

## MINIMIZING STUDENTS' DISENGAGEMENT IN TRANSLATION CLASSES THROUGH UTILIZING STUDENT PORTFOLIO

ADIL AHMED ABDULAZEEZ\* and MOHAMMED SALIH A. SULAIMAN\*\*

\*Dept. of Translation, College of Languages, University of Duhok, Kurdistan Region-Iraq

\*\* Dept. of English, College of Languages, University of Duhok, Kurdistan Region-Iraq

*(Received: October 1, 2022; Accepted for Publication: January 4, 2023)*

### ABSTRACT

In parallel with the other educational fields, translation teaching has taken new turns represented in adopting modern student-centered approaches in preference to traditional teacher-centered ones. The academic perspective necessitates that teachers adapt the approaches that reflect their academic contexts and best serve their objectives. Translation teaching in the Department of Translation/ College of Languages/ University of Duhok (referred to as 'the Department') mostly revolves around the "read and translate" method. Students direct their efforts toward pursuing high marks, though marks by themselves fail to provide a comprehensive assessment. The lack of material for practical subjects and the nature of teaching and testing block students' way toward an effective engagement and obligation to study. This paper investigates the use of portfolio as an alternative teaching tool that is intended inspire students to engage in teaching and learning by providing a framework in which they document their academic growth and achievement. The portfolio, by virtue of its role in engaging students, was utilized as an integral tool in the teaching process. Students' reflection on the portfolio was invested, using a validated questionnaire, to highlight its impact. The statistical analysis of the data illustrates tangible evidence of the success of the approach based on the means and the estimated t-values of the questionnaire items and categories.

**KEYWORDS:** Translation Teaching, Portfolio, Student Engagement, Growth, Achievement

### 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is an endeavor to bring to notice the context of translation teaching in the Department and the need for an alternative approach. The literature on translation teaching has particularly emphasized the acquisition of translation competence. As yet, far too little light has been shed on equally significant issues; how to determine whether or not competence is acquired and where to document and look for evidence of that.

By tradition, teachers engage students in translating different texts and discuss their errors providing correct translations with some instruction. In due course, students answer to standardized exams as the key measurement of success and eligibility to pass regardless of how unreliable they can be to comprehensively and accurately measure students' overall academic level. The problem with this kind of teaching is students' possible loss of interest and motivation that can consequently lead to loss of desire to engage in the teaching and learning processes.

Modern teaching methods empower students to actively participate and become fully engaged in teaching and learning. Such methods have paved the way for a core and inevitable alteration in translation teaching. This paper explores an educational initiative that comprises an effective application of the portfolio as a teaching and learning tool. The portfolio is, in principle, interactive in the sense that it engages teachers and students in joint work. The portfolio developed here is also integrative in the sense that it incorporates modern approaches. A questionnaire was developed in consultation with a specialized jury to measure students' reflection on the utilization of portfolio. The students' reflection was statistically analyzed, categorized and quantified.

Students were found to overwhelmingly be in favor of the utilization of portfolio in translation teaching. The results advocated that the portfolio could be utilized as an effective alternative teaching method that had a statistically significant impact on engaging students in

teaching and learning and providing evidence of academic growth and achievement.

## 2. PROBLEM BACKGROUND

In contrast to most of the subjects taught in college, neither have students studied translation at schools nor do they now have textbooks to study practical subjects. This can be attributed to the fact that teaching focuses on translating texts in the class with emphasis on students' errors. On the other hand, the exams have only a little direct relation with what teachers teach and what students learn since the exams mostly consist of unseen passages to translate. In consequence, students often find themselves uncompelled to prepare or study. They may eventually become disengaged in the process. In the worst case scenario, they may cease to even care about teaching and learning.

## 3. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The main objective of this paper is to contribute to translation teaching by introducing a teaching tool that:

- 1- Provides translation students with an effective and long-lasting framework that can help them engage in teaching and learning and document their academic growth and achievement.
- 2- Help the students reflect on the academic process including teaching and learning.

## 4. METHODOLOGY

This paper follows a quantitative study method utilizing a questionnaire with 30 participants and 21 items to be examined for scale and frequency. It also follows a qualitative study method including the analysis of students' reflection on the teaching methods applied.

