



Active, strategic reading for translation trainees: Foundations for transactional methods

Kelly Washbourne
Kent State University
rwashbou@kent.edu

Abstract: The often-neglected issue of reading – a skill that is inextricable from translation – affects virtually every aspect of a translator trainee’s profile, from resourcing skills to background knowledge to linguistic competence itself. How can empirical studies improve the teaching of the act of reading for translation? What can we do as educators to see that novices situate the text in the world, what I call world-involvement? What are the implications of students’ changing reading patterns and habits for translator training and education, particularly in an age of alternate literacies? How do reading models and their theorization fit with process-orientedness, and with the translator as subject, as negotiator of meaning, as constructively responsive agents of text transfer? Does it make sense to consider reading competence as part of the translator’s macrocompetence? This study aims primarily to engage with the research on reading, and with the changing conceptualizations of reading and the reader. A brief array of hermeneutic and textual analysis approaches and tasks that might be integrated in translator training curricula – predicting, schemata activation, metacognitive monitoring, intertextual awareness-raising, and strategic processing – are then outlined, contributing toward a fuller repertoire of tasks and task construction components for strategic reading in translator training. In sum, a transactional view of reading in both non-literary and literary translation environments is proposed, and pedagogical interventions and diagnostics oriented in expertise studies and reading theory are examined.

Keywords: strategic reading; reading theory; transactional reading; reading for translation

Reading the world

Reading is a highly complex act, or series of acts, involving the coordination of “phonological, semantic, syntactic, morphological, pragmatic, conceptual, social, affective, articulatory, and motor systems” (Wolf, 2007, p.223). As reading entails strategic decision making, we must conceive of reading to translate, what Neubert and Shreve call reading for translation (1992, p.49), as a distinct set of microcompetences: distinguishing relevant from less relevant information (including meaningful from random patterns), reliable from less reliable information, textual norms from anomalies. Crucially, reading involves the universes of meaning both textual and *beyond the text*. Lawall (1994) claims the role of the reader is crucial in working with the concept of world literature, and we may extend this claim to the production and reception of translations. She sees in the term itself, world literature, an emphasis on the *connection between world and reading*. “The role of the reader of world literature is not just to consume certain important texts, but to ‘read the world’, to grapple in a creative manner with the world view of a text which may originate in a far corner of the world” (Eysteinnsson, 2006, pp.18-19). Parallels drawn in recent years between travel writing and translation as hermeneutic journeys (e.g. Bassnett, 2000) attest to this awareness, and perhaps too the cultural imbeddedness of reading as a metaphor for

discovery, for lived experience. Similarly, as Umberto Eco (1985, p.20) argues, world knowledge must anchor a translator's conception of a work: "In order to understand a text, or at least in order to decide how it should be translated, translators have to figure out the possible world pictured by that text."

The key lies in "possible", as reading is no longer considered a passive or receptive skill, but a meaning-making, potentialising one. Reading is now conceptualised aggressively in instructional jargon as acts of "extraction"; learners develop "text-attack" skills (Nutall's term; Wallace, 2003, p.15). This new metaphor for the reading act has important implications for pedagogical diagnostics¹ in translation:

[S]tudent-translators take the meaning of the entire text for granted and they seem to equate the text's meaning with the text itself, treat it as a static/passive property rather than a dynamic outcome of their own interaction with the text. [...] Most decisions as to the way meaning is interpreted seem to concentrate on the level of semantics with pragmatic considerations being of secondary importance. General knowledge of the world is rarely called upon to facilitate SL meaning comprehension. [...] There is a visible lack of drawing information from the macro-context of the text. Students do not seem to make enough effort to recreate the situation offered by the text, or in Fillmore's terms the scene they create is vague.... (Whyatt, 2003, p.5, emphasis mine)

We might state part of the problem in this way: the surface-structure reading in which some novices engage betrays a *text-involvement* to the detriment of a *world-involvement*. Reading theory marks this difference in levels of representation with the terms *textbase*, the textual unit interconnections, and *event model* (formerly 'situation model'), the world knowledge and personal experience connections (e.g. van Dijk and Kintsch 1983). Similarly, in the philosophy of language, *narrow* meanings (the mental representation of a concept formed by individual thinkers) are distinguished from *wide* meanings (external—'extensional'—or socially consensual realities, the *denotata*, that enable the meanings' referentiality).

Meanings, whether private or public, take shape not as revelations but as *negotiated constructions*, continually modified mental models. Our translation students, moreover, must learn to read expertly, and yet too often this expertise is assumed to take place as a matter of course. Whyatt's lament above attests that students are confusing the more visible target production stage with the whole act of translation, and giving the short shrift to the pre-translation acts of reading and re-reading. Our goal, in response to this deficiency, should be to foster *constructively responsive readers*:

Pressley and Afflerbach's (1995) framework ... describes 'constructively responsive' behaviour of first language

¹ This term is used here for its evaluative implications before, during and after task completion, and because it keeps the learner uppermost in the process. As Bloemers, Ondracek and Störmer note (2007, pp.160-1), "Pedagogical diagnostics are oriented on educational situations and tasks. Primarily, they serve planning, accomplishment, and control of educational and learning processes." An observational method, pedagogical diagnostics seeks to examine characteristics of behaviour, organismic variables (such as physiological symptoms) and individual effects of positive and negative reinforcements.

readers. A key underpinning of the framework is the concept that metacognitive processes are involved the creation of meaning. Theories that share a similar view include [schema, frames, scripts and macrostructures] (Gruba, 2004, p.54).

