

Doktori (Ph.D.) értekezés tézisei – Summary of Doctoral Dissertation

Motivation, Autonomy and Assessment in Translation Studies BA Classes

Huszárné Prikler Mária Renáta

Supervisor: Dr. habil. Lehmann Magdolna, PhD

Doctoral Programme in English Applied Linguistics and TEFL/TESOL

Doctoral School in Linguistics

University of Pécs

2020

1. The focus of the dissertation and the main chapters

The dissertation addresses three different but interrelated fields of language pedagogy, autonomy, motivation and assessment with its main focus on how these fields are implemented in translation studies. The text is organized in three main parts, each comprising an overview of the relevant literature and an empirical research conducted in order to answer the research questions summarized in Table 1.

Part I is dedicated to student motivation in Translation Studies (TS). Chapter 1 provides an overview of the discipline in focus. It offers an introduction into Translation Studies, explains what translation students are expected to know, where they can acquire the necessary knowledge, and how happy they are with their studies.

Chapter 2 focuses on motivation, first in general, explaining the construct, comparing and contrasting different definitions, then turning to the narrower field of translation, discussing motivation in TS classes, pointing out motivating and demotivating factors, seeking and explaining tools which can be used to measure the construct: questionnaires, interviews and documents. The section on questionnaires contains a manual-like description of how this data collection instrument can be used, and explains how to construct such a tool, what researchers have to take into consideration to be able to collect the information they are interested in. The interviews and documents, including student essays and course syllabi, are discussed in a similar way.

Chapter 3 discusses the empirical study conducted in order to collect data on student motivation in Translation Studies BA classes. To explore the background, sections 3.1 and 3.2 overview translator training programs in Hungary as well as at the University of Pécs, where the research was conducted. Section 3.3 presents the rationale for the research methodology applied, along with the research questions for Study 1. It also describes the context, the participants, the data collection instruments, as well as the procedures and phases of data collection, and, finally, the analysis. For an overview of the main research questions see Table 1. The three phases of this study, each conducted with different data elicitation instruments (student essays, follow-up interviews, student questionnaire), are discussed in individual sections.

Chapter 4, Part II deals with autonomy, first in L2 acquisition in general. The section on learner autonomy (4.2) offers a range of definitions and an overview of milestone models. It also examines how learner autonomy is represented in the syllabi and how motivation and

learner autonomy are related. Section 4.3 is about teacher autonomy, also comparing definitions, and discussing how it can be traced in the syllabi, followed by describing how autonomy works in L2 classroom, and in translation studies seminars. The interdependence of learner and teacher autonomy essential in creating a student-centered autonomous learning environment is discussed in section 4.4.

The empirical study reported in Chapter 4 on the learner autonomy of BA students specializing in translation is forestalled by a short literature review of autonomy in translation (4.5). This small-scale study seeks answers to two research questions detailed in Table 1, using questionnaire as data collection instrument.

Part III places assessment in Translation Studies classes in the focus. It comprises three empirical studies with the main goal of examining translation assessment practices in Hungary, especially at the University of Pécs, and developing a new assessment instrument based on the positive features of existing grading scales by eliminating their drawbacks. To achieve this goal, the assessment scales currently used by numerous institutions were examined and compared, including the one in use at the University of Pécs. The small-scale study discussed in Chapter 5 examines how this scale worked by applying statistical procedures and analyzing inter-rater and intra-rater reliability measures. The findings indicated the necessity of developing a new, more valid and more reliable scale, a norm-referenced method which is independent of a priori judgments about the source text. It was assumed that an objective and reliable tool has to be based on the practice of using preselected items, presupposing a dichotomous approach to the evaluation of the preselected text segments: a translated segment is either acceptable (correct) or not acceptable.

Chapter 6 focuses on the steps of working toward a new assessment tool named PIER (PIE Revised), which is an adaptation of Kockaert and Segers' (2017; Van Egdom et al., 2019) norm-referenced assessment method, Preselected Items Evaluation (PIE). Section 6.1 presents a preliminary study on the lexical characteristics of 14 student translations. The aim of this small-scale research was to establish the lexical quality and readability of the translated texts before being assessed by expert-raters in order to provide pre-assessment information for the raters concerning what to expect and what to focus on. Section 6.2 reports the details of developing and piloting the new tool, PIER for assessing translations. Comparing it to the 'old' UP scale, advantages and disadvantages are identified based on assessment data and rater opinion.

Chapter 7 draws the final conclusions about what was analyzed and discussed in the three main parts of the dissertation; findings concerning each study are summarized and

integrated. Finally, the last section outline possible limitations of the research, the pedagogical implications of the studies, and suggestions for further research.

