English Translator Training Curriculum Revisited: Iranian Trainees' Perspectives

Masood Khoshsaligheh[1]
Associate Professor, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran
Mahboubeh Moghaddas
PhD Candidate, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran
Saeed Ameri
PhD Candidate, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran

Abstract

English and Persian translator training has been offered by many Iranian universities as an undergraduate program nation-wide. However, the program failed to keep up with the dynamics of the market demands, findings of Translation Studies research, and varied competences of students in the past two decades. This study investigated the Iranian English translator trainees' perspectives on the former curriculum that was used for over twenty years. The other aim was to understand whether their needs and wants correspond to either of the old and the recently revised curriculum in 2018. Based on focus group interviews and literature review, a questionnaire was designed and validated, and the survey responses of over five hundred English and translator trainees (351 females & 152 males) from twelve universities in Iran were statistically analyzed. The findings revealed that the courses related to translation practice were ranked as the most important component of the curriculum by the trainees, highlighting that trainees favor practice-oriented translation courses the most.

1. Introduction

From its inception, translation education or translator training has always been the main concern of researchers, who were supposed to teach translation

---
[1] Corresponding author: khoshsaligheh@um.ac.ir

and trainer future translators. Thanks to recent developments, there has been a research boom in the discipline of translation pedagogy (e.g., Kelly, 2005, 2010b; Kim, 2013; Laviosa & González-Davies, 2020). This has led to recognizing the need to improve the curriculum and educational policies, as Pietrzak (2019) emphasizes.

Modern translator education, however, has substantially benefited from the recent findings of this field, particularly with regard to curriculum reform (Kim, 2013). Despite these advances, the current practice of translator education suffers from the fact that the curriculum in many parts of the world, including Iran, is solely based on the scholars' anecdotes, subjective experiences and judgments and many other significant sources of insight and information have been neglected—a criticism which has also been leveled against the European Master's in Translation (EMT) curriculum (Pym, 2008).

The translator-training program developed for the English-Persian language pair dates back to many ages ago, which supposedly aims to prepare students for the translation market. However, it has failed to fulfill its goals in fully equipping trainees with determining skills and competences demanded to work as translators and intercultural mediators in the labor market (Khoshsaligheh, 2014; Miremadi, 2003; Mirza Ebrahim Tehrani, 2003; Riazi & Razmjoo, 2004; Zia Hosseini, 2003). Moreover, considering the multi-billion-dollar industry of translation worldwide, with the Persian speaking community as a considerable market for international products, one can rule out the shortage of job opportunities as the reason for the meager income of the average translator. The only remaining factor explaining the reasons why English and Persian translation graduates have not yet been able to benefit and enjoy a lucrative profession can be attributed to the inefficiency of the training programs. The improvement of program has been viewed from different perspectives, including utilization of modern teaching approaches

(Moghaddas & Khoshsaligheh, 2019; Parvaresh, Pirnajmuddin, & Hesabi, 2019) or taking into account trainees' motivations (Ameri & Ghahari, 2018); nevertheless, the major problem seems to be the curriculum and its implementation.

Unlike numerous translator training programs across the world, English translation program in Iran is not entirely devoted to translation competence of the students. This program has been in use for over decades and the vast changes including the varied clients of the programs and different market demands have been overlooked. Scholars in translation studies have stressed the importance of students' opinions, aims, and purposes, among many other sources of guidance for improvement of any translation curriculum (D. Li, 2001, 2002; Kelly, 2005). Pym (2008) contends that designing or redesigning any translation program has to be based on triangulation of analysis of data from multiple sources including, the current and past students and teachers, practitioners, as well as insights from successful programs in addition to the scholarly literature and empirical findings. Likewise, Burnaby (1989) states that what is taught has to be a dynamic and continuous negotiation among the teachers, students, and the educational administrators.

Although relevant to some extent, the Iranian translation curriculum is vastly aiming at developing several other components, among other things, English proficiency, language teaching, linguistics, and literature. Recently the curriculum was completely revised and a new curriculum has been introduced which admittedly aims at improving trainees' translation competence, and preparing them for specialized translation projects. Despite the improvements in the revised version, it seems to be based on neither a specific definition or theory on translation competence nor a careful analysis of the market, professional translators' profile, and trainee translators' needs. However, with all the changing requirements of the modern market,

curriculum design is imperative to be an ongoing, dynamic process and not limited to the commencement of a program. Moreover, learner needs analysis in addition to principles and environment analysis are indispensable processes of curriculum design. On a different note, it seems that the female and male trainees have different purposes of attending translation programs (Ameri & Ghahari, 2018). These individual differences could also be notable among students who are still completing their translation program and graduates who entered the labor market, which deserves some attention. Overall, this study tries to understand whether the Iranian translator trainees' needs and wants correspond to the old and revised curricula of undergraduate English translation and whether male and female trainees, who might be current students or graduates, holds differing views.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Curriculum Development
Curriculum has been a key issue since humans started to make inquiries about how to educate themselves; nevertheless, the works regarding curriculum can be traced back to the education philosophers after Plato (Bellack, 1969). More curriculum-related activities by education scholars were carried out in the late 19th and beginning of 20th century which finally led to the emergence of curriculum as an independent field of study in the US in 1981. The year was replete with influential publications on the issue, the most important of which was Franklin Bobbit's *The Curriculum*; therefore, this is the birth year of the field (Klein, 1986; Wiles & Bondi, 2010).

Since the emergence of the field, the term curriculum has been used to refer to different phenomena, such as a program of study, plan for instruction, and subject matter or content, depending on the approach taken. The general traditional understanding of the term is associated with a physical document, a guideline or a plan for instruction (Wiles & Bondi, 2010). For curriculum

specialists, however, it is a "set of plans, intentions, activities or outcomes that are delivered in a variety of ways in different setting" (Wiles & Bondi, 2010, p. 1).

Central to the field of curriculum is the question of how to develop or plan curriculum. Curriculum development or planning refers to the process of making choices about designing a learning experience for students and activating such choices using coordinated activities (Wiles & Bondi, 2010, p. 2). It concerns the planning, implementation and evaluation of curriculum, along with the involved agents, processes and procedures used in curriculum construction (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2005). Every theory on curriculum development should include objectives, content, methods, and assessment dimensions (Scott, 2001), which are considered as the keys to plan an educationally valid curriculum (Canon & Newble, 2000).

