Social Constructivist Approach to Literary Translation Teaching in Iran
A Qualitative Enquiry

Moslem Fatollahi and Mohammad Reza Hashemi

Translation courses have been taught in Iranian universities for several decades. The undergraduate curriculum of translation, English language, and literature offers a course titled "Translation of Literary Texts." Despite this, translation researchers have paid less attention to literary translation as a separate genre and field of translation. Hence, it is necessary to understand the views of the academic stakeholders, such as teachers and students of literary translation, about the approach to teaching literary translation. Thus, the present research aims to examine the views of teachers and learners of literary translation in Iran's high-ranking universities about the approach to teaching literary translation in the academic setting to clarify the degree of compatibility of this approach with the requirements of social constructivism in translation education. For this purpose,

---

Moslem Fatollahi holds a B.A. in English Language and Literature, an M.A. in English Translation, and a Ph.D. in Translation from Ferdowsi University of Mashhad. He is currently an Assistant Professor at the English Department, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, University of Zabol, Iran. His fields of research and interest include, but are not limited to, Translation Studies, comparative literature, translation stylistics, translation competence, translation assessment, translator training, consecutive and simultaneous interpreting, etc. He has been teaching courses such as literary translation, legal translation, audiovisual translation, new areas of translation, and consecutive and simultaneous interpreting at the University of Zabol since 2013.

Mohammad Reza Hashemi is a professor of Translation Studies at the Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran. His fields of research and interest include, but are not limited to, Translation Studies, Comparative Literary Studies, Translation Stylistics, Translation Competence, Translation Assessment, Translator Training, Translation Poetics, Translation Semiotics, Translation Narratology, Translation Sociology, Translation Historiography, Translation Philosophy, and so forth. He has been teaching various courses, including translation theories, translation poetics, translation and technology, and translation of literary text for more than two decades. He has also been researching widely on various aspects of translation, especially translation sociology.

Fatollahi, M., & Hashemi, M. R. (2025). Social Constructivist Approach to Literary Translation Teaching in Iran. *Journal of Education in Muslim Societies, 7*(1), 26–50. DOI 10.2979/jems.00040 •

The views of 39 teachers and 74 learners of literary translation were collected through semi-structured interviews, and the findings were analyzed using thematic analysis. The approach to teaching literary translation in terms of topics, course materials, teaching procedure, and teaching tools was described and categorized. The research's findings revealed that the linguistic, literary, and translation topics were the most frequently discussed topics in the literary translation classes, and less attention was paid to the topics related to the needs of the literary translation market. Although the literary translation teaching approach in Iranian universities is interactive and collaborative, the scaffolding and strong role of the teacher, as well as the lack of attention to the conditions and needs of the translation market, are contrary to the requirements of social constructivism in translation education.

Keywords: literary translation, teaching approach, social constructivism.

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Translation courses have been taught in Iranian universities for several decades. According to Kafi et al. (2018, p. 91), one of the attempts to expand translation skills in Iran was establishing a Translation University in the early 1970s. The founders of this university aimed to train translators in languages such as Arabic and some European languages. After the Iranian Political Revolution in 1979, the University of Translation was merged with the University Complex of Literature and Humanities.

The bachelor's degree in English language translation was established in Iran more than forty years ago. The four-year bachelor's course in translation was focused on acquiring translation skills between Farsi and English. This course emphasized improving the four skills of the English language and their related categories, such as linguistics, literature, and translation. The bachelor's program in English translation was developed more than two decades ago and was criticized for neglecting the needs of translation students and those of the translation market (Ghazizadeh & Jamalimanesh, 2018). Finally, in 2014, the title of the Bachelor of English Translation was revised, and course titles such as "Translation Market," "Internship," and "Technology in Translation" were added to address some of the course's shortcomings.

Statement of the Problem

The bachelor's program in English language translation includes the "Translation of Literary Texts" course. The same course is available in the "English Language and Literature" undergraduate course. Considering the nuances of teaching the theory and practice of literary translation, capable teachers must teach this course. Therefore, it is required to analyze the views of university teachers and learners of literary translation about the teaching approach to literary translation. Many studies have been conducted on the goals of teaching translation (Rastegar Moghaddam et al., 2020; Yazdanparast, 2012), topics needed in teaching translation (Okhravi, 2015; Varmziari, 2017; Zahmatkesh, 2010), and methods of teaching translation (Sadeghieh, 2008; Majlesifard, 2010) in Iran. Although the aforementioned research considered the goals of teaching translation in Iranian universities, little research has been conducted on the views of teachers and learners of literary translation regarding the teaching approach for literary translation. Therefore, examining their views will have valuable educational achievements for translation teachers and curriculum designers.

The Purpose of the Study

The present research aims to describe and examine the views of literary translation teachers and learners in Iranian universities about the current approach to teaching literary translation. Another goal of this research is to compare the approach described by teachers and learners of literary translation with the requirements of the social constructivist approach in translation education to clarify the orientation of literary translation teachers.

The Importance of Research

The importance of the present research lies in the fact that it provides valuable views about the literary translation teaching approach in Iranian universities. This research makes a significant contribution due to its focus on a specific field and genre of translation, as well as its qualitative analysis of university teachers' and learners' perspectives on literary translation pedagogy. This current research will help generate new knowledge and deepen previous knowledge about teaching literary translation in Iranian universities. In addition, the present research will have practical implications for literary translation teachers and heads of educational groups.

The Theoretical Framework of the Study

In this research, the researchers used the theoretical framework of social constructivism to describe the views of literary translation teachers

and learners about the literary translation teaching approach. They compared the similarities and differences between this theoretical framework and the views of university teachers and learners. Below is a brief description of the basics of social constructivism and its application in translation education.