Table 1
An overview of the five studies research questions

Research questions	Data elicitation instruments	Participants	Method of analysis
PART I, Study 1: BA students' motivation in TS classes (2016-2019)			
Why do BA students choose translation as a specialization?	Student essays; Student interviews; Student questionnaires	8 BA students; 3 BA students; 24 BA students	Content analysis, Statistical analysis
What language background do they have when they enroll for the programme?			Content analysis, Statistical analysis
Which are the most important factors contributing to student motivation in BA translation classes?			Content analysis Statistical analysis
What do students find most motivating and most demotivating in their classes?			Content analysis Statistical analysis
How do they plan to use their translation skills after graduation?	Student interviews Student questionnaires	3 BA students; 24 BA students	Content analysis, Statistical analysis
PART II, study 2: Student autonomy in TS classes (2016-2019)			
How autonomous are BA students specializing in translation?	Student questionnaire	24 BA students	Content analysis, Statistical analysis
How does the BA specialization program support learner autonomy?	Student questionnaires; Syllabi	24 BA students; 4 teachers	Content analysis, Statistical analysis
How do syllabi support autonomy and motivation in translation classes?	Syllabi	4 teachers	Content analysis, Statistical analysis
How does teacher and student autonomy affect student motivation?	Student questionnaire; Syllabi	24 BA students; 4 teachers	Content analysis Statistical analysis
PART III: Assessing translations Study 3: An inquiry into how the 'old UP scale' of assessment worked (2017-2020)			
How does the rating scale in use work??	Rated exam translations (2017); Rating scale used at UP Teacher interviews	16 BA students; 4 teacher-raters	Statistical analysis Content analysis

How consistent are the raters in their assessment?	Rated exam translations (2017); Rating scale used at UP; Teacher interviews	16 BA students; five teacher-raters	Statistical analysis Content analysis
How do the raters evaluate the assessment instrument they apply to assess translation students' work?	Teacher interviews;	4 teacher-raters; head of the translation specialization program	Content analysis
What modifications do they recommend to make the scale more suitable/appropriate for assessing translation tests?	Interviews;	4 teacher-raters; head of the translation specialization program	Content analysis

Study 4: Lexical characteristics and readability of the translated texts chosen for assessment (2019-2020)

What are the most important lexical characteristics of HU – EN translations produced by BA students?	Unrated translations (2020) Compleat LexTutor Coh-Metrix	14 BA students	Statistical analysis
What readability measures can be predicted for the translated texts?	Unrated translations (2020) Compleat LexTutor Coh-Metrix	14 BA students	Statistical analysis

Study 5: Working towards a new assessment scale (PIER) (2020)

How many preselected items are necessary to create a norm-referenced, sufficiently discriminating translation assessment tool?	The source text of the translation test	5 expert raters; 1 financial expert	Content analysis
How does PIER perform in use? - How does it discriminate different qualities in translation? - In which ways does it improve inter-rater reliability? - Does it help raters to become more consistent in their assessment?	Rated translations (2020) The new assessment scale (PIER) SPSS	14 BA students (the translators); 5 expert raters	Statistical analysis
How do the raters evaluate the new tool(PIER) compared to the 'old' UP scale?	The new assessment scale (PIER), The 'old' UP scale Rater questionnaire	5 expert raters	Content analysis
Is PIER a suitable tool for assessing translations?	Rater questionnaire	5 expert raters	Content analysis

2. The findings of the studies

Although motivation seems to be a well-researched area in the vast arena of applied linguistics (Doró, 2010; Dörnyei, 1994; 1998; 2010; 2014; Dörnyei et al., 2014; Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998; Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998; Gardner, 2010; Heitzmann, 2014; Józsa et al., 2014; Kormos & Csizér, 2014; MacIntyre, 2002; Nikolov, 1999; Nikolov & Mihajlević Djigunović, 2006; Ushioda, 2016; Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2012), so far little attention has been paid to English majors who choose translation studies as a specialization at BA level at the University of Pécs (https://felveteli.pte.hu/kepzes_pdf/618).

Study 1 focused on BA students' motivation, seeking answers for five research questions (RQs). The data was collected in three phases, each employing different data collection instruments: student essays (1), semi-structured interviews (2) and, based on the findings of the first two phases and on the procedures recommended by Dörnyei (2010a), a student questionnaire (3).

(RQ1) Why do BA students choose translation as a specialization?

(RQ2) What language background do they have when they roll up for the course?

(RQ3) What are the most important factors contributing to student motivation in BA translation classes?

(RQ4) What do students find most motivating and most demotivating in their classes?

(RQ5) How do they plan to use their translation skills after graduating?

The first and the second phases of the study revealed that motivation was a key ID factor, and also a many-faceted phenomenon: what surfaced as neutral for one student (e.g., family background) turned out to be motivating, or even demotivating for others. Several factors to be taken into consideration when examining BA students' motivation in translation studies surfaced in the study, for instance aspects motivating students to achieve better results in what they do, and other factors to be changed. The students' answers underlined the importance of language proficiency, course content, teachers' personality and knowledge, the assignments they did, the amount they practiced, the way their work was assessed and the feedback they received. The interviews proved the importance of mastery motivation ("the simple fact that I can do my assignments is motivating for me"; "the teachers warned us that translating texts into English would be difficult, but I see I can do it and it makes me satisfied"; "it develops my vocabulary, so I can make better translations"). Instrumental motivation ("It seemed I would be able to make money with it"; "I want to do it because it pays better than literary translation") also got significant emphasis. It also turned out that the effect of the background depended on different, seemingly unrelated factors, for example the politically dependent educational system

of the period when the parents of the participating students went to school: they did not have the freedom of choice in learning foreign languages, which was demotivating for them. Now their children have a large variety of foreign languages to choose from, an opportunity which is motivating itself.

