Original Paper

An Analysis of EFL Learners' Needs for Student-Centered Translation Course Design

Hui-chuan Wang[1*]

[1] Department of English, Wenzao Ursuline University of Languages PO box 80793, 900 Mintsu 1st Road, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, R. O. C.

[*] Hui-chuan Wang, E-mail: cwfranceswang@gmail.com

Abstract

In recent years, translation learning has been a main focus of university language learners, but no studies in students' needs have been explored for translation course design. Thus, the current research aimed to analyze EFL learners' needs for student-centered translation course design. The subjects were 90 juniors from the Department of Applied Foreign Languages at a technological university in central Taiwan. The instrument was a 45-item questionnaire on learning goals, course planning, instructional materials, teaching and learning, and evaluation. Descriptive analysis was conducted on the Likert-scale questionnaire items to calculate frequencies, percentages, means, ranks, and standard deviations. The results showed that English-major students believed translation courses are required for both language and working skill training. The findings also implied that translation curriculum should involve more authentic materials, learning activities, and evaluation. The genres and topics selection need to take learners' interests and small 'c' cultural knowledge into account. It is also suggested that classes be smaller to increase interactions between teachers and students. With explicit guidelines, group work in a translation course can lead to success in translation learning. The practical implications of the current study were also discussed.

Keywords

needs analysis, student-centered, translation course design

1. Introduction

Over the past two decades, English teaching and learning have received considerable attention in Taiwan. Among all the areas of language learning, translation learning is one of the educational goals set by Taiwan's government. In October 2002, the Executive Yuan approved the Action Plan for Creating an English-friendly Environment. One of the key strategies of that plan is to cultivate professional translators. Since then, a number of translation programs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels have been established in language departments in Taiwan (Liao & Chiang, 2005). Although translation learning has been a new main focus of university language learners, a number of

studies have found that many translation teachers still utilize traditional translation teaching methods, which are more teacher-centered and text-centered (Chang et al, 1993; Liao, 2009; Mu, 1992). Liao (2009) pointed out that this may be due to the short history of translation teaching and learning and thus teachers have no common consensus on translation teaching goals, pedagogies, materials, and evaluation. He identified several problems in a traditional translation classroom, including students' passive learning attitudes and no interests in translation learning.

For the past decade, translation theorists in Taiwan have been trying to develop alternative translation teaching methods (e.g., Chang, 2011; Chen, 2011; Hsueh, 2009; Liao, 2008; Liao, 2009). Those new teaching designs have been well constructed based on theories or market needs. For example, Chang (2011) attempted to apply translation teaching theories in subtitling and develop a lesson plan for undergraduate classes and for graduate programs, structured in the instructional sequence of the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach. However, a further analysis of those studies reveals that students' needs in the curriculum planning process seem to be a missing part in those related studies. No needs analysis have been conducted before the design of the course and syllabus.

As a matter of fact, none of the research have been carried out in Taiwan to investigate students' general needs for translation learning and instruction. As Nunan (1989) addressed, course or program 'planning procedures within learner-centered systems need to be developed' in order to generate differentiated curricula for different learner types (p. 42). In other words, in a learner-centered system, the starting point for curriculum development is to conduct needs analysis and have extensive consultation with learners in the pre-course planning procedures for deriving parameters. Those information can serve as "input into the content, design and implementation of a language program" (Richards, 1984, p. 5). Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a needs analysis to understand students' needs for translation learning and teaching.

During the 1970s, needs analysis became widespread in language planning with their adoption by the Council of Europe's modern language projects. The meaning of needs has been illustrated by many scholars, such as Berwick (1989), Brindley (1989), Mountford (1981), and Widdowson (1981) and five models of needs analysis have been developed: a systematic approach (Richterich & Chancerel, 1977), a sociolinguistic model (Munby, 1978), a learning-centered approach (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987), learner-centered approaches (Berwick, 1989; Brindley, 1989) and a task-based approach (Long, 2005). Richterich and Chancerel (1977) proposed a systematic approach for identifying adults' language learning needs. This approach pays more attention to the nature of learners, context, and multiple perspectives. Learners' needs are approached before and during a course through more than one or two data collection methods such as surveys, interviews, and attitudes scales. However, two concerns are raised: lack of attention of learner's real-world needs and over-reliance on learners' perceptions of needs (Kaewpet, 2009).

Munby's (1978) sociolinguistic model specified valid target situations, addressing the importance of communicative competence. This model provides an abundance of needs required for communication,

such as communicative events, channel of communication, and medium, but it has been criticized for not including needs on human variables. West (1994) argued against it and pointed out, "It collects data about the learner rather than from the learner." In other words, learners' perspectives and voices are not taken into consideration.

