**Journal of Translation 20:2 (2024): 1–19**
https://doi.org/10.54395/JOT-PM77P
ISSN 1558-7282
journaloftranslation.org

# Trust the Process: Improving Translator Training Workshops

**PAUL FRANKLIN MORGAN**
Translation consultant, SIL Eastern Congo Group, DR Congo
paul_morgan@sil.org

**Abstract**: This practical paper aims to apply the advances in pedagogical principles of translator training to the overall conception and evaluation of translator training workshops, which form the core training environment for many Bible translators in Africa. Beginning with the essential principles as elaborated by Ernst-Kurdi (2017), namely, that translator training should be process-centered, participatory and collaborative, authentic, focused on priorities, and objectively evaluated, the author considers how these principles shape the development of the curriculum and the accountability structures of the training program. By reorienting training and evaluation around the processes of translation, and by implementing a social learning and accountability structure, workshops can become more effective.

## Introduction

Workshops can be rich occasions of encouragement. Trainers and participants, meeting together after months of collaborating at a distance, are finally able to sit around the same table and be in the real, physical presence of their colleagues. These are indeed invaluable moments of team building in our digital age. However, in the ensuing months, one can start to wonder about how much of an impact that workshop had on behaviors. After all that training and edification, what changed for the translators? What are they doing differently? In this practical paper, I will examine the planning of and follow-up after workshops in the light of best practices for translator training.

In this article, I use the term "workshops" as it is currently used in Bible translation in Africa, and not as in translation studies in general. In academia, a workshop consists of students sharing their drafts of translations with the other students and the teacher to improve the artistry of the translation. Colina and

© SIL International, 2024

Venuti point out that "because workshops are usually multilingual and neither the instructor nor every student commands every source language, the critique emphasizes the literary effects of the translation at the expense of its equivalence to the source text" (2017:211).

In Bible translation, however, workshops gather people together for training. Workshops are used for many different purposes, from introductory training to "regular national or project-specific workshops to train translators beyond the introductory courses" (Muthwii 2006:67). This model for training is used across different aspects of language programs, from translation to literacy to Scripture engagement. In eastern Democratic Republic of Congo, where I serve with SIL-Eastern Congo Group (SIL-ECG), workshops have been the primary method for instruction, largely for logistical reasons: often, both the trainer and the participants live in different locations, so they all have to travel to a central location. During the war years of the early 2000s, these workshops took place in neighboring Uganda, and today they are held in city centers like Bunia or Isiro, still assembling the participants from their often difficult to access home areas around the region.

SIL-ECG has maintained an uneasy relationship with these training workshops over the last few years. Like any marriage of convenience, this relationship has had its advantages. SIL-ECG has made great strides forward in training personnel and passing on responsibilities to those who have been trained, yet everyone acknowledges that these workshops leave something to be desired. Participants often feel overwhelmed with the sheer magnitude of the content during the workshop, as they seek to learn answers to questions they never knew they had. In like manner, the workshop organizers rarely feel as though they are able to accomplish all they would have liked to, and sometimes they have to repeat the same workshop just a few years later as many of the embers of newly acquired information have grown cold. Language Program Managers (LPMs) also can feel pressure that these workshops incorporate multiple functions and domains. For example, the translators from Bas-Uele and Haut-Uele provinces in DR Congo come together for a workshop just twice a year because of the complicated travel and logistics in this remote area. During these workshops, the translation consultants have to meet the training and scripture checking needs for these teams. So these multifaceted workshops are key to the success of the entire project's goals, and there is no room for inefficiency.

In my analysis of the planning and evaluation of translator training workshops, I have chosen to organize the article according to the key features of translator training. In this regard, I am indebted to Eszter Ernst-Kurdi's succinct and insightful overview of the current scholarship of translator training (2017). From her interesting perspective of having worked in professional translation services and in Bible Translation, she distills the essential aspects of translator

training: "It is process-centered; it is participatory and collaborative; it hones the most needed skills required by the field; it is authentic and experiential; and it provides a good basis for objective translation quality assessment" (2017:23). In her article, she presents the merits of a discourse analysis workshop, which does appear to be an effective application of these pedagogical principles. However, I apply these essentials to the overall conception of the translator training program, examining how each of these aspects can impact the effectiveness of these workshops.