The questionnaire with its 26 questions on student motivation not only confirmed the findings of the first two phases, but added new aspects. The first part revealed that although the participants belonged to the same study groups, they claimed to be at different proficiency levels (between B2 and C2) either because there was a significant difference in the numbers of years the individual respondents had devoted to studying English before entering university (ranging from 3 to 13 years), or because they learnt English as a second foreign language at secondary school. Some of them were overconfident and estimated themselves to be well above their actual level. Concerning the motives of choosing translation as a specialization, what experience respondents had in the field and how difficult they found translation, the answers clearly show that most of them chose this program because they wanted to become professional translators, although they hardly had any knowledge of the profession and only very little experience. The questions of the third part aimed to elicit participant evaluation of the courses and program content. The students expressed their opinion on how their expectations were met, what they found motivating and demotivating, useful or not very helpful in their classes. The answers revealed mixed views and experiences; on average, 50% of the participants were satisfied in every respect with what they learnt. The findings of the part on assessment and feedback emphasized the motivating force of meaningful assignments and the importance of regular and detailed feedback: if they were positive or critical, but helpful, they were found to be overwhelmingly motivating, whereas negative feedback affected learning in unfavorable ways and its demotivating effect was documented. It turned out that the majority of the respondents wanted to make translation at least one element of their future professions, others wanted to do it for pleasure. Although the questionnaire was a good choice to elicit data on motivation, there were examples for the so called social desirability bias: some respondents had a preconception about what the desirable answer is and they will give that, even if it is not true (Dörnyei, 2010a). Overall, despite the low number of respondents (nearly everyone in the programme) and the identified caveats, the findings may contribute to improving translation training at University of Pécs.

Study 2 sought to answer research questions on autonomy in TS classes. Although the emphasis was on student autonomy, I examined it as a part of a complex system, because learner autonomy is bound to the teachers' own learning, their teaching experiences and also their

beliefs about autonomy, especially when the learning process takes place in the classroom (Little, 2000). The learning process is a “dialogue” between the learner and the teacher in formal (classroom) contexts (Little, 1995). In such contexts, learner autonomy and teacher autonomy become interdependent: the promotion of learner autonomy depends on the promotion of teacher autonomy. Finch (2001) also claimed that teachers can develop learner autonomy only when they are autonomous and act as facilitators of learner autonomy. All this takes place in the classroom where the “seeds of autonomous learning already exist” (Finch, 2001, p. 8) and presumes a degree of autonomy of both participants (T. Lamb & Murray, 2018; Nunan, 1997). Influenced by these trends in foreign language instruction, researchers called for a more process-oriented, learner-centered approach in translator training (Gile, 2009; Kiraly, 1995).

In order to examine the autonomous behavior of the target group I focused on four research questions:

(RQ1) How autonomous are BA students specializing in translation?

(RQ2) How does the BA specialization program support learner autonomy?

(RQ3) How do syllabi integrate and support autonomy and motivation in TS classes?

(RQ4) How does teacher and student autonomy affect student motivation?

In order to answer these questions, I used several data collection instruments. Ten questions in the previously discussed questionnaire focused on student autonomy. To gain data on teacher and classroom autonomy I examined twelve course syllabi. The findings revealed that the respondents to the questionnaire were at the very beginning of studying their chosen special area – translation – which demands a great deal of autonomy to be successful, starting with identifying one’s strengths and weaknesses, goal setting, choice making concerning tools, words, or ways of expression. At the beginning of their studies, they were dependent on their teachers’ guidance. However, their answers suggest that they were on the path of becoming autonomous both in their beliefs and in their practices. The programme offers the students enough practice to learn to work on their own, to make autonomous decisions concerning the length of the time they wanted to devote to fulfilling their tasks, the tools and background materials they wanted to use and the choices they had to make when translation problems arose. The practice described in the syllabi theoretically offered a motivating, student-centered learning environment, which would not be possible without autonomous teachers. But even if the syllabi suggested a degree of teacher autonomy, they also revealed that the teachers, with a few refreshing exceptions, practically followed the same routine, which might have been their autonomous decision, but resulted in uniform activities the students, according to findings, were satisfied with.

Both the questionnaire findings and the analysis of the syllabi proved that motivation and autonomy were interrelated. Having the opportunity to play an active role in classroom discussions of the translations created individually and to express their opinion on each other's work, to make their own choices, to set their own pace when doing their assignments and to learn from their own and others' mistakes made the participants not only more autonomous, but also more motivated. The teacher interviews revealed that the blended routine in doing assignments (starting them in class with teacher guidance, finishing them at home on their own, then discussing the translations in class) also resulted in a higher degree of motivation on students' part and fostered their autonomous behaviour, proving that student and teacher autonomy were interrelated.

