e-ISSN 2358-4793

Revista de Letras - Centro de Humanidades
Universidade Federal do Ceará/UFC - Fortaleza-CE
www.periodicos.ufc.br/index.php/revletras
DOI- 10.36517/revletras.42.1.19

Recebido em: 01/02/2023
Aprovado em: 24/04/2023

Revista de LETRAS

ANNOTATING TRANSLATION AS A MEANINGFUL METACOGNITION-ORIENTED PRACTICE IN THE TRANSLATION CLASSROOM

COMENTAR A PRÓPRIA TRADUÇÃO COMO PRÁTICA SIGNIFICATIVA PARA O DESENVOLVIMENTO DA METACOGNIÇÃO NA SALA DE AULA DE TRADUÇÃO

Cynthia Beatrice Costa[1], Igor Antônio Lourenço da Silva[2]

ABSTRACT

Translating is a cognitively complex activity aimed at tackling an ill-defined problem: selecting only one viable rendition in the target language from a series of multiple viable choices for a given text in a source language (Pym, 2003). Developing the ability to perform such an activity with a reasonable speed and justified confidence (Pym, 2003) may profit from learning how to perform a parallel activity, i.e., annotating, as a fruitful avenue toward metacognition (Alves, 2005; Shreve, 2006) and the articulation thereof. We argue in this article that annotating (or commenting) can be an effective practice in the translation of any genre and play a relevant role from the beginning of translator's training. Building both on a review of expertise (Ericsson, 2001) and translation pedagogy (Gonçalves, 2020; Esqueda, 2020) and on our own teaching experience, we suggest that annotating translation can: a) be performed as part of deliberate practice (in the broad sense) during the translation process, b) honestly inform students and trainers about the difficulties faced during the process, c) invite useful feedback, and d) potentially leverage students' metacognition.

Keywords: annotated translation; translator's training; metacognition.

RESUMO

Traduzir é uma atividade cognitivamente complexa que lida com um problema mal definido: selecionar apenas uma versão viável na língua-alvo a partir de uma série de possíveis escolhas

[1] Translation assistant professor at Universidade Federal de Uberlândia (UFU), with a PhD degree in Translation Studies from Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC). ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3063-012

[2] Translation assistant professor at Universidade Federal de Uberlandia (UFU), with a PhD degree in Linguistics from Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG). ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0738-3262. Esta pesquisa conta com financiamento FAPEMIG – APQ-02483-18.

para determinado texto na língua-fonte (Pym, 2003). O aprendizado de uma atividade paralela, isto é, a de anotar/comentar, pode colaborar para a realização da tradução com velocidade razoável e autoconfiança justificada (pym, 2003), provando-se um caminho frutífero para a conquista da metacognição (Alves, 2005; Shreve, 2006) e de sua articulação em palavras. Argumentamos neste artigo que anotar (ou comentar) pode ser uma prática efetiva na tradução de qualquer gênero textual e desempenhar um papel relevante desde o início da formação do tradutor. Baseando-nos em uma revisão dos estudos da expertise (Ericsson, 2001) e da pedagogia da tradução (Gonçalves, 2020; Esqueda, 2020) e em nossa experiência de ensino, sugerimos que o ato de comentar a própria tradução pode: a) ser realizado como parte da prática deliberada durante o processo de tradução, b) informar honestamente alunos e instrutores sobre as dificuldades encontradas durante o processo, c) possibilitar feedback útil e d) potencialmente ampliar a metacognição dos alunos.

***Palavras-chave**: tradução comentada; formação do tradutor; metacognição.*

INTRODUCTION

Those who teach translation – whether in undergraduate, graduate, or non-academic programs – often face a double mission: teaching how to translate and teaching how to think translation. The relationship seems obvious enough, for we tend to think about what we do, but it begs the twofold question: how much thinking about one's own performance is desirable for a professional translator and how should this thinking be expressed? This question may permeate the conception of curricula, the trainer's attitude in the classroom, and the activities chosen to assess students' skills or performance.

Translating is a cognitively complex activity aimed at tackling an ill-defined problem: selecting only one viable rendition in the target language from a series of multiple viable choices for a given text in a source language (Pym, 2003). Developing the ability to perform such an activity with a reasonable speed and justified confidence (Pym, 2003) may profit from learning how to perform a parallel activity, i.e., annotating, as a fruitful avenue toward metacognition and the articulation thereof. We propose that annotating can be an effective practice in the translation of any genre and play a relevant role from the beginning of translator's training.

Building on both the literature and our translation teaching experience, we argue in this article that annotating while translating may enhance one's ability to think about one own's translation (whether as practice or as product) and to organize and articulate this thinking, thus constituting an important aspect in translator's training. We suggest that annotated translation[3] can: a) be performed as part of deliberate practice (in the broad sense) during the translation process, b) honestly inform students and trainers about the difficulties faced during the process, c) invite useful feedback, and d) potentially improve students' metacognition. In this endeavor, we resort to the literature on annotated translation (Torres, 2017; Zavaglia; Renard; Janczur, 2015),

[3] Known as *tradução comentada* in Brazil. We chose "annotated translation" for it seems to be the most common term in English; "commented translation" and "translation with commentary" are also used. Those terms may have different meanings, but we use them in this article interchangeably, as we are focused on the metacognition aspects of spelling out translation decisions rather than on defining a genre or meeting genre expectations. For a better understanding of the term, please see Zavaglia, Renard and Janczur (2015).

metacognition and deliberate practice within cognitive translation studies and expertise studies (Ericsson, 1994, 2006; Shreve, 2006, 2009; Silva, 2021), declarative knowledge (Alves, 2005), and theoretical knowledge (Gonçalves, 2020) in translator's training.