Mounting evidence supports the idea of reading as a series of processes with affective dimensions, drawing on long-term memories for top-down processing, and projective imagination that the reader uses to predict and fill in. Burke (2011, pp.25-6) notes that:

[i]n the specific context of literary readings, [five dynamic inputs] can be preliminarily listed as:

- the immediate text that is being read
- sections of the previous text, either the last sentence that was read or more salient past sentences or fragments that are still available for recall
- a reader's projected knowledge of how much texts often unfold and conclude
- subconscious background information about previous reading experiences and previous experiences in general
- various affective and somatic inputs either via the body to working memory from the affective and somatic areas of the brain or directly from the affective and somatic areas of the brain to working memory simulating the mediation of the body

This theorisation supports the model of the reader as a physico-emotional participant in a text, and one who has a 'reading past' and present that are drawn upon, facts that should not go unnoticed in task design. Similarly, van den Broek, Young, Tzeng, & Linderholm (1999, p.73), in their well-known 'landscape' model of reading, suggest that four activations may be at work in the reader's approach to a text: the text itself, carry-over from preceding cycles (units of text analysis), reactivation of concepts from earlier reading cycles, and finally, background knowledge.

Translation and reading

Just as the complexity of the reading act is being mapped, as we saw above, and as the conceptual scope of reading is expanding, as we will see in section following, so too must we accommodate a broader role for the act in the translation process. Research has revealed that translating *is* "comprehension", or more precisely stated, text analysis and translation are overlapping, not consecutive acts (Shreve, Schaffner, Danks, & Griffin, 1993; Cronin, 2005; Kussmaul, 1995):

...the translator is working on various possibilities for translation at the same time that he or she is comprehending the source text. The search for optimal translations may indeed facilitate the comprehension of the source text, just as improved comprehension of the source text facilitates translation. (Danks and Griffin, 1997, p.174)

The first building block toward an expanded definition of comprehension for the translator, then, is that comprehension is part of performance. Doyle (1991, p.13) uses the revealing term “*transreader [qua transwriter]*” to signify the translator’s privileged betweenness. Chan (2006, p.104) terms this “translation-reading”, a process which involves such procedures as creating a mental representation of a text, matching potential solutions, rearranging sequences, and interpreting problematic passages through wider reading from the co-text. This procedure controls for degrees of accessibility for different readers that translation shifts make possible, thus the translator-reader exercises value transformation or manipulation as a function of reader type. For example, Pym distinguishes excluded, observational and participative readers (1992, p.181), classes into which we might claim translators themselves, as first readers, can fall.

Let us recall, too, that the uses to which a translation is to be put can correlate to the kinds of reading performed on it (Sager, 1983, pp.121-8): “scanning and discard; reading for information: detailed information and storage for future reference; draft other texts; publication, for prestige or public record; legal validity.” Apropos here is Bassnett-McGuire’s discussion of literary translation reading “positions”, drawn from semiotician Juri Lotman’s (1970) four essential tacks or approaches:

1. Where the reader focuses on the content as matter; i.e. picks out the prose argument or poetic paraphrase.
2. Where the reader grasps the complexity of the structure of a work and the way in which the various levels interact.
3. Where the reader deliberately extrapolates one level of a work for a specific purpose.
4. Where the reader discovers elements not basic to the genesis of the text and uses the text for his own purposes (Bassnett-McGuire 2002, p. 80).

The first of these positions seems to echo Rosenblatt’s efferent reading (below), a mode used for information only, and recalls gist translation and précis writing in its privileging of the informational function (the source text as an 'offer of information') over other textual features such as style. The others may be said to be either reading strategies (#2) or what we might call reader manipulations or appropriations: reductive reading (#3) and reading *into* (#4). Lotman’s list embraces readings, we might say, then, of the propositionality of a text, the intratextuality of a text, the reducibility of a text, and the multifunctionality of a text. The manner of a given reading for a translation proves inseparable from the purpose of that reading. Translation, in short, has long been linked with reading:

The identification of reading with translation has by now a distinguished literary pedigree (one thinks of a line of modern writers from Proust to Calvino who have either claimed that reading entails an act of translation or, more challengingly, that translation is the only proper way to read a text. ‘Reading is already translation, and translation is translation for the second time,’ wrote Hans-Georg Gadamer, and this is dynamically related to writing, also seen by Proust as, ideally, translation. (Chew and Stead, 2000, p.1)

Barnstone in turn finds reading to be the *interpretive link* to translating, creating a mutual identification:

... reading is a form of translation, and conversely translation is obviously a form of intense reading. [...]
Hence *reading is translation and translation is reading*.
[...] Translation tends to be a certain kind of reading, an “intensive reading” of the original text, which as a result becomes an ‘interpretive reading,’ or as John Hollander has pointed out, a reading that functions as an ‘interpretive translation’ (Barnstone, 1993, pp. 214-16).

Reading to translate and ‘translating to read’ thus converge: a ‘reading’ is an interpretive realisation rather than a prelude to one. “We read to do something else... reading is social practice.” (Wilson, 2002, p.189); translation is a site where reading becomes the ‘something else’.