Kiraly is one of the pioneers of social constructivism in translator training. (Kiraly, 2000) has described the main elements of the social constructivist approach to the empowerment and training of translators. Some of the basic elements of his approach are as follows:

(a) Multiple Perspectives: Kiraly (2000), like other supporters of social constructivism, believes that learners can distinguish between the inner and outer world from their point of view. Also, learners start interacting with their peers and learn how to think by sharing and comparing their views. (Lakoff, 1987) believes that humans cannot look at realities from the outside because they are part of the real world and must participate in it.

(b) Collaborative learning: Newman et al. (2009) believe that internalization is not the result of a person's automatic perception of the outside world but is a personal and interactive process. As a result, learning is the outcome of the interaction between mental processes and external realities. Therefore, the teacher and learners share ideas to create common meanings and internalize them.

(c) Internalization: This term was proposed by Kiraly (2000) to refer to the fact that learning involves the internalization of meanings created in the socio-cultural context. During the learning process, concepts are internalized in an interpersonal way to become intrapersonal knowledge. Internalization shows that learning results from interactive construction and not the transfer of knowledge from the teacher to the learners. Kiraly (2000) emphasizes that learning becomes meaningful only when situated within authentic socio-cultural contexts.

(d) Zone of proximal development: Vygotsky's (1994) socio-historical approach to growth can be best explained based on this concept. In this theory, children can perform their duties by imitating their parents. According to Vygotsky, the zone of proximal development is the difference between what children can do with the help of their parents or teachers and what they can do without their help. As Vygotsky says, learning and growth often do not happen simultaneously. However, growth usually occurs after learning. When learners engage in new tasks and try to do them without help, their zone of proximal development gradually changes.

(e) Situated learning: One of the main ideas of social constructivism is that learning occurs in real-life situations. Vygotsky (1994) believes situated learning is based on the belief in cultural studies that learners acquire their identity through participation in social discourse. Following this line of thought, Kiraly (2000) recommends teaching translation through participation in real translation projects with all their difficulties and complexities.

(f) Viability: According to Kiraly (2000), viability refers to the fact that the comprehensive mental image of the realities of the world remains in his mind as long as

he works. When the learner is confused and his previous mental images do not explain the new observations, he revises his mental perceptions.

(g) Scaffolding: According to Kiraly (2000), scaffolding is the help that learners receive from their teachers to build their mental models of the realities of the world. Scaffolding is a central concept in social constructivism because it shows that the teacher, in the approach of social constructivism, not only assigns tasks to learners but also supports them while they do their homework. The teacher guides the learners towards the optimal method of doing the task and then gradually stops providing support because the learner learns to continue their work without the teacher's support.

(h) Socio-cognitive apprenticeship: Kiraly (2000) believes that support leads to a cognitive internship, during which learners become cultured through interaction with their peers in real learning. When learners compare their abilities with those of professionals, they become more independent in learning. Social-cognitive learning depends on the ability to monitor one's development without the guidance of others.

Social constructivism has already been applied to translator training programs around the world. According to Kiraly (2000), translator training should be collaborative so learners can acquire knowledge and skills by sharing ideas with their peers, internalizing skills, and passing the zone of proximal development. Translator training should use situated learning and real-life meaningful tasks. Translation trainers should withdraw scaffolding step by step so learners can act as independent translators. Further, socio-cognitive apprenticeship would help learners master the main norms and conventions of the translation market.

In this research, the tenets of the Complexity Theory proposed by Larsen-Freeman and Cameron (2008) are also used to analyze the approach of Iranian LT teachers. They have proposed six main principles for teaching in the complex and multifaceted situations of the digital era: (1) openness and dynamism (ability to face the latest changes in pedagogical contexts and being able to react to them), (2) complexity (ability to understand and analyze the interactions among various variables influencing the success of teaching), (3) adaptability and feedback sensitivity (being able to change in response to learners' and critics' feedbacks), (4) self-organization and emergence (the ability to interact with the actors in teaching process including learners and colleagues), (5) nonlinearity and unpredictability (abandoning predetermined and static teaching procedures and readiness to cope with unpredictable situations), and (6) strange attractors (recognizing the factors that can change the direction of pedagogy e.g., new technologies).

Complexity theory remains to be applied to the Iranian translator training programs. Teachers need to be open and dynamic, adapting to changes in the translation market, tailoring their teaching to learners' needs, and being able to adjust their teaching materials and procedures in various situational contexts. The present research explores the compliance of the LT teaching approach at Iranian universities with the two theoretical frameworks explained above.

Research Questions

In the present research, the researchers addressed the following questions:

(1) What approach do teachers use to teach literary translation?
(2) Based on the description of literary translation learners, what approach have literary translation teachers used in teaching literary translation?
(3) What are the similarities and differences between the proposed approach of literary translation teachers and the social constructionist and complexity-based approaches in teaching translation?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

So far, many researchers have examined the issues and topics that should be included in translation education curricula. Whitfield (2005) supported the idea of a socio-cultural turn in translation education and lesson planning with special attention to the socio-cultural conditions governing translation. According to Whitfield, in multicultural societies like Canada, translating texts from one language to another has its cultural issues. Whitfield recommended that translation education programs be revised. With this in mind, in these programs, attention should be paid to the socio-cultural roles of translation and the implications of the cultural turn for translation education.

Critical thinking is one of the topics suggested to be included in translator training programs. Pishghadam et al. (2013) investigated the relationship between the critical thinking of undergraduate English students and their performance in English to Persian and Persian to English translation. Their findings showed a significant relationship between critical thinking and its subscales on the one hand and translation performance on the other hand. These researchers suggested that critical thinking should be included in university translation education programs (Heidari et al., 2014; Marashi & Arefnia, 2013).

