

Gender in Translation: Training Future Translators to Become Aware of Gender Bias

الجنـدر في الترجمة: تدريب مترجمي المستقبل لإدراك التحيز الجنـدري

سعيد عبدلاوي Said ABDELLAOUI

*Moulay Ismail University,
Polydisciplinary Faculty of Errachidia, Morocco
abdellaoui@gmail.com*

Received date: 27/09/2021

Revised date: 30/12/2021

Publication date: 10/05/2022

Abstract:

Given the importance of training in gender-sensitivity issues, this article focuses on raising gender bias in the learning/teaching of translation. The classroom is viewed as the perfect space where prospective translators become aware of how gender is part and parcel of the source text and the target text, and how lexical and semantic choices are powerful to reveal underlying ideologies, attitudes and mind-sets.

This research project is corpus-based. It was carried out with my undergraduate students studying the module of 'English and Translation.' Text samples containing problematic gender issues were purposefully selected to bring about the reactions that I sought to make. By adopting the critical discourse analysis (CDA) with its three dimensional framework: the descriptive, interpretive and explanatory, as developed by Fairclough (2003), in a pedagogically collaborative learning environment, the texts with the group discussions were meant to measure how training can practically sensitize future translators and interpreters to the salience of androcentrism in language use hence triggering in them the need for change.

Keywords: Gender; Translation; Bias; Sexism; Training; CDA.

ملخص:

نظراً لأهمية التدريب في الترجمة وخصوصاً في إثارة القضايا الحساسة تجاه النوع الاجتماعي (الجنـدر)، تركز هذه المقالة على قضية التحيز بين الجنسين في تعلم الترجمة وتعليمها. لبلوغ هذا الهدف، تم اعتبار الفصل الدراسي المكان المثالي ليصبح مترجمو الغد على دراية تامة بكيفية اعتبار

الجنذر جزءاً لا يتجزأ من النص المصدر (ST) والنص الهدف (TT)، وكيف أن الاختيارات المعجمية والدلالية كفيلة للكشف عن الأيديولوجيات والعقليات المجتمعية.

تم القيام بهذه الدراسة مع طلابي الجامعيين الذين يدرسون وحدة "اللغة الإنجليزية والترجمة". وقد اختيرت عدة عينات نصية تحتوي على مشكلات تتعلق بالنوع الاجتماعي بهدف إحداث ردود الفعل التي سعت إلى تحقيقها؛ من خلال اعتماد تحليل الخطاب النقدي (CDA) بإطاره الثلاثي الأبعاد: الوصفي والتفسيري والتوضيحي، كما طوره نورمان فاركلوف (2003)، في بيئة تعليمية تعاونية وتربوية، مع دراسة وترجمة لمجموعة من النصوص ومناقشتها. كل هذا في سبيل قياس مدى نجاعة التدريب المعتمد. وكذلك لفت انتباه المترجمين عملياً لإدراك هيمنة المركزية الذكورية في استخدام اللغة، ومن ثم إثارة الحاجة إلى التغيير.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الجنذر؛ الترجمة؛ التحيز؛ التمييز على أساس الجنس؛ التدريب؛ (CDA).

Introduction:

It is well-stated in recent studies that translation is “wrongly thought to be an activity just limited to two texts, ignoring that (it) is a powerful ideological instrument to create identities, politics and stereotypes” (Montés, 2019, p.63). This ignorance is ascribed mainly to an accuracy-based approach which focuses on lexical, grammatical and semantic equivalences, failing therefore to capture the textual richness of languages and the discourses that envelop them. There are important elements, if overlooked, hidden meanings, encoded ideologies, individual experiences would remain unattended to.

One of the salient aspects of these encoded ideologies is embodied in how gender relations as represented and translated in language, and how the dichotomous images of women and men are transferred from the ST to the TT to the reader. This confluence of translation and gender has preoccupied theorists and researchers to gain “critical consistency and experience a remarkable growth” (Castro, 2013, p.7). For decades, there have been a number of studies devoted mainly to examine this inextricable relationship with an emphasis on its linguistic, feminist, ideological, social and historical circumstances (Cameron, 1990; Simon, 1996; Flotow, 2001; Mills, 2005;

Montés, 2019) amongst others. However, little interest has been given to the pedagogical perspective, and how the translation classroom can be redesigned to help change pre-established ideologies and conventions among would-be translators, especially in what concerns gender sensitive issues.

The emergence of feminist translation studies has largely contributed “to scrutinize how various relations of power intersect with gender in different situations and examine how resistant solidarities are forged against normative regimes” (Ergun and Castro 2017, p. 94). Such contributions have nurtured a feminist pedagogy which is not only interested in counteracting patriarchy in society, but also in countering its presence in the way subjects are taught (Accardi, 2013). Accordingly, the attention has shifted towards redesigning innovative practical teaching/ training pedagogies able to establish a modern translation classroom that would challenge the socio-cultural and the linguistic challenges of language, particularly for those related to gender bias, dominance and discrimination.

As a teacher of English and translation for more than four years, I have always been aware of how gender-related issues are entangled with translation issues, specifically from English into Arabic and vice versa. The manners in which the source texts are translated by either professionals or trainees disclose how women and men are described in ways that reflect the authors’ and the translators’ different cultural and gender affiliations. I have also witnessed how the male and female would-be translators are caught struggling in their laborious process of translation to reach a product in which each one of them has her/his own say in a target text with different, often conflicting, semantic, lexical and grammatical choices.

This un/conscious conflict may be partially ascribed to how gender issues can create challenges when trying to keep the textual meaning unchanged, or when translating from a culture where gender-related issues are ignored, or rather tabooed, to a culture where they are considered normative. Indeed, it seems very thought-provoking to observe how sometimes non-sexist texts become sexist when translated, intentionally or

unintentionally (Leonardi, 2017, p.10), but in fact, they are to reveal the translators behind the product; their textual manipulations tend to colour the target text with her/his own visions and convictions, and which may preserve the same amount of gender bias inherent in the source text and culture.

Therefore, to overcome these ideological challenges posed by gender-bias from one language and culture to the other is first to revision the ways our translation classrooms are designed and to assess whether the adopted pedagogies highlight gender issues or simply maintain them. For doing so, this study questions the use of language which is believed to “mask an underlying androcentrism: a belief that man is at the centre of things (Green and LeBihan, 2001, p.32). To uncover this androcentrism, which is both linguistic and cultural, is to unfold how gender-sensitivity issues and translation training can find answers to a number of questions, among which are the following:

Are translators aware of gender issues while translating from the ST to the TT? Do they contribute to the maintenance of gender bias inherent in language? Are they conscious of the stylistic differences of fe/male writers and the subtleties of their language? How can translation training play a role in changing gender bias in translation? And can the translation classroom become a consciousness-raising place to change the weight of the patriarchal discourses?