## Conception of a translator training program

### Process-centered

The process of translation, that is, the procedures that translators follow as they do their work, has been highlighted in translation studies as a key feature of translator training programs. This has come about largely as a result of an epistemological shift, from "positivist to a constructivist epistemology" (Colina and Venuti 2017:203), which gave rise to changes in pedagogical methods. Under the positivist understanding, the teacher put "an emphasis on the source and target texts rather than on the students, their learning, or the translation process" (2017:204). The constructivist approach, on the other hand, views "the teacher's role as that of a facilitator who guides the learners in their process of knowledge construction" (2017:206). Whether or not one agrees with this epistemological shift, this pedagogical approach has proven very effective for training translators, in part because the emphasis shifts from knowing facts (*savoir quoi*) to knowing how to do something (*savoir comment*) as evidenced in the analysis of translation competencies by Amparo Hurtado Albir (2008:28). She points out that the strategic sub-competency holds sway over the other sub-competencies for translation because translation is an "operational knowledge and not declarative" (27). This sub-competency "enables an efficient translation process and the resolution of problems along the way" (29, my own translation). In other words, a translator is able to plan out the translation project and, part way through, evaluate it, making adjustments to meet the final objective.

At this point, one might wonder if this sub-competency is indeed an achievable objective in training Bible translators. Yet it must be kept in mind that the translator is not alone in the process of Bible translation—our procedures involve input from administrators, community leaders, consultants, review committees, and many others. The translators must simply master their contribution to this process. Process-centered training can be likened to the adage, "Give a man a fish, and he'll eat for a day. But teach a man to fish, and he will eat for the rest of his life." Ultimately, by focusing on the process, the teacher

can help students to discover how to find the answers to their questions, thus empowering them to resolve new and diverse challenges. Wendland refers to this dynamic in his suggestion that translator training be inductive, "which places emphasis upon students discovering for themselves basic exegetical or translation guidelines and analysis procedures by actually working through a number of illustrative biblical texts and local cultural case studies" (2006:60). It is worth noting that "process-centered" does not imply a complete departure from teaching theoretical or content knowledge. For Hurtado Albir, the strategic sub-competency is one of five, the others being the bilingual, extralinguistic, translation knowledge, and instrumental sub-competencies (28–29). For their part, Colina and Venuti regret that some teachers completely omit theoretical instruction:

> As a result, students do not see that translation strategies always rest on theoretical assumptions about literature and translation, so that any attempt to draw a hard-and-fast distinction between theory and practice is deeply questionable. The exclusion of theoretical texts deprives students of the conceptual resources they need to think critically about their work as well as the teacher's comments. (2017:212)

What remains important is simply that all instruction be tied to the actual process of translation. In this regard, both of the textbooks that SIL-ECG uses for translator training are written in such a way that the facilitator can introduce translation principles in a process-centered manner. For example, in Barnwell (2020), the second major section of the textbook is organized according to the steps in the process. In like manner, Wright and Boone (2006) has three chapters dedicated to applying principles in translation procedures.

When planning the curriculum for a group of translators, special attention needs to be given to the process on all its levels. On a global level, process can refer to the steps that the translator is to follow in order to take a translation from draft to published translation, but each of these steps in the process can be broken into smaller processes. For example, one step in the global process is "Exegesis", but this entails a subset of processes in order to accomplish this step. In addition to these considerations, the trainer also needs to be keenly aware of where each translation team is in their *particular* process of translating certain books by proposed dates. For SIL-ECG, some of the inefficiencies in our workshops arose in the past because of a lack of orientation around the process. At times, due to various other constraints, the translation teams found themselves at different stages in the process, and so at a workshop, the trainer tried to cover a little bit of everything to meet each of those diverse needs. However, when a team did not need to immediately apply what they had learned,

such as Paratext technical checks, then they forgot it altogether by the time they reached that stage in the process. SIL-ECG has through the years held exegetical workshops for translators preparing to translate a particular book of the Bible, and this type of workshop is by its nature process-centered. However, what about other more general translator training workshops, where all the translators from different projects attend?