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) provided a learning-centered approach to ESP, which focuses on how learners learn. Learner needs are approached from two directions: target needs and learning needs. Target needs are defined as "what the learner needs to do in the target situation" (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, p. 54). Learning needs refer to numerous factors, such as learners, learning background, and age. Similar to the systematic approach, the learning-centered approach encourages constant needs analysis and multiple methods of data collection.

Unlike the systematic approach, learner-centered approaches look at learner needs in three ways: perceived vs. felt needs; product vs. process oriented interpretations; and objective vs. subjective needs (Berwick, 1989; Brindley, 1989). According to Berwick (1989), 'perceived needs' are from the perspective of experts, while 'felt needs' are from learners' views. In the product-oriented interpretation, learner needs are considered to be the language that is required in the target situations, while in the process-oriented interpretation, the focus is on how learners respond to their learning situation. Finally, objective needs are derived from various kinds of factual information about learners, their real-life needs, their current language proficiency, and their difficulties (Brindley, 1989), while subjective needs can be derived from information related to affective and cognitive factors such as attitudes, learning wants, and learning expectations. Learners' attitudes and feelings are especially highlighted in the learner-centered approaches, but they also combine the concepts of needs as specified in the sociolinguistic model and the learning-centered approach (Kaewpet, 2009). Needs in the product-oriented interpretation are similar to Munby's (1978) communication needs and Hutchinson and Waters' (1978) target needs, while needs in the process-oriented interpretation correspond to learning needs.

Long (2005) proposed a task-based approach to needs analysis, teaching, and learning in a belief that learners are "active and cognitive-independent participants in the acquisition process" (Long, 2005, p. 3). Tasks are the units of analysis and "samples of the discourse typically involved in the performance of target tasks" (Long, 2005, p. 3). The concept of tasks is in fact similar to that of communicative events defined by Munby (1978), but different in terms of the variables. The task-based approach looks at language variables and a sociolinguistic focus at sociolinguistic variables.

As the trend of translation teaching has shifted from teacher-centered to student-centered, course or curriculum development without extensive consultation with learners may not meet students' needs. From a literature review of works on needs analysis, it can be found that although needs analysis has come to the language acquisition world, it seems to have passed by translation teaching. Until now, only a few needs analysis studies have been done for the students who are learning translation. Mutlu (2004) explored management students' needs with regard to the English-Turkish Translation Course

78

through a questionnaire and structured interviews with students, instructors, and subject-area instructors. Sun, Ma, and Wang (2010) analyzed the requirements of the translation competence of the science and technology majors, including their personal needs, social needs, present needs, and target needs, and tried to improve the translation competence of science and technology majors. Much effort has been given to the development of alternative translation teaching approaches, and needs analysis is just a part of the research focus and only for teaching methods' modification.

The current alternative teaching approaches may provide more effective ways of teaching, but they might not result in the expected learning outcomes when learners' psychological manifestations are not taken into consideration. To make a course successful and advance the development of learner-centered translation learning curriculum, learners' needs must be addressed. Therefore, the current study aimed to conduct an analysis of EFL learners' needs for student-centered translation course design. Nunan's (1989) summary definition of needs analysis is the main basis of this study, as it serves for investigating possible gaps between what translation learners want to learn and how policy makers develop the curriculum and design related courses. The current study, following his definition, intended to specify the parameters of a course to find "the criteria and rationale for grouping learners, the selection and sequencing of course content, and methodology" (Nunan, 1989, p. 45). The parameters were based on Richards' (2001) components in language curriculum development: learning goals, course planning, instructional materials, teaching and learning, and evaluation.

As for a model of needs analysis, this exploratory study chose learner-centered approaches to analyze Taiwanese translation learners' needs and focused more on **felt needs, process oriented interpretations, and subjective needs**. Very few reports in the related literature reviews present information on learners' needs from learners' views (felt needs), while more studies have been conducted from the perspective of translation theorist experts (perceived needs) in terms of theories or real-world job requirement (product-oriented interpretation). For example, Hsueh (2009) tried to develop a course of Business English Translation which met practical needs of the market by interviewing media companies and institutions to explore the qualifications and job requirements for professional translators.

Moreover, most of the alternative teaching approaches were conducted based on students' objective needs (real-life needs, language proficiency, or difficulties). No specific studies have been done to explore students' subjective needs; that is, their attitudes, wants, and expectations. Only post-task surveys have ever conducted. Liao (2009) conducted a post-teaching survey to understand students' perspectives toward a communicative translation course. The goal of this survey was to modify the design of the course, not to provide the subjects' general needs for translation learning and instruction. In other words, the survey results can only be used to review and evaluate the existing designed pedagogy. Those guidelines or principles may not be generalized to other translation curriculums or syllabus development. Therefore, to help translation curriculum designers, students' general attitudes, wants, and expectations need to be explored. The current study particularly worked on these three

79

neglected needs.

2. Research Questions

The current study aimed to answer the following two research questions:

1)   What are EFL college students' needs for a translation course?