Farahzad et al. (2010) conducted an experimental study and observed a significant difference between the translation quality of students with higher knowledge of applied translation theories and students with low knowledge. In other words, students who had more knowledge of applied translation theories had higher translation quality than their peers. Farahzad et al. emphasized the importance of teaching applied theories in translation classes and advised translation teachers to use them in their educational programs.

Some previous studies have also addressed the essential issues in teaching literary translation. Early work by Khazaeefar (2002) assumed in his theoretical analysis that the teaching of literary translation should be aimed at conveying the main principles of literary translation to the language learner. Khazaeefar added that the method of translating a literary text is based on two principles: the first principle guarantees the translation's literariness based on the target culture's criteria. The second principle guarantees fidelity in the translation, and literary translation is its result. Literary translator sometimes tends towards stability and sometimes towards change. According to Khazaeefar, future literary translators should know to what extent and under what conditions they should adhere to the two principles. Therefore, Khazaeefar advised translation teachers to use a comparative approach and teach literary translation based on general principles.

Another theoretical research is the research of Barekat (2005). He believes that literary translation is dependent on the type of text, and when the nature of the text is variable, literary translation does not have a fixed definition, so literary translation, like the text, has a variable nature. While the literary text has order and wants to go beyond this order, translation is also a text that avoids the source text to approach it. Consequently, Barekat believes that translation is a form of creative writing and that creative writing exercises should be included in translation education curricula.

Many previous studies have investigated the effectiveness of different approaches and methods of teaching translation. Moghaddas and Khoshsaligheh (2019) implemented a project-based translation training course inspired by social constructivism in university classrooms. The findings of this research showed that learners' attitudes towards this educational method were generally positive. Field data also confirmed improved translation quality, critical thinking abilities, and teamwork skills among learners. These two researchers concluded that using social constructivism to teach translation in Iranian society has its advantages and disadvantages.

Alavi et al. (2013) investigated the effect of task-oriented translation training on increasing the translation competence of English language students. They designed and validated a translation competence questionnaire and trained two groups of students with task-oriented and non-task-oriented approaches. The results showed that the translation competence of the experimental group members who had received task-oriented training was significantly higher than the competence of the control group (Alavi & Ghaemi, 2013).

Some studies on translation education in Iran are also devoted to the translation education method. Parvaresh et al. (2015) presented an approach for teaching literary translation in Iranian universities. They emphasized the guiding role of practice and project as basic tools in translation education and addressed issues such as the combination of theory and practice, the needs of translators, and the promotion of teamwork. In their approach, practice and projects play essential roles in the teaching and learning process. They argue that acquiring high-level translation skills is not possible through practice alone, as translation competence at this advanced level requires conscious development. Their approach is consistent with the principles of social constructivism because it is based on needs analysis and teamwork.

Khazaeefar and Pakar (2011) also provided a framework for teaching translation. They introduced a model to evaluate translation quality and described two commenting methods in translation training classes. The researchers suggested that translation teachers provide brief and detailed feedback on minor or major errors in students' translations. They believed that using this model requires teachers to be familiar with the severity of translation errors. This model focuses on the concept of teacher support, which is the cornerstone of social constructivism.

Taebi (2017) conducted an experimental research to implement social constructivism in translation education to measure the effect of the constructivist translation education approach in improving the translation ability of Iranian students. The t-test results did not show a significant difference between the performance of the experimental and control groups, but the experimental group that received training based on social constructivism performed relatively better than the control group.

Another related research conducted by Parvaresh et al. (2015) emphasized revising the current translation teaching program in Iranian universities and suggested a social constructivist approach to teaching literary translation. These researchers emphasized the vital role of work and

projects in improving translation ability, combining theory with practice, paying attention to learners' needs, and strengthening teamwork and the spirit of interaction among learners.

A review of the related literature reveals that there is little research that has explored the current LT teaching approach at Iranian universities based on the tenets and requirements of social constructivist and complexity-based frameworks. The present research aims to fill the gap.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research aims to identify, describe, and categorize the perspectives of literary translation teachers and students at Iranian universities regarding approaches to teaching literary translation. This section describes the research sample, sampling method, and data collection and analysis method.

Research Sample and Sampling Method

The statistical population of the present research includes all the people who had taught or completed the course "Translation of Literary Texts" or "Literary Translation" in the English language departments of Iranian universities at the undergraduate level. Due to the large number of Iranian universities offering undergraduate programs in translation, English language, and literature, this research selected its statistical sample from high-ranking institutions to obtain a more representative overview of the field. In this regard, all undergraduate teachers and students who teach literary translation at level one (international), level two (national), and level three (regional) public universities (according to the 2016 ranking of the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology) and non-governmental universities of eight official Iranian cities with a population of over one million people (Tehran, Mashhad, Isfahan, Karaj, Shiraz, Tabriz, Qom and Ahvaz) were included in the research sample. Following the exclusion of institutions that did not offer literary text translation courses, the final research sample included 35 public universities and 18 non-governmental institutions.

By referring to the websites of the English language departments of the target universities, the researchers obtained the list of names and e-mail addresses of the teachers. Then, teachers were invited by e-mail, if they had experience teaching literary translation, to participate in the interviews. A total of 547 e-mails were sent to the teachers. A total number of 171 teachers declared that they had not taught the course or could not participate in the research. In the first stage, 62 teachers declared their readiness to

participate in the research, and 39 teachers from 30 universities (21 public universities and nine non-governmental universities) participated.

The researcher lacked access to contact information for literary translation students. Geographic diversity among participants was necessary for generalizations and comparing student views with teacher perspectives. To solve this problem, the researcher joined post-graduate student groups on various messaging platforms. Members of these groups were then invited to participate in the interviews. The researchers were able to get their consent to participate in the interview with the promise of mutual participation in the group members' research. A total of 74 people from 42 universities of the country (55 state universities and 19 non-governmental universities) who had already completed the undergraduate course in literary translation participated in the interviews.