Transitions underway in reading and the reader: Eight broad trends

We have considered reading processes and some of their intersections with translational reading. Before we can proceed to designing reading instruction for translator trainees, we need first to characterise the reading subject today. We can identify eight broad trends, or transitions, in reading and in the profile of the reader, each of them having applicability to both translational and general educational reading:

1. From written to oral discourse:

Cronin argues in his chapter entitled ‘Deschooling Translation’:

One of the anomalies of translation as an activity in the modern age is that it is primarily about the production and reception of the written word. However, a salient characteristic of modernity has been the *exponential growth of orality* in its various forms in our lives (Cronin, 2005, p.259, emphasis mine).

Ong (1982) terms this phenomenon ‘secondary orality’ in that it post-dates literate practices.

At the same time students have more written material available, they are moving toward imposing oral discourse on traditionally written discourse patterns; the oral/written distinction is blurring. A reader-oriented pedagogy must re-establish that written discourse has a logic, content, and organization different from that of oral discourse.

2. From formal tenor of discourse to informal

Shifts in normed patterns of formal discourse – for example in business correspondence – naturally will produce a parallel change in reader expectations. This development is concomitant with the rise of orality and the influence of social media in both formal informal learning contexts.

3. From intensive and extensive reading to information retrieval

(Intensive: intentional, close reading; Extensive: broad) The phenomenon of ‘Just in Time’ reading replacing ‘Just in Case’ reading mirrors this shift, as

do the gradual inroads that information literacy – the retrieval and use of information – has made into literacy priorities. Berman (1995) draws a key distinction, implicitly emphasizing the importance of both modes: *reading in support of the act of translation* versus *reading for support of the translation itself*.²

4. From aesthetic to efferent reading (Louise Rosenblatt's [1978] terms)

Aesthetic reading is an intuitive, ambiguous act in which the reader wishes to *transact emotionally*; experience itself, not its fruit, is the goal.

Efferent reading is declarative and unambiguous; here, the *reader seeks to gain information*.

Arguably the translator needs both, depending on the text type and function.

5. From text to content

Biau Gil and Pym (2006, pp.11-12): "...there is no final text, but a constant flow of updated, rearranged, re-sized and user-adapted provisional texts based on a large database of content in constant change". The authors pronounce the finite text obsolescent: "[T]ranslators may be employed [nowadays] on programs that have cycles, rather than on texts that have ends".

6. From readers to users

Biau Gil and Pym (2006) note how we speak of 'document use' and 'users' as we transition into the age of non-linear texts, content management systems comprising customisable 'information chunks', databases of user-manipulated content, and decontextualised legacy content;

7. From '1.0' to '2.0'

Here we can point to multiliteracies of production and consumption of texts; 'read-write' web interactions; technological literacy; hypertextual criticism; collaborative platforms; the shift from 'digital immigrants' to 'digital natives'; the largely still-speculative post-literacy (non-text-centric literacies); and reading communities.

8. From linear reading to non-linear reading

This shift is characterised by *navigation, intertextuality, and multimodality* (Pullen, Gitsaki & Bagueley, 2009), for example, in hypermedia environments, in which pedagogies featuring multimodal text annotation are being developed, and which can allow for a measure of reader autonomy. *Intermediality* – "textual relations as a dialogic process taking place between different expressive media, rather than as a set of static references to textual artifacts" (Langford, 2009, p.10) – has emerged as a means of accounting for how one 'reads' across media or media in combination: media themselves as intertextual.³ Related phenomena are: the development, eroding the notion of

² "...[T]ranslating requires enormous amounts of wide-ranging reading. An ignorant translator, who does not do this kind of reading, is a deficient translator. We use books to translate. We call this necessary recourse to reading (and to other 'tools' in Ilich's sense) *support for the act of translation*. This notion is linked but not identical to that of *support for the translation itself*" (Berman, 1995, p.13).

³ In Translation Studies, *intermedial translation* (in the sense of crossings between the verbal, visual, acoustic, and kinesthetic forms of artistic expression) explores these kinds of relations; see, for example, *Music, Text and Translation*, Helen Julia Minors (ed.), forthcoming 2013.

text, of the ‘byte’ or ‘segment’ read in isolation rather than as a textual whole (Sharon O’Brien, personal communication, June 3, 2011); the advent of *transliteracy*, which explores the ‘convergence of literacies’ and modes of reading; Kress’s (2003) idea of *reading paths* (e.g., a Web page has no fixed reading path); and the move from syntagmatics (sequence and connection) to paradigmatics. The long-standing notion that texts are theoretically unending finds support in such conceptions that interrogate the idea of the unitary ‘work’.

The case for ‘Creative Reading’: Toward a transactional view of text processing

Arrojo (1997) has written, in the spirit of the Manipulation School, and, explicitly invoking Roland Barthes⁴ work, of the ‘birth’ of the reader and the deconstruction of originary meanings invested in a source text author (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p.62). Rosenblatt’s theory of reading squares well with this dynamics:

‘Selective attention’ was very important in explaining my transactional view of reading as a dynamic, fluid process in time. It helped to show that reading is a selecting, organising, synthesizing activity. It helped to explain the back-and-forth, spiralling influence of the reader and the text on the emerging meaning: the creation of tentative meanings, their influence on the possibilities to be considered for the following signs, the modification as new signs enter the focus of attention. [Sometimes, as signs emerge that can’t be fitted into what we have constructed, we have to look back and revise. ‘Selective attention’ was also important in explaining the difference between a reading that produced a scientific report and a reading that produced a poem.]
(Karolides, 1999, xxv)