Currently, there are five predominant curriculum approaches, including systematic, existentialist, radical, pragmatic, and deliberative traditions (Null, 2016), each of which deals with the above-mentioned dimensions based on different philosophies. Yet, there is a general agreement among all these traditions that investigation of needs is an integral part of any curriculum development activity. Needs assessment—also referred to as needs analysis—taking different forms, is at work in different stages of curriculum construction, from the primary stage of goal establishment to assessment. In the following section, a description of needs assessment and different approaches to it is provided.

2.2 What is Needs Assessment?

In the context of education, a need is a "learning or performance gap between the current condition and the desired condition" (Gupta, 2007, p. 14). Hutchinson and Waters (1987) classify needs into necessities (learners' needs to perform a task effectively), lacks (learners' current knowledge & what they

lack), and wants (learners' opinion of what they need). Needs assessment is, thus, the process of discovering such gaps and the way to bridge them.

Based on the nature of investigated needs and the approach taken to the investigation, needs assessment can take different forms. It can be knowledge and skill assessment which involves identification of knowledge and skills essential to function effectively and prescription of procedures to close knowledge and skill gap. It can be job and task analysis in which the scope, task and responsibilities for a particular job is profiled. It can take the form of competency-based needs assessment which focuses on identification of the competencies essential to perform a task perfectly. Finally, it can be strategic needs assessment which involves internal and external factors influencing performance in an organization approach and spots the gaps between the existing and desired conditions (Gupta, 2007).

Needs assessment is an important process in any curriculum development and evaluation procedures. Even some curriculum development models are mainly based on needs assessment processes. For instance, Nation and Macalister (2010) introduce a model for language curriculum development which is applicable to other learning situations. They propose the following steps: environment analysis (which can be considered as a form of needs assessment), needs analysis, application of principles, establishment of goals, content and sequencing, format and presentation, monitoring and assessment, and evaluation. Such an approach to curriculum development, is vitally focused on the needs of learning stakeholders including the students, the teachers and the society- what many translator training programs are lacking. Hopefully, research on the renewal of translation programs has proliferated. The following section provides an overview of needs assessment efforts for the purpose of translation curriculum development.

2.3 Needs Assessment in Translator Training

Institutional training of translators began in the second half of 20th century as a result of globalization and consequently the international need for professional translators (Caminade & Pym, 1998). Since the establishment of translation training programs, the debate has mainly revolved around how to train translators (Gile, 2009; González Davies, 2004; Kiraly, 2000; Vienne, 2000) and the competences to be taught (Kelly, 2005; Kiraly, 2000; PACTE, 2011; Schäffner & Adab, 2000) with little reference to the curricular development aspects. Before the implementation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), or Bologna process, the publications related to the curricular aspect of translator training only described the general features of programs at different institutions (Schaffner, 2000; Nord, 2005; Ulrych, 2005) and reported barely any systematic curriculum design processes (Kelly, 2010a). The inadequacy of translation programs in preparing students for the market and the implementation of Bologna process encouraged translator training scholars to look for the underlying problem in the curriculum.

Among the very first authors addressing curriculum development issues is D. Li (2000, 2001, 2002, 2007) who introduces the importance of needs assessment in the translation curriculum development and assessment. Following Reviere, Berkowitz, Carter, and Ferguson (1996), he defines needs assessment as the "systematic and ongoing process of providing usable and useful information about the needs of the target population" (D. Li, 2001, p. 290). He argues if translation programs are indented to aid in fulfilling the changing expectations of their target society, constant analysis and identification of real needs of practicing translators and student translators is crucial. D. Li (2001) maintains using these methods, the needs of not only the stakeholders of learning including the students and teachers but also

professional translators and employers of translation graduate should be investigated.

Kelly (2005) takes a participant-oriented, systematic approach to translation curriculum development and syllabus planning in which a logical link between different dimensions of curriculum, which is objectives, content, methods, and the assessment, is made. For Kelly, curriculum development involves the following steps: identifying social needs, formulating outcomes, identifying students' profiles and needs, designing course content, identifying resources, designing activities, designing assessment, designing course evaluation, implementing the curriculum and enhancing the quality. She is of the view that contextual factors and requirements, such as "social needs, professional standards, industry's needs and views, institutional policy, institutional constraints, disciplinary considerations and student/trainee profiles" (Kelly, 2005, p. 22) influence the curriculum structure.

In her later publication, Kelly (2008) attempts to redefine a translator trainer competence, described in her earlier work (Kelly, 2005), based on the UK Higher Education Academy's Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning in higher education. Highlighting the importance of needs assessment as the first step in establishing learning outcomes and in relating the training to the actual practice, she presents the results of a needs assessment study in Spain to pinpoint competences that translator trainers need to improve. She concludes that needs assessment of the trainees can be used to create a competence-based profile which ultimately demonstrates what training activities to be designed for trainers.

Gabr (2007) is the first scholar who deals with the question of how to develop a curriculum for a translation program. He introduces a quality-centered process for designing, developing, and implementing translation

programs. The model is founded on Total Quality Management (TQM) which is originally a business theory focusing on productivity and quality enhancement in an organization in which customer satisfaction and needs are prioritized. Due to the nature of translation market and its requirements, unpredictable technological developments, and evolving needs of students, Gabr argues, maintaining quality requirements in translation departments is an obstacle which can be overcome by exploring the market's, the translation department's and the student's needs. According to this model, the curriculum development should start with identifying market's and students' needs. The results of market and students needs analysis helps to define objectives.

Needs assessment can also be used to inform course design and adapt ready-made teaching guidelines to different contexts. X. Li (2016) conducted a learning needs assessment in China on 54 second-year undergraduate translation students to identify students' needs regarding their intercultural competence so as to promote intercultural competence in translators through the development of a toolkit for universities to integrate intercultural competence in their translation programs. X. Li argues that through needs assessment not only students' prior knowledge can be estimated but also they can engage in creating curriculum, thus conducting needs assessment. The findings of X. Li's (2015) study demonstrated the students' assessment of their level of intercultural competence, the needs to be focused on in teaching intercultural competence, their preferred learning experience and that the students were aware of the importance of intercultural competence.