Data Collection Methods and Tools

In the present research, the researchers used semi-structured interviews to collect qualitative data. The interviews were conducted in two separate sections; teachers and learners. Participants responded to questions using their preferred method: some engaged in telephone interviews, others submitted recorded audio files, some provided written responses in document format, and the remainder answered through a Google Form link. The interviewees were asked to answer several questions.

Questions for teachers:

1) What topics did you cover in the literary translation class?
2) What content did you teach in the literary translation class?
3) What educational tools did you use in literary translation class?
4) To what extent do you support learners in the learning process of literary translation?
5) To what extent is the content of the literary translation class market-oriented?
6) To what extent do learners interact with each other in the literary translation learning process?

Questions for Learners:

1) What topics did your literary translation teacher cover in his class?
2) What content did your literary translation teacher teach in his class?
3) What educational tools did your literary translation teacher use in his class?
4) To what extent did the teacher support the learners in the learning process of literary translation?
5) To what extent was the content of the literary translation class market-oriented?
6) To what extent did the learners interact with each other in the learning process of literary translation?

After asking the general question, the interviewer provided the interviewee with details and examples to ensure that the interviewee understood the meaning of the questions correctly. Usually, after the interviewee's answer, the interviewer discusses the answer with them by posing a follow-up or probing question to clarify the details of the interviewee's point of view.

Data Analysis Method

The researcher used thematic analysis to analyze the, a method used to identify themes in qualitative data (Saldanha & O'Brien, 2014). The thematic analysis of the data followed these steps:

Step 1: The researcher became familiar with the data. He read the text of the interviews several times to find the basic ideas that emerged in the texts.
Step 2: The interesting features of the data were identified as "codes," and the data related to each code was identified.
Step 3: Codes were combined to form themes.
Step 4: It was checked whether the emerging themes could explain all the relevant codes and data in the texts. Finally, a map of all the themes was drawn.
Step 5: The specific features of each theme were determined, and the themes were defined and named.
Step 6: A useful and relevant summary of the data was found, analyzed, and discussed in relation to the research questions and related literature. Finally, a report of thematic analysis was presented.

First, the PDF files of the interviews were downloaded and saved. Then, the qualitative data analysis software (MAXQDA) was installed, and the interview files were uploaded to the software. Next, the researcher carefully studied the text of the interviews and searched for the statements related to the teaching approach of literary translation. All the sentences the interviewees uttered explicitly or implicitly about the teaching approach of literary translation were identified and coded.

RESULTS

In this research, the approach to teaching literary translation in a number of Iranian universities was described from the point of view of teachers and learners of literary translation. In the following section, the

researchers describe and categorize the opinions of teachers and learners in four general categories: lesson topics, lesson content, teaching tools, and teaching procedures.

Subjects of Literary Translation Classes From the Perspective of Teachers and Learners

In this research, the researchers asked the teachers of literary translation what topics they taught in the literary translation classes. The learners were also asked to describe what topics their teachers discussed in the literary translation classes. The descriptions of teachers and students are presented in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

Table 1: Subjects of the translation of literary texts from the teachers' point of view

Category	Frequency	Subcategories and frequencies
Language	43	English Comprehension (4), English Vocabulary (1), Persian Vocabulary Range (1), Persian Language Fluency (1), Idioms And Proverbs (4), Neologisms (1), Proper Nouns (1) Persian Simple Writing (1), Semantics (1), The Principles Of Grice's Cooperation (1), Lexical Coherence Of The Text (1), Punctuation Marks (1), Linguistic Structure Of Literary Texts (5), Linguistic Knowledge (1), Discourse Analysis (1), Context (4), Language Dialects (2), Semantics (2), Semantics (2), Tone Of Speech (4), Text Types (1), Sociolinguistics (1), Coherence In Translation (1), Co-Occurrences (1)
Social	10	Cultural studies (3), cultural semiotics (3), sociology of translation (1), professional translation (1), examples of translated works (1), audit (1)
Transfer	30	Fluency of translation (1), method of literary translation (12), review of translation (1), translation unit (1), translation of cultural elements (9), translation strategies (3), re-creation of style (2), word-choice (1)
Literary	44	Persian literary texts (2), literary terms (2), literary vocabulary (2), history of Persian literature (2), English literary texts (2), literary arrays (6), analysis and understanding of literary text (4), Comparative literature (1), short story (1), literary genres (4), style of literary texts (13), literary texts of different periods (2), poem structure (1), literary aesthetics (1), poetry (1)
Mental	6	Translation Theory (3), Translation Criticism (3)

Table 2: Subjects of the translation of literary texts from the students' point of view

Category	Frequency	Subcategories and frequencies
Language	10	English vocabulary (1), Persian fluency (3), idioms and proverbs (4), linguistic structure of literary texts (1), rhyming (1)
Social	4	Cultural Studies (3), Sociology of Translation (1)
Transfer	25	Fluency of translation, method of literary translation (9), translation of cultural elements (11), translation strategies (3), word selection (2)
Literary	19	Literary terms (3), history of English literature (3), English literary texts (2), literary arrays (4), literary genres (1), style of literary texts (2), literary texts of different periods (1), structure Poetry (2), poetry (1)
Mental	2	Translation theory (1), translation criticism (1)

As seen in Table 1, the most important category that literary translation teachers consider necessary for teaching in the literary translation class is literary subjects. This category includes the theoretical topics of literature and familiarization with the literature of the source and target societies: "I bring Persian prose texts to study in my classes. Students read and enjoy these masterpieces of Persian prose" (Teacher 4); "In the literary translation class, I introduce literary concepts and terms so that the students get to know them" (Teacher 15); "The range of Persian literary vocabulary of students should be increased. Many students use colloquial words in translating poetry" (Teacher 8).