For Schulte (1985, p. 2), the reading act is the catalyst of the translator’s agency in a kind of perpetually unstable field (cf. Rosenblatt’s ‘tentative meanings’); he sees “reading as the generator of uncertainties, reading as the

⁴ Barthes, in *The Rustle of Language*, writes of reading as a “Science of the Inexhaustible, of infinite Displacement... a permanent haemorrhage by which structure... collapses, opens, is lost... [R]eading is the site where structure is made hysterical” (“On Reading”, 1989, pp.42-3). Barthes famously described a dynamics of writing whereby the text refuses to ascribe a ‘theological’ final meaning, thrusting the reader into the role of one who lies at the vortex of “the total existence of writing: a text [...] made of multiple writings, drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialogue, parody, contestation” (1977, p.147). The reader, for Barthes, is that *someone* constituting the unity of a text; the Author dies, or ‘dies’ as meaning-maker to become a ‘scriptor’ (p.145), bringing this reader, or reader function, forth (p.148). The critic’s description of how, in many cultures, “responsibility for a narrative is never assumed by a person but by a mediator, shaman or relator whose ‘performance’ – the mastery of the narrative code – may possibly be admired but never his genius” (p.142) seems to identify the space that has often assigned to the translator in our own culture, a kind of ‘not-Author’. Maurice Blanchot’s work on reading in *The Space of Literature* is apropos here as well; he asserts that “[r]eading does not produce anything, does not add anything. It lets be what is” (1982, p.194), and that the reader ‘relieves’ the book of an author (p.193). In his view, reading seems to have less agency than it does for Barthes; for Blanchot, the reading of a work *is* the work, “affirming itself in the reading as a work. It is the [work] giving birth, in the space held open by the reader” (1982, pp.198-199).

driving force toward a decision-making process, *reading as discovery of new interrelations* that can be experienced but not described in terms of a content-oriented language” (emphasis mine).

Schulte, significantly, invokes Lotman’s second position – the reading of interrelating levels – as an ineffable irreducibility, making the first position impossible: reading is not the breaking down into propositional meaning but a multiplying of sets of relations. Reading for translation, then, is now conceived as the co-construction from latent possibilities in a text, not the recognition of a fixed code. It is a recursive, attentional, and interventionary act. As Cherland and Harper phrase it, “Both writing and reading involve orchestrating multiple cueing systems.... Reading, like writing, is an act of composing” (2007, p.175). As we will see, translation pedagogues can heighten awareness of our *selecting, organizing, synthesizing* role by choosing texts that require shifts in rhetorical strategies and pragmatic macrostrategies.

Toward a typology of reading methods performed by translator-readers

We may delineate the basic reading methods for the translation task, and their usual attendant purposes, as follows:

Reading method	Purpose/Subtask
Skimming	Pre-reading; gaining global familiarity with or first impression of a text; choosing a text; using parallel texts and background texts
Scanning	Attesting term candidates or collocations
Exploratory reading	Between skimming and close reading; reading published translations to gain a global understanding or a familiarity with new information
Close reading, rereading ⁵	“Reading to write”; reading and annotating, finding patterns, multiple strategic readings of a source text. Nabokov: “An active and creative reader is a rereader” (“Good Writers and Good Readers”); Iser/Poulet: <i>noetic</i> aspect of reader (text experienced in the time flow of reading) and the <i>noematic</i> (actualized work at the end of reading): First and subsequent readings differ: the text evolves from lacunary to actualized (Cornis-Pope & Woodlief, 2003, p.155).
Reading to integrate/ “stereoscopic reading”	Creating a single organising frame [compare-contrast, problem-solution]

⁵ "Rereading, an operation contrary to the commercial and ideological habits of our society, which would have us 'throw away' the story once it has been consumed ('devoured'), so that we can then move on to another story, buy another book, and which is tolerated only in certain marginal categories of readers (children, old people, and professors), rereading... alone saves the text from repetition (those who fail to re-read are obliged to read the same story everywhere)" (Barthes, *S/Z*, 1974, pp.15-6). Rereading, then, distinguishes the text consumer from the text reader.

(Gaddis Rose, 1997)	across multiple texts; “stereoscopic reading” finds the “interliminal” (Gaddis Rose 1997, p.90) through triangulation of the source text read in concert with one or more translations
Revision reading/Spot reading/Proofreading	Unilingual re-reading/comparative re-reading (work of self and others)

Table 1: Methods and purposes of reading types for translation

This non-hierarchical typology of reading for translation (and translation assessment and criticism) may be used as part of a *diagnostic post-mortem checklist* for students to self-report: when did they do each, how many times, etc. Partnering in this way with students, instructors can learn whether students are scanning instead of reading for mastery, or exploratory reading instead of close reading. Alternatively, Wright (1999, p.96) describes three broad modes that the reader of functional texts employs: *access* (reader asks questions, skips to relevant information); *interpretation* (reader infers, integrates); and *application* (reader integrates with own beliefs, develops a goal and subgoals in response, executes).