When planning the curriculum for this kind of workshop, trainers should look over all of the training topics and divide them into two categories: "ONGOING: Topics that can be applied at any point in the process" and "USE OR LOSE: Topics that are only applied at particular points in the process". For example, one could divide up the topics for a translation workshop as follows:

- Ongoing
  - Foundational translation principles
  - Project planning
  - Biblical Terms tool
  - Interpersonal relationships
  - Making the back-translation
  - Using Keyman
  - Introducing Scripture engagement, etc.
- "Use or Lose"
  - Translating rhetorical questions
  - Analyzing tense/aspect
  - Analyzing pronoun reference
  - Topic-comment
  - Installing PT9
  - Using HearThis software
  - Testing a draft
  - Developing a Scripture engagement plan
  - Making a glossary, etc.

While there may be still some debate about how to classify different topics, ultimately this could help workshop organizers structure the activities and assignments. For any of the "Use or Lose" topics, the trainer should verify that the participants are at a point in the process where they will need to use this topic, and subsequently, the trainer should establish accountability for those activities. I will elaborate more on the system of accountability when I come to the social environment below. Additionally, "Use or Lose" topics should be taught as close to implementation as possible. In this regard, workshops may not be the most effective means for teaching these skills, and those charged with curriculum design could perhaps consider other options for these skills, such as short video modules, virtual training, or *ad hoc* in-person training (e.g., tagged

on to a consultant visit). In SIL-ECG, the media department has been able to provide supplemental training through a WhatsApp group, where participants from a workshop can ask questions about specific challenges that they encounter when they are back at work in the village. WhatsApp has worked even in lower bandwidth areas where Zoom trainings are impossible, and this platform has helped the students to feel connected and to receive ongoing support.

**Participatory and collaborative**

Workshops would be more effective if trainers establish a supportive social learning environment. To be sure, trainers should make the instruction time participatory and collaborative so that participants can learn from one another *during* the workshop. In this article, however, since my emphasis is on the conception of the training program, I will focus on the collaborative learning environment *beyond* the classroom: each participant needs a cohort and a mentor.

*Cohort (growth in understanding)*

Part of the reason that workshops may fail to make an impact afterwards is that the participants leave the educational community. After the workshop is done, students go home, and they do not interact anymore with their classmates and teachers until the next time they are called together for a workshop. Stephen Schooling, who served in Melanesia, flips this problem on its head by saying that the workshop should ideally be held in the local community setting and involve the entire community (1987:40). This is indeed an ideal situation because the educational cohort then can be the entire village, and the translators would not be leaving these people.

Unfortunately, many workshops are constrained to be in a central location, but even then it is possible to create a vibrant cohort of learners. Most of the translators and back-translators in SIL-ECG projects feel the bond of a cohort with each other since they have spent time together at workshops. At any of these workshops, one can sense the camaraderie. But in between workshops, these translators rarely see each other and rarely interact about work. This is a real conundrum.

One possible solution is to create a WhatsApp group during a workshop, and require some level of interaction after the workshop. From time to time, the trainer can post questions to this forum, or provide further instructional videos or articles. Participants can share some of their work via that forum. I think this would work best if there was some requirement or assignment from the workshop that had to be completed via the forum. Perhaps this could lead into the final "grade" for the workshop that would permit them to participate in

further training. As mentioned above, in SIL-ECG, this method has been used for helping media-technicians continue their training and stay connected to their learning cohort even though they all come from different remote communities.

Another way to create a cohort is to look into which translation teams are neighbors. For example, in eastern DR Congo, the Lese and Dhongo are closer to each other than to others. After a workshop, representatives of these two teams could meet somewhere to conduct an evaluation of each other's work, which could be sent to the workshop trainers.

In either case, the trainers, the managing organization, and the local community need to keep in mind the cohort, praying for them and supporting these collaborative efforts financially. It will be very difficult to make this happen without money for phone credit or for travel.