To attempt answering these questions, the translation classroom is given priority as a space where pedagogy has to be fine-tuned to fit within the demands of a more bias-free approach. The established relationship between the trainers/ trainees has to be reconsidered to prepare future translators and interpreters whose responsibility “extends beyond clients to include the wider community to which they belong (...) they are responsible for the consequences of their behaviours and therefore have to reflect carefully about how their decisions, both textual and non-textual, impact the lives of others” (Baker and Maier, 2011, p.1-2).

In a collaborative learning environment, critical discourse analysis with its three dimensional framework: the descriptive, interpretive and explanatory, as developed by Fairclough (2003) will be the thread uniting all the pedagogical efforts promising to make of prospective translators a trigger for social change; as a means through whom much of gender bias inherent in the source and target texts may be questioned and possibly reversed.

1. Gender, Language and Translation

In the literature of translation studies, the target text, unlike the source text, has been described as feminine and equated to the female as imperfect, inferior and defective. Sherry Simon states that “translators and women have historically been the weaker figures in their respective hierarchies: translators are handmaidens to authors, women inferior to men” (Simon, 1996, p. xi). To be relegated to this inferiority is manifest when translation is likened to a woman; “if it is beautiful, it is unfaithful. If it is faithful, it is most certainly not beautiful.” Simon criticised such analogy between women and translation to embody the relation between original and copy, and between author and translator, which is a mere feminization of translation. Yet, it is beyond the scope of this paper to evaluate the subaltern position of translators as invisible and devalued by privileging a masculine approach to authorship, rather, how, they themselves exert the same devaluation when reproducing a target text laden with sexist expressions about the category ‘woman.’

So, starting from the premise that language is mostly used as an ideological tool, it is then of paramount importance for translators to examine how issues of femininity and masculinity are encoded in language use. The latter is described by feminists as representative to name the world from masculine viewpoints and in accordance with stereotyped beliefs about the sexes. As Cameron puts it, feminists have discovered that “many languages have an underlying semantic or grammatical rule where the male is positive and the female negative, so that the tenets of male chauvinism are encoded into language” (Cameron, 1990, p.13).

This concern with an androcentric version of language has been fostered by the many waves of feminisms since the 60s and 70s. The first, the second, and the third waves of feminisms have struggled to achieve a full equality between females and males in order to free women from the oppression of male supremacy in all fields of society where discrimination, prejudices and sexism are prevalent. However, the emergence of feminist linguistics, namely (Cameron, 1996; Mills, 2005; Coats, 1995; Tannen, 1999) among others, aimed at identifying, demystifying and resisting the ways in which language use reflects, maintains, reinforces and perpetuates gender division and inequality in society (Camus, et al. 2017). This kind of gender bias is characteristic of language use and of the practices and beliefs in daily life, which pose particular challenges to professionals as well as future translators.

Therefore, translation can be seen as a fertile ground for studying the gendered manifestations of language and its manipulative aspects. It serves to reveal the linguistic imbalances while approaching gender and the omnipresent discourses about women and men, particularly, how they are socio-culturally misrepresented favouring one gender over the other. Hall believes that ideology is a reproduction of dominant discourses (...) it can refer to the sexist discourses where the manipulation of language reinforces issues of discrimination (1982, cited in Mills 2005). Thus, any sexist language is a reflection of a sexist culture and English and Arabic languages are no exception.

1.1. Gender in Arabic and English

The word gender in Arabic can be translated as ‘جنس’ (jins) which means "kind" or "sort". It is of two kinds: ‘مذكر’ (mudhakkar) masculine and ‘مؤنث’ (mu'annath) feminine. Unlike sex, which refers to the biological aspect that designates the female and male traits of women and men, gender refers to the sociocultural and ideological construction of both sexes; that is, the roles, attributes, behaviours and activities that any society attach to only women or only men. These socialized distributions are well-encoded in the linguistic choices that we often take for granted as being normative and mostly introduced to be man-made.

If we take the following examples: carpenter (نجار male)/ baker (male) (خبّاز)/ mechanic (ميكانيكي male)/ blacksmith (male) (حداد), but not (نجارة female)- (خبّازة female)- (ميكانيكية female) and (حدادة female). To be conventionally rendered, these jobs can be in English as female carpenter, female baker, female mechanic, and female blacksmith. They are exclusively restricted to males' domain. This can confirm Cameron's view that languages are structured in a sexist way, that their rules and meanings have been literally man-made: women have been excluded from naming and definition (Cameron, 1990, p.12). If a female takes the role of a carpenter, she is titled a *female* carpenter where she appears as a deviation from the norm. Interestingly, with the addition of the feminine grammatical gender suffix morpheme, the derived forms are either linguistically not stored or they do not refer to female agents; instead, they refer to machines and qualities (Al-Ramahi, 2014). The Arabic words: (خبّازة/ نجارة/ ميكانيكية/ حدادة) as feminine can be literally translated as (bakery / carpentry / mechanical / blacksmithery), respectively. These words have nothing to do with the naming of jobs pertinent to women, but rather to a kind of disjuncture between the feminized Arabic words and their equivalents; they simply refer to non-existent titles of jobs.

Even other jobs like engineer/ مهندس, scientist / عالم, professor/ أستاذ, member/ عضو, coach/ مدرب, etc., are commonly used to be labelled with the world/word of man. This shows males as the norm and therefore leaves out the female identity and experience unattended to. Sheldon states that our language reflects sexist, male-centered attitudes that perpetuate trivialization, marginalization, and invisibility of female experience" (1990, p.4). Indeed, language use does affect the way the world is perceived to somehow agree with the renowned Whorfian hypothesis of 'linguistic determinism'.

The exclusion of women from the world of men is also manifest in the overuse of the word (man). As a noun and a verb, it permeates the English language at significant levels. 'Man' as an affix is used in many words such as: 'craftsman' "حرفي", 'policeman' "شرطي", 'fireman' "إطفائي", 'postman' "ساعي بريد", 'dustman' "عامل تنظيف", 'fisherman' "صياد",

‘seaman’ "بحار", ‘workman’ "عامل", ‘a gentleman’ "رجل نبيل", ‘Chairman’ "رئيس الجلسة", night-watchman "حارس ليلي", ‘husbandman’ فلاح, hangman الجلاد, ‘chairman’ رئيس الجلسة, ‘layman’ "من عامة الشعب".