We might also mention *inquiry reading* (questioning; data-gathering; making inferences), *critical reading* (which seeks to probe underlying assumptions; sees reading as a social process, and meaning as negotiated in communities), and the controversial *symptomatic reading*, which consists of finding the written exclusions conditioning the competing discourses within a written text, and of establishing links to the text’s historical conditions – called a ‘double reading’ of a manifest text and its latencies (Storey, 2003, p.38). Introduced by Louis Althusser and Étienne Balibar in *Reading Capital*, symptomatic reading “can also be useful in demystifying the illusion of transparency in translation” (Venuti, 2008, p.29) by laying bare the ideological constructedness of texts, and the rewriting inherent in translation. In this way one can attempt hermeneutically to account for textual discontinuities and lacunae that belie the idea of an illusory single ‘voice’ or authorial control constituting a text.

Pedagogical interventions: Strategic reading

Strategic reading consists of “deliberate, conscious procedures used by readers to enhance text comprehension” (Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001, p.433). Two broad strategies of strategic reading behaviour are as follows:

- *local strategies*: reading adjunct information, pausing, rereading, backtracking; and
- *global strategies*: using aids to comprehension; adjusting speed; asking questions; summarising; generating representations (Rouet, 2006, pp.22-3)

Below, we consider major ways that professionals perform strategic readings, both local and global, in the translation task environment. These cognitive and metacognitive habits cut across all the methods and functions set forth above (scanning, close reading, etc.). Experts strategically read to translate in the following ways:

- *They have and use document knowledge*
Experts know how knowledge is represented in documents, the characteristics of them, how to evaluate discrepant information across multiple documents (the *corroboration heuristic*, (Rouet 2006, p.66), how to integrate information in broader contextualisations and in their prior knowledge.
- *They perform metacognitive monitoring* (Grabe, 2009, p.53)
Planning, executing, evaluating, repairing and adjusting actions and progress that lead to fulfillment of reading goals; *they know when they are not understanding* and thus know to implement executive control of their strategies.
- *They extract translation-relevant cues* (Shreve et al., 1993)
It has been theorized that lack of *lexical access* (the ability to call up a word's meaning) can drain attentional resources and interfere with meaning production. Hypothesis: The expert reader-translator knows what to allocate more energy for, and what to give less for.

Professionals, experts, are strategically, *deliberately reading*, engaged in meaning construction. They are more adept at identification and characterisation of sources, comparisons across sources, and integration of information into coherence (following from Rouet, 2006, p.91). A key descriptor of novice reader-translator performance is unawareness of comprehension breakdown – repairing comprehension can come only after recognition of its interruption. Novice readers tend to focus on decoding individual words, cannot adjust their reading rate, are not aware of alternative strategies for enhancing comprehension and memory, and are not adept at monitoring their own comprehension (Almasi, 2003, p.5).

Strong tasks for growth toward translational reading competence and expertise tend to intersect with the six functions common to the instruction of comprehension skills (Palincsar and Brown, 1984, p.120)⁶:

- 1) understanding the purposes of reading;
- 2) activating relevant background knowledge;
- 3) allocating attention to the major points over the trivia;
- 4) critically evaluating content for consistency, compatibility with prior knowledge;
- 5) self-monitoring to see if comprehension is happening;
- 6) drawing and testing inferences (interpretations, predictions, conclusions).

Key instructional goals for teaching reading to translate include:

- *to activate readers' prior knowledge* through pre-reading.
“Successful readers construct coherent *mental representations*”

⁶ The question arises naturally as to whether reading strategies are language-specific or are transferable across languages. While it would seem that strong L1 readers will transfer skills to L2, studies show that L2 reading problems have much to do with language competence rather than reading strategy use. However, there is support for the hypothesis that good L1 readers will read well in L2 once a certain competency threshold has been passed (Alderson & Urquhart, 1984, p.20). See also Atari and Radwan (2009).

(McNamara, 2007, p. 466), i.e. event models, or linking text with what is already known about the world and the topic;

- *to privilege the awareness of schema; instructional design should account for multiple ways knowledge structures are modified in reading: a reader's knowledge structures are affected in three ways, according to Rumelhart and Norman (1978):*

Accretion: The new information may fit into a slot in an existing schema, and thus be quickly comprehended.

Restructuring: A reader may use new information to create a new schema.

Tuning: A reader may use new information to 'tune' an existing schema so it is more accurate, complete, or useful (Grow, 1996).

- *to structure tasks with different 'reading briefs' and reading goals lest students read everything in the same mode;*
- *to assign 'process-oriented reading' (e.g. by using reading inventories and miscue analysis: see Gambrell, Morrow, and Pressley, 2007); also reading logs (reading protocols), annotations after each reading, or self-questioning;*
- *to use a transactional dialogue method such as Reciprocal Teaching (Palincsar and Brown, 1984), which uses the multi-component strategy of prediction, summarisation, questioning, and clarification; or dense questioning (Christenbury, 1983), which fosters a network of connections: text-to-reader, text-to-world, text-to-intertexts, reader-to-world, reader-to-intertexts, etc.*
- *to employ graphic organizers, including concept maps and other knowledge modelling kits (see, for example, González-Davies 2004);*
- *to increase summary translation tasks (following Chi, Glaser, and Farr [1988] in order to promote expert problem representations in which situations are perceived in large meaningful patterns);*
- *to introduce texts for advanced translation that represent authentic, 'inconsiderate texts' (Armbruster, 1984), defined as inconsistent, flawed, authentic, imperfectly 'signposted' texts;*
- *to develop courses in reading for translation and theorize reading for translation.*

Goals for a 'Reading for Translators' course model (following Cronin's 2005 proposal to institute reading courses as part of translation programs) might include:

- distinguishing written discourse markers from oral ones;
- typologising reading;
- establishing reading-writing connections;
- developing context-dependent reading strategies;
- heightening self-awareness of reading as decision-making;
- operationalising *reading for professional purposes*.