According to literary translation teachers, the second most important category is language issues. This category means knowledge of linguistics and familiarity with the potentials and features of the source and target languages: "In the literary translation class, I also teach the skills of reading English texts and review the semantics of words." (Teacher 28); "One of the important subjects that I deal with is idioms and proverbs and the translation of new words" (Teacher 4); "In the literary translation class, I refer to the stylistic, structural and syntactic features of literary texts and review different translation approaches" (Teacher 9).

The third important category from the point of view of translation teachers is the transfer category, which means the issues related to the skill of correct translation of the literary text into the target language: "One of the most important things that I think I should do is to tell them I will make the translated text to work in such a way that the reader won't notice that it is a translation" (Teacher 1); "One of the things I have to do is to

review the strategies and methods of literary translation. In the first three sessions, it is theory, and from the fourth session onwards, practical work" (Teacher 7); "One of the other subjects that I teach in the literary translation class is the method of translating idioms and proverbs" (Teacher 15).

The fourth category emphasized by literary translation teachers is the social category. This category includes issues related to the social and cultural conditions of the source and target societies: "The issues I deal with must include linguistics, discourse analysis, and cultural studies" (Teacher 13); "One of the subjects of the literary translation class is the translation of cultural concepts and the cultural references of these concepts" (Teacher 25); "In the literary translation class, I refer to topics such as literary analysis, translation strategies, cultural semiotics and project management" (Teacher 34).

The fifth and the least frequent category teachers mentioned is the mental category. This category includes theoretical knowledge and skills that help literary translation: "We dedicate the first three sessions of the lesson to translation theory. Other topics will be discussed according to the need analysis and during the sessions" (Teacher 7); "We dedicate a number of sessions to the discussion of the translation unit, translation theories, and the topics and terms related to them" (Teacher 15); "In the literary translation class, I help the students to get acquainted with the theories of translation and their application in literary translation" (Teacher 23).

The categories suggested by the teachers are similar to the descriptions of learners. As seen in Table 2, the most frequent category that has been taught in literary translation classes according to the description of translation learners is the transfer category, which means the issues related to the correct translation of the literary text into the target language: The literary translation class was focused on the method of translation at different levels such as words, sentences, and specific terms " (Learner 5); "This class taught us how to translate common English expressions in the literary text" (Learner 33); "In this class, we got acquainted with the translation of terms, old words, as well as words imported into English from other languages such as French" (Learner 69).

The second most frequent category taught in the literary translation classes, according to the learners' description, is the literary category. This category includes the theoretical topics of literature and familiarization with the literature of the source and target societies: "In this class, we learned about poetry, types of literary texts and literary terms" (Learner 40); "The translation book of literary texts was taught completely and we

got to know a little about the history of English literature" (Learner 60); "In the literary translation class, we got acquainted with various literary genres such as poetry and their translation" (Learner 64).

The third most frequent category that was taught in the literary translation classes, according to the learners' description, is language issues. This category means linguistic knowledge and familiarity with the potentials and characteristics of the source and target languages: "In the literary translation class, we got acquainted with English words and phrases that we could not understand their meanings at first glance" (comprehensive 31); "In this class, subjects such as creative writing, translation unit, types of translation, and methods of text transmission were taught" (Learner 4); "In the course of literary translation, we got acquainted with literary terms, vocabulary, proverbs and literary structures" (Learner 59).

The fourth most frequent category, which was taught in the literary translation class according to the description of the students, is the social category. This category includes topics related to the social and cultural conditions of the source and target communities: "Among the topics discussed in the class was getting to know different cultures and common terms in these cultures" (Learner 11); "In the literary translation class, we got acquainted with the translation of terms, as well as the importance of the culture of the target language and the way characters are expressed" (Learner 25); "In the class, we learned about various topics such as the history of literature, knowing the author, knowing the audience of the translation, knowing the culture of the source and target language, translating terms, the role of the translator and the role of the publisher" (Learner 37).

According to the learners' description, the least frequent category taught in the literary translation classes is the mental category. This category includes theoretical knowledge and skills that help literary translation: "In the literary translation class, the translation of terms, words, and poems, and rhyming and translation theories were discussed" (Learner 28); "Teachers did not have a scientific and accurate criterion for criticizing the translation and only had a favorable opinion, and this evaluation was not self-aware of which indicator is good" (Learner 13).

Literary Translation Teaching Materials From the Point of View of Teachers and Learners

In this research, the researchers asked the teachers of literary translation what teaching materials they used in the literary translation classes. The learners were also asked to describe what teaching materials their

teachers used in the literary translation classes. The descriptions of teachers and learners are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Literary translation teaching materials from the point of view of teachers and learners

Materials	Teachers	Learners
Texts taught in literary classes	1	0
Poetic texts	11	10
A selection of novels	12	5
Excerpt of short story	15	11
A selection of plays	5	7
Biography of literary translators	0	1
Works of Persian literature	2	0
Examples of previous translations	12	2
Literary translation textbooks of others	12	34
Lecturer's pamphlet	0	4
Literary translation textbooks of the teacher himself	2	0
Translation textbooks	5	5
Literary texts of translation textbooks	2	1
Literary articles	5	5
Translated scientific journal articles	4	10
Translation theoretical books	3	2
Translation suggested by the teacher	1	0
Books related to literary translation	4	0
Radio interview clips	1	0
Literary texts taken from the Internet	2	3
Examples of literary magazine translations	5	0
Videos of social networks	3	1
Educational slides	0	1

The results of Table 3 show that the most frequently recommended subject by the teachers for the literary translation class is short story excerpts. This choice is logical because the short story is one of the simplest types of literary text, which is easier to translate than novels and poems, and it is suitable for educational purposes and translation learners. Teachers have used other teaching materials to some extent: selected novels, literary translation textbooks, and examples of translated literary works. Selections of poetic texts are also included in the teachers' materials, but they have a lower

frequency than fiction texts, especially short stories, which is probably due to the delicacy and difficulty of translating poetic texts. The teachers often used the textbooks of other authors and did not author the literary translation textbooks themselves. Among the other teaching materials that the teachers have taught in their classes, we can mention non-literary translation textbooks, examples of literary articles, and translations from literary magazines. In general, the teachers have focused on a textbook of literary translation and a selection of literary texts for translation.