2)   What can be changed in a translation course based on students' needs?

3. Methods

3.1 Subjects

The subjects were 90 college juniors from two *Chinese to English Translation* courses at the Department of Applied Foreign Languages of a technological university in central Taiwan. This university was especially chosen because this department offers intensive courses in translation comparing with the other similar departments in Taiwan, including one-year English to Chinese and two-year Chinese to English translation courses. As Long (2005) addressed the issue that not all learners are clear about what they want. Thus, instead of selecting learners who have no translation learning experiences, learners who had translation learning experience were chosen. The subjects in the present study have studied both *English to Chinese Translation* and *Chinese to English Translation*, each for one year. The subjects were asked to express their process-oriented interpretation of translation learning and teaching, not to evaluate the courses they took. In order to have a full understanding of students' needs and attitudes, all the juniors in this department, a total of two classes, were invited to participate in this study.

3.2 Instrument

The instrument in the study was a questionnaire developed by the lead author (teacher-investigator), including 9 multiple-choice questions, 2 dichotomous questions, and 34 rating scale questions, for a total of 45 items (see Appendix). The questionnaire was divided into five dimensions by adapting Richards' (2001) components in language curriculum development. The dimensions were learning goals, course planning, instructional materials, teaching and learning, and evaluation. The questionnaire was tested and revised following a pilot study with two students at the same institution in order to identify ambiguities and other problems. Based on the results and students' comments, the questionnaire was modified and finalized for data collection. The rating scale questions required the subjects to rate each five-point Likert-scale item in terms of frequency, importance, and agreement level to the statements.

3.3 Procedures

Based on Richards' components in language curriculum development, Nunan's (1989) summary definition of needs analysis, and related literature reviews on translation teaching, a questionnaire was developed and later piloted. Based on the pilot study's results, the questionnaire was modified and finalized for data collection. The study, conducted in the junior course *Chinese to English Translation*,

80

took place at the end of the school year so that the subjects could point out their learning preferences and attitudes toward translation teaching and learning based on their learning experiences. The questionnaire was administered in class. First, the subjects were told the objectives of the questionnaire and encouraged to express their opinions by answering the questionnaire items. To elicit reliable responses, the researcher read each item and gave a brief explanation in Chinese for the subjects to make sure they understood the English phrasing of each item. It took approximately 35 minutes to complete the survey.

3.4 Data Analysis Procedure

Ninety questionnaires were distributed and collected. The results of the questionnaire were analyzed by the descriptive statistics (frequencies, means, percentages, standard deviations, and ranks). Responses to each dimension were analyzed. Moreover, the total number and percentage of each alternative chosen by the subjects in multiple-choice and dichotomous items were calculated in order to understand the number of subjects who agreed on each alternative.

4. Results

The main purpose of the present study was to systematically explore English-major college students' learning needs for a more student-centered translation course. The results of the questionnaires completed by the subjects are described below in five parts.

4.1 Learning Goals

Table 1 indicates that the most important goal in a translation course was 'sharpening real working skills of translation,' while 'raising your language learning motivation' was the least important goal. The next three important goals were 'improving English ability,' 'using languages' and 'understanding the major differences between English and Chinese.'

Table 1. Importance Level of Each Goal in Translation Courses

Goals	N	Mean	SD	Rank
1. sharpening real working skills of translation	90	4.51	0.60	1
2. improving English ability	90	4.22	0.83	2
3. using languages	90	4.21	0.76	3
4. understanding the major differences between English and Chinese	90	4.07	1.11	4
5. finding language weakness	90	3.89	0.89	5
6. raising your language learning motivation	90	3.43	1.18	6

4.2 Course Planning

As to the course planning, 100% of the subjects thought English-majored students need translation

courses. Almost half of the subjects (49%) believed that students should start translation courses in their first year of university, and 38% of the subjects thought they should start such courses in their second year. In addition, 80% of the subjects thought the appropriate number of students for a translation class should be limited to 15-25.

4.3 Instructional Materials

As for the instructional materials, 60% of the subjects saw no need for a textbook in a translation course. Table 2 indicates that among the ten kinds of content, 'language structures' was ranked as the most important content to be included in a textbook. 'Resources related to translation' was ranked as the least important content. According to the rank in Table 2, in a textbook for a translation course, the five most important types of content were 'language structures,' 'translation skills,' 'language knowledge (i.e., slang and idioms),' 'comparison of two languages,' and 'punctuation of two languages.'