As an example of the latter, a task environment for reading for professional purposes might replicate or simulate reading as it is done on the job; for instance, some translation agencies offer *document sifting and review*, a kind

of triage that combines many of the reading methods discussed above with the executive function of determining the relative importance of documents; as one LSP describes their service:

When inundated with thousands of foreign-language documents, clients rely on Morningside to provide talented linguists, adept in the technical and legal terminology pertaining to the case. Our staff is able to organize and prioritize millions of pages of foreign documents, either on-site, online, or at Morningside. [...] Additionally, our translators work closely with attorneys to provide summaries and technical explanations of supplementary documentation.... (Morningside Translations).

A team task could be set for students whereby archives of texts could be what we might term *extraction-translated*, i.e., a text processing operation in which key information is isolated and translated (“What are they calling this component of our product in German?”). More advanced judgment and higher-order thinking skills can be called into play, expanding both the translator’s agency and risk (“What is in this accident report from our foreign supplier that could hurt our case?”, “Does this product infringe on our patent?”, “Does this slogan in Japanese convey our brand message?”). Such prompts call for, and develop, text-typological ‘reading’ – top-down processing – expertise. Other translation-in-situation subtasks might include finding and justifying all documents relevant to a particular legal case, which could be assigned to translation teams for pre-reading. Such tasks can help students experience the appropriateness of different reading methods for translation and other related tasks; in this case, scanning is revealed not to be superficial, as it would be for some kinds of tasks, but in fact to be a time- and money-saving operation for the client.

Many task formats are possible in designing tasks for reading to translate. For example, DeBeaugrande and Dressler (1981) posit seven text-linguistic principles as constitutive of *textuality* (cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality) (see also Neubert & Shreve, 1992, pp.69-123). These standards of textuality can be the building blocks for designing reading-oriented tasks: comparison readings of two translations for two briefs (inbound translation for information only vs. a translation for publication); identification of assumptions on which text meaning depends (inferences); judging of relevancy of a text based on information redundancy; determining the necessary conditions that define a text type (an induction prompt); or ascertaining what texts are relevant to a given pragmatic context. Other tasks may focus on scaffolding pragmatic dimensions, functional considerations such as target reader typology, or on workflow structures such as team translation; for example:

pragmatic cues – instructor manipulates the textual profile⁷ of the source text (e.g. insert an argument in an instructional text; use second person in a patient information leaflet); student must identify violation or shift;

⁷ Neubert and Shreve (1992, p.42) define this term as the adherence to textual conventions, or features, that allow text users to recognise and accept a text; roughly, the reader expectations of a target community for a given text.

the unreliable brief – student must plot information in a brief (commission) on a cline from relevant to irrelevant;

whole-group guided practice – students must identify dimensions of a text that will affect strategic translation decisions; predict and confirm;

think-aloud modelling – in small groups, students can rehearse problem-solving strategies while others critique;

placing the text type – a given text must be placed in a typology with, or contrasted with, similar text types (e.g. dissecting a white paper with a Venn diagram to reveal it to contain a hybrid of informational and promotional purposes;

translating from information display to verbal text – charts, graphs, etc. – to verbal text’ [or vice versa];

jigsaw reading – three groups each need information from the other groups to comprehend and translate a text passage from a linked text. A representative from each breakout group meets another representative and has to peer teach and respond orally to questions, report back and compare notes;

retranslating for different readers – learners build a profile of the intended reader of a given text, and identify gaps between implicit reader, ideal reader, actual reader, etc. Alternatively, comparisons can be made between the processes and products of one team translating for ‘real readers’ (known readers), and a second team translating for ‘projected readers’ (an inferred readership) (Mossop’s terms, 2001, p.43).

We can assign students the task of reverse engineering the source, giving them the source text disassembled for them to restore before translating. This task or pre-task dramatically demonstrates textuality (see above) as the set of constraints that organizes the rhetorical and logical unity behind a source text. In other words, the reader-translator trainee must institute the order, the coherence structure (Neubert and Shreve’s term, 1992, pp.93-94) of the whole, simultaneously and indivisibly from processing the semantic levels of each utterance. Ignoring macrostructure is rendered an impossibility, inasmuch as if global coherence is treated as a given, the L2, the translation, will not cohere. The other tasks proposed above centre on such principles as situationality and acceptability.