The subjects of the study were volunteer second year students from the Department of Translation at the College of Languages / University of Duhok. They were all in the 4th semester, studying General Translation in the academic year 2021-2022. The students were divided into two groups, **A** and **B**, according to their achievements in regular exams (with group **A** scoring higher marks). They were also divided into two groups, Male and Female, according to gender.

The students experienced three modern approaches to learning: the Competence-Based approach, the Task-Based approach and the

Problem-Based approach. These approaches were integrated into the different activities, tasks and problems that students experienced throughout the semester. Students included documents in their portfolios as evidence of experiencing different approaches with different activities, tasks or problems they experienced along with their reflections on the approach.

A questionnaire was developed and validated in consultation with a jury, whose members specialized in applied linguistics, to help students reflect on the application of the portfolio. The questionnaire covers seven categories addressing seven different issues. The *Portfolio* category addressed the utility of the portfolio for the students. The *Teaching* category addressed the relevance of the teaching process to the profession needs. The *Outcome* category addressed the outcome of the utilization of the portfolio. The *Competence* category addressed the workability of the Competence-Based approach. The *Problem-Based learning* category addressed the students' problem solving skills. The *Learning aspect* category targeted students' empowerment. The *Activities conducted* category addressed the effectiveness of the activities students conducted in the class. The questionnaire data were statistically analyzed, categorized and quantified using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program, and finally conclusions were drawn.

## 5. ANALYTICAL REVIEW OF THE CURRENT TRANSLATION CONTEXT

Translators, according to Baer and Koby (2003), used to be thought of as born not made and translation used to be thought of as learned on the job not in the classroom. This concept made translation teaching undervalued for years (p. vii). Nowadays, translation is taught as a part of a degree program in language classes or as a full degree program in translation departments.

Translation teaching in the Department mostly revolves around the "read and translate" method. Students translate different texts and read their translations aloud. The teacher then identifies the problematic areas and discusses students' errors providing correct versions of translation. This procedure brings students' participation to the minimum while the other students remain inactive.

There exists a noticeable difference in content between teaching on the one hand and the exams students take on the other hand. The

exams have a little direct relation with what has been taught and learned. Students have to pass standardized exams traditionally placed at the end of the semester. In most cases, these exams are the key measurement of students' success and their eligibility to pass regardless of their reliability in comprehensively and accurately measuring students' overall growth and achievement. Students, consequently, may either study and prepare aimlessly or give up studying and preparing altogether.

## **6. THE NEED FOR AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH**

The educational development in the recent years has necessitated new tendencies to dramatic changes in the traditional approaches to teaching. Hence, the need for a major shift in translation teaching model becomes an inevitable requirement for the academic translation program to succeed. The alteration of the traditional translation teaching requires translation teachers to step beyond the “read and translate” method. Teachers need to lead and guide students through the teaching and learning processes. Students, on the other hand, should no longer be passive absorbers of the passed on knowledge. Instead, they should actively engage in the teaching and learning processes.

Teachers adopt the methods that are the most appropriate to their classroom contexts and best serve their objectives. However, a method that is not comprehensive to the modern approaches to translation teaching may be ineffective. Observations of the current classroom context and the plan for change can guide our search for an alternative teaching method that places less emphasis on test results and give more importance to students work and progress.

## **7. WHY THE APPLICATION OF STUDENT PORTFOLIO**

This paper creates a favorable climate for the utilization of student portfolio as a valuable alternative to traditional teaching. The portfolio measures students' learning, progress, efforts and hardworking in a more comprehensive and accurate way than regular tests do. Anness and Darling-Hammond (1994) stress this point stating that portfolios inspire students to employ a wide range of skills to make the most of their learning experiences (p. 9).

The portfolio provides a framework within which teachers' and students' role is redefined as advocated by Klenowski (2002, p. 104). The portfolio is the best way to shift students' passive role in the learning process to an active role. Using portfolio allows students to be fully engaged and to participate in their learning process.

It is important for the teacher and students to be aware of the story the portfolio intends to tell. They also need to take into account what it takes and what is needed to successfully tell that story. The story the portfolio intends to tell here stands on two main pillars. The first one is the effective integration of modern teaching methods into the activities, tasks and problems students experience throughout the semester. The second one is the inclusion of evidence of students' engagement, academic growth and achievement.