As it is noticed, most of the jobs are male-identified. Although some feminists have suggested gender-neutral labels, such as, police officer, fire-fighter, chairperson, etc., they remain culturally attached to the masculine world. In this vein, Mills states that the semantic derogation of women is "the process whereby words associated with women begin to have negative connotations" (Mills, 2005, p.170). This derogation is semantically encoded in naming men and women and in distributing selectively social and cultural attributes. The following examples are a case in point:

Master سيد / Mistress عشيقه / Bachelor أعزب / Spinster عانس
Courtier حاكم - مومس / Courtesan سمسار - خادم - أحد رجال البلاط
Governor حاكم / Governess المربية /

As it can be remarked in the above English nouns and their Arabic equivalents, the scope of the female-specific term is different from that of the male-specific term. It is used solely to refer to someone of lower status and frequently having an overlaid sexual connotation (Mills, 2005, p.84). The lexical and semantic aspects tend to designate men as dignified individuals and to locate women at lower and denigrating positions.

In Arabic, for any sentence which includes women and men as its subject, the verb of the sentence is conjugated for the masculine. "خمس نساء ورجل ذهبوا إلى المدينة" can be translated as: "Five women and one man went to the city." Following the Arabic grammar rule of subject-verb agreement in number and gender, the verb in this sentence must be conjugated for the plural masculine form for the five women and only one man. Instead of (ذهبن) for the plural feminine, (ذهبوا) for the masculine plural is used. This type of sentence structure emphasizes that Arabic is a sexist language for the masculine gender and against the feminine gender because masculine forms are used as the basic ones from which the feminine forms are derived. This type of rule in Arabic ignores the feminine presence of women as separate from men.

Another instance of sexism is disclosed when language users refer ambiguously to one sex, which is explicitly the masculine, when implicitly referring to both sexes. The use of the supposed generic pronouns ‘he’ and ‘his’ do contribute to prioritize the males over the females. This can be illustrated as:

“Every student should return his work. “Can be translated as:

“يجب على كل طالب إعادة عمله”

The word (student طالب) is noticed to refer to the masculine as the default grammatical gender and subsumes the feminine gender within its morphemes. The use of the generic pronoun ‘His’ in (his work عمله) represents a male person omitting the distinctive elements of the visibility of female experience. For more neutrality, some feminists suggested the use of both his and her to appear in English as: “Every student should return his/her work,” which can be rendered in Arabic as:

“يجب على كل طالب إعادة عمله/عملها” or “يجب على كل طالب/طالبة إعادة عمله/عملها”

The repetition of (عمله/عملها; طالب/طالبة) is not a perfect solution; it provides an awkward mistranslation which can only cast the female in a position secondary to the male.

Another example where gender bias is well-illustrated is found in proverbs. In The New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy (Third Edition, 2002), proverbs are defined “short, pithy sayings that reflect the accumulated wisdom, prejudices, and superstitions of the human race”. Generally, the ‘function’ of proverbs as discourses is to disseminate certain cultural values. Proverbial expressions are found both in Arabic and English in speaking and writing.

‘A woman has half a brain “المرأة بنصف عقل” / women’s talk. “حكي نسوان” / women’s driving “سواقة نسوان” / A woman’s work is never done “لا عمل المرأة لا ينتهي أبداً”

‘The way to a man’s heart is through his stomach.’

أقصر طريق إلى قلب الرجل معدته

‘A man is as old as he feels, and a woman as old as she looks.’

عمر الرجل يقاس بقلبه وعمر المرأة بشكلها

There are, of course, other thousands of proverbs and proverbial expressions in all languages that show “gendered frameworks” (Mills, 2005, p.123). By looking at the patterns, words and phrases, the discourse can be associated with a wide range of gender ideologies already established in culture. Most of the above examples show how the category woman is denigrated and categorized as less than man. Mieder asserts that “proverbs, like riddles, jokes or fairy tales, do not fall out of the sky and neither are they products of a mythical soul of the folk. Instead they are always coined by an individual either intentionally or unintentionally” (Mieder, 2008, p.14). Other 100 proverbs and their translations will be given more space in the illustrative corpus of this study and the experimental classroom training.

As the few aforementioned examples have shown, the linguistic choices unfold what women and men should consider as an officially correct use of language. To continue this gender-discriminatory adoption of a man-made discourse is to contribute to the alienation and invisibility of women hence to the perpetuation or normalization of a purely sexist language. In this respect, Cameron speaks of the role of men in this process and asserts that "we need to look at languages as cultural edifices whose norms are laid down in things like dictionaries, grammars, style books, and glossaries - all of which have historically been compiled by men" (Cameron, 1996, p.18). This masculine man-made language has been targeted by Feminists who have always stressed that "language reforms are pointless, because as long as society is sexist, sexist meanings will reappear, and to change language forms is to deal with symptoms, not the cause" (Cameron, 1996, p.85).

The Cause is related primarily to how dominant ideologies pigeonhole men as superior and women as inferior. It is the androcentric dimension that hinders the progress of an egalitarian society and perpetuates sexism in culture as well as in language. Cameron warns against reducing sexism as to the examination of single words or isolated grammatical features: "Sexist language" cannot be regarded as simply the "naming" of the world from one, masculinist perspective; it is better conceptualized as a

multifaceted phenomenon occurring in a number of quite complex systems of representation, all with their places in historical traditions (Cameron, 1996, p. 14).

Therefore, to tackle this multifaceted phenomenon from a pedagogical perspective, it is of utmost importance to examine the ways translators and interpreters as trainees are taught, with particular attention to how they handle gender discriminatory and sexist uses of language. The foundation should be the translation class-room as a space where training is the driving power that can raise awareness and change preconceived ideas about women and men in the source target texts.

2. Translation Training and the Class-room

2.1. Is there Room for Gender-related Issues?

The translation classroom is the right space for an in-depth study of the varying pedagogies and the dominant discourses that have preoccupied teachers and trainees alike. However, in tertiary levels, this classroom has always been criticized “as being teacher-centered, uncreative, rigid, and out of date” (Colina, 2003). By adopting an accuracy oriented approach while teaching translation, that is, to be concerned solely with developing a translation competence of finding equivalent messages from the source texts to the target texts (Zhong, 2002), the prospective translators passively internalize the approaches, methods and techniques taught and practiced. This passive internalization is ascribed to how “the learner’s autonomy and self-confidence are sapped by this focus on the translation product rather than the translation process” (Colina, 2003, p.52). To focus on the product is the result of a top-down transmission of knowledge, which is posited to have somehow fallen short to engage the learner in the socio-cultural diversity and the ideological richness that texts harbour in their multifaceted layers (Kiraly, 2000; Zhong, 2004; Colina, 2003; Stewart, 2008; Baker, 2011).