In translation pedagogy, there seems to be a preference toward practice (Gonçalves, 2020; Esqueda, 2020), i.e., translating itself would be the best way of learning how to translate, which has been extensively influenced by Hurtado Albir's (1999, 2007) task-based approach and the PACTE's (2005) centering of strategical subcompetence (which consists mostly of procedural knowledge) in their translation competence model. The field of expertise studies, however, may help us understand why translating alone, albeit fundamental, may not be enough to become a good translator, since this is not "the inevitable result of the mere accumulation of domain-specific experience" (Shreve, 2006, p. 28).[4] One of the major approaches (expert performance) within expertise studies, as part of the larger field of cognitive psychology, suggests that the enhancement of cognitive skills in a certain domain may lead to "*consistent* superior performance" (Ericsson; Charness, 1994). Such enhancement would be achieved through the buildup of experience[5] "within the framework of deliberate practice, [*i.e.*] engagement in regular activities that are specially designed to improve performance" (Shreve, 2006, p. 27).

This article is centered around our argument that annotated translation should be included as a form of deliberate practice in the broad sense. To this end, we extend the range of deliberate practice from the expert-performance framework (which is aimed to improve full-fledged practitioners' performance) to include the training of any individual in the novice-expert continuum. Based on tenets of cognitive translation studies, annotating one own's translation offers an opportunity to articulate knowledge (and the lack thereof) during the process of translation, in addition to individualizing the translator's point of view and approach to the text. It can also provide material to informed feedback. However, not every annotated translation serves such purposes, because commentary is often provided without any specific goal and no specific audience in mind; while we may argue that annotating can always constitute an interesting thinking exercise, if not purposeful it is not an effective practice in the path of expertise acquisition.

One main issue regarding the academic use of annotated translation is the general absence of clear criteria. Zavaglia, Renard and Janczur (2015) pointed not only to the lack of academic discussions, but also to the uncertain scope of the term, which has concomitantly entailed 1) an explanation of the strategies and procedures adopted, 2) a theoretically grounded (self)criticism, and 3) an addition of historical, encyclopedic, and contextual complements. These possibilities are not mutually exclusive – and maybe it matters less what one wants to express through commentary and more how and why this commentary is conceived and at whom it is aimed, as we intend to discuss in the next sections.

Firstly, we approach annotation as a potential instrument toward deliberate practice in translation; then we suggest potentially effective ways to apply annotation in the context of translation training.

[4] Please notice that competence and expertise are not interchangeable constructs. For a thorough explanation, please see Silva (2021), who claims that competence has a pedagogical value, while expertise is a more robust construct for empirical accounts of translation from a cognitive perspective.

[5] Please notice that expertise entails experience, but experience does not necessarily entail expertise. Most experienced practitioners achieve a point of arrested development and are happy with performing their tasks competently, satisfactorily, "good enough" see (Silva, 2021).

ANNOTATION AND METACOGNITION

In literary translation, annotation constitutes a tradition and can be considered a genre in its own, combining criticism, historicism, and hermeneutics, besides placing the translator in evidence. All founding works – Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Dante's *Divine Comedy*, Cervantes's *Quixote*... and, evidently, the Bible – have been translated and annotated multiple times, to the point of annotation becoming as relevant as the translation itself. In the editorial market, translator's notes and comments often complement the main text through paratexts (Genette, 2009) in the so-called "critical editions", with the translator's preface or postface often posing as long commentary (Costa, 2015; Amarante, 2018; Pisetta, 2020). In his famous study on different translations of *The Thousand and One Nights*, Borges (2012, p. 98) traces a war between translators by confronting their biographies, translation choices, and, of course, rationale: "To keep his subscribers with him, [Captain Richard Francis] Burton abounded in explanatory notes on the 'manners and customs of Moslem men,' a territory previously occupied by [Edward] Lane". In the translation of travel writings, epistolary collections, journals, and biographies, annotation is also a common and celebrated practice, especially as a way of clarifying vocabularies, adding pertinent information, and, frequently, relativizing and/or contextualizing outdated or inappropriate attitudes expressed by the original author in relation to places, customs, peoples, etc. (Freitas; Nascimento, 2021; Torres; Thomé, 2022).

Torres (2017, p. 18) lists the main aspects of annotated literary translation as authorial (the translator is also the one who annotates), metatextual, discursive-critical, descriptive, and historical-critical. These aspects imply an exercise that might lead to theorization and method development, a phenomenon palpable in the works of Brazilian translators Rónai (1981, 1987) and Britto (2012), among many others (Galindo; Costa, 2019). Commentary left by translators of all times have been shaping our notions of translation, as illustrated by Attwater (2005, p. 125) in her study about historical approaches and strategies for translating poetry: "The mainstream trichnotomy of terms that [John] Dryden used in his 1680 preface to *Ovid's Epistles*: 'metaphrase', 'paraphrase', and 'imitation' were respectively linked with the more common terms in use today: 'word for word', 'sense for sense', and 'free translation'".