As previously mentioned, the implementation of European Higher Education Area (EHEA) (1999), or Bolonga process, has been the springboard for the reform in higher education and relating the programs more to societal and market needs across Europe. As one of the goals of EHEA, studies on the employability have recently proliferated. The scope of

the concept goes beyond preparing for the market place, encompassing the ability to find and to maintain employment, and to grasp the changing market opportunities (Beyond, 2010). Such a concept urges the collaboration between the higher education institutions and the labor market to enhance students' employability. Therefore, obtaining formal feedback from students and employers (i.e., needs analysis) is at work both in the process of identifying and embedding employability skills in the curriculum and ensuring that employability skills are properly defined and incorporated in the curriculum (Álvarez-Álvarez & Arnáiz-Uzquiza, 2017; Astley & Torres Hostench, 2017; Rodríguez de Céspedes, 2017; Schnell & Rodríguez, 2017).

Al-Batineh and Bilali (2017) evaluate translator training programs in the Middle East and North Africa by conducting a comparison between the curricula and course descriptions of the programs and the job descriptions in this region. The findings demonstrated the most important competences according to the job descriptions and the most and least covered areas by the programs. The results revealed a general inconsistency between the priorities of the market and those of the programs. The authors urge bridging the gap between the academia and the language industry so that the programs can better serve the market demands. This can be conducive to identification of the market's current as well as future trends which leads to introduction of more efficient programs.

2.4 Studies on the Translation Curriculum in Iran

The outdated undergraduate English translation program of Iran has been constantly criticized by scholars. Some criticisms have been leveled against the students' admission process and their language requirements before entering the program (Toosi, 1990 in Riazi & Razmjoo, 2004). It is also criticized for its deficiency in clarifying its objectives to the teachers (Yarmohammadi, 1985). Miremadi (2003) and Mirza Ebrahim Tehrani

(2003) criticize the program for its strong focus on language learning skills instead of translation skills and for ignoring Persian language skills.

Riazi and Razmjoo (2004) highlight the translation students' and graduates' inability in assuming a functional role in today's life and find its underlying reason in inadequacy of the curriculum. They recommended the inclusion of courses that can help students reach full mastery of English and Persian, courses for introducing translation tools, some courses on text and discourse analysis, together with several courses on audiovisual translation, sight translation, machine translation and computer-aided translation.

Ahmadisafa and Amraii (2011) attempt at identifying a competence pattern in the undergraduate translation program and draw a comparison between the derived pattern and Kelly's (2005) competence model to detect the required changes to improve the curriculum. Their study reveals that the curriculum covers five translation sub-competences, including communication, transfer, cultural, subject-area, and research competence. Moreover, the curriculum does not cover three subcompetences in the model, including professional and instrumental, interpersonal, and attitudinal competencies. The authors suggest the inclusion of some courses, such as information management, computer and information technology, professional issues in translation, translator cognition, and team translation so that the curriculum can better fit Kelly's (2005) model.

Khoshsaligheh (2012) conducts an exploratory factor analysis on the opinion of 41 translation graduates on the old curriculum in order to identify its core elements. He classifies the courses under four categories: translation-, language-, linguistic- and literature-relevant courses. In his later publication on the topic, he qualitatively investigates translation faculty members' opinion about the old translation curriculum (Khoshsaligheh, 2014). The participants point to basing the curriculum on the needs of the market by

conducting market needs analysis. They highlight the importance of practical and workshop courses on translation and recommend the inclusion of internship to the curriculum. Less emphasis on linguistic, testing and teaching principles is also demanded.

Salari and Khazaee Farid (2015) conduct a needs analysis on active agents of translation market, including certified and professional translation agencies, clerks of international bank branches, publishers, travel agencies, translation trainers and trainees. Their analyses revealed translation graduates' deficiencies in the work environment as well as the required skills for each work environment. Their findings indicated the importance of such courses as Persian writing, literary translation, translation of legal documents, and morphology. The courses suggested to be included in the future curriculum include technical translation, culture, internship, editing, tourism translation, computers and CAT tools, and reversed translation. Testing, linguistics, and teaching principles are identified as inessential courses.

Considering the importance of learners' needs assessment in curriculum development and the limited research on the learners' perceptions, this study attempts to answer these research questions:

1. What are the most and the least important categories of pedagogical courses to improve translation competence in the view of the Iranian translator trainees?

2. What are the most and the least important pedagogical courses to improve translation competence in the view of the Iranian translator trainees?

3. To what extent the Iranian translator trainees' needs and wants correspond to the current and revised curricula of undergraduate English translation?

3. Method

Based on a criterion sampling technique, 503 Iranian native speakers of Persian (351 females & 152 males) participated in this study. Their age ranged from 21 to 42 (M=26.4). The sample comprised 292 senior students who were finishing an undergraduate program in English translation and 211 graduates with a BA in English translation from Iranian universities. The participants were invited and selected from a wide range of twelve institutes of higher education across Iran.

To gauge the translation trainees' perspectives on the old syllabus a structured questionnaire was used as the instrument for data collection; it was self-designed based on preliminary focus group interviews and review of the literature. The questionnaire's items were about different courses currently taught in the Iranian universities, in addition to proposed courses extracted from the focus group interviews with professional translators and translation scholars and the related literature on translation pedagogy.

The questionnaire items were thematically classified into six basic groups based on the comments and recommendations of several Iranian TS scholars and translator educators. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was run on the collected quantitative data both to examine the adequacy of the inventory as well as to evaluate the construct validity of the questionnaire. After verification of the model of categorization, descriptive statistics were used to identify the most and the least important category of pedagogical courses. To address the second and third research questions, the courses were classified on the basis of their means to identify the most and least pedagogical courses. Independent samples t-tests were run to investigate the perceived importance of the pedagogical categories across gender and educational levels.

4. Results

For the ease and clarity of the analysis, the items were thematically classified and a six-category model was created. The six main categories were named

Language Mastery, *Literature*, *Applied Linguistics*, *Translation Theories*, *Translation Practice*, and *Development*. Although the inventory model enjoyed content validity as it was already subjected to the comments and recommendations of several Iranian TS scholars and translator educators, the categorization model was quantitatively examined for adequacy through the goodness of fit indices, calculated by IBM SPSS Amos 19.0. The relevant indices are presented in Table 1. As evident, the model fits the data adequately considering that the indices are as they should be: chi-square index divided by the degrees of freedom *(χ^2/ df)* should be less than 3 (Ullman, 2001), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) over .90, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) equal or less than .06 (Schumacker & Lomax, 2004).

