and teaching is seen to:

Improve communication between participants.

Sustain learning.

Increase access to information.

Provide a rich environment for collaboration among students.

16- There is a strong argument that traditional translation learning and teaching is better than electronic translation learning and teaching, are you:

With…

Against….

17- In terms of Perception of Interactions, e- translation teaching in comparison with traditional classroom translation teaching, the amount of interaction with other students:

Increased.

Somewhat Increased.

No Change.

Somewhat Decreased.

Decreased.

18- How would you compare the value of the online vs. the face-to-face translation teaching method?

The online method is more successful.

About the Same.

The face-to-face method is more successful.

19- How easy was it for you to use technology in electronic translation classrooms compared with traditional translation classrooms?

Easy.

Somewhat easy.

Somewhat difficult.

Difficult

20- The amount of knowledge do your students gain in traditional translation classrooms compared with electronic translation classrooms?

Increased.

Somewhat Increased.

No Change.

Somewhat Decreased.

Decreased

10.Teachers' Responses to the Questionnaire

The following table shows the attitudes of the respondents.

Item	With Traditional Methods of Teaching and Learning Translation	With Electronic Methods of Teaching and Learning Translation
Q1	48 (96%)	2 (4%)
Q2	49 (98%)	1 (2%)

Q3	50 (100%)	0 (0%)
Q4	50 (100%)	0 (0%)
Q5	35 (70%)	15 (30%)
Q6	50 (100%)	0 (0%)
Q7	50 (100%)	0 (0%)
Q8	34 (68%)	16 (32%)
Q9	50 (100%)	0 (0%)
Q10	44 (88%)	6 (12%)
Q11	45 (90%)	5(10%)
Q12	48 (96%)	2 (4%)
Q13	50 (100%)	0 (0%)
Q14	43 (86%)	7 (14%)
Q15	45 (90%)	5 (10%)
Q16	49 (98%)	1 (2%)
Q17	44 (88%)	6 (12%)
Q18	46 (92%)	4 (8%)
Q19	30 (60%)	20 (40%)
Q20	40 (80%)	10 (20%)
Av.	90%	10%

The results show that 90% of the teachers are in favor of the Traditional Methods of Teaching and Learning Translation whilst 10% of them are in favour of the Electronic Methods of Teaching and Learning Translation. Teachers have a positive or very positive attitudes towards the Traditional Methods.

Conclusions

The following has been concluded:

Generally speaking, male as well as female translation teachers favor the Traditional Methods of Translation Teaching. This research has concluded that translation is not favored in e-teaching environments by any of the participants

involved. The respondents have clearly shown that the traditional classroom translation teaching methods are more popular when compared with the e-methods. The e- teaching setting does not effectively allow students of translation to learn to cope with the pressures of real translation environments.

In online classes, the learner is not directly interacting with the instructor. So, in case of having any questions, the student may find it difficult to ask the instructor online, as communication is often very impersonal. Classroom teaching helps translation teachers know each student in a better manner. This permits teachers of translation know the students' performance and evaluate their strengths and weaknesses in translation. In a traditional classroom, students can directly communicate their views and clarify their own queries with the teacher, thus getting their questions answered right away. So, this paper recommends the employment of the traditional translation teaching methods rather than e- translation teaching methods.

REFERENCES

Abbad, M. M., Morris, D., & de Nahlik, C. (2009). Looking under the Bonnet: Factors Affecting Student Adoption of E-

Learning Systems in Jordan. The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning.

Abouchedid, Kamal; Eid, George M., (2004). E-learning challenges in the Arab world: Revelations from a case study profile. Quality Assurance in Education. 12 (1), 15 – 27.

Aldosari, H., & Mekheimer, M. (2010). Utilisation of English-English online dictionaries for enhancing culture-specific translation skills in college students. Paper presented at the The International Conference of Suleyman Demirel University, Building Cultural Bridges: Integrating Languages, Linguistics, Literature and Translation into Education, Almaty.