It is thus clear that annotated literary translation is a complex intellectual assignment with a potential historical, cultural, and theoretical impact. However, one can annotate any sort of translation, and not necessarily as a means of contributing to human knowledge in a larger sense. For instance, annotated translation can be seen as useful and appreciated in commercial terms. To clients in general, reports detailing choices, and even offering different vocabulary options can be welcome. "The translator might for instance provide a note or comment to the effect that two readings were possible at the point in question", suggests Vermeer (2012, p. 201-202) when explaining, according to skopos theory, that translations are not performed in a void and should meet both the commission brief and the customer's needs.

Most important to the present discussion is the role of annotated translation as a pedagogical instrument in translation training. Especially in the beginning of their training, translation students comment their decisions because they are required to (otherwise, their work would not be considered academic enough). They are expected to explain their choices, strategies, difficulties, etc., and thus elevate praxis to theory-grounded performance. Yet, they often complain that they do not know what to comment or that they have nothing to comment on, which can be indicative of an unclear or unplanned task design on the trainer's part or otherwise the students' lack of knowledge about the text or about translation, misunderstanding of the task, or simply lack of interest in thinking

about translation. As a result, their commentary may sound artificial and more of an afterthought than an actual clarification of procedures and reasonings.

We contend, however, that annotating should be encouraged as a habit from the start, because it allows reflecting on the process of translation: "Repeated translation without focus on the process provides no evidence of learning or progress" (Wadhwa, 2006, p. 106). Translation process research has shown that professional translators and seasoned field specialists tend to automate their processes to the point they cannot describe their own thoughts for particular choices, but their ability to justify their overall choices in the light of the brief is much superior to that of novices (Alves, 2003, 2005; Silva, 2007, 2012; Alves; Silva, 2021). Novices, in contrast, tend to focus on the lexical pole rather than accounting for the task as the result of planning and thoughtful text organization to meet the client's demands and the audience's profile (Silva, 2015; Silva; Pagano, 2017).

Annotated translation can be pedagogically purposeful when it implies the ability of metacognition, i.e., the ability "to reflect upon, understand, and thereby modulate one's own cognition" (Shreve, 2009, p. 255) – more specifically, the ability of meta-reflection, i.e., the ability to monitor or manage the translation process and reflect upon it subsequently (Alves, 2003). The conscious awareness of not knowing or not remembering how to solve a problem during translation, and the decisions derived from it – e.g., to look up for a term, to re-read the text from the beginning, to ask somebody for help – is a typical metacognition occurrence. To be considered as such, "there must also be active, strategic use of cognitive resources to control the progress of the task toward successful completion" (Shreve, 2009, p. 257).

Studies have shown not only that metacognition and the achievement of expertise potentialize each other, but also that enhancing one's awareness during the process of translation has a positive pedagogical impact (Alves, 2005; Shreve, 2006; Angelone, 2010). The more experienced the translators, the higher level of metacognition they are expected to display, i.e., they are more able to apply "task-relevant metacognitive strategies" (Shreve, 2009, p. 259); this comprehends the capacity of monitoring one own's work and controlling the process by performing modifications, corrections, and resolutions when they are needed.

Monitoring and controlling are cognitive resources (Shreve, 2009; Angelone, 2010; Silva, 2015). The former is related to self-reflection during problem-solving sequences, while the latter conveys a more general management of the progress of the task, including planning and the selection of strategies. Because it "involves the ability to reflect on, plan for, and exercise deliberate and strategic control over the progress of a problem-solving sequence" (Angelone, 2010, p. 19), monitoring is a strong enough reason to annotate *during* translation. This is different from commenting *after* the process of translation, when the translator analyzes the work in retrospect and provides more of a general idea about key decisions, justifying them.

Scholars have hesitated over the validity of retrospective reports, because there have been experiments showing inconsistencies between what was reported and what had been done (Ericsson, 2006). This have led expertise scholars to create think-aloud protocols (TAP) with instructions for participants "to verbalize their thoughts in a manner that does not alter the sequence and content of thoughts mediating the completion of a task" (Ericsson, 2006, p. 227). The idea is to decrease to a minimum the interference of time, memory, and afterthinking, at the risk of not knowing anymore what has occurred in the process, but only a representation of that process. Spontaneity is an important aspect, even if it is affected by the simple fact that participants know verbalization is expected from them, and therefore, they "engage in additional cognitive processes to generate the thoughts corresponding to the required explanations and descriptions" (Ericsson, 2006, p. 228).

Knowing what happens during the process of translation – even if it is not a perfectly faithful picture – is beneficiary for those in training and for those who teach alike. Think-aloud experiments, in which "subjects are asked to utter everything that goes on in their minds while they solve a task", have been used to find out where students have problems and to generate models based on the strategies adopted by more experienced translators (Kussmaul; Tirkkonen-Condit, 1995, p. 178). One reason to apply such protocols in the classroom is that trainers not always infer where their students' difficulties are solely based on the finished product. "We may, for instance, have the impression that students have problems with text-comprehension while, when we talk to them, we find that they actually have problems expressing what they had understood" (Kussmaul; Tirkkonen-Condit, 1995, p. 178-179).