As students are trained to be ‘accurate language facilitators’ rather than ‘thinking translators’, the teacher-centered approach with its “exercise ridden classroom cannot equip translators-in-training with the wide range of

professional and interpersonal skills, knowledge and competence they will need to meet the requirements of an increasingly demanding language mediation market” (Kiraly, 2000, p.193). As such, topics like gender bias would not be of any interest or at best can be merely treated as glosses over the margin.

To break away from this conventional approach and move towards transforming the traditional translation classroom, trainers need to step outside their comfort zone teaching style as depicted by the often-mentioned “*read and translate*” instruction method (Gonzalez and Davies, 2004). In this same vein, Zhong also suggests that translation training “should involve selective interpretations and representations of meanings, (and) must not disguise translation with a discourse of accuracy but rather, it should reveal its biased nature. Because, as Zhong puts it, “translation is not an entirely natural, innocent, fair, accurate or objective process, we as educators must not be bothered about turning students into inhuman, selfless, accurate and objective translation machines with mechanical precision. It must therefore not dis-empower (students) by depriving them of their subjectivities and their right to think independently” (Zhong 2002) p.579), instead, would-be translators “need to be faced with the various ethical implications and moral challenges that they may be confronted with in the course of their career without relying blindly on context-less codes of practice or abstract lists of dos and don’ts” (Martínez and Albiar, 2001).

2.2. On Training Prospective Translators about Gender

Following Baker (2011), Vigo states that “training should make trainees aware that nearly every action in professional translation is a possible ethical action. Therefore, their choices as translators can have an ethical meaning and, sometimes, virtual consequences too” (Vigo, 2019). This kind of training seems to impact the trainees more as individuals than as students, because it goes beyond a linear relation between the ST and the TT. It is not concerned with providing them with methods to follow and techniques to adopt, but it intends to trigger in them a critical handling of every lexical, semantic and grammatical aspect together with the underlying

ideologies buttressed in the ST. It is a deeper kind of training that addresses what goes beyond the superficial level to attend to the trainee's visions about sociocultural or political manifestations. However, to reach this end, it is important that teachers refrain from prescribing strategies or specific courses of action (Baker, 2011); rather, the focus of interest should be on the trainees.

However, the enquiry that poses itself here is: which kind of translation training that tertiary levels can adopt to have this kind of impact on would-be translators on gender sensitivity issues? To answer this question, Vigo declares that training translators can be considered as an opportunity to take the “shame-veil off gender and gender-related issues through reflection and analysis. (...) to bring to light hidden meanings and lexical choices, thus raising the students' awareness on these topics, strengthening their ethical value, and increasing their gender-sensitivity, which, in turn, will become a lens through which they can look at the whole world” (Vigo, 2019, p. 18). Montés' study (2019) exemplifies a case of raising awareness through training by using advertising and marketing to gauge how it is (mis)used to reinforce gender stereotypes in contemporary societies. Ninet and Vayá's pilot study (2020) of AVT (Audio Visual Translation) is another interesting class experiment that aims to enhance the intercultural awareness among students by using subtitling and dubbing. Both studies stress the importance of students' active involvement in the training class to be held accountable for their own translation decisions. This accountability is well-expressed when Montés states that developing teaching strategies to uncover the gender power relations that underlie each translation act and presenting choices to make gender visible will contribute to an equal gender construction in society (Montés, 2019, p.64).

In order to enhance a modern bias-free translation classroom, training should work towards reaching the objective of the translator as a conscious interpreter who uses “intellectual discretion, to make ethical and technical decisions, to seek information, to reconstruct and manipulate knowledge” (Zhong, 2002, p.579). This conscious manipulation of knowledge is essential when dealing with instances where gender and

sexism are into play, not only at the linguistic level, but also at the ideological levels affecting individual translators, readers and all members of society.

Therefore, the creation of a modern, authentic and a more pluralistic classroom seems to fit the purpose of this study that aims to “enhance the critical consciousness of translators-to-be” (Martínez-Carrasco, 2019, p.47). This intention goes hand in hand with Baldo’s strong emphasis on experiential knowledge and reflexivity, and on the idea of using experience as a resource-including using students’ and teachers’ own everyday experiences of sexism and oppression as learning materials (Baldo, 2019, p.87). Hence, the gender sensitive training classroom with a critical pedagogy is best implemented in a collaboratively-oriented space that involves all students and teachers. The following sections will elaborate more on how collaborative learning adopting a critical discourse analysis can fit to meet the expectations of a tertiary class-room.

2.3. Collaborative-based Training/learning

A collaborative learning environment has become a pedagogical necessity in modern teaching and the translation classroom is no exception. O’Brien and Schäler define collaborative learning as “when two or more agents cooperate in some way to produce a translation” (2011, p.7). It is the embodiment of a teamwork which engages individuals to work together in a cooperative environment to achieve common team goals through sharing knowledge and skills," as Kiraly puts it (2000, p. 36). Of course, collaborative learning does not mean simply dividing up the work on a task; it is instead the active involvement of all members to accomplish both the short and long term goals of learning.

Collaboration calls for the interaction and cooperation of learners and instructors to bridge the gap between real-life and the courses taught in class. The shared projects and activities in pairs or small groups to discuss gender related concepts or find solutions to language problems can enhance interpersonal and decision-making skills, and provide the opportunity for practicing conversational and critical thinking skills. In doing so,

constructivist and collaborative learning environments have been emphasised where students can actively participate in classroom activities, achieve deep learning, and get involved in real-life tasks. According to Kiraly's socio-constructivist approach to translation training, learning is a social process created through dynamic interactions between teachers and learners (2000, p.10), and he suggests diversified in-class activities like partial/complete translation, small group work, guided translation exercises, use of parallel texts, sight translation, simulated interpreting situations, 'gist' translation, documentation and reviewing. (Kiraly, 2000, p. 40).

Therefore, translation pedagogy should be based on a wide range of student-centered tasks in which the lecturer becomes the facilitator. She/he prompts students to engage collaboratively and critically in different tasks in which training about gender issues can be realised by specific educational strategies and techniques playing a similar role to the one advocated by feminist pedagogy. It is a reinvigorating approach to teaching that employs critical theory and methods to accentuate gender-based topics.

It is a critical pedagogy that encourages students to think holistically by taking their learning beyond the texts and beyond the classroom to transform theory into practice. The nature of this action "involves a constant movement between doing things and asking what doing those things in those ways does to those things" (Henderson 2015, p. 5). Thus, the act of doing of things in translation is a critical doing, which is the crux of training students and stimulate their engagement in gender sensitivity issues. The adoption of a critical discourse analysis can further prepare the trainees towards creating the changes about gender that they all aspire to make.