Table 1
Goodness of Fit Indices

Fit index	χ^2/ df	GFI	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
Model	2.57	.95	.93	.92	.06

The scale reliability analysis also showed that each category enjoyed an acceptable internal consistency value of approximately .71 or higher (Table 2).

Table 1

Reliability information of the Scale of Relevant Pedagogical Courses for an Undergraduate Curriculum of English Translation

Subscales	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Item No.
C1: Language Mastery	12	.82	3, 7, 18, 21, 22, 23, 28, 31, 40, 43, 52, 54
C2: Literature	9	.85	6, 13, 16, 25, 29, 33, 39, 45, 58
C3: Applied Linguistics	7	.79	4, 10, 19, 44, 46, 48, 51
C4: Translation Theories	10	.82	12, 15, 17, 24, 26, 34, 41, 53, 55, 57
C5: Translation Practice	15	.84	1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 20, 27, 30, 32, 35, 37, 47, 49, 50
C6: Development	5	.71	9, 36, 38, 42, 56

Descriptive statistics were used to identify the most and the least important category of pedagogical courses in the view of translation trainees who attended the survey. The descriptive statistics demonstrate that the most important category was Translation Practice (M=1.89, SD=.71) and after that, by a slim margin, Language Mastery (M=1.85, SD=.78) stood. The third, fourth, and fifth categories, also by a slim margin, were Applied Linguistics (M=1.39, SD=.90), Translation Theories (M=1.28, SD=.94), and Development (M=1.00, SD=.98). Finally, Literature (M=.89, SD=1.05) was the least important category in the view of the translation trainees.

In order to address the second research question of the study, that is identification of the most and the least important pedagogical courses to improve in the view of the trainees, the courses were classified on the basis of their mean (see appendix for more details on the significance of each course, the category it belongs to, and its existence in the old and the revised curricula). The highest rated pedagogical courses in the category of translation practice were Interpreting (M= 2.41, SD=.99), Idioms in Translation (M=2.36, SD=1.01), Audiovisual Translation (M=2.27, SD=1.12). In the category of Language Mastery, the three highest rated courses included Listening Comprehension (M=2.27, SD=1.10), Reading Comprehension (M=2.22, SD=1.11), English Language Grammar (M=2.17, SD=1.14). Theoretical Principles of Translation (M=1.64, SD=1.49), Advanced Translation Theories (M=1.54, SD=1.60), and Cultural Studies and Translation (M=1.50, SD=1.45) were the highest rated courses in Translation Theories group. In Applied Linguistics category, English Morphology (M=1.86, SD=1.41), Contrastive Analysis (M=1.60, SD=1.44), and Discourse Analysis (M=1.57, SD=1.25) stood as the highest rated courses. In the category of Development, the highest rated courses were Language Study

Skills (*M*=1.53, *SD*=1.47), Data Mining and the Internet (*M*=1.46, *SD*=1.46), and Critical Thinking (*M*=1.14, *SD*=1.49). In the least important category, that is Literature, the highest rated courses included English Prose (*M*=1.50, *SD*=1.42), Poetry (*M*=1.18, *SD*=1.44), and Literary Criticism (*M*=1.07, *SD*=1.39). The least important courses, obtaining means lower than one, included French as a Foreign Language (*M*=.96, *SD*=1.82), Persian Literature in the World Literature (*M*=.91, *SD*=1.55), Ethics and Philosophy in Translation (*M*=.83, *SD*=1.56), Persian Classical Texts (*M*=.81, *SD*=1.73), Modern Literature in Iran (*M*=.78, *SD*=1.62), Project Management (*M*=.75, *SD*=1.44), Language Testing (*M*=.70, *SD*=1.57), Persian Poetry (*M*=.39, *SD*=1.61), Third-world Literature (*M*=.38, *SD*=1.65), and Principles of Logic (*M*=.12, *SD*=1.71). In order to determine to what extent the Iranian translator trainees' needs and wants correspond to the old and revised curricula of undergraduate English translation the data were collected from the course descriptions in each of the curriculum, which is summarized in a table (see appendix).

Another objective of the study was to examine whether there is a significant difference between the perceived importance of the pedagogical categories by the male and female translator trainees. Therefore, an independent samples *t*-test was conducted, suggesting that there was not a significant difference between the views of the male (*M*=1.82, *SD*=.78) and female trainees (*M*=1.87, *SD*=.74) of the importance of Languages Mastery category; *t* (491)=-.65, *p* =.52. There was not a significant difference between the views of male (*M*=.83, *SD*=1.16) and female trainees (*M*=.92, *SD*=.99) of the importance of the category of Literature; *t* (491)=-.88, *p*=.38. There was not a significant difference between the views of male (*M*=1.36, *SD*=.87) and female trainees (*M*=1.41, *SD*=.90) of the importance of the category of Applied Linguistics; *t* (491)=-.52 *p*=.60. There was not a significant

difference between the views of male (M=1.33, SD=.91) and female trainees (M=1.25, SD=.93) of the importance of the category of Translation Theories; t (491)=.83, p=.41. There was not a significant difference between the views of male (M=1.85, SD=.68) and female trainees (M=1.91, SD=.69) of the importance of the category of Translation Practice; t (491)=-.98, p=.33. There was not a significant difference between the views of the male (M=1.05, SD=1.01) and female trainees (M=.99, SD=.95) of the importance of the category of Development; t (491)=.62, p=.53.

An independent samples t-test was conducted to examine whether there is a significant difference between the perceived importance of the pedagogical courses by the undergraduate and graduate students of translation. The results indicated that there was a significant difference between the views of undergraduate (M=1.93, SD=.65) and graduate students (M=1.73, SD=.91) of the importance of Languages; t (355.1)=2.80, p=.01. There was a significant difference between the views of the undergraduate (M=1.47, SD=.88) and graduate students (M=1.26, SD=.91) of the importance of Applied Linguistics; t (442.7)=.55, p=.01. There was a significant difference between the view of the undergraduate (M=1.12 SD=.91) and graduate students (M=1.49, SD=.95) of the importance Translation Theories; t (438.5)=-4.36, p=.00. However, there was not a significant difference between the views of the undergraduate (M=.91, SD=1.06) and graduate students (M=.87, SD=1.04) of the importance of the category of Literature; t (500)= -.91, p=.68. There was not a significant difference between the views of the undergraduate (M=1.91, SD=.70) and graduate students (M=1.86, SD=.74) of the importance of Translation Practice; t (435.2)=.64, p=.52. Finally, there was not a significant difference between the views of undergraduate (M=1.02, SD=.97) and graduate students (M=.97, SD=.98) of the importance of Development; t (446.9)=.64, p=.52.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

The first objective of the study was to identify the importance of each category of pedagogical courses to improve translation competence in the view of the translator trainees. As the findings suggest, the trainees found Translation Practice as the most important category. This finding substantiates previous findings in the literature on the significance of practical courses in the view of translation students, translator trainers, professional translators and administrators of translation services (Khoshsaligheh, 2014; D. Li, 2000, 2002, 2007; Salari & Khazaee Farid, 2015), highlighting the importance of practice-oriented courses in the development of translation competence. It might also imply that the majority of the trainees studying in the Iranian translation programs seem to primarily aspire translation-related occupations. Fortunately, both the old and revised curricula mainly consist of such courses.