A similar reason may justify the use of annotated translation in translator's training: it is expected to show where the major problems are, both to students and trainers. A distinction in relation to think-aloud protocols is that annotating may take longer and require more sophisticated articulation. Both, however, draw from and entail metacognition and therefore may facilitate the acquisition of translation skills as procedural knowledge, declarative knowledge, and explanatory knowledge. Procedural knowledge is the implicit know-how; declarative knowledge (i.e., knowing what) can be accessed from the outside because it is explicit, conscious, and deliberate; and explanatory knowledge refers to knowing why something is done (Alves, 2005). Annotating a translation can be seen, then, as an enhanced exercise of all these types of knowledge: to annotate, one should know both how to translate and how to report on it (procedural knowledge), one should know what to spell out from one's own process, particularly by relying on a theoretical framework (declarative knowledge), and one should know why some decisions have been made, which may be at the crossroads of the procedural knowledge and the declarative knowledge.

Several studies have suggested that declarative knowledge and explanatory knowledge evolve in the path toward expertise (Alves, 2005). Translator's training tends to be more procedural in the beginning, for students must first acquire basic translation skills. With time, training becomes more reflexive, thanks "to the centrality of meta-reflection for problem-solving and decision-making" (Alves, 2005, p. 5). However, such a perspective is more related to how one believes translation skills should be acquired (i.e., translation pedagogy) than to actual considerations about how someone does learn to translate. One major point is that the pedagogy of translation has overlooked how interlingual reformulation – i.e., any neurocognitive activity through which a linguistic material in one language is rendered into a linguistic material in a different language – is performed by any bilingual and even foreign language learners (García, 2019). In other words, the question remains as to what the point is in saying that translation learning requires first learning how to translate if any bilingual learner can already reformulate interlingually.

Obviously, translating professionally entails much more than just being able to reformulate interlingually, but the reasoning stands, as translating does not preclude reformulating interlingually. It seems, therefore, that further aspects should be factored in, and we particularly contend that declarative knowledge and explanatory knowledge should play a role from the very beginning by taking advantage of the learner's interlingual reformulation skills.

Even though expertise is a goal that is farther away, for it depends on more practice than a single educational program is generally able to offer, expertise studies may contribute to the way we teach translation – not because we expect to certificate finished experts, but because we can introduce students from the start to a path toward superior performance. At least, we can teach them that their development can be arrested at some point if they do not engage in further learning opportunities.

Conscious deliberation is key to acquiring superior performance: "The single biggest factor in the evolution of expertise is deliberate practice" (Shreve, 2006, p. 29). Unlike the mere accumulation of experience in performing a regular activity, deliberate practice is focused and well-planned; it necessarily requires the *regular* engagement in well-defined tasks *tailored* with predetermined goals or expected levels of achievement according to needs of a given individual, who is expected to perform it *sequentially*, with gradually *increased levels of difficulty*, and respond to *informative feedback* followed by opportunities for peer observation, repetition, and error correction (Ericsson, 1996, 2006) over a significant period of time – ten years or so (Ericsson; Crutcher, 1990). Such an engagement entails monitoring performance consciously (Horn; Masunaga, 2006), avoiding arrested development associated with automaticity, and acquiring metacognitive skills to support continued learning and improvement (Ericsson, 2000, 2006).

Outside the sphere of expertise, it may be odd to consider deliberate practice so relevant, since it seems evident that a translator in training, or a professional, can only translate willfully, as Vermeer (2012, p. 198) jokes: "Someone who translates undertakes to do so as a matter of deliberate choice (I exclude the possibility of translating under hypnosis)". Deliberation, however, can be established in multiple levels: willing to perform a translation task is certainly the first one, but then come all the other complex cognitive resources at play in the translation process, of which the translator can be more or less aware. Awareness leads to a more deliberate attitude in all steps of the way. Remembering to correct an aspect pointed out in the last feedback, for example, is indicative of greater deliberation (i.e., thoughtfulness in decision or action).

Adding a parallel activity to translation may lead to cognitive load, especially amongst individuals who are still learning how to translate in the first place. Even though Ericsson and Smith (1991) contend that think-aloud protocols do not disturb the performance in the target domain task, Jakobsen (2002) showed that was not the case in such a language-rich activity as translation. In other words, we might expect that annotating while translating certainly adds complexity to an already very complex task.

As Shreve (2009) puts it, translation is an effortful complex cognitive task with several component cognitive processes, including reading, text comprehension, syntactic decoding, construction of semantic representation, and application of target textual conventions. Even though we do not dispose yet of a similar description of cognitive processes involved in annotation or commentary in the context of translation, it may be useful to borrow the general notion of effort during note taking as it is approached within cognitive studies. Piolat, Olive and Kellog (2005, p. 291) observe that note takers simultaneously comprehend (in the case of translation, we can suggest, they comprehend not only the text, but their own mental processes and behaviors), evaluate, sort, and write down the information, as a means of storing it in a sort of long-term external memory. Text composition demand note takers "to find a balance between the quality of the text they want to reach and the cognitive cost of the activity", and "this balance is sensitive to the level of expertise (domain knowledge, linguistic skill)" (Piolat; Olive; Kellog, 2005, p. 306).

We believe that performing the dual task of translating and annotating can be seen as a skill acquirable over time and training that pays off the extra costs in the learning beginning. However, more importantly, it is part of a larger ability of metacognition, i.e., being able to regulate, control, monitor, and interfere with cognitive processes. Angelone (2010, p. 36) has found that "as a result of expertise, professionals are better equipped than non-professionals to articulate metacognition". It is then possible to hypothesize that the more translators annotate during translation, the more they will be apt to do so.