## **8. THE INTEGRATION OF PORTFOLIO IN MODERN TEACHING APPROACHES**

One of the challenges this paper aims to address is the integration of the portfolio into modern teaching approaches mentioned below. Accordingly, how successfully this process is carried out plays a critical role in the maintenance of a successful application of the portfolio as a teaching tool.

### **A- Competence-Based Learning**

Competence, as defined by Hager and Gonczi (1996, p. 15), is the ability to carry out ‘up to standard’ the main professional tasks characterizing a certain profession. With reference to translation, there has always been a link between translation teaching and translation competence. Colina (2003) proposes that translation teaching aims to facilitate the acquisition of translation competence (p. 30).

The Process in the Acquisition of Translation Competence and Evaluation group (PACTE, 2000) defines translation competence as “the underlying system of knowledge and skills needed to be able to translate” (p. 100). Translation competence can be realized in terms of the knowledge required to translate well (Hatim & Mason, 1990, p. 32f). It includes a good comprehension of the source text, the ability to transfer the meaning into the target language and the skills required to assess and edit the translation. Translation competence comprises a number of sub-competences as in (PACTE, 2000, p. 102):

1. Bilingual sub-competence: the practical knowledge and skills needed for linguistic communication between two languages.
2. Extra-linguistic sub-competence: including general world and specific field knowledge along with source and target cultures knowledge.
3. Instrumental sub-competence: technical knowledge and skills associated with the use of tools and technology.
4. Strategic sub-competence: knowledge needed to find solutions for the problems that arise.

It is important when designing any curriculum to establish a specific competence to acquire through tasks and activities. Colina (2003) calls attention to the fact that the purpose behind experiencing different kinds of activities is to facilitate the acquisition of translation competence by means of guided translation tasks (p. 30). Accordingly, students experienced different related activities throughout the semester to help them practice and acquire these sub-competences. They were asked to document each activity along with their reflection on the activity as evidence in the portfolio.

### **B- Task-Based Learning**

In Task-Based Learning, teaching appears to be a simulation of real-world experience. This approach can alter the teaching method from the concentration on abstract knowledge to its application in the real world.

Willis' (1996) model of Task-Based Learning is the most frequently used and it defines three stages for every task. The first stage is the "**pre-task stage**" in which the teacher introduces the task and motivates the students to work on it explaining the expected outcome. The "**task stage**" is the second and the main stage of this approach. Students work on the task either individually or in groups. The teacher monitors and guides the students offering hints anytime the students need support. The third stage is the "**post-task stage**" in which the teacher can ask the students to discuss and assess each other's work. The teacher can also offer his/her review of frequent errors committed during the task.

The application of this approach in this paper required the researchers to associate the learning outcome with the right "translation task". The "translation task" is defined as "a unit of work in the classroom, representative of translation practice, formally directed towards learning how to translate and designed with a specific objective, structure and sequence" (Ablir, 1999, as cited in Sachinis, 2011, p. 41). The significance of this procedure was reflected in

the fact that the intended learning outcome determined the task the students carried out. The students documented every task they carried out as evidence in their portfolios along with their reflection on the task or the activity. The tasks were simulated to help the students put themselves in a professional translator's place and handle the task in a rather professional way.

### **C- Problem-Based Learning**

Problem-Based Learning, a highly student-engaging method, employs real-world problems to stimulate students' learning. Students are faced with a real-world problem and start working in groups supervised by the teacher to come up with practical solutions. The teacher acts as a facilitator, rather than a primary source of information. He/she determines and analyzes the problem, sets objectives and finally helps establish new information.

Duch et al. (2001) believe that the problem should drive the students to have a more comprehensive understanding of concepts. It should also motivate students to make decisions. Finally, the problem should have a level of difficulty so that students work together to come up with suitable solutions (p. 6).

Translation teachers, according to Honebein (1996, pp. 11-12), often drop the real-life noise from learning activities. This practice violates one of the important objectives of translation programs which is preparing students to find suitable solutions for real world problems. The application of Problem-Based Learning in translation context develops students' capacity to deal with different translation challenges (Tan, 2008, p. 597).