Finally, we should not omit mention of exploiting interactive environments for translation, including the vast possibilities for:

- hyperlinks and hypermedia
- goal-based scenarios – reading simulation training for trainees
- student annotations and forum discussion embedded into text
- scaffolded strategies: e.g., text that charts possible decision paths and scripts diagnostics (or the student rolls cursor over a signal word, coherence markers throughout the text light up, or student must provide reader-supplied information)
- hot buttons/hidden text to signal problem-solving, global and resource strategies
- use of corpora to detect stylistic patterns, intertextual links, and macrostructural clues

Such pedagogical interventions and formats are promising for *reading to translate* in that they are intended to help learners construct meaning at all stages of the reading task in online environments. Feedback loops built into these environments signal comprehension breakdowns and trigger immediate repair strategies that are process-oriented and thus more visible for

troubleshooting and self-monitoring. Instructors can gain process knowledge about what strategies students are using for different sections of text, what predictions and reassessments they are making, how well they are distinguishing primary propositions from supporting details, how well they are summarising, and what questions they are generating—in short, the behaviours shown in decades of research to be characteristic of expert reader behaviour.⁸

Reading research, both theoretical and applied, remains underexplored in translation studies. Some areas that may prove fruitful for translation trainers and educators include *error analysis* (schema-driven [assimilation, developmental] miscues; schema-forming [accommodation] miscues) and empirical testing of *self-report research instruments*, for example, the MARS (Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory). Such instruments may shed light on global, problem-solving, support reading strategies modified for translation trainees. *Readability scales*, both for source and target texts, are beginning to be factored into discussions of acceptability and audience (e.g. O'Brien 2010), though much more remains to be done. We still need to determine key questions such as how and how well translation trainees/students are reading for different respective purposes (reading to learn, reading to integrate, reading to use, and reading to evaluate). We also need data on reading to translate in both native-competence users (L1) of a language and non-native language (L2) users, and the effects of directionality in the equation. Reading theory has much to offer translation studies, and cognitive scientists in particular have taken up the gauntlet. Our success in using best practices to foster competence in this age of evolving information literacy depends in large part on our training active, strategic readers who read deliberately and purposefully rather than assuming learners' reading competence, or worse, treating reading as a passive skill rather than a transactive, cognitively complex activity.

⁸ These examples follow Braunger and Lewis' (2006, p.91) recounting of expert reading strategies.

References

- Almasi, J. F. (2003). *Teaching strategic processes in reading*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Alderson, J. C. and Urquhart, A.H. (1984). *Reading in a foreign language*. London: Longman; New York: Longman.
- Althusser, L. and Balibar, E. (1970). *Reading capital*. London, NLB.
- Armbruster, B. B. (1984). The problem of 'inconsiderate text'. In G.G. Duffy, L.R. Rochler, and J. Mason (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Perspectives and suggestions* (pp.202-217). New York: Longman.
- Arrojo, R. (1997). The 'death' of the author and the limits of the translator's visibility. In M. Snell-Hornby, Z. Jettmarová, & K. Kaindl (Eds.), *Translation and intercultural communication* (pp.21-32). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
- Atari, O. F. and Radwan, A. A. (2009). A cross-sectional study of translator trainees' L2 reading comprehension skills and strategies. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer (ITT)*, 3(2), 225-256.
- Barnstone, W. (1993). *The poetics of translation: History, theory, practice*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Barthes, R. (1989). On reading. *The rustle of language*. Trans. Richard Howard. Berkeley : University of California Press.
- Barthes, R. (1974). *S/Z: An essay*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Barthes, R. (1968/1977). "The death of the author". *Image - Music - Text*. S. Heath (Ed. and Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang, 142-148.
- Bassnett, S. (2000). Authenticity, travel and translation. In M. Kadric, K. Kaindl, and F. Pöschhacker (Eds.), *Translationaswissenschaft. Festschrift für Mary Snell-Hornby zum 60. Geburtstag*, (pp.105-114). Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Bassnett-McGuire, S. (2002). *Translation Studies*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge.
- Berman, A. (1995). Pour une critique des traductions: John Donne. *Gallimard* , 13. Translated by Luise von Flotow. Retrieved from aix1.uottawa.ca/~vonfloto/_articles07/Berman.final.with_note_to_translators.doc.
- Biau Gil, J. and Pym, A. (2006). Technology and translation: a pedagogical overview. In A. Pym, A. Perekrestenko, and B. Starink (Eds.) *Translation technology and its teaching*. Tarragona, Spain. Retrieved from http://isg.urv.es/publicity/isg/publications/technology_2006/index.htm.
- Blanchot, M. (1982). *The space of literature*. S. Smock (Trans.). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Bloemers, W., Ondracek, P., and Störmer, N. (2007). *Diagnostik und planung*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Braunger, J. and Lewis, J.P. (2006). *Building a knowledge base in reading*. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association ; Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Burke, M. (2011). *Literary reading, cognition and emotion: An exploration of the oceanic mind*. New York: Routledge.
- Chan S. (2006). Form and spirit in poetry translation. *The Humanities Bulletin* 3, 100-111. sunzi1.lib.hku.hk/hkjo/view/8/800063.pdf
- Cherland, M. and Harper, H. (2007). *Advocacy research in literacy education: Seeking higher ground*. Mahwah, New Jersey; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Chew, S. and Stead, A. (Eds.). (2000). *Translating life: Studies in transpositional aesthetics*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Chi, M. T. H., Glaser, R., and Farr, M.J. (Eds.). (1988). *The nature of expertise*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Christenbury, L. (1983). *Questioning: A path to critical thinking*. Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Cornis-Pope, M. and Woodlief, A. (2003). The rereading/rewriting process: Theory and collaborative, on-line pedagogy. In M. Helmers (Ed.), *Intertexts: Reading pedagogy in college writing classrooms* (pp.153-72). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cronin, M. (2005). Deschooling translation. In M. Tennent (Ed.), *Training for the new millennium: Pedagogies for translation and interpreting* (pp.249-265). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Danks, J. H., & Griffin, J. (1997). Reading and translation: A psycholinguistic perspective. In J.H. Danks, G.M. Shreve, S.B. Fountain, & M.K. McBeath, (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in translation and interpreting* (pp.161-175). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DeBeaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Doyle, M. S. (1991). Translation and the space between: Operative parameters of an enterprise. In M. Larson (Ed.), *Translation: Theory and practice, tension and interdependence* (pp.13-26). Binghamton: State University of New York at Binghamton (SUNY).
- Eco, U. (1985). *Lector in fabula*. Paris: Grasset.
- Eysteinnsson, A. (2006). Notes on world literature and translation. In I. Klitgård (Ed.), *Literary translation: World literature or 'worlding' literature?* (pp.11-24). Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Gaddis Rose, M. (1997). *Translation and literary criticism: Translation as analysis*. Manchester, England: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Gambrell, L. B., Morrow, L. M., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- González Davies, M. (2004). *Multiple voices in the translation classroom: activities, tasks and projects*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins,
- Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: moving from theory to practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grow, G. O. (1996). Serving the strategic reader: Reader response theory and its implications for the teaching of writing. Retrieved from <http://www.longleaf.net/ggrow>. Original paper available as Eric Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 406 644.
- Gruba, P. (2004). Understanding digitized second language videotext. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 17(1), 51–82.
- Karolides, N. (1999) Theory and practice: An interview with Louise M. Rosenblatt. *Language Arts*, 77(2), 158–70. Reprinted in Rosenblatt, L. M., *Making Meaning with Texts: Selected Essays* (xv-1). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. New York: Routledge.
- Kussmaul, P. (1995). *Training the translator*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Langford, R.(Ed.) (2009). *Textual intersections*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Lawall, S. (1994). *Reading world literature: theory, history, practice*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Lotman, J. (1970). *Struktura khudozestvenogoo teksta*. Moskow: Iskusstvo.
- McNamara, D. S. (2007). *Reading comprehension strategies: Theories, interventions and technologies*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Morningside Translations, retrieved from <http://www.morningtrans.com/services/litigation-support/document-sifting-and-review>.