If taken as an expression of metacognition, annotated translation can certainly play an important role in translator's training. However, if we consider the day-to-day experience in the classroom and in the academic sphere, we can easily see that annotated translation is not always the result of relevant meta-reflection in a context of deliberate practice. In their analysis of an annotated translation produced by a graduate student, Zavaglia, Renard and Janczur (2015, p. 344) noted that there were no detailed explanations in the commentary, but simply mentions of choices thought and made: "during the translation act, the translator does not aim at another reader besides themselves; s/he aims at his/her own reinterpretation as translator carrying out the ongoing process".[6] This is a relevant observation, because it is also important to know how and when annotations are conceived. From a cognitive point of view, explaining decisions made at another time is very different from reporting them as soon as they are made. Besides, while self-reflection certainly has its cognitive gains, it does not always invite feedback – yet, according to expertise studies, feedback is crucial to the upgrading of an activity.

In the next section, we focus on the practice of teaching annotated translation, suggesting task designs in the context of translator's training.

TEACHING HOW TO ANNOTATE

In academia, annotated translation is often conceived of as a pretext to justify a translation project. This is not meaningless, since being able to comment one's own work in depth is a possible sign of research, experience, knowledge. From a pedagogical point of view based on expertise studies, however, we may argue that there are more effective and less effective ways of annotating a translation.

As mentioned in the prior section, annotating can be relevant for both sides of the learning process: translators in training benefit from the meta-reflection involved in commentary writing, while trainers can provide more useful feedback when they are presented with an honest description of the process. If applied systematically, this is partially relatable to Gile's (2011, p. 122) Integrated Problem and Decision Report, which "requires the students to report systematically all the problems they encounter in the course of a translation and provide information about the options considered and the reasons for their final decisions". The major difference, however, is that meta-reflection is not an exclusively *ad hoc* problem-based ability, for it can and should also involve planning and monitoring, as well as articulating thoughts and reasonings.

Theory provides content for these thoughts and reasonings. We can consider, for instance, one of the favorite dichotomies among translation students: domestication and foreignization as proposed by Venuti (1995). Once they understand these concepts, students begin using them in their annotations – timidly at first, which is expected. Faced with a cultural translation challenge, they tend to remember these two different attitudes toward a foreign text. An actual classroom example concerns the translation of the Brazilian word *mafagafo*, which designates a non-existent animal in a popular tongue-twister; students in the fifth semester in our undergraduate program in translation questioned the trainer (the first author) whether they should adopt a foreignizing approach – therefore, maintaining *mafagafo* – or a domesticating one, creating a neologism compatible with

[6] Our translation of "durante o ato tradutório, o tradutor não visa outro leitor além dele mesmo; visa a sua própria releitura enquanto tradutor realizador do processo em curso".

the phonetics of the English language. Both solutions were valid, especially in a pedagogical context in which their underlying reasoning mattered the most.

Ideally, annotated translation merges theory, practice, and the articulation of both, if we consider that practice should rely on conscious, well-grounded reflections and that the ability to articulate comes from the development of metacognition and metalanguage. From this combination arises the mission of instilling theory into students' minds while encouraging them to practice translation – without any theoretical concept or framework, annotating becomes not only difficult, but much too impressionist and/or personal for academic purposes. This does not equal saying that translators can only annotate by referencing theory, for they can describe their own behavior toward the text without ever bringing up other sources – but, if properly presented to them, theory will be ingrained in their minds and guide their strategies and choices.

Gonçalves (2020) argues for greater attention to theoretical and metatheoretical knowledge in translator's training. He proposes that these can activate pragmatic and strategic abilities in the process of translation. By adding to this equation the act of annotating, other cognitive processes are included, as well as a more substantial demand for knowledge about translation as praxis, translation as a discipline, and even about the subject of the translated text – the more knowledge the translator possesses and the more ability the translator has to articulate this knowledge, the more relevant the annotation will be to others. This means that annotated translation, even when encouraging the author's metacognition and self-reflection, serves a collective purpose, especially in the academic environment.

Also, linking theory and practice may allow the construction of translations accompanied by comments that are relevant to the specific audience at which they are targeted. For instance, a trainer, a specialized scholar, and a client at an agency or publishing company probably have different expectations when they approach an annotation. Therefore, teaching annotation also entails teaching different types of annotation: while an academic work may require extensive previous research and detailed explanations, notes provided to a client who expects to submit a translated article to a journal, for example, should be punctual and focused on the peer-reviewed publication flow.

Assuming the existence of a client can contribute to the experience of translators in training. Additionally, working with annotated translation can be an opportune occasion to approach translation as a purposeful task: "The aim of any translational action, and the mode in which it is to be realized, are negotiated with the client who commissions the action" (Vermeer, 2012, p. 191). The "client" in the classroom is generally the trainer, but simulations with imaginary clients may also work. The experience can be even more meaningful in actual tasks, including those commissioned by a trainer's peer at the university and those carried out at junior enterprises or the like (Silva *et al.*, in press).

Ericsson (2000, p. 195) has approached deliberate practice as dependent on the goal of "improving some aspect of performance". In translation training, this would mean aiming at a certain aspect at each task, instead of providing generic demands such as "comment your translation". One task could focus on commenting semantic equivalents, another on cultural differences, and so on. As Ericsson (2000, p. 195) noted, "improvement of performance was uniformly observed when individuals, who were motivated to improve their performance, were given well-defined tasks, were provided with feedback, and had ample opportunities of repetition". Besides, tasks could be tailored to meet individual needs, i.e., by accounting to the student heterogeneity in the classroom, the same translation task could incorporate different annotation

instructions depending on each student's previous performance.