Table 2. Importance Level of Each Content When Choosing a Textbook

Content	N	Mean	SD	Rank
1. language structures (grammar)	90	4.23	0.78	1
2. translation skills	90	4.16	0.72	2
3. language knowledge (i.e., slang and idioms)	90	4.10	0.82	3
4. comparison of two languages	90	3.91	0.86	4
5. punctuation of two languages	90	3.81	0.85	5
6. translation difficulties	90	3.73	0.86	6
7. Chinese and English rhetoric	90	3.59	0.98	7
8. model translations	90	3.27	1.25	8
9. translation theories	90	3.08	0.96	9
10. resources (books, websites, etc.)	90	2.98	1.18	10

Table 3 indicates that the subjects seemed to prefer the textbooks from Taiwan or Hong Kong to those from Mainland China in terms of the mean scores. As for the teacher-generated materials, the mean score of 4.13 indicates that students had a positive view on them. Additionally, the mean scores of materials related to interests and those related to work are similar, with that of the former just a little higher than that of the latter. In order to understand the suitable proportions of the materials in a translation course, the subjects were required to select the desired percentages of these two materials, choosing between 25% vs. 75% and 50% vs. 50%. In all, 31% of the subjects preferred 25% vs. 75%, and 41% of the subjects felt 50% vs. 50% was a better proportion.

Table 3. Agreement Level of the Materials

Materials	N	Mean	SD
1. textbooks from Mainland China	90	2.98	1.18
2. textbooks from Taiwan or Hong Kong	90	3.71	0.82
3. teacher generated materials	90	4.13	0.75
4. materials related to work	89	4.15	0.83
5. materials related to your interests	89	4.19	0.77

Table 4 shows that the subjects were more interested in the genres of translation tasks related to daily life. According to the percentages and the rank, the first five genres above 50% were 'songs,' 'stories,' 'conversations,' 'schedules,' and 'letters.' 'Riddles' had the lowest percentage.

Table 4. The Percentages of the Genres Related to Lives

Genres related to lives			
Genres	N	Percentages	Rank
1. songs	90	64%	1
2. stories	90	56%	2
3. conversations	90	54%	3
4. schedules (TV)	90	51%	4
5. letters	90	49%	5
6. jokes	90	30%	6
7. dramas	90	23%	7
8. poems	90	18%	8
9. cards	90	13%	9
10. tables	90	12%	10
11. riddles	90	7%	11

Table 5 shows the genres of translation tasks related to work in which the subjects were more interested. The first four genres above 40% were 'business documentation,' 'advertisements,' 'internet information,' and 'official forms.' 'Academic articles' had the lowest percentage.

Table 5. The Percentages of the Genres Related to Work

Genres related to work			
Genres	N	Percentages	Rank
1. business documentation	90	60%	1
2. advertisements	90	46%	2
3. internet information	90	43%	3
4. official forms	90	40%	4
5. cartoons	90	39%	5
6. newspaper	90	38%	6
7. language magazine articles	90	37%	7
8. other magazine articles	90	29%	8
9. handbooks	90	21%	9
10. menus	90	17%	10
11. signboard	90	13%	11
12. professional books	90	12%	12
13. maps	90	11%	13
14. recipes	90	11%	13
15. academic articles	90	7%	14

Table 6 shows the topics of translation tasks in which the subjects were more interested. The three genres with percentages above 40% were 'traveling,' 'fashion,' 'living,' and 'culture and art." The topics with percentages below 10% were 'technology,' 'medical issues,' 'science,' 'law,' and 'politics.'

Table 6. The Percentages of the Preferred Topics

Topics			
Genres	N	Percentages	Rank
1. traveling	90	67%	1
2. fashion	90	62%	2
3. living	90	57%	3
4. culture and art	90	47%	4
5. recreation	90	41%	5
6. business	90	38%	6
7. public media	90	29%	7
8. sports	90	26%	8
9. social issues	90	26%	8
10. health	90	20%	9

11.	animals	90	18%	10
12.	education	90	12%	11
13.	computer	90	11%	12
14.	technology	90	8%	13
15.	medical issue	90	6%	14
16.	science	90	3%	15
17.	law	90	3%	15
18.	politics	90	2%	16

4.4 Teaching and Learning

With regard to grouping, 75% of the subjects preferred group work, while only 2% indicated a preference for whole-class work. Based on the percentages of the subjects' agreement, the order of groupings was group work (75%), pair work (27%), and then individual work (19%), with whole-class work in last place (2%). Table 7 indicates the learning activities the subjects preferred in a translation classroom. According to the percentages and rank, the three preferred learning activities were 'group in-class translation,' followed by 'training of language skills' and then 'discussion on translation.' 'Group presentation' was the least-preferred learning activity.