The second most important category by a slim margin is Language Mastery or technically bilingual competence—the basic and integral sub-competence of translation competence (PACTE, 2011; Schäffner & Adab, 2000). Our finding is in a good agreement with D. Li (2000), Riazi and Razmjoo (2004) and Al-Batineh and Bilali (2017). Although our finding emphasizes the importance of language-relevant courses in developing translation competence, it also suggests another fact in the Iranian context. Most translator trainees in Iran do not hold a perfect mastery of the foreign languages when entering the programs, as English is treated as foreign language in Iran. The students' second language proficiency is poorly assessed before entering the program, so, in many cases; their language learning process coincides with the development of their translation competence, which leads to inadequate development of both their language and translation competence. It has been a challenge to both the previous and

revised curricula and the only solution was presenting several language-relevant courses, such as reading comprehension and grammar, throughout three semesters of the program. The long-term solution, however, can be a change in the admission process at Iranian universities.

Courses pertaining to Applied Linguistics and Translation Theories were ranked as the next categories, respectively, and stood in the middle of the categorization. Salari and Khazaee Farid (2015) report that courses on Applied Linguistics as not favored courses by the students and that they prefer using translation theories in practice than studying them as stand-alone courses. Khoshsaligheh (2014) is of the view that there should be a few courses on Applied Linguistics and reports that translator trainers hold contradictory views about courses on Translation Theories. Our finding can be regarded as an indication of the students' preference toward a program, which provides a combination of theoretical and practical courses. However, most students were unsure about the contribution of these two categories in development of their translation competence and their future careers as translators. Moreover, this finding can be interpreted as the wash-back effect of the MA admission examination for Translation Studies in Iran. The MA admission examination and MA programs are basically focused on linguistics and translation theories. This has led both the undergraduate and graduate students to find these two categories almost as important as each other.

The next category is development, which mostly involves personal development skills and workplace-related professionalism. This finding is inconsistent with the literature, which revealed the great importance of such skills in the view of employers and in job descriptions (Al-Batineh & Bilali, 2017; D. Li, 2007). Ahmadisafa and Amraii (2011) report that this category is missing in the old curriculum and assert that this important translation sub-competence should be given due consideration and attention in upcoming

curricula. Interestingly, the trainees considered such courses irrelevant to the work of a translator. They did not seem to have a clear conception of their future work situation and the required skills in the translation market, and it can be deduced that the translation program has failed to properly introduce the market needs and wants to the would-be translators. Fortunately, some of the courses under this category are included in the revised curriculum to help students make this career as professionals.

Finally, Literature stands as the least significant category, which is in line with Salari and Khazaee Farid (2015). The rationale for the abundance of Literature-related courses in both old and revised curricula is unknown—whether they are included as a tool for first and second language improvement or for introducing cultures (Ahmadisafa & Amraii, 2011). Therefore, the curriculum planners are advised to clarify the objectives of the curriculum and each single course for the trainers, otherwise it results in the students' confusion or lack of interest and trust toward the program or a given course.

As far as the second research question is concerned, the most important course in the view of translator trainees is *interpreting* which is in line with D. Li (2000, 2001) who reports professional translators and translator trainees identified the interpreting courses among the most helpful courses in their job. This finding is inconsistent with Salari and Khazaee Farid (2015) and Khoshsaligheh (2014) who suggest that for interpreting needs a separate specific program to be established and teaching it in the translation program is not helpful. These courses are among the most popular courses because many students aspire to become an interpreter and think there are many interpreting job opportunities in the market—which is not quite true. As there are no specialized interpreting programs in Iran, students have always been complaining about the few interpreting courses. Both the current and revised

curricula aim to train interpreters, however, only three two-credit courses have been introduced for this purpose. An improvement in the revised curriculum is that the title of each course has changed so that in each course a specific type of interpreting is practiced, say simultaneous interpreting.

The second most important course is Idioms in Translation. Although the name of the course suggests that it focuses on translation of idioms, according to the old curriculum, it has other objectives, including learning how to use dictionaries and reference tools and how to deal with terminological challenges. This has led the course to practically go beyond what it appears to be and become the first course focusing on translating into English. This fact can explain why it is ranked as the second most important course. Given that each objective requires a stand-alone course, in the revised curriculum, a new course is introduced, which is Translating Cultural Expressions and the focus is on identification and translation of idioms and culture-specific items. The students become familiar with dictionaries and reference tools in another course titled Principles of Translation. A separate course titled Translating Persian Texts in Humanities is incorporated which concerns translating into English.

The third course is English listening comprehension. This finding correlates with our earlier finding on interpreting as the most important course, as the interpreters are assumed to have high listening comprehension capabilities for their careers. In the revised curriculum, as previously mentioned, listening and speaking course numbers have reduced, which is inconsistent with the needs of the trainees and will affect their level of preparation for interpreting courses and jobs. Audiovisual translation is ranked as the fourth most important course, which is consistent with D. Li (2002) and Khoshsaligheh (2014). The market on audiovisual translation has expended in the past few years and diverse and rewarding job opportunities

in subtitling and revoicing markets became available (Khoshsaligheh & Ameri, 2017).

There are some courses, which were also rated important by the respondents, which were not embedded in the old curricula and now are included in the revised version. These new courses are Translation Internship, Editing & Revision in Translation, Computer Aided Translation, Data Mining and the Internet, Terminology Management, Critical Thinking, Machine Translation, Localization and Globalization and Literary Criticism. As the list suggests, these courses mostly serve the purpose of market preparation, which hopefully make the next generation of the translator trainees more familiar with the technological and technical know-hows in the industry.