Following this method, students were occasionally faced with certain challenges that comprised problematic areas. Having agreed on the nature of the problem, students worked in different groups every time to come up with practical solutions for each problem. They made discussions proposing different solutions and then decided on the most practical and applicable ones to the problem at hand. Students were guided to document the whole process as evidence in their portfolios along with their reflection on the challenge or the problem.

## **9. EVIDENCE AND DOCUMENTATION**

Evidence documents are collected and included in the portfolio over a period of time that may cover the whole semester or academic year. Portfolios can be characterized as being

evidence records in which students need to provide evidence for each and every claim they make. These records include evidence of efforts and accomplishments, i.e., the process and the product.

Scholars have similar views towards the utilization of portfolios as evidence records. Ahmed (2015), for example, considers it necessary for the portfolio developer to record a collection of the best work achieved and efforts made in addition to selected samples of works (p. 277). Forde et al. (2009) address this issue with more details in stating the items to be included in this record such as materials, students' work, progress evidence and learning resources (p.9).

Given the fact that every document students include in their portfolios usually represents one aspect only, they are tempted to include as many documents as they can to cover every aspect and come up with higher scores. Williams (2009), however, recommends that students be economical about the items they include (p. 4). A portfolio with big content is difficult to manage. The portfolio should include appropriate and high- quality evidence to compensate for the number of items.

There can be found no exact rule that forces portfolio developers to include certain content and evidence. This mostly depends on the portfolio developer and the purpose of the portfolio. Another way, as stated by Birgin and Baki, (2007), is through negotiation between teachers and students (p.78).

#### **A- Evidence of experiencing modern approaches**

The portfolio allows for the inclusion of evidence of the application of modern approaches. This procedure is realized through experiencing different activities, carrying out different tasks and solving different problems throughout the semester along with their reflection on these practices.

#### **B- Evidence of growth and achievement**

Portfolios are devised to view a more comprehensive picture of students' work and to show their progress and product throughout the semester. Students commonly enrich their portfolios with evidence over a relatively long period of time. By retaining students' works in a portfolio, we can demonstrate not only the final level of student product but also what it took to get there (cf. Haiyan 2006). Hakim and Srisudarso (2020) extend the scope of the portfolio in education to cover the evidence of students' work collected to demonstrate the effort, progress, and accomplishment (p. 10).

#### **C- Reflection reports**

Reflection is a very important and common ingredient of the portfolio as it is considered the core of the portfolio. Jones and Shelton (2006), for instance, describe students' reflection on their own learning as the defining characteristic of a portfolio. According to them, it is reflection that links evidence to learning and presents indications of progress over time (p. 80). Students reflected in reaction and interaction to the utilization of the portfolio using a validated questionnaire instead of writing a reflection report.

### **10. ANALYSIS OF DATA**

The category-based descriptive analysis of the questionnaire shows that the agreement on the items (S.A – A) for all the categories was at a high level ranging between (80.0) as in item 10 of *Competence* category (Table 4) which reads "This pedagogical approach enhanced the acquisition of translational competence more than the translation and analysis of some texts" (Appendix 3) and (96.7) as in item 1 of *Portfolio* category (Table 1) which reads "The portfolio helped me make the most of my working time" (Appendix 3).

**Table (4): Competence**

Item	Percentage %					Means	Ranking	
	S.A.	A.	Und.	D.	S.D.		T Test	P-Value*
10	33.3	46.7	6.7	10.0	3.3	3.97	20.377	0.000*
11	26.7	73.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	4.27	51.958	0.000*
12	43.3	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.30	29.648	0.000*
Average	34.4	56.7	2.2	5.6	1.10	4.17	40.068	0.000*

\* Significant at level of (0.05)

**Table (1): Portfolio**

Item	Percentage %					Means	Ranking	
	S.A.	A.	Und.	D.	S.D.		T Test	P-Value*
1	46.7	50.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.40	37.721	0.000*
2	43.3	53.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.37	35.768	0.000*
3	40.0	56.7	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.33	34.913	0.000*
Average	43.3	53.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.37	43.500	0.000*

\* Significant at level of (0.05)

The disagreement on the items, (D – S.D), did not exceed (13.3) of the above mentioned item 10 of *Competence* category. The results were extracted measuring the Means of the items, showing strong agreement upon the items of the questionnaire as the Means approached the highest weight of Likert scale (Tables 1-7, Appendix 1). The average of t-values of the

categories shows that t-values were all significant at level 0.05. The highest average t-value represents the highest frequency. The *Outcome* category (Table 3) has the highest frequency over the other categories because the average t-value of the category is 53.026 which is the highest among the seven categories.