Table 7. The Percentages of the Preferred Learning Activities in Class

Learning activities		N	percentages	Rank
1.	group in-class translation	90	65%	1
2.	training of language skills	90	54%	2
3.	discussion on translation	90	49%	3
4.	reading translation models	90	37%	4
5.	peer-editing	90	35%	5
6.	teachers' lecture	90	29%	6
7.	individual in-class translation	90	15%	7
8.	group presentation	90	10%	8

Table 8 shows the importance level of each type of instruction listed. According to the rank, the most important type of instruction to be included in translation courses was "informing common translation errors." Moreover, in terms of the mean scores, the types of instruction above the mean score of four were 'common translation errors,' 'translation skills,' 'group meeting and discussion,' and 'students' translation errors.' In the top four preferred types of instruction from teachers, there were two types related to errors, including 'common translation errors' and 'students' translation errors.' 'Translation theory' was ranked as the least important.

Table 8. The Importance Level of Teachers' Different Instruction

Instruction	N	Mean	SD	Rank
1. common translation errors	90	4.43	0.67	1
2. translation skills	90	4.41	0.73	2
3. group meeting and discussion	90	4.18	0.80	3
4. students' translation errors	90	4.16	0.92	4
5. language knowledge (i.e., slang and idioms)	90	3.92	0.89	5
6. models translation	90	3.91	0.76	6
7. suggested translation of students' translation exercise	90	3.86	0.89	7
8. comparison of two languages	90	3.83	0.95	8
9. online resources	90	3.77	0.84	9
10. use of dictionaries	90	3.73	0.91	10
11. jargons	90	3.62	0.99	11
12. translation software	90	3.11	1.02	12
13. translation theory	90	3.06	1.11	13

4.5 Evaluation

Table 9 shows the percentages of each kind of teacher evaluation and the rank. As Table 9 shows, 'in-class translation tasks' with their group members was ranked the first, while 'take-home translation exercise' was second and 'tests of language knowledge' was third. 'Reports on translation analysis' was last.

Table 9. The Percentages of Teacher Evaluation in Translation Classes

Evaluation	N	percentages	Rank
1. in-class translation tasks (group)	90	78%	1
2. take-home translation exercises	90	50%	2
3. tests of language knowledge	90	40%	3
4. in-class translation tasks (individual)	90	29%	4
5. tests of translation skills in the textbook	90	29%	4
6. peer-evaluation	90	27%	5
7. reports on translation analysis	90	11%	6

5. Discussion

The results of the present study explored EFL college students' needs for a translation course and helped translation teachers know what can be changed in a translation course based on students' needs. First, from the subjects' responses to learning goals, the finding showed that the subjects considered

work-oriented learning to be a top priority. Translation courses were not only considered the courses for language proficiency but also training in translation competence for their future careers, especially for college students in technological universities. In other words, translation courses should be more pragmatic, rather than theoretical or linguistic. However, this perspective may not be consistent with teachers' beliefs and not be held by the translation teachers who have studied in fields such as TESOL, literature, or linguistics. Without formal translation education or teacher training, it is likely that those teachers will simply turn a translation course into another language course, which typically ignores the development of translation competence.

Kelly and the AVANTI research group (2007) have shown the complexity of translation competence in their categorization. A translator needs to have communicative and textual competence in two languages and cultures, to be familiar with subject areas and the instrumental tools for using resources, to hold a serious attitude toward translation work, to cooperate with others such as fellow translators, and to use appropriate translation strategies. From these sub-competences, it can be found that translation competence is not just the ability to transfer meanings between two languages. Language pedagogy, which focuses only on language learning, may not meet the instructional needs for the development of translation competences. Other translation competences should be developed in order to meet students' needs for working skills identified in this study.

How college students valued translation courses was also shown in this study. All of the subjects believed all English-major college students need translation courses in Taiwan, even though they expressed different goals in taking such courses. It seems clear from the results that translation courses are required and important courses for English-major students. The results also showed that 87% of the subjects suggested that translation courses be offered to English majors as early as the first or second year of their enrollment in university and that class size should be limited to 15-25 students in order to promote effective learning and instruction. It is possible to conclude that the subjects held the opinion that learning translation requires long-term training and explicit instruction from teachers in a small class. In fact, this need for small-class translation instruction has become a new trend. In the past five years, several English departments in Taiwan have attempted to transform large-size translation courses into small-size ones.

Concerning instructional materials, there was a general agreement that a textbook was not a necessity. Teacher-generated materials were especially suggested by the highest mean score of agreement level among the three sources. It can be inferred that students were not satisfied with the textbooks on the market and believed that teacher-generated materials were more likely to meet their learning needs. If a teacher wants to choose a textbook for learners, a textbook with language structures, translation skills, and language knowledge (i.e., slang and idioms) could be a good option, as students believe those areas to be the important content in a translation textbook. A possible explanation for students' need for the learning of language structures is that those students ever confronted some difficulties in translating sentences. Thus, when students are translating from Chinese to English, it is essential for teachers to

87

pay more attention to the teaching of language structures.