*Mentor (growth in accountability)*

In order to increase the impact of the training for all "Use or Lose" topics in workshops, the trainer needs to find a way to connect the participant with a mentor. The mentor's role will be defined by the "Use or Lose" skill that has been taught to the team. During the workshop, the trainers will create assignments and activities for all "Use or Lose" skills. At the end of the training, the trainer should be able to share these assignments with the participants' mentors so that when the participants return to their homes, the mentor will follow up with them and ensure accountability. Wendland also applauds the idea of mentoring, stating that "[a]n indigenized style of instruction also prefers apprenticeship training whereby a student attaches him/herself to an expert or authority in the field who then educates the person on-the-job, so to speak, over a more extended period" (2006:61).

The ongoing relationship with a mentor creates a natural structure for accountability that transcends the sporadic workshop schedule. As to the selection of the mentor for each translator, I will discuss this further below in the context of evaluation.

**Authentic**

In order for workshops to be effective, they need to be centered on the current processes of the translation team, but they also need to be integrated into the managing organization's planning and budgeting. Otherwise, the activities in the workshop will lack authenticity, and someone will end up feeling like they received some random bits of information that are not easily put into practice. This is so because activities require time and financial resources and not merely good intentions. When translators receive training in a particular aspect of the translation process, ideally they need to return to find the LPM waiting for them

with funding and the expectation that they put into practice what they have learned. For example, if the workshop trainers want to teach participants how to establish and train a translation review committee, then the trainers should first ensure that the LPM has a plan and financing to create these review committees. If this is not the case, this activity lacks authenticity—it is a task that is just classified away in the recesses of the mind. Large regional workshops are particularly susceptible to this kind of inauthentic training. Perhaps the trainers have come into a stream of funding to lead a workshop on a regional level, and so they invite participants from many different countries and from diverse points in the process of translation. It is imperative that the trainers require the managing organizations that are sending these participants to show proof of their plans to implement the skills of this workshop in the near future. If not, the trainees will find the workshop inapplicable.

Another factor that contributes to the authenticity of activities is coordination with local churches in the language community. I have often heard translators describe themselves as cooks who are preparing food for the community to enjoy. Sadly, sometimes the community feels disconnected and uninformed about the work of the translators. Wendland laments this lack of collaboration between the translation team and the primary stakeholders of the translation:

> One of the weakest links that I have noted in projects over the years is that essential link between translators and the primary target group, its laity as well as clergy, for whom a translation is being prepared. In most cases, much more community involvement is needed, and one way to stimulate this is through various educative and public relations initiatives. (2006:63)

In order for training to be truly authentic, the translators and the managing organization must be in tune with the desires of the community. In DR Congo, one of the most effective platforms for community engagement has been through Bettina Gottschlich-Modibale's workshop entitled "Preferred Future". In this workshop, community leaders and church leaders of a particular language group gather together, and are led to reflect on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) that their community faces. After this, the workshop facilitator leads the participants through *God's Story—our story* (2022), and then the leaders consider areas where the Gospel message has not been fully understood and applied in their community. Finally, these participants synthesize the preceding discussions and create a plan for how the community can address priority issues in collaboration with the local language program.

**Focused on priority skills**

Workshops are ineffective when the trainers try to achieve too much in one session. Learning is best achieved through smaller increments with practical work interspersed, allowing for the iterative learning/application/evaluation cycle, which ultimately allows for synthesis and integrating these skills into one's habits. Barnwell wisely counsels both trainers and participants to recognize the cyclical nature of training:

> Training is cyclic. It takes a long time—in fact, it never finishes. (This applies for everyone involved in Bible translation and related disciplines, whether mother-tongue or non-mother-tongue team members.) Each new cycle builds on what has gone before, deepening the understanding of what has already been learned. From the beginning, share the expectancy that we all go on learning. (2000:57)

In order to help trainers not overstretch the goals of a workshop, managing organizations need to develop a comprehensive training curriculum that clearly defines the limited objectives for each workshop. This should be done in a targeted way that takes into account translation teams' particular requests. As Barnwell writes (2000:58), "Don't aim to standardize training. Make the best of every individual situation. Plan strategically."

