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| Page 50  **1.1. Machine Translation, Past and Present**  Over the last two decades, digital tools such as online dictionaries and spelling and grammar checkers have become widely available. More recently, the use of machine translation tools such as Google Translate has increased significantly. Together, these tools have proved especially useful to students who need to write academic assignments in a foreign language. From one point of view, this might be seen as surprising because machine translation was not originally developed for educational purposes.  The origins of modern machine translation are usually associated with the work of Israeli philosopher, mathematician, and linguist of Yehoshua Bar-Hillel (1915 – 1975) during his time at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). However, it was American information technology company IBM that demonstrated a working machine translation system for the first time in 1954. IBM’s system used a sample of 49 Russian sentences translated into English. The system was limited to 250 words and just 6 grammar rules. Nevertheless, the demonstration stimulated worldwide interest in the field (Hutchins, 2007).  In the following decades, research continued, hardware improved, and a variety of approaches to translation were applied. One of these was the rule-based approach, which bases the translation on a series of linguistic rules; another was the corpus-based approach, which bases the translation on texts taken from databanks (Hutchins, 2007); yet another was the phrase-based approach, which breaks down sentences into words and phrases (Hsu, 2016).  Page 51  In November 2016, Google switched from the phrase-based approach to Neural Machine Translation, which uses Artificial Intelligence (AI) to learn from millions of examples. Artificial Intelligence has greatly improved the quality of *Google Translate* (Schuster, Johnson & Thorat, 2016), which now goes beyond sentence-by-sentence translation and takes the whole text into account (Innovations Report, 2017). This has reduced the number of translation errors by at least 60% in comparison with the earlier phrase-based approach (Hsu, 2016).  **1.2. Machine Translation in Language Classes**  A number of studies have been conducted into the attitudes and behaviour of students and tutors with regard to machine translation. For example, a survey by Niño (2009) considered the use of machine translation in foreign language learning at a number of universities around the world. Her survey found that 75% of students felt that machine translation was helpful to them and 81% reported that it had contributed to improvements in their writing in the foreign language. Niño’s investigation also discovered that 23% of the language tutors used machine translation in their lessons to translate words and phrases both from the students’ language into the foreign language and from the foreign language into that of the students. This practice was common with students from intermediate level onwards. Thirty percent of the tutors who did not currently use machine translation in their lessons reported that they would be willing to use it in future .  Another study conducted in Australia by Garcia and Pena (2011) investigated whether machine translation could help beginner learners of Spanish to communicate better in writing. They found that machine translation helped students not only write more, but also better. They concluded that machine translation can therefore contribute positively to both the quality and quantity of second language writing, at least for students at lower levels of language ability.  A 2013 study by Clifford, Merschel, Munne, and Reisinger focussed on the use and perceptions of machine translation of more than 900 students of Spanish, French, Italian and Portuguese at Duke University in the USA. They reported that 91% of these students had noticed mistakes in grammar and vocabulary made by the translation software. Nevertheless, many students continued to use machine translation in their studies with 43% reporting that they used translation software to double-check what they had written in the foreign language and 85% agreed that machine translation had helped them to increase their vocabulary knowledge (Clifford, Merschel, Munne, & Reisinger, 2013). In short, students felt that machine translation has helped them to improve their language skills. | |
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| Page 271  **INTRODUCTION**  **Writing Processes**  Research into second language (L2) writing developed out of the process approaches to first language (L1) writing in English of the 1970s and 1980s.  It was during these two decades that teachers and researchers of L1 English education began to shift their attention from an analysis of the finished *products* of student writing (i.e. essays, reports, case studies, etc.) to an analysis of the *process* that the students used when they were writing (i.e. an analysis of how students prepared to write, what kind of decisions they made while they were writing, and how students felt about their own writing).  This new direction in research on writing led to the discovery of a number of characteristics that belonged to “skilled” writers on the one hand and to “unskilled” writers on the other (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Emig, 1971; Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1981; Hillocks, 1986; Langer & Applebee, 1987). For example, it was found that *unskilled* *writers* spend too much time worrying about the mechanics of writing such as spelling, punctuation, and grammar.  Page 272  These unskilled writers also frequently spent very little time on planning before they wrote. As a consequence, they did not pay enough attention to the organisation of their texts and they rarely (or even never) considered how the readers of their text might react. Unskilled writers were also poor at revising their work, and seldom made any changes to paragraph organisation or sentence structure. In fact, it was found that the only revisions unskilled writers were likely to make only involved changing a few words or short phrases.  