Another two types of learning content mentioned by the subjects but easily ignored by translation teachers were 'the comparison of two languages' and 'punctuation of two languages.' As most Taiwan college learners learn Mandarin Chinese and English separately, they are not taught the differences between the two language systems. Although the learners might not be aware of the differences between the languages, they were aware that they lacked this knowledge and would like to learn it in a translation classroom. As such, instructional materials should include content related to the introduction of the differences between the source language and target language. Also, more emphasis should be placed on the punctuation of two languages as students tended to use the punctuation of two languages interchangeably.

In this study, it is found that students preferred textbooks from Taiwan or Hong Kong, and they could not accept the textbooks from Mainland China. It may be assumed that the subjects gave a negative impression of all products from Mainland China. Three of the subjects expressed their concerns to their teacher about the quality of textbooks. Thus, when using materials, a teacher should explain the criteria for selecting a textbook to dispel at least partially students' negative attitudes toward the textbooks. As Shulman (1987) suggested, when attempting to select or adapt instructional materials, students' concepts, preconceptions, misconceptions, and difficulties should be taken into consideration.

There is some evidence in this study suggesting that students expected translation courses to provide materials that not only meet their interests but also sharpen their working skills. This corresponds to their primary goal of learning. Therefore, if a teacher need to set the proportion of these two kinds of materials, the preferred ratio can be 50% for each one, or with a higher proportion, up to 75%, on the materials related to work.

In terms of the genres, the current research found that the subjects preferred 'songs,' 'stories,' 'conversations,' 'schedules,' and 'letters' for the genres related to daily life, and they preferred 'business documentation,' 'advertisements,' 'online information,' and 'official forms' for the genres related to work. It seems that the topics the subjects were more interested in were related to small 'c' culture; that is, social patterns of living (Nostrand, 1974). Since good materials arouse the learners' interests and encourage them to practice (Richards, 2001), the topics chosen by a teacher can include more knowledge about small "c" culture. In contrast, the least preferred topics were 'technology,' 'medical issues,' 'science,' 'law,' and 'politics.' However, this low level of preference does not mean that translation teachers should eliminate texts on those topics, for those are the most common topics for translation practitioners. The findings here implied students' learning difficulties. Since the texts in those topics tend to be more difficult, it is possible that students would like to avoid practices in those fields. Therefore, when a translation teacher is arranging a translation course, it is important to consider students' translation and language proficiency and to choose the materials with appropriate difficult level for them.

When completing translation tasks, most of the subjects would like to engage in group work rather than

any other kinds of grouping. In a word, they would like to work with group members and had a chance to discuss the translation work with members or teachers. Zimmerman (2010) has discussed the benefits of group work in EFL/ESL classrooms. Zimmerman (2010) addressed that students in group work can practice their language skills in a low-stress environment. Group work also encourages students' active participation if roles are specifically designed. Many translation researchers have advocated group work in translation learning (Kiraly, 1995; González Davies, 2004; Nord, 2005). Kiraly (1995) proposed small-group exercises in order to foster creativity and cooperation, while González Davies (2004) encouraged discussion forums as real-life situations so that students have a chance to live in the professional world. Similarly, Nord (2005) believed that role-playing (i.e., client, reviser, terminologist, documentation assistant, free-lancer, in-house translator) and acquiring responsibility in training for teamwork are the qualifications of a professional translator.

However, some potential disadvantages have been found in group-work classrooms. To avoid them and conduct successful group work, some guidelines on organizing group work can be followed. Ur (1996) suggested four sections: presentation, process, ending, and feedback. For the first phase, it is important to select tasks that are simple enough to describe easily, to give the instructions before giving out materials, to have a rehearsal or 'dry run' of a sample activity, and to have a 'reserve' task to occupy members of groups who finish earlier. As for the process phase, teachers can go from group to group, monitor, and contribute, or they may not focus on group work. Activities should be ended while the students are still enjoying them. Finally, a feedback section can be held to express appreciation of the efforts that have been invested and their results.

Turning to teachers' instruction, there are some reasons to believe that the subjects needed the teacher to provide corrections on translation works. Among the four kinds of instruction preferred by the subjects, two were related to information on errors from teachers, and one was 'error identification and correction' during group meetings with teachers. It is of interest to note that a certain sequence of instruction seems to be expected by the students in terms of the rank of the instruction. It is highly probable that students expect a translation teacher to inform them of common translation errors and teach translation skills before they are assigned a group-work translation task. After the translation work is completed, the teacher is expected to conduct a group meeting and discussion with each group before sharing each group's translation errors with the whole class.

This sequence supports Ur's organization of group work (1996). Informing students of 'common translation errors' and teaching them 'translation skills' can be scheduled in the preparation section, while 'group meeting and discussion' and informing students of 'students' translation errors' can be placed in the feedback section. Therefore, when designing translation syllabus and tasks, teachers' corrections have to be taken into consideration, and the sequence of the four important phases of instruction also plays an important role. Liao and Chiang (2005) have suggested using portfolios for translation learning as a more effective way to help teachers and students to identify errors and monitor their learning progress.