The first step in coordinating in a strategic manner is gathering information—just like a human brain knows all the members of the body, someone needs to be aware of all of the moving parts in training language program personnel. SIL-ECG used to have a dedicated Training Coordinator, but now, due to staff shortages, perhaps the most practical convergence could be a Google Spreadsheet that all the domain leaders and the LPM can access (see Appendix A). For each domain (literacy, Scripture engagement, translation, administration, media, etc.), the leader should develop a list of the basic topics that need to be covered over a three-year period of a language program. These topics should be divided up according to "Ongoing" and "Use or Lose". Finally, and most importantly, for the fiscal year that is approaching, each domain leader needs to identify the training needs for personnel in their domain. For example, the translation coordinator would compile a list of needs in collaboration with each translation team. As an important side benefit, Schooling points out that asking the translation team about their felt needs in training actually encourages local leadership (1987:41). The LPM can use this training planning to help coordinate and capitalize on workshop scheduling.

With this type of information, the LPM will be able to see if there is significant overlap between some of these training needs. For example, interpersonal skills and teamwork are modules that impact every domain of our

work. This Google Spreadsheet would also encourage "just-in-time" training because the LPM and domain leaders could commission the production of necessary video modules or ask a consultant to walk a team through a particular training module.

Once all this information on training needs has been gathered, the workshop trainers need to prioritize the skills to be learned. In her article, Ernst-Kurdi relies on the work of Lafeber (2012) to address this issue. Lafeber's work is based on research among inter-governmental organizations' (IGO) translators. She provides a list of high-impact skills that she observed among these translators, and she further divides this list into skills which are "commonly found" and those that are "often lacking" among the translators. In her analysis, the high-impact and commonly found skills were a knowledge of the source language (SL), the ability to ensure completeness of the translation, and a knowledge of the target language (TL) grammar, punctuation, vocabulary, and spelling rules (2012:123). These may be commonly-found skills among IGO translators, but for Bible translators working among developing languages, this is not the case, which Ernst-Kurdi alludes to in her translator comparison charts (2017:12–13). Due to the scope of her article, Ernst-Kurdi does not further delve into these differences, and merely launches an appeal for a similar empirical study among BT agencies (2017:16).

Here in Isiro, DR Congo, we have been training six new translation teams since May 2022, and they are still continuing on their journey to master these high-impact skills. Despite the incongruity with BT, Lafeber's work still could provide a starting point with a little modification. For knowledge of the SL, the trainers would need to help the translators have better access to the source language through exegetical practice in the process of using translation resources, e.g., multiple Bible versions, *Translator's Notes* and enriched resources like NBS11+. For "knowledge of TL grammar", the Bible translator often does not have access to a published grammar, and will need to be mentored as Karl Franklin has recounted (2020). For punctuation and spelling, these are basic skills that are so often lacking in new translators and must be continually reinforced through collaborating closely with the literacy department. As one continues going through Lafeber's list, there are more glaring contrasts that arise. For example, she categorizes "Type accurately and fast" as a low-impact skill. However, in my experience, Bible translators who are proficient at typing have a huge impact on the productivity of the team. Even though BT scholarship lacks correlative empirical study to Lafeber's work, Barnwell has provided a succinct list of "Knowledge and Skills needed for a viable translation project" (2000:12–13). Her list is divided into "Exegetical knowledge and skills", "Translation Knowledge and Skills", "Computer and Secretarial Skills", and "Organizational Skills". Later in the book, in section 8.3 "Objectives for training

mother-tongue translators", she provides a detailed list that would be an excellent starting point between the translation team and the consultant to determine the training priorities (2000:59–62). If the trainer used Barnwell's objectives in conjunction with a thorough knowledge of where the team is in the translation process, then this would yield a list of priorities for the translators.