Among the least important courses is French as a foreign language which stood in the 49th rank. The obsolete translator training curriculum did not have any courses on second language learning opportunities. The revised version inserted some five two-credits courses on learning a new language. Given the non-mandatory nature of these courses, the translation departments could offer other courses. These courses were not rated important by the students. One reason that could be attributed to it is by taking five courses, one would not be perfect in the given language. Five literature-related courses are also among the least important courses, namely Persian Literature in World Literature, Persian Classical Texts, Persian Poetry, Modern Literature in Iran and Third-world Literature. As the title of the courses suggests almost all of them pertain to Persian language. It can support our previous speculation about the fact that the trainees are barely aware of the role of literature in building knowledge of language and culture, and that they have taken first language and culture as something they are already perfectly familiar requiring no practice. Despite the students' lack of interest in these

courses, Persian Classic Literature, Persian Contemporary Literature, and Resistance Literature are included in the new curriculum. Here again, the curriculum developers need to specify and clarify their reasons for inclusion of these courses and how they can help building translation competence.

Ethics and Philosophy in Translation is among the least important course. This course is highly theoretical and beyond the scope of undergraduate programs and needs of the students. Moreover, in the case of Ethics students believed that there is no need for a single course on ethics, as they can become familiar with the issues during practical courses. Project Management, interestingly, is ranked as the 54th category. Project management is considered as an important skill in the market (Olohan, 2007), nevertheless, the trainee translators studied in this study seemed to be quite unfamiliar with it. The reason may well be that the Iranian translation market probably has few job offers that may require skills and capabilities in project management. Language Testing stood was not rated high, which is in line with the literature (Ahmadisafa & Amraii, 2011; Khoshsaligheh, 2014; Salari & Khazaee Farid, 2015). It is a highly theoretical topic in second language teaching. Although a majority of the trainees aspires to become an English teacher, they mostly know that in the Iranian language institutes–where they will be working in future—the ready-made tests designed by the authors of books instructed in the institutes are used to assess the students' language skills. Finally, the least important course is Principles of Logic. In fact, the trainees are not familiar with logics, so they are not the right people to be asked about its effectiveness for translation jobs. Besides, the decision regarding to inclusion or exclusion of such a course requires empirical evidence on its importance in translation quality.

Another finding of the study was that in none of the pedagogical categories, there was a significant difference between the perceived

importance of the categories by the male and female translator trainees. This finding together with our further findings regarding the educational level of the trainees might reflect that differences in perception of the trainees can better be explained by some other factors, such as knowledge, needs, and experiences. Our final analyses on the trainees' educational level and their perception of the importance of the pedagogical categories revealed that the categories of Languages and Applied Linguistics were found more important by the current students in comparison to the past students. That is said, the past students found Translation Theories more important. This is perhaps because they are now working as professional translators and better appreciate the importance and use of theories in practice and in guiding their translation decisions.

Taken all together, the changes in the revised curriculum have made the translation programs more student-friendly. However, it can be felt that the past students who received training according to the old curricula are suffering from a lack of knowledge in many aspects, especially market requirements. The teachers are also required to keep pace with the market changes and technological advances. Moreover, curriculum planners should hold workshops for and meetings with the translator trainers, as the agents in charge of putting the curriculum into practice in order to introduce the curriculum and its objectives. In the course of such meetings, collaboration is fostered and ongoing, and constant curriculum renewal is facilitated. It is suggested that future works focus on examining the recent market needs and surveying translation agencies, professional and seasoned translators as well as translation trainees to have a more comprehensive overview of the translator training program in Iran.

Acknowledgements

References

Ahmadisafa, M. A., & Amraii, A. (2011). An evaluation of undergraduate translation curriculum in terms of the development of translation competence. *Language and Translation Studies, 44*(3), 22-50.

Al-Batineh, M., & Bilali, L. (2017). Translator training in the Arab world: are curricula aligned with the language industry? *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 11*(2-3), 187-203.

Álvarez-Álvarez, S., & Arnáiz-Uzquiza, V. (2017). Translation and interpreting graduates under construction: do Spanish translation and interpreting studies curricula answer the challenges of employability? *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 11*(2-3), 139-159.

Ameri, S., & Ghahari, S. (2018). Developing a motivational framework in translation training programs: A mixed methods study following self-determination and social capital theories. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 12*(2), 227-243.

Astley, H., & Torres Hostench, O. (2017). The European graduate placement scheme: an integrated approach to preparing Master's in Translation graduates for employment. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 11*(2-3), 204-222.

Bellack, A. A. (1969). History of curriculum thought and practice. *Review of educational research, 39*(3), 283-292.

Beyond, B. (2010). Report on the development of the European Higher Education Area. Leuven Ministerial Conference 28-29 April 2009.

Burnaby, B. (1989). Parameters for projects under the settlement language training program. Toronto, Candada: TELS Canada Federation.

Caminade, M., & Pym, A. (1998). Translator-training institutions. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 280-285). London, England: Routledge.

Canon, R., & Newble, D. (2000). A handbook for teachers in universities and colleges. *A guide to improving teaching methods.* London, England: Routledge.

Gabr, M. (2007). A TQM approach to translator training: Balancing stakeholders' needs and responsibilities. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 1*(1), 65-77.

Gile, D. (2009). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training* (Vol. 8): John Benjamins Publishing.

González Davies, M. (2004). *Multiple voices in the translation classroom: Activities, tasks and projects*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Gupta, K. (2007). *A practical guide to needs assessment* (2ⁿᵈ ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Hutchinson, T., & and Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Kelly, D. (2005). *A handbook for translator trainers*. Manchester, England: St. Jerome.

Kelly, D. (2008). Training the trainers: towards a description of translator trainer competence and training needs analysis. *TTR: Traduction, terminologie, rédaction, 21*(1), 99-125.

Kelly, D. (2010a). Curriculum. In Y. Gambier & L. Van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 87-94). Amsterdam, The Nethelands: John Benjamins

Kelly, D. (2010b). Translation didactics. In Y. Gambier & L. v. Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 389-396). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Khoshsaligheh, M. (2012). *EFL competence, translation competence, translator competence: An unfortunate comprise.* Paper presented at the The first conference on language learning and teaching: an interdisciplinary approach, Mashhad, Iran.

Khoshsaligheh, M. (2014). Target competences in training English-Persian Translators. *Language and Translation Studies, 47*(3), 113-143.