**Table (3): Outcome**

Item	Percentage %					Means	Ranking	
	S.A.	A.	Und.	D.	S.D.		T Test	P-Value*
7	50.0	36.7	10.0	3.3	0.0	4.33	29.583	0.000*
8	33.3	60.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	4.27	40.065	0.000*
9	53.3	40.0	3.3	3.3	0.0	4.43	33.358	0.000*
Average	45.5	45.6	6.7	2.2	0.0	4.35	53.026	0.000*

\* Significant at level of (0.05)

In the same way, the *Activities conducted* category has the lowest frequency because the average t-value of the category is 35.234 which

is the lowest among the seven categories (Table 7).

**Table (7): Activities**

Item	Percentage %					Means	Ranking	
	S.A.	A.	Und.	D.	S.D.		T Test	P-Value*
19	26.7	66.7	3.3	3.3	0.0	4.17	35.234	0.000*
20	53.3	46.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.53	48.934	0.000*
21	50.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.30	25.729	0.000*
Average	43.3	51.1	1.1	1.1	0.0	4.33	35.234	0.000*

\* Significant at level of (0.05)

Based on the t-values, the frequency of the categories reads like: *Outcome* 53.026, *Learning aspect* 45.897, *Teaching* 44.847, *Problem-based learning* 44.237, *Portfolio* 43.500, *Competence* 40.068 and *Activities conducted* 35.234.

As Table 8, (Appendix 2) shows, there are significant differences in students' reflection on item 5, 11, 15, and 20, which read:

- "Teaching was not limited to classroom context, but also market needs".

- "We exercised some skills required to build professional-like identities".

- "I experienced doing critical and creative thinking vis-a-vis problem-solving and decision-making".

- "The conducted activities shifted focus from the teacher to the student".

These differences are in favor of group (A) based on the highest Means of each of these items. There is also significant difference in students' reflection on item 16 which reads "This pedagogical approach helped me assume responsibility for my own learning". This difference is in favor of group (B) based on the highest Mean of each of these items.

Table 9 (Appendix 2) shows significant differences in students' reflection on item 4, 9, 13 and 15, which read:

- "The pedagogical approach engaged all students".

- "The portfolio gave me a personal sense of achievement".

- "Presentation of real-world profession problems helped come up with well-constructed solutions".

- "I experienced doing critical and creative thinking vis-a-vis problem-solving and decision-making".

These differences are in favor of female students based on the highest Means of each of these item. Table 9 (Appendix 2) shows no significant differences in students' reflection in favor of the male students.

## 11. FINDINGS

The analysis of the data shows that the majority of the students overwhelmingly favored the utilization of the portfolio in the teaching of translation. The students view the portfolio as the key to the development of a variety of skills and knowledge. The findings are in tandem with the argument that students' work improved due to the utilization of a portfolio as it helped them document all progress and product throughout the semester.

The order of the categories shows that the students prioritized the categories that highlight their engagement, long lasting work and achievement and also shift the class mode to the real world practice of translation.

Students' level and gender showed little significant difference in their reflection on the utilization of the portfolio. The difference was in favor of the high level students in the items that

highlighted the preparation of a professional translator and was in favor of the lower level students in the item that urge students to take more responsibility over their learning. The difference was in favor of female students in the items that highlighted their engagement and achievement. Finally, no significant difference was found in favor of the male students.

## 12. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of our research, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Based on students' response and the reflections given in the questionnaire, most of the participants reflected positively towards the application of portfolio in the teaching of translation.

2. There can be seen statistically significant tangible evidence of students' engagement in the teaching and learning process and evidence of academic growth and achievement. The selection of activities and problems motivated the students to improve certain related sub-competences. Overall, it can be concluded that the application of the portfolio proved to be a promising teaching strategy with a significant value to students and has helped when applied in an appropriate manner.