2.4. Critical Discourse Analysis in Translation (CDA)

It has become obvious now that behind every lexical/semantic choice of any writer/translator/trainee lies deliberate acts that reveal his/her subjectivities, knowledge, histories, cultures and socio-political surroundings. They are not always innocent choices, especially in what concerns gender domination and discrimination issues. Hence, an effective approach like CDA can help unearth these intentions and look deeper into

exploring the multi-layered aspects of the target text to guide us through the processes of producing the source text. With its focus on the ideologies and power relations embedded in language, CDA can reveal how the pre-established beliefs about gender are articulated in a discourse which is profoundly sexist with its underlying “gendered frameworks” (Mills, 2005, p.123).

Critical discourse analysis, as developed by Fairclough, examines both the linguistic and the extra-linguistic features surrounding the context. It is also characterized by its common interests in de-mystifying ideologies and power relations through the systematic and retroductable investigation of semiotic data (written, spoken or visual) (Wodak and Meyer, 2008). A text cannot be analyzed discursively through its linguistic components alone, there has to be other social and cultural considerations to disclose language use and social practice as ideologically mediated (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2004, p.66). Hence, it aims at systematically exploring how these non-transparent relationships are factors in securing power and hegemony. It draws attention to power imbalances, social inequities, non-democratic practices, and other injustices in hopes of spurring people to correction actions. (Fairclough, 1993).

The translator, as a discourse analyst, should not be seen solely as a mediator who renders one language into another, but, on the contrary, s/he produces a new discourse in the TL. This same idea is suggested by Iețcu-Fairclough who regards translated texts as recontextualizations (de-location of a practice from its original context and its re-location within another) of source-language texts in new social and cultural contexts. (Fairclough, 2008). This recontextualization is explained as omissions, additions, permutations and substitutions that may be included in the vocabulary of CDA as well (Vald  on 2007, p.102). The translators, therefore, can have the facility to create a new act of communication on a previously existing one in a new target language environment by using background knowledge (linguistic, social and cultural) and negotiating the meaning between the ST producer and the TT reader (Hatim and Mason 1990, p.2).

Fairclough's three-dimensional model of CDA perceives discourse as having three components:

1-Description (text-linguistic analysis) which refers to organization, clause combination, clause grammar, and vocabulary.

2-Interpretation (Discursive practices) which refer to how the text is produced, distributed, interpreted and appropriated.

3- Explanation (Sociocultural practices) which refers to the context on a situational, institutional or societal level (Fairclough, 2003, p.97).

These three interrelated dimensions of discourse analysis enable any translator to focus on the minimal details of any given text. The specific structural, lexical and semantic selections, the process by means of which individual words make up the ST and TT as originally produced, received and reproduced. The reproduction and reception involve multiple points of interest to the overall descriptive, interpretive, and explanatory aspects leading to understand the ideological traits of gender.

To read the ST critically is to detect instances where gender bias is linguistically located. This entails questioning the text from different facets with the intention to embark on textual deconstruction of hidden sexist ideologies to a reconstruction of a bias-free TT. However, it is not important with which type of textual or non-textual analysis one should begin, the three dimensions mentioned above allow simultaneity to show independence and interference of one over the other. Such flexibility in practice tend to merge the three together and to help achieve one supreme goal, that is, to read against the ST and the TT to ultimately unearth gender-bias.

3. In the Training Classroom

The study is corpus-based. It consists of illustrative text samples I selected to meet the goals I set out to achieve with my undergraduate students. In the time of conducting this study, they were in the third semester studying the module of English and Translation at the FPE,

Moulay Ismail University (Morocco). It took place during the period between March and June of 2018.

I chose to work with 26 students in total (16 females and 10 males) their ages ranged between 19 and 20 years and whose level of language proficiency in both English and Arabic was quite satisfactory; with 12 years studying Arabic and 6 years of English. The reason I chose to carry out my research with that particular class was due to their language competence and also to the fact that they had already been initiated to translation methods and approaches in their second year of study.

The classroom training experience targeted students' reactions, responses, and awareness to concentrate more on gender related issues. To reach this end, the training covered three phases: translating gender at the word level, at the sentence level and at the text level. And since the context is a pedagogical one, I opted for a collaborative learning environment coupled with a critical discourse analysis approach as developed by Fairclough (2003). This choice is ascribed to the effectiveness they would trigger in the students' dynamic participation in most of the tasks and activities I designed.

3.1. Translating Gender at the Word Level

The first task was a kind of a diagnostic test. I provided all students with a list of 50 English words containing job titles to be aurally translated into Arabic. The goal was to gauge students' instant reactions and to measure their general understanding of gender-related issues. By giving primacy to the oral over the written, I aimed at making the task more interactive involving all students. The list was as follows:

Student, professor, scientist, engineer, coach, police officer, fire fighter, citizen, financial adviser, postman, designer, tailor, farmer, lawyer, governor, doctor, pharmacist, plumber, poet, electrician, burglar, project manager, magician, lion tamer, gardener, counselor, dentist, explorer, inventor, porter, teacher, technician, waiter, accountant, journalist, driver, architect, director, inspector, pilot, soldier, writer, economist, analyst,

stockbroker, programmer, software developer, optician, driving instructor, surgeon, and translator.

Surprisingly, all the female and male students translated the words into Arabic as masculine job titles without any reference to the feminine. Even the word ‘**translator**’ was translated as (مترجم). The students’ translations presented the jobs as only appropriate to the male world or should be held solely by men.

The job titles were translated by the students as:

طالب، أستاذ، عالم، مهندس، مدرب، ضابط شرطة، رجل إطفاء، مواطن، ساعي بريد، مستشار مالي، مصمم، خياط، مزارع، محامي، محافظ، طبيب، صيدلي، سباك، شاعر، كهربائي، لص، مدير مشروع، ساحر، مروض الأسد، بستاني، مستشار، طبيب أسنان، مستكشف، مخترع، حمال، مدرس، فني، نادل، محاسب، صحفي، سائق، مهندس معماري، مدير، مفتش، طيار، جندي، كاتب، اقتصادي، محلل، سمسار البورصة، مبرمج، مطور برامج، أخصائي بصريات، مدرب قيادة، جراح ومترجم.