On the other hand, the description of the translation learners shows that the most important subject taught in their literary translation class was literary translation textbooks, followed by short stories, poetic texts, and scientific essays. They have been used in literary translation classes. In this way, the students' description of literary translation course materials is more or less consistent with the description of translation teachers.

Literary Translation Teaching Tools From the Point of View of Teachers and Learners

In this research, the researchers asked the teachers of literary translation what tools they used in teaching literary translation. The learners were also asked to describe the tools their teachers used in the literary translation classes. The descriptions of teachers and learners are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Literary translation teaching tools from the point of view of teachers and learners

Teaching tools	Teachers	Learners
Vocabulary	3	2
reference books	1	0
Online cultures	1	3
Internet websites	7	7
Audio visual tools	5	2
Translation project management software	4	1
Artificial intelligence	1	0
Search tools	2	0
Text editing tools	1	1
Translation bodies	5	0
Translation memory	7	0
machine translation	2	1
Not using a special tool	20	57

The results of Table 4 show that 20 of the teachers (51%) and 57 of the learners (72%) reported that no special educational tools were used in the literary translation classes. This description shows that the use of translation tools is not very common in literary translation classes. According to translation teachers, translation memories, websites, audio-visual tools, and translation corpora are the most frequently used tools in literary translation classes. On the other hand, the students of literary translation consider websites and online dictionaries to be the most common tools in the literary translation class. It seems that the possible reason for the learners not referring to translation corpora is their lack of familiarity with the concept of corpora and, as a result, their lack of recognition of its use in literary translation classes. Both teachers and learners have made the most use of internet sites to download literary texts and access criticisms of literary works.

Literary Translation Teaching Approach From the Point of View of Teachers and Learners

The present research investigated the compatibility of the literary translation teaching approach in Iranian universities with the three main axes of social constructivism in translation education. The results of this research are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Literary translation teaching approach from the point of view of teachers and learners

Frequency Axis	Teachers	Learners
Scaffolding	28	61
Situated learning	11	18
Collaborative learning	32	65

The first axis of social constructivism in translation education is scaffolding. Scaffolding is the teacher's support for learners in the learning process, and the teacher should gradually reduce the support after the initial support to the learners so that the learners can continue their activities as independent actors. The findings of the research showed that 28 of the teachers (71%) and 61 of the learners (82%) said in their descriptions that in the literary translation class, the teacher's support continues until the end. As a result, the literary translation class is teacher-centered, which is contrary to the requirements of social constructivism in translation education. Examples of the views of the participants are given below: "I draw students' attention to the lexical coherence of the text. For example, Sepehri's poem

is completely about nature. In my book, I have talked about different styles in literary translation" (Teacher 8); "I always tried to attract students' attention verbally. Then I would explain to them the issue of the tone and rhythm of the speech" (Teacher 14); "First, I compare Persian translation texts with the original so that students can distinguish different aspects of literary translation from each other" (Teacher 18); "I used to explain to the students the meaning of the text they are reading and the depth it has " (Teacher 3); "I strongly recommend students to use a dictionary because their minds do not help them remember all the words" (Teacher 1); "Our teacher recognized all the inconsistencies in the students' translation and gave the students a chance to correct their mistakes" (Learner 22).

The second axis of social constructivism is situated learning, which means paying attention to the real conditions of the translation market and training for a professional presence in the translation market. According to the research results, 11 of the teachers (28%) and 18 of the learners (24%) considered their literary translation class to be market-oriented. Thus, most of the teachers and learners believed that the needs of the translation market are not taken into account in the literary translation classes, and the learners are not prepared to participate in the literary translation market, which is contrary to the requirements of social constructivism in translation education. Examples of the statements of the interviewees are given below: "we also bring up the translation of a famous translator in the class and show that his work was not without errors and, he had gross errors" (Teacher 11); "It is important to interact with professional translators in lecture sessions and to ask them how much they relied on language knowledge in their translation and how artistic was their translations (Teacher 3);" "In order to distinguish between correct and incorrect translations, the teacher must provide examples of good and successful translations, for example, Don Quixote by Mohammad Ghazi" (Teacher 17); "In education, we have a discussion called the role model. It means the student can improve by being inspired by a successful person. Students need role models such as successful literary translators" (Teacher 11); "I want the students to introduce important literary works in English and Persian and find out what the difference is between the styles of the writers of the two countries" (Teacher 24); "I share my experience in the publishing market of literary works with students. I hope this experience will help them to be in the publishing market" (Teacher 30); "I tell the students what genre to choose for literary translation, how to sign a contract, and how to go to arbitration if the publisher doesn't pay for some reason" (Teacher 7); "The

student should have seen and read literary texts, both prose and poetry, and know that he is going to enter this field professionally and use the experiences of experts in this field" (Teacher 6).