3. The application of the portfolio, though not the easiest teaching approach to utilize, can be very effective in enriching students' academic experiences. The portfolio promotes the skills needed for a successful translation and provides concrete evidence of engagement, academic growth and achievement.

4. The reason for students' positive reflection on the utilization of the portfolios is due to the amount of guidance and support they felt they had received and the amount of work they did throughout the semester.

5. Students' level and gender showed little significant difference in their reflection on the utilization of the portfolio.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, M. N. (2015). The student's portfolio in English language classroom. *Educational Studies*, 30, 277 – 286.
- Ancess, J. & Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). *Authentic teaching, learning, and assessment with new English learners at International High School: A series on authentic assessment and accountability*. New York: Columbia University Teachers College, National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching.
- Baer, B. J., & Koby, G. S. (2003). Translation pedagogy: The other theory. In B. J. Baer & G. S. Koby (Eds.), *Beyond the ivory tower: Rethinking translation pedagogy* (pp. vii–xv). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Birgin, O. & Baki, A. (2007). The use of portfolio to assess student's performance. *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, 4(2), 75-90.
- Colina, S. (2003). Towards an empirically-based translation pedagogy. In B. J. Baer & Koby, G. S. (Eds.), *Beyond the ivory tower: Rethinking translation pedagogy* (pp. 29-59). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Duch B.J., Groh S.E. & Allen, D.E. (2001). Why problem-based learning? A case study of institutional change in undergraduate education. In B. Duch, S. Groh & D. Allen (Eds.), *The power of problem-based learning* (pp.3-11). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Forde, C., McMahon, M. & Reeves, J. (2009). *Putting together professional portfolios*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Hager, P. & Gonczi, A. (1996). What is competence? *Medical Teacher*, 18(1), 15-18.
- Haiyan, L. (2006). Cultivating translator competence: Teaching & testing. *Translation Journal*, 10(3), 9-14.
- Hakim, P. K. & Srisudarso, M. (2020). A washback study on portfolio assessment. *ELT in Focus*, 3(1), 9-14.
- Hatim, B & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. London. Longman.
- Honebein, P. (1996). Seven goals for the design of constructivist learning environments. In B. G. Wilson (Ed.). *Constructivist learning environments* (pp.11-24). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Jones, M., & Shelton, M. (2006). *Developing your portfolio-enhancing your learning and showing your stuff: A guide for the early childhood student or professional* (2nd ed.). New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Klenowski, V. (2002). *Developing portfolios for learning and assessment: processes and principles*. London: Routledge.
- PACTE. (2000). Acquiring translation competence: Hypotheses and methodological problems of a research project. In B. Allison, E. Doris & P. Marisa (Eds). *Investigating translation* (pp. 99-106). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sachinis, M. (2011). Curriculum renewal in Greek taught postgraduate translation courses: Aligning student needs and translation market requirements. [Doctoral dissertation, Imperial College London]. <https://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/bitstream/10044/1/9639/1/Sachinis-M-2012-PhD-Thesis.pdf>
- Snadden, D. & Thomas, M. (1998). The use of portfolio learning in medical education. *Medical Teacher*, 20(3), 192–99.
- Tan, Z.X. (2008). Towards a whole-person translator education approach in translation teaching on university degree programmes. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 53(3), 589-608.
- Williams, G. (2009). Build your training portfolio. *Infoline*. 26(0905), 1-20.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Harlow: Longman.



**Appendix 1: Descriptive Statistics & Ranking Tables****Table (1): Portfolio**

Item	Percentage %					Means	Ranking	
	S.A.	A.	Und.	D.	S.D.		T Test	P-Value*
1	46.7	50.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.40	37.721	0.000*
2	43.3	53.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.37	35.768	0.000*
3	40.0	56.7	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.33	34.913	0.000*
Average	43.3	53.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.37	43.500	0.000*

\* Significant at level of (0.05)

**Table (2): Teaching**

Item	Percentage %					Means	Ranking	
	S.A.	A.	Und.	D.	S.D.		T Test	P-Value*
4	40.0	46.7	10.0	3.3	0.0	3.67	19.530	0.000*
5	50.0	46.7	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.23	29.963	0.000*
6	76.7	16.7	0.0	6.7	0.0	4.43	35.767	0.000*
Average	55.6	36.7	3.3	4.4	0.0	4.11	44.847	0.000*