Not surprisingly, the findings of this research from L1 writing greatly interested researchers in L2 writing. This interest resulted in a number of studies of second language writing that investigated how “skilled” and “unskilled” writers produced texts in their first language compared to the way they wrote in their second language (see e.g. Cumming, 1989; Raimes, 1987; Sommers, 1980; Zamel, 1983). The results of these studies showed many similarities between first and second language writing processes. However, while there are now many studies of language learners’ second language writing processes, there has been very little discussion of the translation processes L2 writers use (Uzawa, 1994).  One exception to this can be found in Gerloff (1987) who described the translation processes of “skilled” and “unskilled” translators of French to English. She observed that a professional translator in the study paid more attention to the discourse-level questions. Examples of such questions might be ‘What is the purpose of this text?’, ‘Who is going to read this text and why?’, and ‘How can I organise this text in a way that will help the reader understand the purpose more easily?’. The process used by the skilled translator contrasted sharply with that used by the unskilled participants in Gerloff’s study. She discovered that the latter group focussed too much of their attention on the choice and form of words when they were translating. In contrast, Gerloff found that the professional translator went through the whole text more than once, moving backward and forward constantly, whereas poor translators translated small units (words and phrases) and very rarely went through the whole text more than once.  In sum, the characteristics of skilled and unskilled translators are very similar to those of skilled and unskilled writers. It may therefore be that second language writing and translating performances involve the same cognitive processes.  \*\*\*\*\*\*  Page 288  **CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS**  In this study, only 22 Japanese students from one educational community were involved. Thus, conclusions and implications are based only on this context. If students with high levels of English proficiency from other educational backgrounds are studied, different results may be possible. Furthermore, the students in this study were given only one translation task to complete and this may be a limitation of the study.  The results of this study show that translation tasks may be useful for second language learning because such tasks force second language writers to pay frequent attention to their language use during translating processes. Most students in this study indicated that both translation and L2 writing tasks are helpful for learning and improving a second language. However, those students whose scores in the L2 writing task were relatively high believed that translation is more helpful than L2 writing because they found it was necessary for them to use words and expressions that are slightly beyond their current language level when they translate. | |
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| Page 134  **Introduction**  In general, researchers in second language writing agree that inappropriate textual borrowing should be viewed as an opportunity for L2 writers to learn, develop, and improve. This is in contrast other views which have suggested that such inappropriate use of source texts may be caused by:  **(i)** a deliberate attempt to plagiarise original texts in order to compensate for limited proficiency in the second language (see e.g. Johns & Maye, 1990; Keck, 2006);  **(ii)** a lack of understanding of the Western concept of plagiarism (see e.g. Pennycook, 1994; Pennycook, 1996; Shi, 2006);  **(iii)** uncertainty about which style is appropriate for writing in the student’s academic discipline (see e.g. Angélil-Carter, 2000; Petrić, 2004).  All three of these views share a common assumption, namely that that there are standard or fixed rules about how students should use source texts in their writing. The purpose of this study is therefore to explore what criteria both students and teachers use to evaluate the use of paraphrase. In order to do this, 48 students and 27 members of teaching staff were invited to comment on four examples of paraphrases, summaries, and translations of source texts that had been written by students for whom English is a second language.  Page 135  **Literature review**  ***Paraphrasing and inferential thinking***  An important process in academic writing at university is paraphrasing a source text in one’s own words and citing the original author appropriately. D’Angelo (1979) defines paraphrasing as a writer’s ability to rewrite part of a source text as ‘‘a freely formed version of the original’’ while preserving the essential meaning (p. 256). This definition does not, however, answer the question of how far the words in the original source should be changed in order to avoid plagiarism.  It is possible to think of changes to source texts in terms of superficial (or ‘light’) and substantial (or ‘heavy’) paraphrase. Keck (2006) defines a substantial paraphrase as one that contains only general words related to the topic of the source text. In contrast, Roig (1999) defines a superficial paraphrase as one that only makes minor changes such as deleting a word from the original text, replacing a word in the source with a suitable synonym, or changing the structure of the sentence. Most of the paraphrases in student writing, as Keck (2010) has noted, are superficial and use this kind of deletion, substitution, and reorganisation.  Although such superficial paraphrasing, also known as *patch-writing* (Howard, 1995), might be viewed as an example of inappropriate textual borrowing (even when the source has been cited), many L2 students nevertheless take the risk of using this kind of paraphrase because they do not have enough confidence to rewrite the source texts in their own words (Abasi & Akbari, 2008).  