Al-Shehri, A. M. (2010). E-learning in Saudi Arabia: 'To E or not to E, that is the question'. Journal of family and community medicine, 17(3), 147.

Casanovas I, Fernandez G, Hrastinski S, Keller C, Lindh J (2008) Teachers Perception of Institutional Strategies on e-Learning Implementa-tions : A Comparative Study of an Argentinian and a Swedish Uni-versity. In: Proceedings of ICEL: The 3rd International Conference on E-learning.

Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2008). E-Learning and the Science of Instruction. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Colina, S. (2003). Translation teaching. Boston [etc.]: McGraw-Hill.

Deng, M. (2016). Research on the Development Condition of Functional Translation Theory and the Applications on Modern English Translation Practice. Social Science, Education and Human Science. education. Learning, Media and Technology, 27(1), 55-67.

Elango, R., Gudep, V. K., & Selvam, M. (2008). Quality of e-learning: An analysis based on elearners' perception of e-learning. The Electronic Journal of e-Learning, 6(1), 31-44.

Gavrilenko, N. (2018). Online Model for Teaching and Learning the Specialized Translation. EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 14(6), 2711- 2717.

Ghaffari, A. & Abbas, E. (2011). Improving education in adult through online Gile, D. (1995). Basic concepts and model for interpreter and translator training. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Hildebrandt, B. U., & Teschler, S. J. (2006). Towards a model for structuring diversity: Classifying & finding quality approaches with the EQO model. In Handbook on Quality and Standardization in E-Learning (pp. 171-182). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Hjeltnes,T.A. & Hansson , B. (2004).Cost efficiency and cost effectiveness in e –learning. Quis- Quality, Interopferability and Standards in e-learning. Trondheim, Norway: TISIP Research Foundation.

Horton, W. (2006). E-Learning by Design. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

James, Paul TJ. (2008). Academic staff perceptions of ICT and eLearning a Thai he case study. The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology 7.(4), 36-44.

Jara, M. & Mellar, H. (2007). Exploring the mechanisms for assuring quality of e-learning courses in UK higher education

institutions. European Journal of Open and Distance Learning.

Jennex, M.E. (2005). Case Studies in Knowledge Management. Idea Group Publishing: Hersley.

Johnson, J. E. (2003). Learning through portfolios in the translation classroom. In B. J. Baer & G. S. Koby (Eds.), Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking translation pedagogy (Vol. 12). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Keller, C. & Cernerud, L. (2002).Students' perception of e-learning in university

Király, D. (1995).Pathways to translation:Pedagogy and process.Ohio: Kent State University Press.

Király, D. (2000).A social constructivist approach to translator education.Empaworment from theory to practice.Manchester: St Jerome.

Kiraly, D. (2003). From instruction to collaborative construction: A passing fade or the promise of a paradigm shift in translator education? In B. J. Baer & G. S. Koby (Eds.), Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking translation pedagogy (Vol. 12). Amsterdam/ Philadephia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukophadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being?. American psychologist, 53(9), 1017-31.

Kukulska-Hulme, A. (2005). Mobile Learning: A Handbook for Educators and Trainers. London & New York: Routledge.

LaRose, R., Gregg, J., & Eastin, M. (1998). Audio graphic tele-courses for the Web: An experiment. Journal of Computer Mediated Communications, 4(2).

Laurillard, D. (2002). Rethinking university teaching. A conversational framework for the effective use of learning technologies. London: Routledge

learning. Life Science Journal, 8 (3). Retrieved from http://www.lifesciencesite.com.

Liaw, S.S., Huang, H.M. (2003). Exploring the World Wide Web for on-line learning: a perspective from Taiwan. Educational Technology 40(3): 27–32.

Mangan, K. S. (2001). Expectations evaporate for online MBA programs. Chronicle of Higher Education, 48(6), 31.