There is also the matter of assessment. Trainers need to mark a "qualitative differentiation" (Shreve, 2006) when dealing with different translations and their respective annotations. This can be more easily done by specifying clear objectives to each task. How much commentary is good commentary? What should annotations approach? Who is the potential reader of the notes? One can annotate the translation of an article on astronomy, for instance, by focusing on terminology and the resources used to find equivalents. Otherwise, one can annotate the translation of advertising content by mapping creative processes and reporting difficulties and translator's mental block. To sum it up, we can list a few *recommendations* (or some food for thought) for trainers when designing a task of annotated translation:

- Ask for annotation at every translation project, regardless of text type: from the start, students can develop metacognition by knowing that commentary is always expected.
- Make it clear whether notes should be taken concomitantly or after the translation process. It might be easier to start with annotation as an afterthought, but tasks should evolve to aim at concomitant annotation.
- In starting with annotation as an afterthought, make it sure that students have a more robust material on which to rely. For instance, Esqueda and Silva (2022) describe the use of a keylogger for pedagogical purposes. Students may also use a screen recorder.
- Make it clear how the notes should be handed in: comment balloons attached to the text excerpt to which they refer, answers to predefined questions, a running text, etc. This could also include some learning of how to use technological resources, including text editors' track changes and comment functionalities.
- Ask for a report about *how* annotations were made (at what intervals, by writing whole sentences or keywords, etc.). An important trace of metacognition in translation is that experts tend to comment on the text or context level even when they apparently refer to a single word or expression, while novices tend to focus on very low and operational levels (Silva, 2007, 2015).
- Make the task specific: asking for a specific type of annotation allow students to distinguish strategy, choice, difficulty and so on, in addition to focusing their efforts on a pre-determined aspect.
- Vary the audience at which commentary is aimed: clients, fellow students, editors, professors, an examination board, etc. However, make it sure that students understand how this changes expectations.
- Always provide punctual and clear feedback, so that students may try and modify their processes in future translations. Preferentially, have students perform the task or part of it again upon feedback to assure that they did understand the message.
- Teach how to annotate as an acquirable skill, i.e., do not take for granted that everyone knows how to annotate translation. Tasks could start as specific questions targeting particular points in the source text and evolve to be a coherent running text. As a consensus is yet to emerge as to what annotated translation should be like, trainers could explore or come up with a wide range of possibilities.
- Allow students to repeat the task (or part of it) after providing informative feedback. In this case, ask students to report on what they have learnt from the previous experience and what they believe they could (or could not) improve from one task to another.

- Provide opportunities for students to share their feedback and experiences, whether orally in the classroom, in virtual learning environment forums, etc. This itself could be a type of annotated translation.

Despite the imperative characteristic of the list above, these are only suggestions that by no means restrain or exhaust the possibilities of annotation in translation training. In fact, these should be read as a preliminary proposal, as empirical evidence is necessary to support or refute our claims and to lead to better task designs. Further proposals should also target annotation in machine-translation post-editing, collaborative translations, and other practices involving teamwork and/or machine translation.

Effective task design should be adapted to the objectives of the course and to each group of students. Preferably, if conditions allow, they should be tailored to each student's particular needs considering their prior performance. This would allow the tasks to be sequential and contain increased levels of actual difficulty. As a result, feedback should target each individual's performance – although some generic and group feedback can and should be provided, individual feedback is expected to be more informative.

FINAL REMARKS

Considering annotated translation as both a potentially formative practice and an opportunity to perform deliberate, effective translation tasks, in this article we first proposed a reflection to interconnect the concepts of metacognition, self-reflection, deliberate practice, and types of knowledge, and then listed very preliminary suggestions of task designs for translator's training.

Our experience in translation teaching and researching point to annotated translation as a valid, celebrated activity, especially in the realm of literature and culturally rich written works. However, the way it is produced varies considerably – actually, there is no way of knowing how it was elaborated, as it remains often concealed, rarely enlightened in methodological terms. If produced as an afterthought, it risks not reflecting what did occur during translation, and while this might be irrelevant when approaching annotation as a source of interesting information, it poses a problem from a pedagogical point of view.

Effectiveness in a pedagogical sense is most probably related to the way annotated translation is performed. If produced during translation as think-aloud protocols are – even if writing tends to be longer and more syntactically sophisticated, requiring complex cognitive processes – the result is bound to help both translators and their trainers promote adjustments. Our view is that promoting corrections without knowing how and when they occurred in the process tends to be pedagogically troublesome, hence the importance of monitoring processes. In other words, we assume that annotating translation can a) be performed as part of deliberate practice (in a broad sense) during the translation process, b) honestly inform students and trainers about the difficulties faced during the process, c) invite useful feedback, and d) potentially improve students' articulation of metacognition.

Extensive application of and future experiments with the tasks suggested here and others to come are yet to prove the effectiveness of applying annotated translation under such controlled, specific guidance. Further investigations are also needed to tap into the impact of annotated translation as a regular practice in translator's training and as a means of enhancing metacognition in translation. Yet, if our hypothesis stands, teaching should not focus on translation as mere

procedural knowledge; it should embrace the bilinguals' ability to reformulate interlingually and aim at its improvement for professional purposes by drawing the students' attention to the importance of declarative knowledge and explanatory knowledge as a way to develop and articulate metacognition. We are aware that this might entail cognitive overload in the very beginning, but the results might pay off if they show that students understand translation as a complex cognitive task, one which can be automated at some levels, but will always require critical thinking.