Surprisingly, however, even substantial paraphrasing of the original source may not be considered to be a good paraphrase by some readers even when it includes a suitable citation. Yamada (2003) completed a review of webpages from North American colleges whose purpose is to advise undergraduate students on how to avoid plagiarism in their writing. Yamada found that the ‘good’ examples of paraphrases in these websites suggested to students that the best approach to paraphrasing actually involves two types of inferential thinking. One is *deductive* and involves making a conclusion based on statements made in the source text. The other is *analogical* and requires the student to notice similarities between two different domains (such as texts, behaviours, systems, etc.).  Both of these approaches ask students to combine information from the source texts with their own ideas on the topic they are writing about. As Yamada (2003) points out, this definition of good paraphrasing seems to contradict what students are frequently taught about paraphrasing. That is, as a rule, students are told that they need to be faithful to the source text. Moreover, a review of the literature seems to show that there is little information on what students can do to successfully incorporate one’s own point of view when they paraphrase in the ways that Yamada found on the college websites.  ***Good versus bad paraphrasing***  To explore how students and tutors distinguish between good and bad paraphrasing, several researchers have asked university students and teaching staff to compare the original source texts with various rewritten versions which were paraphrased by the researchers with or without citations (Chandrasegaran, 2000; Deckert, 1993; Hale, 1987; McCormick, 1989; Pennycook, 1994; Roig, 1997, 2001). Many participants, in both L1 (Hale, 1987; McCormick, 1989; Roig, 1997, 1999, 2001) and L2 contexts (Chandrasegaran, 2000; Deckert, 1993; Pennycook, 1994), showed disagreement as to which paraphrased versions had been plagiarized. For example, many students made a judgment based on whether or not a citation had been included. The students believed that it was acceptable to copy long strings of words from a source text as long as the original author was cited appropriately in the text (Roig, 1997).  The question is: How much copying is too much? Explaining why teachers and students might disagree on the appropriateness of textual borrowing, Pecorari (2008) states that ‘‘the problem may not be that one group has a mistaken perception, but that two groups have different perceptions’’ (p. 10). | |
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| Science fiction loves the idea of being able to understand every language effortlessly. Douglas Adam’s classic 1979 novel *The Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Galaxy* has the Babel Fish – a tiny yellow fish that is “probably the oddest thing in the universe” because “if you stick one in your ear, you can instantly understand anything said to you in any form of language”. *Star Wars* has C-3PO – a robot interpreter who explains to Luke Skywalker that he is “fluent in over six million forms of communication”.  Multilingualism is likely to become a reality soon as speech recognition and machine-learning software continues to improve. Translation of websites is already a reality thanks to (still imperfect) *Google Translate*, and other projects are going even further.  One example is *Unbabel*, a group that uses artificial intelligence to help human translation. The four-year-old company — based in San Francisco and Lisbon — has developed a system that allows messages to be sent and received in a native tongue. It translates everything from customer-support emails to live chats on social media.  Once technologies such as this have been perfected, they will be life-changing. As the 20th-century philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein put it: “If we spoke a different language, we would perceive a different world.”  Like Google, Facebook and Microsoft, Unbabel uses deep learning to process data and information it has not encountered before.  To ensure accuracy, it reviews translations using measures such as fluency, tones of speech and specialised terminology. It has to reach 90% accuracy; if not, the translation will be edited by one of the company’s community of 55,000 human translators, who are all freelancers. “Unbabel combines the strengths and limits the weaknesses of machine and human intelligence to achieve a high-quality translation,” says Vasco Pedro, the company’s chief executive.  “Once [a basic translation] has been performed by machine, [the freelance translators] provide the ‘final and human touch’, smoothing out hard-to-catch errors and ensuring the final result sounds fluent,” says Mr Pedro.  Mr Pedro does not expect machines to take over. “We firmly believe that there will always be a human component […] the less work they do on individual tasks, the more work they are able to process on the whole,” he says. The company works across 28 languages and the technology is fast enough for almost-real-time video subtitling.  Another company in the field of machine translation is Mymanu based in Manchester in the UK. It plans to launch a set of earbuds called *Mymanu Clik* that translate as someone speaks.  The wireless earbuds are paired with a smartphone and offer real-time translation in 37 languages. “*Mymanu Clik* uses speech-to-text and text-to-speech technology and voice-recognition technology to deliver the live translation,” says Mr Manu.  Mr Manu says his experiences abroad before *Mymanu Clik* often left him depressed about his inability to communicate with those around him. Recalling an initial trip to China, he says: “It was like I was on a different planet — I was completely lost. But when I returned with my translation technology, I could learn more, speak to the people, learn about the culture and it motivated me to go back.” | |

1. **L1** refers to a person’s first language (e.g. Chinese, Czech, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Polish, Romanian, Spanish, etc.). **L2** refers to the second language a person is learning or using (e.g. English). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)