Khoshsaligheh, M., & Ameri, S. (2017). *Didactics of audiovisual translation in Iran so far: Prospects and solutions*. Paper presented at the National Conference on Interdisciplinary Approaches to Translation Education, Tehran, Iran.

Kim, M. (2013). Research on translator and interpreter education. In C. Millán & F. Bartrina (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation studies* (pp. 102-116). Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Kiraly, D. C. (2000). *A social constructivist approach to translator education: Empowerment from theory to practice*. Manchester, England: St Jerome.

Klein, M. F. (1986). Alternative curriculum conceptions and designs. *Theory into practice, 25*(1), 31-35.

Laviosa, S., & González-Davies, M. (Eds.). (2020). *The Routledge handbook of translation and education*. London, England: Routledge.

Li, D. (2000). Tailoring translation programs to social needs: a survey of professional translators. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies, 12*(1), 127-149.

Li, D. (2001). Needs assessment in translation teaching: Making translator training more responsive to social needs. *Babel, 46*(4), 289-299.

Li, D. (2002). Translator training: What translation students have to say. *Meta, 47*(4), 513-531.

Li, D. (2007). Translation curriculum and pedagogy: Views of administrators of translation services. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies, 19*(1), 105-133.

Li, X. (2016). The first step to incorporate intercultural competence into a given translation curriculum: a micro-level survey of students' learning needs. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 10*(3), 285-303.

Lomax, R. G., & Schumacker, R. E. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Miremadi, S. A. (2003). A reflection on translation curriculum in universities and the solutions to tackle the problems. *Iranain Translation Studies Quarterly, 1*(2), 53-64.

Mirza Ebrahim Tehrani, F. (2003). Shortcomings of teaching translation in Iran. *Iranain Translation Studies Quarterly, 1*(2), 89-94.

Moghaddas, M., & Khoshsaligheh, M. (2019). Implementing project-based learning in a Persian translation class: a mixed-methods study. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *13*(2), 190-209.

Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. London, England: Routlege.

Nord, C. (2005). Training functional translators. In M. Tennent (Ed.), *Training for the new millennium: Pedagogies for translation and interpreting* (pp. 209–223). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Null, W. (2016). *Curriculum: From theory to practice*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Olohan, M. (2007). Economic trends and developments in the translation industry: what relevance for translator training? *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 1*(1), 37-63.

Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2005). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

PACTE. (2011). Results of the validation of the PACTE translation competence model: translation problems and translation competence. In C. Alvstad, A. Hild & E. Tiselius (Eds.), *Methods and strategies of process research: Integrative approaches in Translation Studies* (pp. 317–343). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Parvaresh, S., Pirnajmuddin, H., & Hesabi, A. (2019). Student resistance in a literary translation classroom: A study within an instructional conversion experience from a transmissionist approach to a transformationist one. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 13*(2), 132-151.

Pietrzak, P. (2019). The potential of reflective translator training. *Intralinea, 21*, online. Retrieved from http://www.intralinea.org/specials/article/the_potential_of_reflective_tran slator_training

Pym, A. (2008). On a proposed European Masters in Translation. Retrieved from http://www.tinet.cat/~apym/on-line/training/2008_eu_masters.pdf

Reviere, R., Berkowitz, S., Carter, C. C., & Ferguson, C. G. (Eds.). (1996). *Needs assessment: A creative and practical guide for social scientists*. Washington: Routldge.

Riazi, A. M., & Razmjoo, L. (2004). Developing some guidelines for a change in the program of English translation in Iranian universities. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities of Shiraz University, 21*(1), 28-39.

Rodríguez de Rodríguez de Céspedes, B. (2017). Addressing employability and enterprise responsibilities in the translation curriculum. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 11*(2-3), 107-122.

Salari, Z., & Khazaee Farid, A. (2015). The necessity to update the undergraduate translation curriculum based on the market needs. *Language and Translation Studies, 51*(1), 19-51.

Schaffner, C. (2000). Running before walking? Designing a translation programme at undergraduate level. In C. Schaffner & B. Adab (Eds.), *Developing translation competence* (pp. 143-156). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Schäffner, C., & Adab, B. (2000). *Developing translation competence*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Schnell, B., & Rodríguez, N. (2017). Ivory tower vs. workplace reality: Employability and the T&I curriculum–balancing academic education and vocational requirements: a study from the employers' perspective. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 11*(2-3), 160-186.

Scott, D. (2001). Curriculum theory. In N. J. Smelser & P. B. Baltes (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences* (Vol. 11, pp. 3195-3198). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier

Toosi, B. (1990). *Is translation teachable*. Paper presented at the first conference on Translation, Tabriz, Iran.

Ullman, S. (2001). Structural equation modeling. In B. Tabachnick & L. Fidell (Eds.), *Using multivariate statistics* (pp. 653-771). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Ulrych, M. (2005). Training translators: Programmes, curricula, practices. In V. M. Tennent (Ed.), *Training for the new millennium: Pedagogies for translation and interpreting* (pp. 3-34). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Vienne, J. (2000). Which competences should we teach to future translators, and how? In C. Schäffner & B. Adab (Eds.), *Developing translation competence* (pp. 91-100). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Wiles, J. W., & Bondi, J. C. (2010). *Curriculum development: A guide to practice*. London, England: Pearson.

Yarmohammadi, L. (1985). General guidline for the principles and regulations of translation and its research and teaching in universities. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities of Shiraz University*(1), 79-98.

Zia Hosseini, S. M. (2003). Translator training. *Iranain Translation Studies Quarterly, 1*(2), 83-88.