I tried to draw student’s attention to the idea that they could have added to the basic form of the Arabic words only a feminine marker called *إِلَاءَ الْمَرْبُوطَةِ* (ة) علامة تَأْنِيث to the end, and then to derive the feminine job titles like: أستاذة etc., to encompass also the category and identity of women as well. The problem, however, was not in the addition of (ة), because most students had acquired a good mastery of the Arabic language and its morpho-lexical rules since their early schooling.

When asked why they had opted specifically for the masculine versions rather than the feminine, their responses ranged from the fact that the words by default refer only to men’s jobs, that the majority of men occupy those jobs, or that only few women could have access to those jobs.

Despite their English language proficiency and knowledge of the existing generic use in occupational titles to include women and men, they opted for the masculine in their Arabic translations. This can be attributed to their unconscious reproduction of the dominant discourses in society and to how most of them were socialized to think about the fields that are always designed for men and those designed for women. This would confirm Mills’ view advocating linguistic determinism following Sapir and Whorf that “our

thought-systems are influenced by the language of our community; so that our idea of ‘reality’ is constrained by the linguistic forms available to us as members of that community” (Mills, 2005, p.63). The circulation of words that exclude the identity and experience of women are enhanced in androcentric translations whose meanings reproduce and reinforce sexism of a man-made language. Similar to this sexist circulation has been identified in a recent study (Ullmann and Saunders, 2021) of biased algorithms in Google Translate and suggest that it needs a little gender-sensitivity targeted training to help artificial intelligence avoid gender stereotyping in online translation.

The introductory part of the training was very useful to trigger certain interest and to engage the trainees in the on-going discussions in a class-room inspired by a gender-committed pedagogy. To offer opportunities for the students to concentrate on gender issues, I devoted a lot of time and space to classroom debates, which involved dividing students into pairs of one male and one female and small groups that involved male and female members. The debates were particularly valuable for sensitizing students to the importance of including gender issues when translating; the many forms of direct/ indirect sexism, gender assumptions, stereotypes, ideologies, gender bias, masculine dominance and discrimination against women were given ample importance.

3.2. Translating Gender at the Sentence Level

The second phase was to provide students with samples at the sentence level. For doing so, I selected 100 proverbs and proverbial expressions taken from both *The Oxford Concise Dictionary of Proverbs* (2003) which contains over 1000 proverbs, and from *The Book of Proverbs and Arabic Proverbials* (Kassis, 1999). Given the value that proverbs enjoy in everyday conversations and how memorable they are to be handed down from one generation to the other, they seem to be the perfect epitome of what it is taken for granted as truth to establish cultural standards about gender in ethical and moral behaviors. They constitute a powerful ‘rhetorical device’ for shaping the public opinions in society as mechanisms of non-formal education and ideological control” (Gindara, 2004). They are

also overloaded with meanings to “communicate values and identities, not just through their content but through their structure” (Machen and van Leeuwen, 2007, p. 105). As powerful strategies in argumentation, they have didactic tendencies and rootedness in social imagination where images of men and women are manifest to invoke specific discursive functions.

Most of the 100 samples I selected for the students contain varying instances of sexism, direct and indirect, with images of denigration and discrimination against the category woman.

Each of the four groups was given 25 proverbs in order to select, reflect on, analyze, and decide on a suitable translation based on what they had gained in the previous discussions about gender sensitive issues. They were asked to follow the three dimensional framework of CDA (description, interpretation and explanation) and to categorize them according to their level of sexism, from the most sexist to the least sexist. By trying to find key linguistic elements about gender relations between men and women, they were encouraged to critically analyze the discourse at work and uncover the in/direct forms of sexism both in the Arabic and English proverbs/proverbials. Once the task of categorization and analyses was over, the trainees worked on translating them. The aim behind doing the task collaboratively was to see how the trainees could position themselves vis-a-vis the ST, the TT and the readers who were members of other groups to provide a student-student feedback.

The most five sexist English and Arabic proverbs and proverbials from the corpus of 100 samples were selected, analyzed, discussed and collaboratively translated by the four groups as follows:

Table 1. English /Arabic Proverbs and Proverbial Expressions

English Proverbs with Arabic Translations	Arabic Proverbs with English Translations
<p>1- One hair of a woman draws more than a hundred yoke of oxen.</p> <p>(شعرة امرأة واحدة تجر أكثر من مائة نير من الثيران).</p>	<p>1- شينان لا يحمدان إلا عند عاقبتهما: الطعام والمرأة: فالطعام لا يحمد حتى يستمر والمرأة لا تحمد حتى تموت.</p> <p>(Two things are not praised until their outcome: food and woman. Food until it is digested and the woman when she dies.)</p>
<p>2- “A woman, a dog, and a walnut tree, the more you beat them the better they be.”</p> <p>(امرأة وكلب وشجرة جوز، كلما ضربتهم أكثر كلما كانوا أفضل).</p>	<p>2- حَدَّثَ حَدِيثَيْنِ امْرَأَةً، فَإِنْ لَمْ تَفْهَمْ فَأَرْبَعَةً.</p> <p>(Repeat a speech twice to a woman and if she does not comprehend, then repeat it four times.)</p>
<p>3-A woman and a ship ever want mending</p> <p>(أي امرأة وسفينة في حاجة دائمة إلى الإصلاح).</p>	<p>3- ثلاثة تجب مداراتهم: الملك السليط، والمريض، والمرأة.</p> <p>(Three are to be watched: the authoritative king, the ill, and the woman.)</p>
<p>4- “A man is as old as he feels, and a woman as old as she looks.”</p> <p>(عمر الرجل يقاس بقلبه وعمر المرأة بشكلها).</p>	<p>4- أربع لا يشبعن من أربع: أرض من مطر ولا أنثى من ذكر ولا العين من النظر ولا العالم من العلم</p> <p>(Four are not satisfied of four: land of rain, a female of male, an eye of seeing, and a scholar of knowledge.)</p>
<p>5- Man is the head of the family and woman is the neck that turns the head.</p> <p>(الرجل هو رب الأسرة والمرأة هي العنق الذي يدير الرأس).</p>	<p>5- الشيطان يكفيه ساعات ليخدع رجلاً وامرأة، والمرأة يكفيها ساعة واحدة لتخدع عشرة شياطين.</p> <p>(Satan takes hours to deceive a man and a woman, and a woman takes one hour to deceive ten demons.)</p>

The selected English and Arabic proverbial expressions provide authentic data for the analysis of gender bias and the established sexist stereotypes. Most of them are remarked by the students to cast an androcentric quality on the lexical and semantic choices of the words and

structures. Although some of them are anonymous as they have no original author, they play a considerable role in expressing a principle or giving a piece of advice to caution against the category of women. Their educational and didactic goals to shape moral consciousness describe negatively women from a sexist perspective.