- Mossop, B. (2001). *Revising and editing for translators*. Manchester, UK; Northampton, MA: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Nabokov, V. (1980). Good readers and good writers. In F. Bowers (Ed.), *Lectures on literature* (pp.1-5). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.
- Neubert, A. & Shreve, G. M. (1992). *Translation as text*. Kent, Ohio; London, England: The Kent State University Press.
- O'Brien, S. (2010). Controlled language and readability. In G. Shreve and E. Angelone (Eds.), *Translation and cognition* (pp.143-168). Philadelphia, PA; Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- O'Brien, S. (2011). RE: Comments: chapter 2. Email to S. Laviosa, J. Byrne, and K. Washbourne. 3 June, 2011.
- Ong, W. J. (1982). *Orality and literacy: The technologizing the word*. New York: Methuen.
- Palincsar, A. S. and Brown, A.L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1(2), 117-175.
- Pressley, M., & Afflerbach, P. (1995). *Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of constructively responsive reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pullen, D. L., Gitsaki, C. and Bagueley, M. (2009). *Technoliteracy, discourse and social practice: Frameworks and applications in a digital age*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference.
- Pym, A. (1992). *Translation and text transfer: An essay on the principles of intercultural communication*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rouet, J. (2006). *The skills of document use: from text comprehension to web-based learning*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Rumelhart, D. E. and Norman, D. A. (1978). Accretion, tuning, and restructuring: Three modes of learning. In J. W. Cotton & R. L. Klatzky (Eds.), *Semantic factors in cognition* (pp.37-54). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sager, J. (1983). Quality and standards – the evaluation of translation. In C. Picken, (Ed.). *The translator's handbook* (pp.121-128). London: Aslib, The Association for Information Management.
- Schulte, R. (1985). Translation and reading. *Translation Review*, 18(1-2). Retrieved from http://translation.utdallas.edu/translationstudies/reading_essay1.html
- Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *System*, 29, 431-449.
- Shreve, G. M., Schaffner, C., Danks, J. H. and Griffin, J. (1993). Is there a special kind of 'reading' for translation? *Target*, 5(1), 21-41.
- Snell-Hornby, M., Z. Jettmarová, & K. Kaindl (Eds.). (2006). *Translation and intercultural communication* (pp.21-32). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
- Storey, J. (2003). *Cultural studies and the study of popular culture*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- van den Broek, P., Young, M., Tzeng, Y., and Linderholm, T. (1999). The landscape model of reading: Inferences and the online construction of a memory representation. In H. van Oostendorp and S. R. Goldman (Eds.) *The construction of mental representations during reading* (pp.71-98). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- van Dijk, T. A. and Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Venuti, L. (2008). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Wallace, C. (2003). *Critical reading in language education*. New York: Palgrave

Macmillan.

- Whyatt, B. (2003). Reading for translation: investigating the process of foreign language text comprehension from an information processing perspective. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia: International review of English Studies*, 39, 133-147.
- Wilson, L. (2002). *Reading to live: how to teach reading for today's world*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Wolf, M. (2007). *Proust and the squid: The story and science of the reading brain*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Wright, P. (1999). Writing and information design of healthcare materials. In C. N. Candlin and K. Hyland (Eds.). *Writing: Texts, processes and practices* (pp.85-98). London and New York: Longman.