This might also help teachers overcome the difficulties of dealing with machine translation in the classroom, which has been extensively used by students even when they are openly told not to do so (Silva; Costa, 2020; Costa; Silva, 2021). If asked to think about their own translation process and told that the process itself is more important for their training than the final product, students can only be encouraged to perform translation as a thoughtful task, and if they do use machine translation, they at least will have to account for the machine's "choices".

REFERENCES

ALVES, F. Bridging the gap between declarative and procedural knowledge in the training of translators: meta-reflection under scrutiny. *Meta*, v. 50, n. 4, p. 1-24, 2005.

ALVES, F. Tradução, cognição e contextualização: triangulando a interface processo-produto no desempenho de tradutores novatos. *D.E.L.T.A.*, São Paulo, v. 39, p. 71-108, 2003. (Volume especial: Trabalhos de Tradução).

ALVES, F.; SILVA, I. A. L. da. Looking back to move forward: towards a situated, distributed, and extended account of expertise. *In*: HALVERSON, S.; MARÍN, A. (org.). *Contesting epistemologies in cognitive translation and interpreting studies.* New York: Routledge, 2021. v. 1, p. 1-23.

AMARANTE, D. W. Posfácio. *In*: JOYCE, J. *Finnegans Wake (por um fio)*. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2018.

ANGELONE, E. Uncertainty, uncertainty management, and metacognitive problem solving in the translation task. *In*: SHREVE, G. M.; ANGELONE, E. (ed.). *Translation and cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2010. p. 17-40.

ATTWATER, J. Perhappiness: the art of compromise in translating poetry or 'Steering Betwixt Two Extremes'. *Cadernos de Tradução*, Florianópolis, n. 15, p. 121-143, 2005.

BORGES, J. L. The translators of the one thousand and one nights. Tradução de Esther Allen. *In*: VENUTI, L. (ed.). *The translation studies reader*. New York: Routledge, 2012. p. 92-106.

BRITTO, P. H. *A tradução literária*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2012.

COSTA, C. B. Nota da tradutora. *In*: CARROLL, L. *Alice através do espelho*: e o que ela encontrou lá. Florianópolis: Poetisa, 2015.

COSTA, C. B.; SILVA, I. A. L. da. On the translation of literature as a human activity par excellence: ethical implications for literary machine translation. *Aletria*, Belo Horizonte, v. 30, p. 225-248, 2020.

ERICSSON, K. A. How experts attain and maintain superior performance: implications for the enhancement of skilled performance in older individuals. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity*, v. 8, p. 346-352, 2000.

ERICSSON, K. A. Protocol analysis and expert thought: concurrent verbalizations of thinking during experts' performance on representative tasks. *In*: ERICSSON, K. A.; CHARNESS, N.; FELTOVICH, P. J.; HOFFMAN, R. R. (ed.). *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance*. Cambridge: CUP, 2006. p. 223-242.

ERICSSON, K. A. The acquisition of expert performance: an introduction to some of the issues. *In*: ERICSSON, K. A. (ed.). *The road to excellence*: the acquisition of expert performance in the arts and sciences, sports and games. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996. p. 1-50.

ERICSSON, K. A.; CHARNESS, N. Expert performance: its structure and acquisition. *American Psychologist*, v. 49, n. 8, p. 725-747, 1994.

ERICSSON, K. A.; CRUTCHER, R. J. The nature of exceptional performance. *In*: BALTES, P. B.; FEATHERMAN D.L.; LERNER, R.M. (ed.). *Life-span development and behavior*. New York: Routledge, 1990. p. 188-214.

ERICSSON, K. A.; SMITH, J. *Toward a general theory of expertise*: prospects and limits. Cambridge: CUP, 1991.

ESQUEDA, M. D. (org.). *Ensino de tradução*: proposições didáticas à luz da competência tradutória. Uberlândia: EDUFU, 2020.

ESQUEDA, M. D.; SILVA, I. A. L. da. Ensino e aprendizagem de Tradução em caráter remoto: como continuar perseguindo uma pedagogia emancipatória? *In*: PEREIRA, G. H.; COSTA, P. R.; D'AVILA, R. (org.). *Ensino de tradução remoto e a distância*: desafios e propostas em tempos de pandemia. São Paulo: Pontes Editores, 2022. p. 1-20.

FREITAS, L. F. de; NASCIMENTO, K. S. do. A voyage up the river Amazon with a residence in Pará, capítulo XXI: uma tradução anotada. *Cadernos de Tradução*, Florianópolis, v. 41, esp. 1, p. 142-148, 2022.

GALINDO, C. W.; COSTA, W. C. *Paulo Henriques Britto:* entrevista. Curitiba: Medusa, 2019.

GARCÍA, A. M. *The neurocognition of translation and interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2019.

GENETTE, G. *Paratextos editoriais*. Tradução de Álvaro Faleiros. São Paulo: Ateliê Editorial, 2009.

GILE, D. *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training*. Revised edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011.

GONÇALVES, J. L. V. R. A formação acadêmica do tradutor e o espaço do conhecimento teórico (e metateórico) sobre tradução. *In*: PEREIRA, G. H.; COSTA, P. R.; D'ÁVILA, R. *Formação de tradutores*: desafios da sala de aula. Campinas: Pontes, 2020. v. 9, p. 33-56.