Appendix

Table 3

Significance of each course and the existence the current and the revised curricula

Subject	Mean	SD	Category	Current		Revised	
08 Interpreting	2.41	.992	C5: TP	Yes	Interpreting1&2&3	Yes	Consecutive +Simultaneous Interpreting+ Introduction to Modes of Interpreting
30 Idioms in Translation (En)	2.36	1.01	C5: TP	Yes	Idioms in Translation	Yes	Translating Cultural Expressions+ Methods and Principles of Translation
07 Listening Comprehension (En)	2.27	1.10	C1: L	Yes	Listening and Speaking 1&2	Yes	Basic + Advanced Listening-Speaking Skills
27 Audiovisual Translation	2.27	1.12	C4: TP	Yes	Translation of Audiovisual Files	Yes	Translating multimedia Texts
18 Reading Comprehension (En)	2.22	1.11	C1: L	Yes	Reading Comprehension 1&2&3	Yes	Basic+ Advanced Reading Comprehension
43 English Language Grammar	2.17	1.14	C1: L	Yes	Grammar 1&2	Yes	Basic + Advanced Grammar
03 Persian Language Grammar	2.13	1.13	C1: L	Yes	Persian Language Grammar	Yes	Persian Grammar
47 Translation of Journalistic Texts	2.10	1.15	C5: TP	Yes	Translation of Journalistic Texts	Yes	Translating Journalistic Texts
54 Conversation (En)	2.09	1.27	C1: L	Yes	Listening and Speaking 1 &2	Yes	Basic + Advanced Listening-Speaking Skills

English Translator …

49 Translation of Political Texts	2.05	1.24	C5: TP	Yes	Translation of Political Texts	Yes	Translating English + Persian Texts in Humanities
22 Reading Journalistic Texts (En)	2.04	1.19	C1: L	Yes	Reading Journalistic Texts	Yes	Reading Journalistic Texts
21 Essay Writing (En)	2.00	1.21	C1: L	Yes	Essay Writing + Advanced Writing	Yes	Essay Writing
02 Translation Quality Assessment	2.00	1.09	C5: TP	No		Yes	Translation Quality Assessment
35 Translation of Technical Texts	1.97	1.20	C5: TP	No		Yes	Translating Scientific and Technical Texts
50 Translation of Legal Documents	1.90	1.39	C5: TP	Yes	Translation of Correspondences and Legal Documents	Yes	Translating Legal Documents
11 Literary Translation in English	1.89	1.13	C5: TP	Yes	Translation of Literary Texts	Yes	Translating Literary Texts
37 Translation of Economic Texts	1.87	1.25	C5: TP	Yes	Translation of Economic Texts	Yes	Translating English + Persian Texts in Humanities
19 Morphology (En)	1.86	1.41	C3: AL	Yes	Morphology	Yes	Etymology and Terminology (En&Pr) + Introduction to Linguistics
14 Translation Internship	1.84	1.30	C5: TP	No		Yes	Translation Practicum
52 Business Correspondence (En)	1.82	1.31	C1: L	Yes	Letter Writing	Yes	English Correspondence
01 Editing & Revision in Translation	1.81	1.15	C5: TP	No		Yes	Persian Editing and Revising
41 Principles of Translation	1.64	1.49	C4: TS	Yes	Methods and Principles of Translation	Yes	Methods and Principles of Translation
28 Controlled Writing (En)	1.63	1.39	C1: L	No		No	
48 Contrastive Analysis	1.60	1.44	C3: AL	Yes	Contrastive analysis of Sentence Structure	Yes	Comparative Analysis of English and Persian Structures
10 Discourse Analysis	1.57	1.25	C3: AL	No		No	
55 Translation Theories	1.54	1.60	C4: TS	Yes		Yes	Introduction to Translation Theories
36 Language Study Skills	1.53	1.47	C6: D	Yes	Language Study Skills	Yes	Study Skills

57 Cultural Studies and Translation	1.50	1.45	C4: TS	No		No	
33 English Prose	1.50	1.42	C2: Lit	Yes	Samples of Simple Prose	Yes	Introduction to English Prose
20 Computer Aided Translation	1.49	1.38	C5: TP	No		Yes	Translation and Technology
31 Essay Writing (Pr)	1.48	1.44	C1: L	No	Persian Writing	Yes	Persian Writing
34 Translation Research Methodology	1.47	1.53	C4: TS	Yes		Yes	Research in Translation Studies
42 Data Mining and the Internet	1.46	1.46	C6: D	No		Yes	Translation and Technology
51 General Linguistics	1.41	1.44	C3: AL	Yes	General Linguistics 1&2	Yes	Introduction to Linguistics+ Applied Linguistics
23 Oral Reproduction of Stories	1.38	1.70	C1: L	Yes	Oral Reproduction of Stories	No	
44 Phonology (En)	1.29	1.65	C3: AL	Yes	Phonology (En)	Yes	Introduction to Linguistics
46 Language Teaching Methodology	1.25	1.76	C3: AL	Yes	Language Teaching Methodology	Yes	Language Teaching Methodology+ Teaching Language Skills
05 Terminology Management	1.25	1.34	C5: TP	No		Yes	Translation and Technology
17 Sociology and Translation	1.23	1.47	C4: TS	No		No	
24 Interpreting Studies	1.23	1.57	C4: TS	No		No	
13 English Poetry	1.18	1.44	C2: Lit	Yes	Samples of Simple Poetry	Yes	Introduction to English Poetry
38 Critical Thinking	1.14	1.49	C6: D	No		Yes	Lecturing and Speaking
32 Translation of Islamic Texts	1.12	1.71	C5: TP	Yes	Translation of Islamic Texts	Yes	The Study of Translated Islamic Texts 1&2+ Translating English Islamic Texts
15 Machine Translation	1.12	1.59	C4: TS	No		Yes	Translation and Technology
12 Localization & Globalization	1.11	1.49	C4: TS	No		Yes	Emerging Areas in Translation
53 Ideology and Translation	1.10	1.59	C4: TS	No		No	
06 Literary Criticism	1.07	1.39	C2: Lit	No		Yes	Introduction to Literary and Film Criticism
39 Survey in Literature (En)	1.01	1.47	C2: Lit	Yes	An Introduction to Literature (En)	Yes	English Literature: Short Story &

English Translator …

							Novel
40 French as a Foreign Language	.96	1.82	C1: L	Yes		Yes	Foreign Language
16 Persian Lit. in World Literature	.91	1.55	C2: Lit	No		No	
26 Ethics & Philosophy in Translation	.83	1.56	C4: TS	No		No	
58 Persian prose	.81	1.73	C2: Lit	No		Yes	Persian Classic Literature
29 Modern Literature in Iran	.78	1.62	C2: Lit	No	An Introduction to Contemporary Literature	No	Persian Contemporary Literature+ Resistance Literature
09 Project Management	.75	1.44	C6: D	No		No	
04 Language Testing	.70	1.57	C3: AL	Yes	Language Testing	Yes	Testing
25 Persian Poetry	.39	1.61	C2: Lit	No		No	
45 Third-world Literature	.38	1.65	C2: Lit	No		No	
56 Principles of Logic	.12	1.71	C6: D	No		Yes	Lecturing and Speaking