**Evaluation**

Ernst-Kurdi's final essential to translator training is that "it provides a good basis for objective translation quality assessment" (2017:23). If translators have truly learned the material in workshops, then trainers should see the results in the translations. Evaluation of translators has been considered just a natural part of consulting sessions. Matteson points out that "most of the consultation time is spent on evaluation which pinpoints the MTT's problems, and in specific training directed toward overcoming those problems" (Matteson 1994:17). That said, Ernst-Kurdi raises a very probing new metric for translator evaluations:

> It would also be interesting to measure how much time is spent on formative, process-centered assessment as opposed to product-centered error correction. In Bible translation, there is a justifiable emphasis on the product, but that can sometimes hinder the didactic role of the evaluation/checking sessions. (2017:18)

In many cases, given the strong desire to create a valuable final product and the pressure of publishing deadlines, the consultant will perhaps naturally tend toward fixing the translation rather than mentoring the team in the process. If this were to happen, then the evaluation that is taking place is only highlighting problems at the surface level of the text. The translators may not learn for themselves how to change or perfect their procedures so as to avoid this issue in the future. Therefore, it seems pertinent to evaluate translators not only by their translations, but also by the procedures that they follow as they do their work.

In order for this evaluation to be ushered into the already compacted workflow of a translation team, the evaluation form needs to be simple. If one were to use Barnwell's list of objectives (2000:59–62) or Hurtado Albir's operationalization of a competency (2008:39–41), then the evaluation form would be long and unwieldy. The translator evaluation form proposed by SIL-ECG aims both to be simple and to focus on procedures (see Appendix B). If there is an issue to be addressed or a new competency to be learned, then the mentor needs to guide the team to identify the procedural step involved and to brainstorm solutions. Our hope is that this will encourage both mentors and translators to invest more time and effort in building the strategic sub-competency of the translator.

A great question still remains: who should be mentoring the translators and evaluating them? As revealed in the preceding discussion, translation consultants have naturally assumed this role, but this question will need to be answered differently according to local contexts. As Hemphill points out,

> Additionally, perceived power dynamics or cultural power distance mismatches may have a powerful effect on the learning environment. The ways teachers provide evaluation and feedback, and the ways students are asked for evaluation and feedback should take into consideration the cultural dynamics of saving face and politeness strategies. (2022:101)

In some places, the translation consultant may be able to fill in an evaluation form for each of the translators. In other contexts, perhaps the team will need to evaluate themselves or be evaluated by other workshop participants in their cohort. Ernst-Kurdi noted that in Cameroon, "direct feedback is hardly ever given, especially in front of others, in order to avoid shaming" (2017:14). In DR Congo, where there are fairly strong shame/honor dynamics at play as in Cameroon, I hope to experiment with the consultant evaluating the team as a whole concerning the core competencies and procedural competencies in the ECG translator evaluation form. Concurrently, the director of the project (team leader) can fill in the "Interpersonal and Spiritual" section for each of the translators along with his/her own self-evaluation. In this way, there will be a sort of dual mentorship: the consultant mentoring the entire team, and the team director mentoring the individual team members.

Finally, it is worth remembering that translators will also be evaluated by their own language communities if they have a robust testing program. Wendland states,

> A well-organized testing program makes it possible for members of the target group to "educate" a translation team as to what their priorities are with regard to the version being prepared for them, and also the general or specific problems that they have found with the drafts and trial publications that they have already critically examined. (2006:59)

Therefore, trainers should ensure that the translation team is conducting the required testing, as in the case of SIL-ECG, with various community groups and with the revision committee.

## Conclusion

Careful thought needs to be given when establishing and implementing a workshop-based translator training program. Given the funding and scheduling pressures that BT projects encounter, trainers need to make these workshops as

efficient as possible by shaping them in line with pedagogical best practices—workshops should be process-centered, participatory and collaborative, authentic, focused on priorities, and objectively evaluated (Ernst-Kurdi 2017). If the implementation is undergirded by social support of a continuing educational cohort and mentorship, then trainers and participants will experience increasing impact in the actual day-to-day procedures of translating Scripture.