Studies 3, 4, 5 dealt with assessment in Translation Studies classes. **Study 3**, an inquiry into the 'old UP scale' aimed to find answers for the following research questions:

(RQ1) How does the rating scale in use (the 'old UP scale') perform in terms of inter-rater reliability?

(RQ2) How consistent are the raters in their assessment?

(RQ3) How do the raters evaluate the assessment system they apply to assess translation students' work?

(RQ4) What modifications would they recommend for making the tool more appropriate for assessing the quality of translation and students' translation competence?

In order to answer RQ1 and RQ2, I examined 16 exam translations from English to Hungarian and 16 translations from Hungarian to English, each assessed by two raters independently. Although they used the same evaluation sheet, and followed the same criteria, there were considerable differences in their judgment concerning individual errors and the grades they gave the students in the end. The findings of the analysis, including Krippendorff's alpha, Cronbach's alpha and Intraclass Correlation Coefficient indicated low inter-rater reliability, which can be attributed to the poorly designed assessment tool, as well as the inconsistent use of the scale by the evaluators. There is another factor to be mentioned: the nature of error based assessment, which, from the students' perspective, is extremely demotivating; as for the raters' perspective, concentrating on and counting errors reveals only what candidates do not know, while what they know, might remain unnoticed. Also, the raters, when focusing on error counting and categorizing, which involves differentiating between error levels, can arrive at completely, often contradictory, even conflicting results. The reasons must

be looked for in the nature of the scale, which, as it has been already established, leaves room for subjective judgments in assessment (Angelelli, 2009; Eyckmans et al., 2009). The situation is similar when we look at intra-rater reliability (a measure of how consistent an evaluator is at measuring a constant phenomenon) of the same assessment tool. Although the major and minor errors are defined in the scale, the definition in some cases is so permissive that even the same evaluator scores identical solutions differently in the texts he assesses. It means that two students, making the same mistakes, can get different grades because of the rater's inconsistent scoring.

Concerning RQ3 and RQ4, the interviews underlined that the assessment scale in use did not meet the requirements of reliability in every respect. It contains elements, which are permissive and give place to subjective judgment, and consequently, to unfair grading. It has other caveats: it does not stipulate the treatment of repeated errors and it does not allow giving extra points for creative or otherwise brilliant solutions. It concentrates on errors, which is demotivating. Additionally, on the other hand, its pass level is extremely low, as it allows too many errors. The teacher-rater definitely would welcome a scale, which did not allow subjective judgement concerning the scores and that would stipulate repeated errors and reward excellent solutions. One rater even suggested that a different scale should be used for each exam, which would put more emphasis on terminology.

Study 4, already marking out the path to working towards a new assessment instrument focused on the best predictors of translation quality: lexical characteristics and readability. In this phase, 14 translations from Hungarian to English were examined in order to answer two research questions:

(RQ1) What are the most important lexical characteristics of BA students' HU-EN translations?

(RQ2) What readability indices characterize their texts?

To measure these two important features of translations, I relied on tests which are regarded to be reliable in measuring text difficulty and readability in general: Compleat Lexical Tutor (Cobb, 2015) and Coh-Metrix (Graesser, McNamara, Louwerse, & Cai, 2004). The lexical frequency profile of the 14 translations revealed features of specialized texts. A low coverage of frequent, general English words (73.35 %) was found in the translations as opposed to the 78-81% of K1-K2 words Nation found in general English texts (2006). The percentage of Coxhead's (2000) academic words was found to be high: 13.46%, whereas these words usually

provide around 10% the lexis in general English texts. It implies possible difficulties in the translation process.

Running Coh-Metrix tests on the translations provided further information on their quality and indicated high text difficulty level. The best-grounded index of Coh-Metrix, the RDL2 score (Biler, 2019) which is based on psycholinguistic and cognitive models of reading including the word overlap index, a word frequency index and an index of syntactic similarity, variables closely connected to text comprehension processes (Crossley, Allen, & McNamara, 2011) which, also predicted difficult readability in the case of the translations. It may either imply that the students were able to produce native-like translations displaying the features of difficult specialized texts, or a lot of translation errors in the texts, either lexical or grammatical, which contribute to reading difficulty. Therefore, applying an automated analysis of translation text quality may not prove to be reliable measures on their own. These findings are also important for their pedagogical implications: translation students should begin with easier texts in their training, and be offered more difficult ones only later, when they have the strategies to cope with the emerging translation problems.

Study 5 originally aimed to construct a new translation assessment instrument, which, in the end, mostly due to the Covid-19 pandemic did not get further than piloting. In order to develop a new scale, I relied on what was discussed in the relevant research literature and the findings of Study 3 and Study 4. I also revised the teacher interviews on the 'old UP scale' to see if I could implement any idea suggested by R2 to include text-specific criteria with an emphasis on terminology. I intended to see whether such a step would improve the reliability of Preselected Items Evaluation, PIE, Kockaert and Segers' (Kockaert & Segers, 2017) norm referenced scale to assess translations. The result of my efforts was the tool named PIER (Preselected Items Evaluation Revised). I formulated four research questions I intended to find answers to:

(RQ1) How many preselected items are necessary to create a norm-referenced, sufficiently discriminating translation assessment tool?