Corresponding to teacher evaluation, the subjects preferred authentic tasks such as in-class translation tasks and take-home translation exercises. Despite this fact, in order to apply their language knowledge more effectively, they regarded tests of language knowledge as another appropriate type of evaluation. Accordingly, the practice of students' learning may not be limited to translation works. Alternative exercises on language abilities can be conducted in order to understand students' progress and motivate their language development.

6. Conclusions

The present study looked into EFL learners' process-orientation interpretations of translation learning and teaching. Several pedagogical implications were drawn from this study. First, the findings implied that translation curriculum should involve more authentic materials, learning activities, and evaluation, since students expect translation courses to not only sharpen their language skills but also give them chances to practice the target language for their future career. Moreover, the selection of genres and topics needs to take learners' interests and small 'c' cultural knowledge into account. It is also suggested that classes be smaller to increase contact and interactions between the teachers and students, thereby allowing students to get more direct help from the teachers. With more explicit guidelines, group work in translation courses can lead to success in translation learning. It is anticipated that translation teachers will treat the teaching of translation as the teaching of communication to develop students' sound theoretical and practical translation skills (Malmkjaer, 1994).

Although all the juniors in this department participated in this study, the generalization of the results to all the English-major college students in Taiwan may be limited. Therefore, it would be beneficial to replicate this study in larger and different populations. Furthermore, we are hopeful that future research will provide more information on students' needs by employing other models of needs analysis through qualitative research and multiple methods of data collection.

References

Berwick, R. (1989). Needs assessment in language programming: From theory to practice. In R. K. Johnson (Eds.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 48-62). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brindley, G. (1989). The role of needs analysis in adult ESL programme design. In R. K. Johnson (Eds.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 63-77). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chang, P., Yu, Y., Li, Z., & Peng, M. (1993). *A course in English-Chinese translation*. Taipei: Bookman Books Company.

Chang, Y. M. (2011). A course design of audiovisual translation at tertiary level. *Studies of translation and interpretation, 14*, 247-270.

Chen, J. C. (2011). A corpus-assisted approach to teaching translation and interpretation. *Studies of translation and interpretation*, *14*, 115-134.

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

Hsueh, T. A. (2009). A tentative approach to teaching translation of business English-concepts and practice. *Studies of translation and interpretation*, *12*, 277-302.

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purpose: a learning-centred approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaewpet, C. (2009). A framework for investigating learner needs: Needs analysis extended to curriculum development. *Electronic Journal of foreign language teaching, 6*(2), 209-220.

Kelly, D., & AVANTI Research Group. (2007). Translator competence contextualized. Translator training in the framework of higher education reform: In search of alignment in curricular design. In D. Kenny, & K. Ryou (Eds.), *Across boundaries: International perspectives on translation studies* (pp.128-142). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Liao, B. S., & Chiang, M. Y. (2005). The use of portfolios to teach translation. *Studies of translation and interpretation, 9*, 291-312.

Liao, B. S. (2008). The use of moodle for translation instruction. *Studies of translation and interpretation, 11*, 163-186.

Liao, B. S. (2009). The implications and implementation of communicative translation teaching. *Compilation and translation review, 2*, 65-91.

Long, M. H. (2005). Methodological issues in learner needs analysis. In M. H. Long (Eds.), *Second language needs analysis* (pp.1-16). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Malmkjaer, K. (1994). *Stylistics in translation teaching*. ERIC EJ487810

Mountford, A. (1981). The what, the why and the way. *Aupelf/Goethe Institut/British Council, 1*, 19-34.

Mu, L. (1992). *Translation teaching in China*. Taipei: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design: A sociolinguistic model for defining the content of purpose-specific language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mutlu, ö. (2004). *A needs analysis study for the English-Turkish translation course offered to management students of the faculty of economic and administrative sciences at Başkent University*. Doctoral dissertation, middle east technical university.

Nord, C. (2005). Training functional translators. In M. Tennent (Ed.), *Training for the new millennium*. (pp. 249-266). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nostrand, H. L. (1974). Empathy for a second culture: Motivations and techniques. In G. A. Jarvis (Eds.), *Responding to new realities* (pp. 263-327). The American series. National Textbook, Skokie, IL.

Nunan, D. (1989). *The learner-centred curriculum: A study in second language teaching*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (1984). Language curriculum development. *RELC Journal, 15*, 1-29.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richterich, R., & Chancerel, J. (1977). *Identifying the needs of adults learning a foreign language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard educational review*, *57*(1), 1-22.

Sun, X. T., Ma, X. Y., & Wang, D. J. (2010). Needs analysis of the translation competence of science and technology majors. *Shandong foreign language teaching journal, 1*, 14.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: practice and theory*. New York: Cambridge.

West, R. (1994). Needs analysis in language teaching. *Language teaching, 27*, 1-19.