\* Significant at level of (0.05)

**Table (3): Outcome**

Item	Percentage %					Means	Ranking	
	S.A.	A.	Und.	D.	S.D.		T Test	P-Value*
7	50.0	36.7	10.0	3.3	0.0	4.33	29.583	0.000*
8	33.3	60.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	4.27	40.065	0.000*
9	53.3	40.0	3.3	3.3	0.0	4.43	33.358	0.000*
Average	45.5	45.6	6.7	2.2	0.0	4.35	53.026	0.000*

\* Significant at level of (0.05)

**Table (4): Competence**

Item	Percentage %					Means	Ranking	
	S.A.	A.	Und.	D.	S.D.		T Test	P-Value*
10	33.3	46.7	6.7	10.0	3.3	3.97	20.377	0.000*
11	26.7	73.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	4.27	51.958	0.000*
12	43.3	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.30	29.648	0.000*
Average	34.4	56.7	2.2	5.6	1.10	4.17	40.068	0.000*

\* Significant at level of (0.05)

**Table (5): Problem**

Item	Percentage %					Means	Ranking	
	S.A.	A.	Und.	D.	S.D.		T Test	P-Value*
13	23.3	60.0	6.7	10.0	0.0	3.97	25.552	0.000*
14	50.0	36.7	3.3	10.0	0.0	4.27	24.744	0.000*
15	26.7	63.3	10.0	0.0	0.0	4.17	38.544	0.000*
Average	33.3	53.3	6.7	6.7	0.0	4.13	44.237	0.000*

\* Significant at level of (0.05)

**Table (6): Learning**

Item	Percentage %					Means	Ranking	
	S.A.	A.	Und.	D.	S.D.		T Test	P-Value*
16	53.3	43.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.47	35.902	0.000*
17	63.3	33.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.57	36.842	0.000*
18	33.3	63.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.27	36.533	0.000*
Average	50.0	46.6	0.0	3.3	0.0	4.44	45.897	0.000*

\* Significant at level of (0.05)

**Table (7): Activities**

Item	Percentage %					Means	Ranking	
	S.A.	A.	Und.	D.	S.D.		T Test	P-Value*
19	26.7	66.7	3.3	3.3	0.0	4.17	35.234	0.000*
20	53.3	46.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.53	48.934	0.000*
21	50.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.30	25.729	0.000*
Average	43.3	51.1	1.1	1.1	0.0	4.33	35.234	0.000*

\* Significant at level of (0.05)

**Appendix 2: The Differences Tables****Table (8): Differences According to Groups**

Item	t value	Group	Means	P-Value	Results
1	0.864	A	4.29	0.395	No Difference
		B	4.50		
2	0.468	A	4.43	0.643	No Difference
		B	4.31		
3	0.732	A	4.43	0.470	No Difference
		B	4.25		
4	0.826	A	3.50	0.416	No Difference
		B	3.81		
5	2.836	A	4.50	0.027*	There is difference
		B	4.00		
6	0.497	A	4.50	0.623	No Difference
		B	4.38		
7	0.601	A	4.43	0.552	No Difference
		B	4.25		
8	1.449	A	4.43	0.158	No Difference
		B	4.13		
9	1.507	A	4.64	0.143	No Difference
		B	4.25		
10	0.520	A	3.86	0.205	No Difference
		B	4.06		
11	0.213	A	4.29	0.036*	There is difference
		B	4.25		
12	1.306	A	4.50	0.375	No Difference
		B	4.13		
13	1.094	A	3.79	0.283	No Difference
		B	4.13		
14	0.102	A	4.29	0.920	No Difference
		B	4.25		
15	1.781	A	4.36	0.049*	There is difference
		B	4.00		
16	1.992	A	4.21	0.046*	There is difference
		B	4.69		
17	0.035	A	4.57	0.972	No Difference
		B	4.56		
18	0.719	A	4.36	0.478	No Difference
		B	4.19		
19	0.748	A	4.07	0.461	No Difference
		B	4.25		
20	1.909	A	4.71	0.037*	There is difference
		B	4.38		
21	1.294	A	4.07	0.206	No Difference
		B	4.50		