Martín-Blas, T., & Serrano-Fernández, A. (2009). The role of new technologies in the learning process: Moodle as a teaching tool in Physics. Computers & Education, 52(1), 35–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2008.06.005

Moore, J. L., Dickson-Deane, C., & Galyen, K. (2011). e-Learning, online learning, and distance learning environments: Are they the same? ScienceDirect, 1-4.

O' Hagan, M. (2009). Evaluation of user-generated translation: Fansubs, translation hacking and crowd sourcing. The journal of translation and localization 1, pp.94-121.

O'Hagan, M. (2011). Community Translation: Translation as a social activity and its possible consequences in the advent of

Web 2.0 and beyond. Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series–Themes in Translation Studies, (10).

Paulsen, M. F. (2003). Online education and learning management systems. Global e-learning in a Scandinavian perspective. Bekkestua: NKI Publishing.

Pérez-González, L., & Susam-Saraeva, Ş. (2012). Non-professionals translating and interpreting: Participatory and engaged perspectives. The Translator, 18(2), 149–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2012.10799506

Phipps, R., & Merisotis, J. (1999). What's the difference? A review of contemporary.

Provaznikova, L. (2009). The effects of online previewing activities on the comprehension of authentic video and on short-term vocabulary retention. (PhD Doctoral dissertation), The University of Iowa, Iowa, USA.

Pym, A. (1992). Translation error analysis and the interface with language teaching. In C. Dollerup & A. Loddegaard (Eds.), The teaching of translation (pp. 279-288). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pym, A. (2011). Training translator. In K. Malmkjaer & K. Windle (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of translation studies. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pym, Anthony, Carmina Fallada, José Ramón Biau and Jill Orenstein (eds.) (2003), eds., Innovation & e-learning in Translator Training. Tarragona: Universitat Rovira i Virgili. research on the effectiveness of distance learning in higher

education. Washington DC: Institute for Higher Educational Policy.

Rosenbaum, D. B. (2001). E-learning beckons busy professionals. ENR,246(21), 38-42.

Smith, L. J. (2001). Content and delivery: A comparison and contrast of electronic and traditional MBA marketing planning courses. Journal of Marketing Education, 23(1), 3.

Steeples, C., Jones, C., & Goodyear, P. (2002). Beyond e-learning: A future for networked learning (pp. 323-341). Springer London.

Stewart, D. (2008). Vocational translation training into a foreign language. INTRALINEA ON LINE TRANSLATION JOURNAL, 10 1-17. Retrieved from: http://www.intralinea.org/review_articles/article/Translati on_textbooks_translation_into_English_as_a_foreign_lan guage [Accessed: 12 Sep 2014].

Tai, L. (2008). Corporate E-Learning: An Inside View of IBMs Solutions. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Teachers College Record, 107(8), 1582-1600. doi: 10.1111/j.1467- 9620.2005.00534.x.

Twigg C. (2002). Quality, cost and access: the case for redesign. In The Wired Tower. Pittinsky MS (ed.). Prentice-Hall: New Jersey. p. 111–143.

Wagner, N., Hassanein, K., & Head, M. (2008). Who is responsible for e-learning success in higher education? A Stakeholders' analysis. Educational Technology & Society, 11 (3), 26-36.

Welsh, E. T., Wanberg, C. R., Brown, K. G., & Simmering, M. J. (2003). E-learning: emerging uses, empirical results and future directions. International Journal of Training and Development, 7(4), 245-258.

Westberry, N. C., (2009). An activity theory analysis of social epistemologies within tertiarylevel eLearning environments, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/bitstream/10289/4184/3/thesis.pdf.

Willigen-Sinemus, M. (1988). Typology of translation in the classroom. Meta, 33 (4), 472-479. Doi: 10.7202/004160ar. Zhong, Y. (2002). Transcending the discourse of accuracy in the teaching of translation: theoretical deliberation and case study. Meta, 47 (4), 575-585. Doi: 10.7202/008037ar.

Robson, C. (2002) Real World Reserch (2nd ed), Oxford: Blackwell.
Saunders, Levis and Thornhill (2007).Research methods for business students(4th. Ed). England: Prentice Hall