# Appendix A: Example of training coordination spreadsheet

| TRANSLATION DOMAIN | BUDU KOYA LP | 3 Year Plan | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Person to be Trained | "Ongoing" Topic | "Use or Lose Topic" | When | How |
| Project administrator, translators, back-translators | The project plan | | Year 1 | Workshop |
| Project administrator, translators, back-translators | Specific problems with project plan | | on demand | Consultant training/ video module |
| Translators and back-translators | How to make a back-translation | | Year 1 | Workshop |
| Translators and back-translators | | A glossary | Year 2 | Consultant training |
| etc. | | | | |

# Appendix B: SIL-ECG Translation Team evaluation form[1]

| Evaluation scale | *1: Beginner* | *2: Functional* | *3: Independent* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| **1. Base Competency** | **Current Competency** | **Activities** | **Timeline** | **Commentary** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grammar of TL | | | | |
| Vocabulary of TL | | | | |
| Orthography of TL | | | | |
| Punctuation of TL | | | | |
| IT (typing and Paratext) | | | | |

| **2. Procedural Competency** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Step 1**—Draft (exegesis, draft, subtitles and notes, format) | | | | |
| **Step 2**—Team check (read aloud, natural and accurate, key terms, parallel passages) | | | | |

[1] Contributors: Coordinator Malega H. Ernest and other consultants of ECG.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Step 3**—Testing (choose passages, test) | | | | |
| **Step 4**—Preparing for consultant check (back-translation, inform the consultant, respond to consultant comments, revise translation) | | | | |
| **Step 5**—Consultant check (participation, punctuality, performance) | | | | |
| **Step 6**—Revision (modifications, testing, reviser committee, 2nd read aloud, back-translation) | | | | |
| **Step 7**—Publication (introduction, glossary, illustrations, technical checks) | | | | |

| **3. Interpersonal and Spiritual** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Regular Bible study, personally and with other believers | | | | |
| Team work | | | | |
| Teachable; constant desire to improve | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Persevering; disciplined life, faithful and dependable at work | | | | |
| Church: regularly gathering with other believers for praise and worship, encouragement and accountability | | | | |

# References


Barnwell, Katharine. 2000. *A handbook for translation consultants*. Dallas: SIL International.

Barnwell, Katharine. 2020. *Bible translation: An introductory course in translation principles*. Fourth edition. Dallas: SIL International. https://doi.org/10.54395/K8VP-T5WD.

Colina, Sonia, and Lawrence Venuti. 2017. A survey of translation pedagogies. In Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *Teaching Translation: Programs, Courses, Pedagogies*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315623139-26.

Ernst-Kurdi, Eszter. 2017. The importance of collaborative discourse analysis in the training of novice translators. *Journal of Translation* 13(1):11–25. https://doi.org/10.54395/JOT-F9CV4.

Franklin, Karl. 2020. Mentoring a mother tongue speaker. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Religion* 1(1):57–83. Dallas: Dallas International University. Available at https://www.diu.edu/jlcr/volume-1-number-1/ (accessed 16 February 2024).

Gottschlich-Modibale, Bettina. 2022. *God's Story – our story*. https://bloomlibrary.org/phash:E9B592496C62975A/book/VVZrdlKtlS?lang=en (accessed 23 April 2024).

Hemphill, Christy. 2022. Theological decolonization and training local translators. *Journal of Translation* 18(1):94–110. https://doi.org/10.54395/JOT-3HR2J.

Hurtado Albir, Amparo. 2008. Compétence en traduction et formation par compétences. *TTR Traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 21(1):17–64. https://doi.org/10.7202/029686ar.

Lafeber, Anne. 2012. Translation skills and knowledge – Preliminary findings of a survey of translators and revisers working at inter-governmental organizations. *Meta Translators' Journal* 57(1):108–131. https://doi.org/10.7202/1012744ar.

Matteson, Esther. 1984. The consultant and the receptor language. *Notes on Translation* 103:10–19.

Muthwii, Margaret J. 2006. Translator training: The on-going search for relevance and appropriateness in Anglophone Africa. *The Bible Translator* 57(2):65–71. https://doi.org/10.1177/026009350605700203.

Schooling, Stephen J. 1987. Practical proposals for training mother-tongue translators. *Notes on Translation* 120:37–48.

Wendland, Ernst. R. 2006. Translator training in Africa: Is there a better way of teaching and learning? *The Bible Translator* 57(2):58–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/026009350605700202.

Wright, Douglas, and Jennings Boone. 2006. *Organisation, principes, et méthodes de la traduction biblique.* Bunia: SIL Eastern Congo Group.