The third axis of social constructivism is collaborative learning, which means learning through group activity and interaction with the teacher and students in the classroom. Based on the research results, 32 of the teachers (82%) and 65 of the learners (87%) considered the teaching of literary translation in their classes to be collaborative, which indicates the collaborative nature of literary translation classes in Iranian universities. This is in line with the requirements of social constructivism in translation education. Examples of the statements of the interviewees are given below: "I usually use exercises and group activities. The work is done in a workshop and as a team. I ask the students to discuss the various reasons for the success of the work" (Teacher 8); "Sometimes I give my translation to students to criticize without saying that it is my translation. At the end, I mentioned that it was my own translation" (Teacher 11); "We were discussing the translation of terms and searching different dictionaries. These class discussions were very useful" (Teacher 5); "The work is done in groups so that the students can see if they can achieve a better translation with the cooperation of their friends" (Teacher 1); "The students and I used to get the text together from the internet and work on the text at the same time. It would be better to do a small amount of work, but let the students do it themselves" (Teacher 5); "We do not follow a specific process in class. Students produce the translation themselves. I allow the students to talk about the famous literary works they have read in English or Persian" (Teacher 24); "Students read their translation in class and give each other feedback. The class is collaborative" (Teacher 4); "In the literary translation class, all students participated in the translation process and correcting translation errors" (Learner 24); "In the literary translation class, we practiced translation, checking other people's translations, discussing and exchanging opinions, group translation and text analysis" (Learner 50).

DISCUSSION

In this research, the current conditions of literary translation teaching in a number of Iranian universities were described from the point of view of teachers and learners of literary translation. The results suggest that according to the description of teachers and learners of literary translation, linguistic, literary, and transfer categories were the most

frequently discussed topics in literary translation classes. The results of this research are consistent with the results of Oraki and Tajvidi (2020). By examining the target competencies in the English translation curriculum in Iranian universities, these two researchers concluded that these programs mainly focus on improving language skills in translation, and they pay less attention to cultural, technological, ethical, and professional competencies.

The findings revealed that the subjects related to professional competence and market needs are rarely included or discussed in the LT classes. This is mainly due to teachers' unfamiliarity with market demands and the lack of internships and job observation in classes. This way, LT classes do not prepare learners to act as professionals in the LT publishing market. In fact, the current LT teaching approach does not comply with social-constructivist and complexity-based education systems.

On the other hand, the teachers' and learners' descriptions of literary translation course materials showed that they used published textbooks and selections of literary texts (mainly short stories) in their classes. In this way, many teachers choose educational materials in a predetermined manner without analyzing the specific needs of the learners. Previously, Parvaresh et al. (2015) had criticized this approach of translation teachers. They suggested that teachers implement social constructivism in literary translation classes and use exercises and projects instead of course materials.

The current approach of the Iranian LT teachers in selecting teaching materials is also contrary to the requirements of Complexity Theory, as proposed by Larsen-Freeman and Cameron (2008), which regards openness and dynamism as the tenets of pedagogy in today's complex and multifaceted world. Teachers need to be sensitive to the surrounding environments and the contextual factors, and they need to be open to change when selecting content materials rather than preselecting them.

The results of the present research showed that most of the literary translation teachers do not use technology-related translation tools in their teaching. These results are in line with the findings of Khoshsaligheh (2013). By conducting qualitative research and interviewing leading translation teachers in Iran, he discovered one of the shortcomings of the current English translator training program in Iran, which should be included in updating translation training programs. This shortcoming is the lack of focus on developing knowledge and skills in applying technology.

In response to this research's first and second questions regarding the approaches used by literary translation teachers, our findings showed that

the general approach of literary translation teachers is a teacher-centered approach in which the teacher is the decision-maker in choosing course subjects, course materials, and teaching tools. The only category in which learners are relatively involved in teaching literary translation is the teaching procedure. Our findings are a reminder of adaptability and unpredictability as the main tenets of Complexity Theory (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008), which maintains that teachers should be able to adapt themselves to the latest methodological and technological changes in the field. Our findings revealed that LT teachers in Iran have not managed to adapt to the use of technology (such as translation tools and artificial intelligence) in their teaching.

In response to the third question of the research, what are the similarities and differences between the approach of literary translation teachers in Iranian universities and the social constructivist approach in teaching translation, the results of the research revealed that collaborative learning has a strong presence in the process of teaching literary translation. Situated learning in these classes has been limited to studying samples of translated works, interviews with literary translators, and listening to the teacher's experiences in the publishing market. The learners have not participated in real translation projects. On the other hand, scaffolding has often been done continuously by the teacher, and in limited cases, teachers have stopped building support to help the learners perform independently.

CONCLUSION

In the present research, the literary translation teaching approach was described and categorized by analyzing interviews with teachers and learners of literary translation. The results of this research showed that linguistic, literary, and translation categories were the most frequently discussed topics in literary translation classes, and less attention was paid to topics related to the needs of the literary translation market. Although the approach to teaching literary translation in Iranian universities is interactive and collaborative, the teacher's complete support and strong role, and the lack of attention to the conditions and needs of the translation market are contrary to the requirements of social constructivism in translation education.

The research's results revealed that the current LT teaching approach in Iranian universities fails to adapt to either social constructivist or complexity-based pedagogy. LT teaching in Iran is not based on situated and

meaningful learning, does not train independent literary translators, or familiarize learners with the LT market norms and conventions. On the other hand, LT teachers are not attentive to the latest changes in the teaching environment and specific needs of the learners and, as a result, are not well-prepared to adapt themselves to the rapid changes in education requirements in the digital era.

A comparison of the research findings with the related literature in Iran and the current international trend revealed that the LT teaching approach in Iran does not comply with the current collaborative and market-oriented trend in Western countries. In terms of subjects, Iranian teachers focus mainly on linguistic and translational topics and mainly neglect the necessary issues for the professional presence of learners in the LT market. The teaching procedure is also teacher-oriented and does not prepare learners for independent presence in the professional market. Furthermore, teaching tools are mainly traditional, and the latest technological tools and advancements are not applied in classes.

The mentioned limitations are partly due to the non-familiarity of translation trainers with the LT publishing market, as almost none of them have any experience in that market. Translation instruments, software, and AI translation tools are not available in most universities. Further, Iranian universities suffer a lack of cooperation with the professional market as learners do not participate in internship and job supervision programs, and professional literary translators are not willing to share their experiences with academic practitioners.