The sexist connotations both in the English and Arabic source texts, which were preserved by the students in the target texts, portray the woman as unwanted, futile and can be praised only when she is dead (Arabic proverb 1). Such chauvinistic view is well-illustrated in how women are treated and belittled in a patriarchal society to be less than man. She is stupid or slow of understanding (Arabic proverb 2) that men have to repeat for her to understand, and because of her evil spirit, she is to be watched lest she misbehaves like an authoritarian king or a sick person (Arabic proverb 3), she is a lustful person who never gets satisfied (Arabic proverb 4), she is a cunning person who outperforms ten demons (Arabic proverb 5), and because of a woman's charm, she can influence and can do what others cannot, or pull men to look like a disturbing figure (English proverb 1), she is to be beaten and treated violently like a dog or a walnut in order to do what is required of her to do (English proverb 2), she is likened to a ship that needs repairing constantly (English proverbs 3), she is only seen as a body which is given importance only if it is attractive and young (English proverb 4), and despite her lower status as seen in the metaphor of being the neck of the bottle, she is in fact in control to turn her husband's head whichever way she wants (English proverb 5).

Despite the eloquence and stylistic features of the selected Arabic and English proverbs and proverbials, they disclose a very high amount of verbal aggression towards women in particular. This is well-illustrated in the use of Arabic words like (لَمْ تَفْهَمِ- لَا يَشْبَعُنِ- اتَّخَذَ- حَتَّى تَمُوتَ) and of English words like (you beat them-mending-she looks).

All the proverbs and proverbial expressions engaged all the trainees as they provided most of them with tangible evidence to the existence of asymmetries in the life of men and women. Men are positive and women are

negative. These inherent sexist connotations in language as in daily life seem to sustain a biased culture by shaping the moral consciousness of all members, be they feminine or masculine.

I asked the four groups to try and re-contextualize (deconstruct-construct) the proverbs and proverbial expressions in order to mitigate the effect of sexism. The students confirmed the impossibility of such an intervention in the ST. This impermeability is first attributed to the stylistic devices used at the phonological, syntactic and lexico-semantic levels (parallelism, repetitions of sounds, rhyming, etc.), which make them appear impenetrable as if frozen in form. After several attempts to lessen the weight of sexism in them, some trainees suggested that “if revision is not possible, then the rejection of such expressions can be the right solution.”

3.3. Translating Gender at the Text Level

The third phase consisted of dealing with eight texts that were selected according to their amount of gender bias. Each group was given two texts to work on; one in Arabic and the other in English, and then the two texts were exchanged among all the four groups to have a diversified experience. The goal was to help the trainees apply (CDA) on many different texts as possible and to try to disclose the hidden patriarchal ideologies inherent in them. Group and whole class discussions were also encouraged to deal with most of the stylistic features of the texts and to point to the instances where women and men are stereotypically represented. The students formulated new questions, which were not exactly related to the texts under study and their linguistic aspects, but to the other issues related to how language can be manipulated to serve ideologies and common beliefs.

The following sample was chosen to be a flagrant embodiment of the most sexist samples found in the corpus.

“If a woman is swept off a ship into the water, the cry is “**Man overboard!**” If she is killed by a hit-and-run driver, the charge is **manslaughter**. If she is injured on the job, the coverage is **workmen’s compensation**. But if she arrives at the threshold marked **Men Only**, she

knows the admonition is not intended to bar animals or plants or inanimate objects. It is meant for her.” (Alma Graham, quoted in Salzmann, 1993)

It was translated collaboratively in Arabic as follows:

إذا جرفت امرأة من السفينة إلى الماء، فإن الصرخة هي رجل في البحر. إذا قُتلت على يد سائق صدم وهرب بعد الحادث، فإن التهمة هي القتل غير العمد. إذا أصيبت أثناء العمل، فإن التغطية هي تعويض العمال. ولكن إذا وصلت إلى العتبة التي تحمل علامة "للرجال فقط" فإنها تعلم أن التنبيه لا يهدف إلى منع الحيوانات أو النباتات أو الأشياء إنما يعنيها هي.

This ST raised controversial issues by most of the students. Despite its humorous aspect, it is full of gender sexist forms as manifest in the many stereotypes attached to the woman. The use of (**Man overboard! Manslaughter, workmen's compensation, and Men Only**) can allude to a man-made language that excludes the female and makes most women dependent on a male world/word. She is demeaned, trivialized and denigrated to convey stereotypes based on discrimination and masculine domination. The TT seems to preserve the masculinist vision and faithfully render the St in ways that perpetuate gender bias and the power that language and society exert over women. Some female students suggested a more neutral version of translation by replacing the word Man by human to come up with (**Human overboard! Humanslaughtther, workhuman's compensation, and Human only**). Such intervention in the ST revealed the ability of the trainees in deconstructing the language and the ideologies built upon it. But still, the word man is persisting to appear in the word 'human' and in its Arabic equivalent 'إنسان', which refers also to the masculine.

Nevertheless, these varying operations at the text level disclosed a great engagement of the four groups. The many attempts and efforts made to analyze, interpret and describe the texts were an indication of the students' total involvement to delve deeper into the process of translating the ST and of rewriting the TT. Despite the structural hurdles presented by the language, becoming aware of gender related issues by most trainees and their readiness for change was highly satisfactory.

4- Conclusion:

The diagnostic test together with the three phases of this translation training: the word, the sentence and the text levels have significantly contributed to raise students' awareness to gender as an all-encompassing word that permeates all languages. They have also highlighted how linguistic representations govern the ways women and men are introduced in texts as in their everyday life, and the ways translators render those texts with their built-in ideologies.

The considerable power of the translation classroom has contributed in activating trainees' schemata to ultimately trigger in them the need for a renovating bias-free approach to translation. Most importantly, prospective translators have been targeted not as students, but rather, as individuals whose responsibility goes beyond a simplistic act of moving from the ST to the TT, it is a critical intervening in a rigorous act of deciphering a wide range of ideological codes that may be either covert or overt.

By minimizing the roles of the instructors and maximizing those of the students, the adoption of the critical discourse analysis in a collaborative learning environment has been effective. It has contributed in actively engaging the trainees in all the group work, the discussions and other in-class activities. CDA, in particular, has provided the trainees with the possibility to expound the hidden parts of the underlying discourses, the producer of the ST and the translator of the TT. Its implementation in the training classroom has enhanced the students' knowledge about gender ideologies and revealed how issues of sexism and masculine domination are entrenched in the word/world of translation. Therefore, the efficacy of collaborative learning methods in translation with the support of a critical pedagogy would further emphasize the need for abandoning traditional and instructor centered methods.