(RQ2) How does PIER perform in use?

- a) How does it discriminate between different qualities of translations?
- b) In what ways does it improve inter-rater reliability?
- c) Does it help raters become more consistent in their assessment?

(RQ3) How do raters evaluate PIER compared to the UP scale?

(RQ4) To what extent and in what ways is PIER a suitable tool to assess translations?

As the preselected items do not cover the whole text, I decided to use more items than Kockaert and Segers did in their study (25 compared to the original 10), also taking longer chunks keeping in mind the Firthian advice: “You shall know a word by the company it keeps” (Firth, 1957, p. 11). Preselection of items for evaluation was carried out by five volunteering expert-raters, who also provided a range of possible translations for each item. Then, the list of items was checked by a financial expert. In this way, 128 words (roughly 40%) of the text were included in the list of preselected items, which was then used by four raters to assess the 14 translations. The raters were instructed to decide if the translations of the preselected items were correct or not, and give one score for each correct translation. After this, the raters were asked to use the ‘old UP scale’ and assess the same translations again with the old scale so that the evaluations can be compared. The scores in both cases were analyzed in SPSS. Concerning RQ1, even 25, longer preselected chunks left relatively large text sections uncovered by evaluation, however, the new tool performed well (although not perfectly) in terms of inter-rater reliability and rater consistency.

The comparison of the two scales revealed that the new tool, PIER, with its list of preselected item, offered more objective assessment than the old one. Covering 40% of the text, and including domain specific terminology, grammatical structures with emphasis on the use of tenses, style and register, spelling and punctuation and translation specific features, it sufficiently measured different qualities of translation. Although inter-rater reliability was much higher than with the UP scale (0.5190 vs. 0.2376), it was clear that in the unchecked sections of the translations both major translation errors and good solutions (not listed as acceptable) remained unnoticed. Therefore, based on the 14 translations and the datasets provided by four raters, the answer to the research question concerning to what extent and in what ways PIER was a suitable tool to assess translations the results are encouraging. Rater opinions seem to support these finding as well: three raters evaluated PIER to be a more objective and more user-friendly tool than the old scale in use at UP However, more participants and more careful preselection are necessary to examine how PIER may further be improved and used even more reliably. To achieve this aim, more rater training will be necessary. Including think aloud protocols in a future study could also ensure the development of a more valid, reliable, and fair assessment tool.

Summary of the main findings

Despite the substantial research on motivation, autonomy and assessment, which are clearly interrelated according to the literature cited throughout the dissertation, these issues seem to have been neglected in the field of translation studies. One of the reason for this might be the widely recognized fact that translation as a linguistic domain, has struggled for recognition for a long time and has been underestimated as a profession (Baker, 2011). These trends did not contribute to the prestige of the activity and also hindered the interest in the field of translation studies. As a researcher as well as a teacher and a practicing translator, I aimed to address this gap with my thesis. The BA in Translation Studies specialization at the University of Pécs offered an area in need of research: on the one hand, it had a curricular structure to examine and on the other hand, a convenience sample to study. However, what seemed to be convenient and feasible at the beginning, turned out to be a hindering factor: I soon had to realize that the number of translation students was minimal and not everyone in the target groups was a willing participant in my research.

Motivation, autonomy and assessment might be considered as overarching areas to be researched independently, in their own right. That is why I devoted separate sections to the three main focal points and implemented empirical research on these topics. The study applied a mixed methods research tradition. The qualitative phases of the thesis included data collection applying semi-structured interviews with students and teachers, essay and syllabus analyses, a student questionnaire comprising both closed and open-ended questions and the analysis and the development of a new assessment tool. The datasets compiled in the studies were analyzed by applying both qualitative and quantitative procedures.

Study 1 aimed to find answers for research questions addressing students' motives to choose translation as a specialization, their language background when they enrolled for the programme, the most important factors, which fostered and/or hindered their motivation throughout their studies, and the ways they were planning to use their translation skills after graduating. The collected data revealed that their choice to learn translation was twofold: they either wanted to learn to become professional translators, and the specialization seemed to be a good first step to achieve this goal, or they found translation interesting and rewarding, and they were happy to do it as a hobby. As is most often the case, their linguistic background was not the same, their level of English language proficiency ranged between B2 and C1 on the CEFR scale, so those, who were less prepared linguistically had more demotivating influences expressed in grades and feeling less successful than the ones with firmer knowledge. The study

underlined what was emphasized in the cited literature, as well: motivation is a many-faceted ID factor, which can be boosted extrinsically, e. g., by regular and useful feedback on what they do, and intrinsically, e. g., by finding more and more interest in their tasks and activities. However, if their training lacks the boosting factors, students can easily become demotivated. A promising finding is that the majority of respondents wanted to use the learnt skills either in becoming a professional, or as part of their future work. The others wanted to do translation for pleasure (translating songs, film subtitles, comics for themselves), i. e., as a hobby.