The findings of this research will be useful for literary translators, academic and non-academic teachers, and learners of literary translation in Iran, and they will familiarize them with the current approach to teaching literary translation. In addition, the results of this research will be a guide for the heads of the educational departments to more accurately select the teachers of literary translation. Considering that the current research is the first of this kind on the literary translation teaching approach in Iran, this research provides the readers with the views of literary translation teachers and learners in Iran.

This research, like any other research, has faced limitations. These limitations are mainly related to the field of research. The current research has focused primarily on the views of teachers and learners of literary translation. Future researchers can also explore the views of other actors in literary translation, such as professional translators, publishers, and other relevant stakeholders. On the other hand, our research has focused on the

literary translation teachers in English language departments of a number of public and private universities. Collecting the views of teachers of other universities and foreign language departments will help deepen and expand this study's findings.

References

Alavi, M., Nemati, M., & Ghaemi, H. (2013). Measuring the growth of translation ability by considering the task-oriented translator training model. *Quarterly Journal of Translation and Language Studies, 46*(1), 1–17.

Alavi, S. M., & Ghaemi, H. (2013). Reliability assessment and construct validation of translation competence questionnaire (TCQ) in Iran. *Language Testing in Asia, 18,* 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/2229-0443-3-18

Barekat, B.. (2005). *Literary Translation As L'ecriture. Translation Studies, 3*(10), 55–63. SID. https://sid.ir/paper/96146/en

Farahzad, F., Azhideh, P., & Razmjou, L. (2010). Translation Quality and Awareness of Functional Translation Theories. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies, 2*(1),1–16. DOI: 10.22111/ijals.2012.58

Ghazizadeh, K. & Jamalimanesh, A. R. (2008). A brief look at the chaotic situation of translation education in some Iranian universities. *Iranian Journal of Translation Studies, 8*(30), 91–104.

Heidari, F., Khoshsaligheh, M., & Hashemi, M. R. (2014). Narrative intelligence and translation quality. *Language and Translation Studies, 48*(2), 113–130. DOI: 10.4038/sljss.v39i2.7442

Kafi, M., Khoshsaligheh, M., & Hashemi, M. R. (2018). Translation profession in Iran: current challenges and future prospects. *Translator, 24*(1), 89–103. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2017.1297693

Khazaeefar, A. (2002). The method of translating literary texts. *Specialized journal of language and literature of Mashhad Faculty of Literature and Humanities, 35*(3–4), 447–458.

Khazaeefar, A., Pakar, A. (2011). Introducing a model for evaluating translation quality and describing two ways of commenting in translation training classes. *Linguistic Researches, 4*(1), 53–66.

Khoshsaligheh, M. (2013). Target competences in Farsi and English translator training. *Language and Translation Studies, 47*(3), 113–143.

Khoshsaligheh, M., Haroon, H., & Karimdadian, S. (2011). *Social Constructivism in English and Persian Translation Class.* Proceedings of the Seminar on Translation of South East Asian Languages, University Sains Malaysia.

Kiraly, D. (2000). *A social constructivist approach to translator education, Empowerment from theory to practice*. Manchester: Saint Jerome.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago London: University of Chicago Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics*.Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Majlesifard, A. (2010). *A study of translation teaching methods in Iran*. Master's thesis, Tarbiat Modarres University.

Marashi, H. Arefnia, F. (2013). The relationship between imagination and translation quality of translation students. *Translation Studies, 9*(3), 15–30.

Moghaddas, M. Khoshsaligheh, M. (2019). Implementing project-based learning in a Persian translation class: a mixed-methods study. *Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 13* (2), 190–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2018.1564542

Newman, D., Griffin P., & Cole M. (2009). *The construction zone: working for cognitive change in school.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Okhravi, A. (2015). *Designing educational materials: an activity-oriented method for translating political texts in Iran.* Master's thesis, Imam Reza International University.

Oraki, A. Tajvidi, G. R. (2020). Training translators and interpreters: The need for a competence-based approach in designing university curricula. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*(2), 42–56.

Parvaresh, S. Pirnajmuddin, H. & Hesabi, A. (2015). The need to improve the teaching methods of practical translation courses: a plan for teaching literary translation. *Research and Writing Academic Books, 20*(1), 1–25.

Pishghadam, R. Hashemi, M. R., & Hesami, S. (2011). Critical thinking and translation: the relationship between critical thinking and translation ability. *Language and Translation Studies Quarterly, 4*, 15–33.

Rastegar Moghaddam, M. R., Khoshsaligheh, M., & Pishghadam, R. (2020). English Translation Students' Attitude towards Teamwork Skills in Subtitling Training Classroom. *Language-Related Research, 11*(3), 95–119.

Sadeghieh, H. (2008). *Applying the adaptive hypertext model in teaching specialized translation in the web environment*. Master's thesis, Allameh Tabatabai University.

Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2014). *Research methodologies in translation studies*. London, England: Routledge.

Taebi, E. (2017). *Social-constructivist teaching and assessment: a learner-centered approach to teaching translation*. M.A. thesis, Allameh Tabataba'i University.

Varmziari, H. (2017). *Teaching translation from a sociological perspective: Compilation of teaching-oriented translation exercises* [Doctoral dissertation, Allameh Tabatabai University] Vygotsky, L. (1994). Extracts from thought and language and mind in society In B. Stierer & J. Maybin (Eds.), *Language, literacy, and learning in educational practice* (pp. 45–58). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Whitfield, A. (2005). Towards a Socio-Cultural Turn in Translation Teaching: A Canadian Perspective. *Meta, 50*(4). https://doi.org/10.7202/019906ar

Yazdanparast, M. (2012). *A Study on the courses for MA translation students in Iran: Are graduate students welcome by the market?* Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.