As the English and Arabic corpus has shown, language does possess a great deal of sexist expressions that denigrate the category woman linguistically and culturally speaking. This denigration continued to appear in some male students' translations during the training. Although many

attempts have been encouraged by most trainees to neutralize some of them, they were hindered by the considerable power of a sexist language that seems to resist such revisions. Of course, it is not a question of linguistic features to be replaced and rendered gender-inclusive or not, it is the mentalities behind the used word that have been ossified in patriarchal norms to distribute roles and maintain power relations.

Translation is indeed a powerful activity to help better understand the word gender in language. Hence, this research recommends that translators should reconsider this word/world and be aware of its usage. I believe that instructors in translation should also give ample time and space to highlight the inextricable relation between gender and translation. It will surely result in promising transnational and trans-linguistic relations between the ST and TT, authors and translators, process and product, and women and men.

Other research areas, such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Computer Assisted Translation (CAT), are calling our attention to be explored as well. Their current applications in everyday life are inviting researchers in translation studies and other fields to measure how gendered identities have been massively digitized.

References

- Al-Ramahi, A. (2014). Gender in Translation from English into Arabic: Ideological Perspectives Case Study: Texts on Products. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics* Vol. 40, NO. 1-2, Jan-Dec 2014.
- Baldo, M. (2019). Queer(y)ing (Im)Possibilities in the British Academic Translation Classroom in M. De Marco and P. Toto (Eds.), *Gender Approaches in the Translation Classroom*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-04390-2_6. Retrieved from <http://www.https://z-lib.org/>
- Castro, O. (2013) Gender, Language and Translation at the Crossroads of Disciplines. 10.1558/genl.v7i1.5 Gender and Language. *G&L* Vol. 7.1 2013 5–12. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273818908_Introduction_Gender

_language_and_translation_at_the_crossroads_of_disciplines. [Accessed: 11 Jun 2021].

- Cameron, D. (1990). The Feminist Critique of Language. "Toward a Feminist Poetics." *The New Feminist Criticism*. 125-43. Print.
- Coates, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language*. London Routledge.
- Colina, S. (2003). *Translation Teaching*. Boston [etc.]: McGraw-Hill.
- Baker, M. & Maier, C. (2011). Ethics in Interpreter & Translator Training Critical Perspectives. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 5 (1): 1–14.
- Ieşcu-Fairclough, I. (2008). Critical Discourse Analysis and Translation Studies: Translation, Re-contextualization, Ideology. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*. Issue 2. 67-73.
- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse: The Universities. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 133-168.
- Flotow, L., V. (1997). *Translation and Gender: Translating in the Era of Feminism*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing. Retrieved from [http://www. https://z-lib.org/](http://www.z-lib.org/)
- Green, K. and LeBihan, J. (2001). *Critical Theory and Practice: A Coursebook*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge. Fairclough, N. (2003) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London, Longman.
- Hirsch, J. & Joseph F. (2002). *The New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as a Communicator*. London: Routledge
- Kiraly, D. (2000). *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Kassis, A. (1999). *The book of Proverbs and Arabic Proverbial Works*. Boston: Brill.
- Leonardi, V. (n.d.) 'Gender Issues in Translation Studies', *Centre for Interdisciplinary Gender Studies. E- papers*. (<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/gender-studies/epapers/leonardi.htm>)

- Montés, A. (2019). Teaching Gender Issues in Advertising Translation: The Case of University Marketing. In *Gender Approaches in the Translation Classroom: Training the Doers*. Marcella De Marco. Piero Toto (Eds.) Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved from <http://www.https://z-lib.org/>
- Mills, S. (2005). *Feminist Stylistics*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge.
- Martinez, N. & Hurtado, A. (2001). Assessment in Translation Studies: Research Needs. *Meta*, 46 (2), 272-287. Doi: 10.7202/003624ar
- Machen, D., & VanLeeuwen, T. (2007). *Global Media Discourse a Critical Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Mieder, W. (2017). The Humanistic Value of Proverbs in Sociopolitical Discourse Department of German and Russian, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405-0160, USA;
- Ninet, G. & Vayá, R. (2020). Raising Gender Awareness in Translation through AVT and Advertising. *Issn-e 2340-2415 | N° 31 | 2020 | pp. 419-436*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30827/sendebare.v31i0.13600> [Accessed: 8 Jun 2021].
- O'Brien, S. (2011). Collaborative Translation. In Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies*, Vol. 2, 17-20. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Phillips, L. and Jorgensen, M. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage.
- Simon, S. (1996) *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://www.https://z-lib.org/>
- Simpson, J. & Speake, J. (Eds). (2003) *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs New Edition*. Oxford: University Press.
- Santaemilia, J. (Ed.) (2014). *Gender, Sex and Translation: The Manipulation of Identities*. New York: Routledge.
- Schäffner, C. (2004) Political Discourse Analysis from the point of view of Translation Studies, 117-150. In *Journal of Language and Politics* 3:1. John Benjamins Publishing Company, UK.

- Stewart, D. (2008). Vocational translation training into a foreign language. INTRALINEA ON LINE TRANSLATION JOURNAL, 10 1-17. Retrieved from:
http://www.intralinea.org/review_articles/article/Translation_textbooks_translation_into_English_as_a_foreign_language [Accessed: 12 Sep 2020].
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York: Morrow.
- Valdeon, A., R. (2007) Ideological Independence or Negative Mediation: BBC Mundo and CNN en Español's Reporting of Madrid's Terrorist Attacks. In Carr, S.M. Translating and Interpreting Conflict, 99-119. Rodopi, Amsterdam/New York.
- Vigo, F. (2019). Turning Translation Training into Life Training. In *Gender Approaches in the Translation Classroom: Training the Doers*. Marcella De Marco · Piero Toto. (Eds.) Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved from <http://www.https://z-lib.org/>
- Ullmann, S. & Saunders, D. (2021). Online Translators are Sexist – here's how we gave them a little gender sensitivity training. Retrieved (26, 08, 2021, 10: 30) Retrieved from <https://theconversation.com/online-translators-are-sexist-heres-how-we-gave-them-a-little-gender-sensitivity-training-157846>
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Great Britain: SAGE Publications.
- Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2009). *Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology*
https://us.corwin.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/24615_01_Wodak_Ch_01.pdf [Accessed: 7 Jan 2021].
- Zhong, Y. (2002). Transcending the Discourse of Accuracy in the Teaching of Translation: Theoretical Deliberation and Case Study. *Meta*, 47 (4), 575-585. Doi: 10.7202/008037ar.