Widdowson, H. G. (1981). English for specific purposes: Criteria for course design. In L. Selinker, E. Tarone, & V. Hanzeli (Eds.), *English for academic and technical purposes: Studies in honor of Louis Trimble* (pp. 1-11). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Zimmerman, L. W. (2010). *ESL, EFL, and bilingual education: Exploring historical, sociocultural, linguistic, and instructional foundations*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Pub.

Appendix

A questionnaire of EFL college students' needs for student-centered translation course

I.   Learning goals

Rank the importance level of each goal in translation courses.

1 not important   2 less important   3 average   4 important   5 very important

1. using languages	1	2	3	4	5
2. sharpening real working skills of translation	1	2	3	4	5
3. finding language weakness	1	2	3	4	5
4. improving English ability	1	2	3	4	5
5. understanding the major differences between English and Chinese	1	2	3	4	5
6. raising your language learning motivation	1	2	3	4	5

II.   Course planning

7.   Do you think English-majored students need translation courses?

□Yes. □ No.

8.   Which grade of university students should start translation courses?

□ freshmen □ sophomore □ junior □ senior

9.   In your opinion, what is the appropriate number of students in a translation class?

□ 15-25 □ 26-35 □ 36-45 □ 46-55 □ 60~

III.   Instructional materials

10   Do you think there is a need to have a textbook for a translation course?

□Yes.   □ No.

Rank the importance level of the following content, when choosing a translation book.

1 not important   2 less important   3 average   4 important   5 very important

10. comparison of two languages	1	2	3	4	5
11. language knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
12. language structures (grammar)	1	2	3	4	5
13. translation skills	1	2	3	4	5
14. model translations	1	2	3	4	5
15. translation theories	1	2	3	4	5
16. translation difficulties	1	2	3	4	5
17. Chinese and English rhetoric	1	2	3	4	5
18. punctuation of two languages	1	2	3	4	5
19. resources (books, websites, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

Express your agreement level on the materials.

1 strongly disagree   2 disagree   3 no comments   4 agree   5 strongly agree

20. the textbooks from Mainland China	1	2	3	4	5
21. the textbooks from Taiwan, Hong Kong	1	2	3	4	5
22. teacher generated materials	1	2	3	4	5
23. materials related to work	1	2	3	4	5
24. materials related to your interests	1	2	3	4	5

25.   What are percentages you prefer between materials related to interests v.s. work needs?

□ 0 % v.s. 100 % □ 25 % v.s. 75 % □ 50 % v.s. 50 %

□ 75 % v.s. 25 % □ 100 % v.s. 0 %

26.   What kinds of genres of translation tasks you are more interested in?

Genres more related to lives (multiple choices)

□ cards □ conversations □ jokes □ letters □ dramas □ poems □ riddles □ songs

□ stories □ tables □ schedules (TV, movie, etc.)

27.   Genres more related to work (multiple choices)

□ academic articles or abstract □ advertisements □ business documentation such as order letter,

resume □ cartoons □ official forms or documentation □ handbooks □ internet information

□ language magazine articles □ other magazine articles □ maps □ menus □ newspaper

93

□ professional books □ recipes □ signboard

28.   What kinds of topics of translation tasks you are more interested in?   (multiple choices)

□ animals □ business □ computer □ culture and art □ education □ fashion

□ health □ law □ living □ medical issue □ politics □ public media

□ recreation □ science □ sports □ social issues □ technology □ traveling

IV.   Teaching and learning

29.   What kinds of grouping do you prefer in a translation class? (multiple choices)

□ individual work □ pair work □ group work □ whole class

30.   What kinds of learning activities do you prefer in a translation class? (multiple choices)

□ discussion on translation □ individual in-class translation □ group in-class translation □ peer-editing

□ group presentation □ reading translation models □ teacher's lecture □ training of language skills

What should a teacher do or provide to help your translation learning? Rank the importance level.

31.	jargons	1	2	3	4	5
32.	use of dictionaries	1	2	3	4	5
33.	online resources	1	2	3	4	5
34.	translation software	1	2	3	4	5
35.	comparison of two languages	1	2	3	4	5
36.	language knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
37.	translation theories	1	2	3	4	5
38.	translation skills	1	2	3	4	5
39.	common translation errors	1	2	3	4	5
40.	students' translation errors	1	2	3	4	5
41.	model translations	1	2	3	4	5
42.	suggested translation of students' translation	1	2	3	4	5
43.	group meeting and discussion	1	2	3	4	5

VII. Evaluation

44.   How a teacher evaluates your learning is more valid? (multiple choices)

□ in-class translation tasks (group) □ in-class translation tasks (individual) □ reports on translation analysis □ tests of language knowledge (vocabulary, phrases, sentences) □ tests of translation skills in a textbook □ take-home exercises □_____