HORN, J.; MASUNAGA, H. A merging theory of expertise and intelligence. *In*: ERICSSON, K. A.; CHARNESS, P. J.; FELTOVICH, R.; HOFFMAN, R. (ed.). *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance*. New York: CUP, 2006. p. 587-611.

HURTADO ALBIR, A. Competence-based curriculum design for training translators. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, v. 1, n. 2, p. 163-195, 2007.

HURTADO ALBIR, A. *Enseñar a traducir*: metodología en la formación de traductores e intérpretes. Madrid: Edelsa, 1999.

JAKOBSEN, A. L. Orientation, segmentation, and revision in translation. *In*: HANSEN, G. (ed.). *Empirical translation studies*: process and product. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur, 2002. p. 191-204.

KUSSMAUL, P.; TIRKKONEN-CONDICT, S. Think-aloud protocol analysis in translation studies. *Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, v. 8, n. 1, p. 177-199, 1995.

PACTE. Investigating translation competence: conceptual and methodological issues. *Meta*, v. 50, n. 2, p. 609-619, 2005.

PIOLAT, A.; OLIVE, T.; KELLOG, R. T. Cognitive effort during note taking. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, n. 19, p. 291-312, 2005.

PISETTA, L. M. R. Uma viagem pela mente da Austen adolescente. *In*: AUSTEN, J. *Lady Susan e outras histórias*. São Paulo: Martin Claret, 2020.

PYM, A. Redefining translation competence in an electronic age: in defence of a minimalist approach. *Meta*, v. 48, n. 4 p. 481-97, 2003.

RÓNAI, P. *A tradução vivida*. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1981.

RÓNAI, P. *Escola de tradutores*. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1987.

SILVA, I. A. L. da. Conhecimento experto em tradução: aferição da durabilidade de tarefas tradutórias realizadas por sujeitos não tradutores em condições empírico-experimentais. 2007. 273 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística Aplicada) – Faculdade de Letras, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, 2007.

SILVA, I. A. L. da. *(Des)compactação de significados e esforço cognitivo no processo tradutório:* um estudo da metáfora gramatical na construção do texto traduzido. 2012. 294 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística Aplicada) – Faculdade de Letras, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, 2012.

SILVA, I. A. L. da. On a more robust approach to triangulating retrospective protocols. *In*: FERREIRA, A.; SCHWIETER, J. W. (org.). *Psycholinguistic and cognitive inquiries into translation and interpreting*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2015. p. 175-201.

SILVA, I. A. L. da. Translation, expert performance and cognition. *In*: ALVES, F.; JAKOBSEN, A. L. (org.). *The Routledge handbook of translation and cognition*. New York: Routledge, 2021. p. 1-17.

SILVA, I. A. L. da; COSTA, C. B. A tradução automática de textos literários e o comportamento do tradutor em formação: reflexões para o ensino da tradução. *In*: PEREIRA, G. H.; COSTA, P. R.; SILVA, R. D. B. (org.). *Formação de tradutores*: desafios da sala de aula. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 2020. p. 143-166.

SILVA, I. A. L. da; PAGANO, A. Cognitive effort and explicitation in translation tasks. *In*: HANSEN-SCHIRRA, S.; CZULO, O.; HOFMANN, S. (org.). *Empirical modelling of translation and interpreting*. Berlin: Language Science Press, 2017. p. 155-175.

SILVA, I. A. L. da; MACHADO, I. B. R. de A.; MAGALHÃES, J. R.; MORAIS, C. F. Formação emancipatória de tradutores: uma autoetnografia. *In:* MALTA, G. *Ensino de tradução e de línguas*: reflexões e propostas didáticas. In press.

SHREVE, G. M. Recipient-orientation and metacognition in the translation process. *In*: RODICA, D.; SHLESINGER, M. (ed.). *Translators and their readers*. Brussels: Les Éditions du Hazard, 2009. p. 255-270.

SHREVE, G. M. The deliberate practice: translation and expertise. *Journal of Translation Studies*, v. 9, n. 1, p. 27-42, 2006.

TORRES, M.-H. C. Por que e como pesquisar a tradução comentada? *In*: FREITAS, L. F. de; TORRES, M.-H. C.; COSTA, W. C. (org.). *Literatura traduzida*: tradução comentada e comentários da tradução. Fortaleza: Substância, 2017.

TORRES, M.-H. C.; THOMÉ, B. B. As grandes desventuras de Isabel Godin des Odonais na Amazônia na 1ª metade do século XVIII. *Cadernos de Tradução*, v. 42, esp. 1, p. 82-93, 2022.

VENUTI, L. *The translator's invisibility*: a history of translation. London: Routledge, 1995.

VERMEER, H. J. Skopos and comission in translational action. Tradução de Andrew Chesterman. *In*: VENUTI, L. *The translation studies reader*. New York: Routledge, 2012. p. 191-202.

WADHWA, S. *Aspects of teaching and learning in higher education.* New Dehli: Sarup & Sons, 2006.

ZAVAGLIA, A.; RENARD, C. M. C.; JANCZUR, C. A tradução comentada em contexto acadêmico: reflexões iniciais e exemplos de um gênero textual em construção. *Aletria*, Belo Horizonte, v. 25, n. 2, p. 331-352, 2015.