T Critical value at degree of freedom (28) = 1.701

\*Significant at level P-value  $\leq 0.05$ **Table (9): Differences According to Gender**

Item	t value	Group	Means	P-Value	Results
1	1.493	Male	4.40	0.232	No Difference
		Female	4.40		
2	1.157	Male	4.33	0.291	No Difference
		Female	4.40		
3	1.503	Male	4.33	0.202	No Difference
		Female	4.33		
4	2.753	Male	3.20	0.010*	There is difference
		Female	4.13		
5	0.702	Male	4.13	0.489	No Difference
		Female	4.33		

6	0.802	Male	4.53	0.429	No Difference
		Female	4.33		
7	0.449	Male	4.27	0.657	No Difference
		Female	4.40		
8	1.265	Male	4.40	0.216	No Difference
		Female	4.13		
9	2.443	Male	4.13	0.021*	There is difference
		Female	4.73		
10	0.507	Male	4.07	0.616	No Difference
		Female	3.87		
11	0.807	Male	4.20	0.426	No Difference
		Female	4.33		
12	2.201	Male	4.00	0.036*	There is difference
		Female	4.60		
13	1.938	Male	3.73	0.035*	There is difference
		Female	4.20		
14	0.768	Male	4.13	0.449	No Difference
		Female	4.40		
15	2.315	Male	3.93	0.028*	There is difference
		Female	4.40		
16	0.529	Male	4.40	0.601	No Difference
		Female	4.53		
17	0.265	Male	4.53	0.793	No Difference
		Female	4.60		
18	0.822	Male	4.27	0.401	No Difference
		Female	4.27		
19	0.277	Male	4.20	0.784	No Difference
		Female	4.13		
20	0.714	Male	4.60	0.481	No Difference
		Female	4.47		
21	0.592	Male	4.20	0.559	No Difference
		Female	4.40		

T Critical value at degree of freedom (28) = 1.701

\*Significant at level  $P \leq 0.05$

### Appendix 3: Questionnaire

Kurdistan Regional Government - Iraq  
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research  
University of Duhok  
College of Languages / Department of Translation  
Second Year / Fourth semester  
General Translation into English



#### A Questionnaire on Students' Reflection on the Application of Student's Portfolio to the Teaching and Assessment of Translation

Group      A                      B  
1         2  

Gender    Male                      Female  
1         2  

By ticking here, I acknowledge that I participated in this questionnaire voluntarily.

<i>A. Portfolio</i>	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. The portfolio helped me make the most of my working time.					
2. The portfolio increased the interaction between the teacher and students and between students themselves.					
3. The portfolio integrated updated pedagogical approaches with the activities required by the academic system.					
<i>B. Teaching</i>	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
4. The pedagogical approach engaged all students.					
5. Teaching was not limited to classroom context, but also market needs.					
6. The teaching method shifted the class mode to the real world practice of translation.					
<i>C. Outcome</i>	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
7. The portfolio helped keep track of my progress by keeping track of the evidence added or edited.					
8. The portfolio provided me with a framework to document my progress.					
9. The portfolio gave me a personal sense of achievement.					
<i>D. Competence</i>	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
10. This pedagogical approach enhanced the acquisition of translational competence more than the translation and analysis of some texts.					
11. We exercised some skills required to build professional-like identities.					
12. We exercised a wide range of skills in order to make the most of our learning experiences.					
<i>E. Problem-based learning</i>	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
13. Presentation of real-world profession problems helped come up with well-constructed solutions.					
14. I am now more prepared for the challenges of the translation profession.					
15. I experienced doing critical and creative thinking vis-a-vis problem-solving and decision-making.					
<i>F. Learning aspect</i>	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
16. This pedagogical approach helped me assume responsibility for my own learning.					
17. I became more actively involved in the learning process.					
18. This pedagogical approach helped me demonstrate concrete evidence of what I learned.					
<i>G. Activities conducted</i>	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
19. My experience improved as the activities mimicked real life translation tasks.					
20. The conducted activities shifted focus from the teacher to the student.					
21. The conducted activities noticeably improved my translation performance.					