Study 2 examined the role of autonomy in Translation Studies BA classes, with a focus on learner autonomy, in order to find out how autonomous BA translation students were during their studies in the programme, how the specialization programme supported their learner autonomy, how course syllabi integrated and supported autonomy and motivation in TS classes, and how teacher autonomy affected learner autonomy and motivation. Answers to the ten questions in the student questionnaire revealed that the respondents started to become more autonomous thanks to the practices they pursued in and out of classes: they were offered tasks and assignments which taught them to be autonomous in their decisions and allowed them to make their voices heard in the class discussions. The syllabi theoretically embraced both student and teacher autonomy, however, their uniformity did not offer the students too many ways to practice it. Syllabus analysis also revealed that the teachers planned to work along the same guidelines, and each syllabus contained elements which suggested high degrees of teacher autonomy, for instance in defining how they assessed and graded their students' work and how they promoted learner and classroom autonomy.

Studies 3, 4 and 5 were devoted to exploring the assessment system used in the English-Hungarian translation studies BA programme at the University of Pécs. Study 3 focused on the rating scale, or rather error list used for the assessment of exam translations, as well as for diagnostic purposes during the term. The analyses revealed serious caveats, most importantly very low inter-rater reliability and rater consistency in using the tool. The teacher interviews on the scale identified the same problems.

Study 4 reported preliminary research on the quality of student translations by examining lexical characteristic and readability indices. The research data on text quality was provided by Lexical Profiles of translations (Cobb, 2015) and readability indices of the translated texts calculated using Coh-Metrix (Graesser et al., 2004). These provided preliminary information for expert-raters who participated in the assessment of the same translations.

Study 5 embarked the steps of developing and validating a new assessment scale named PIER, the revised version of Cockaert and Segers' (2017) PIE. The study aimed to find out how

many preselected items were necessary to create a norm-referenced, sufficiently discriminating, and reliable assessment tool for translations. First, expert-raters were invited to take part in the assessment process by pre-selecting items in the original text. Then, expert-raters used the list of items identified to assess the student translations Study 4 analysed, in order to see how the test items worked in terms of discrimination, inter-rater reliability and rater consistency. For comparison, the same raters were asked to assess the same translations using the UP scale of major and minor errors. As a finishing touch, the raters were invited to evaluate both scales in a short questionnaire with open-ended questions, and identified advantages and disadvantages of both tools. The findings show that although PIER provided much higher inter-rater reliability and rater consistency than the UP scale, it still has caveats which have to be improved. Study 5 also added an unexpected finding to Study 1 on motivation, which proved to be an important outcome of the research: the tutors teaching translation courses in the programme are neither well-motivated nor autonomous, and are not prepared to assess students' translations in a reliable way. This finding may have important implications for improving teacher and rater training in order to improve the quality of the translation studies programme, as well as other programmes hosted by the Institute of English Studies at University of Pécs.

Limitations of the research

When I designed my thesis, it was not possible to foresee all the possible limitations which might hinder the research. Thus, the limitations of the present thesis are manifold. First, due to the small sample sizes, the findings cannot be generalized beyond the context of the present research project. Working with a convenience sample has its advantages, but the number of participating translation students was lower than expected. On part of both the students and their teachers, willingness to participate the research caused another problem, especially after the Covid-19 restrictions were announced in the spring of 2020. What was intended to be a mixed-methods study on a grander scale, turned out to be a case study in the end, as the research context was confined to the Translation Studies BA programme at the University of Pécs with a limited number of BA students who were available and ready to cooperate. Nevertheless, by using multiple methods and various related perspectives, the study hopefully provides sufficient details to claim a degree of transferability of the results in the three areas it examined: motivation, autonomy and assessment in Translation Studies BA classes and in becoming a translator in general.

Another group of problems emerging in association with the labor-intensive parts of the empirical studies, especially in the field of translation assessment, concerned the reluctance of teacher-raters to participate in the study which at more than one point threatened the feasibility of the plans. Because of their unavailability, partly for reasons nobody could overwrite, I had to give up my plans on rater training and had to modify the procedures to meet them half way: raters received the task descriptions and the instructions in email, but there was no opportunity to do an in-person workshop and think aloud sessions which could have cast further light on the findings. Another limitation concerns that fact that the teachers of the TS programme I interviewed in the first round were not willing to participate in the study on assessment. Therefore, new raters had to be recruited, who were experts in assessing translations. These limitations were partly related to the COVID 19 pandemic. Still, the findings on PIER, the new assessment scale, turned out to be promising. The results showed that a larger section of the text may be covered with more careful item selection and with being more attentive when providing translation options for the items. Testing the scale on larger samples and providing sufficient rater training would also improve the reliability of the method.

Pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research

The research findings of the present thesis focusing on motivation, autonomy and assessment in the field of translation studies have pedagogical implications for syllabus design and the implementation of the BA in TS programme that may benefit both teachers and experts in charge of the programme. The findings underscore the role and importance of motivation, a key factor in individual differences research. Overall, students were found to be motivated, but maintaining their motivation may pose further challenges, especially if the learners lack feedback and ways of assessment demotivate them over time. Further research is needed to find out more about classroom practice and the relationship between teacher and student motivation. It would be necessary to find out more about the reasons why the teachers were not willing to participate in the study on how the assessment scales worked, as well as their perceptions of what role a more valid and reliable tool could play in assessing their students' progress in the TS courses. Classroom observations, including self-observations, could reveal important details about the teaching and learning processes applied, as well as good practice. It would be useful for teachers to work as a team and compare notes as they teach the courses, give students feedback and assess their translations regularly. Students should be involved in every step towards developing assessment scales for their study programme. In addition to these, students

should also be asked about how helpful they find different types of feedback and which type of assessment scale they find conducive to their own development.

As for learner autonomy in translation, the ultimate aim of TS is to help students become autonomous in their studies and as translators when they graduate. The findings indicated that students tended to find learner autonomy motivating in the learning process, therefore, it is important to emphasize self-reliance and autonomy in the programme, and as a next step, to observe what stages students go through and what strategies they apply. As less emphasis was placed on teacher autonomy, this area should also be included in further studies to find out how autonomous teachers feel and how much guidance they need to improve the TS programme.

The studies found that feedback and assessment in the courses were not uniform, teachers varied in their practices, and the frequency and type of feedback or grades students received over a semester depended on their teacher. There seemed to be a need for more frequent and more systematic feedback. Further research is necessary into feedback and assessment practices applied in the courses, which, if done in a fair and responsible way, will help students develop in what they do and encourage them to achieve more. Teacher awareness should be raised about the interrelatedness of these factors, and the fact that they have to be treated differently in the field of translation studies than in other courses students take in the BA in English Studies programme.

As the studies in the present thesis involved a limited number of participants, further research should involve more students, teachers, and expert raters at other universities as well to find out if the challenges and the findings are similar in other contexts. Finally, ongoing rater training would reveal how teachers can become autonomous in their assessment processes. By including think-aloud protocols, further research would definitely bring improvements both in the reliability and consistency of the assessment instrument and improve inter-rater reliability.

References

- Angelelli, C. V. (2009). Using a rubric to assess translation ability: Defining the construct. In C. V. Angelelli & H. E. Jacobson (Eds.), *Testing and assessment in translation and interpreting studies* (pp. 13–48). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Biler, A. (2019). The reliability of readability tools in L2 reading. In S. Papageorgiou & K. M. Bailey (Eds.), *Global perspectives on language assessment: Research, theory, and practice* (pp. 108–121). New York: Routledge.
- Cobb, T. (2015). VocabProfile Home. Retrieved from <http://www.lexutor.ca/vp>
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A New Academic Word List. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213–238.
- Crossley, S. A., Allen, D. B., & McNamara, D. S. (2011). Text readability and intuitive simplification: A comparison of readability formulas. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 23(1), 84–101.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 4, 43–69.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 273–284.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. (2010a). *Questionnaires in second language research* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. (2014). Motivation in second language learning. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton, & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second foreign language* (4th ed., pp. 518–531). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning/Cengage Learning.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán, Muir, C., & Ibrahim, Z. (2014). Directed Motivational Currents: Energising language learning through creating intense motivational pathways. In D. Lasagabaster, A. Doiz, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *Motivation and foreign language learning: From theory to practice* (pp. 9–29). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán, & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Doró, K. (2010). Miért lettem angolos? Elsőéves szegedi egyetemisták szakválasztása és nyelvi felkészültsége [Why did I chose English studies? Study choice and language preparedness of first-year undergraduates at the University of Szeged]. In *A tudomány nyelve, a nyelv tudománya : alkalmazott nyelvészeti kutatások a magyar nyelv évében* (pp. 580–588). Székesfehérvár: MANYE Eszterházi Károly Főiskola.

- Eyckmans, J., Anckaert, P., & Segers, W. (2009). The perks of norm-referenced translation evaluation. In C. V. Angelelli & H. E. Jacobson (Eds.), *Testing and assessment in translation and interpreting studies* (pp. 73–94). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V.
- Finch, A. (2001). Autonomy: Where are we? Where are we going? Presentation at the JALT CUE Conference on Autonomy. Retrieved May 2, 2018, from <http://www.finchpark.com/arts/Autonomy.pdf>
- Firth, J. R. (1957). A synopsis of linguistic theory, 1930-1955. *Studies in Linguistic Analysis*, 1–32.
- Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition: The socio-educational model*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Gile, D. (2009). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V.
- Graesser, A. C., McNamara, D. S., Louwerse, M. M., & Cai, Z. (2004). Coh_Metrix: Analysis of text cohesion and language. *Behaviour Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 36(2), 193–202.
- Heitzmann, J. (2014). The fluctuation of motivation: A longitudinal study of secondary school learners of English. In J. Horváth & P. Medgyes (Eds.), *Studies in honour of Marianne Nikolov* (pp. 23–36). Pécs: Lingua Franca Csoport.
- Józsa, K., Wang, J., Barrett, K. C., & Morgan, G. A. (2014). Age and Cultural Differences in Self-Perceptions of Mastery Motivation and Competence in American, Chinese, and Hungarian School Age Children. *Child Development Research*, 1–17. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/803061>
- Kiraly, D. C. (1995). *Pathways to translation. Pedagogy and process*. Kent, Ohio and London: The Kent State University Press.
- Kockaert, H. J., & Segers, W. (2017). Evaluation of legal translations: PIE method (Preselected Items Evaluation). *The Journal of Specialized Translation*, (27), 148–162.
- Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2014). Longitudinal changes in the interaction of motivation and intercultural contact in a study-abroad context. In J. Horváth & P. Medgyes (Eds.), *Studies in honour of Marianne Nikolov* (pp. 9–22). Pécs: Lingua Franca Csoport.
- Lamb, T., & Murray, G. (2018). Space, place and autonomy in language learning: an introduction. In G. Murray & T. Lamb (Eds.), *Space, place and autonomy in language learning* (pp. 1–9). New York: Routledge.

- Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System*, 23(2), 175–181. [https://doi.org/0346-251X\(95\)00006-2](https://doi.org/0346-251X(95)00006-2)
- Little, D. (2000). Autonomy and autonomous learners. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of language teaching and learning* (pp. 69–72). London: Routledge.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (2002). Motivation, anxiety, and emotion in second language acquisition. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Individual differences and instructed language learning* (pp. 45–68). Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(1), 59–82.
- Nikolov, M. (1999). 'Why do you learn English?' 'Because the teacher is short.' A study of Hungarian children's foreign language learning motivation. *Language Teaching Research*, 3(1), 33–56.
- Nikolov, M., & Mihajlević Djigunović, J. (2006). Recent research on age, second language acquisition, and early foreign language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 234–260.
- Nunan, D. (1997). Designing and adapting materials to encourage learner autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 192–203). Harlow: Longman.
- Ushioda, E. (2016). Language learning motivation through a small lens: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 49(4), 564–577.
- Ushioda, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2012). Motivation. In S. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 396–409). New York: Routledge.
- Van Egdom, G.-W., Verplaetse, H., Schrijver, I., Kockaert, H. J., Segers, W., Pauwels, J., ... Bloemen, H. (2019). How to put the translation test to the test? On Preselected Items Evaluation. In E. Huertas-Barros, S. Vandepitte, & E. Iglesias-Fernández (Eds.), *Quality assurance and assessment in translation and interpreting* (pp. 26–56). Hershey PA USA: IGI Global.

The candidate's publications related to the topic of dissertation

- H. Prikler, R. (2016). 'Yes, We Can!' A corpus based analysis of pronominal choice and modality in American presidential speeches. In S. Senses-Ozyurt, S. Klein & Z. Nemeskéri (Eds.) *Educating for Democratic Governance and Global Citizenship*. World Council for Curriculum and Instruction, San Diego, CA, USA, 2016, 368-379. p.
- H. Prikler, R. (2017). Lost in translation. A corpus-based investigation of BA students' solutions for potential translation problems. In M. Lehmann, R. Lugossi, M. Nikolov and G. Szabó (Eds.) *UPRT 2017: Empirical studies in English Applied Linguistics* (pp. 189-204). Pécs: Lingua Franca Csoport.
- H., Prikler R. & Huszár, Z. (2020). Populistische aspekte in politischen Reden. Populist aspects in dictator's rhetoric. [A lexical analysis of Hitler, Stalin and Rakosi's selected speeches.] In B. Degner and M. Świder (Eds.) *Gedenktage im Schatten des Populismus. Fachliche und didaktische Aspekte*. Heidelberg: Mattes. In print.
- H. Prikler, R. (2020). "I chose it because it is not as boring as other classes and it does not hurt". BA students' motivation in translation classes. In M. Lehmann, R. Lugossi, and J. Horváth (Eds.), *UPRT 2019: Empirical studies in English Applied Linguistics* (pp. 189-204). Pécs: Lingua Franca Csoport.

The candidate's conference presentations related to the topic of dissertation

- H. Prikler, R. (2016, July). 'Yes, We Can!' A corpus based analysis of pronominal choice and modality in American presidential speeches. World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI) 17th World Conference on Education, Budapest
- H. Prikler, R. (2017, June). Lost in translation: A corpus-based study on BA students' solutions for potential translation problems. UPRT 2017 (University of Pécs Round Table), Institute of English Studies at the University of Pécs, Hungary.
- H. Prikler, R. (2017, September). The outspoken mind: Communication, language use and creativity as success factors. Satellite events of FENS Regional Meeting 20-23 September 2017, Pécs, Hungary "Edges of Neurosciences", Medical School, University of Pécs.
- H., Prikler R. & Huszár, Z. (2018, November). Populist aspects in dictator's rhetoric. A lexical analysis of Hitler, Stalin and Rakosi's selected speeches. *Gedenktage im Schatten des Populismus / Days of Remembrance in the shadow of Populism*, Internationale Tagung vom 29. 11. bis zum 1. 12. 2018 in Landau/Pfalz, Germany.
- H. Prikler, R. (2019, May). BA students' motivation in translation studies classes. UPRT 2019 (University of Pécs Round Table), Institute of English Studies at the University of Pécs, Hungary.