

## Learning Approaches and Study Habits of Conference-Interpreting Students

Aymil Dogan\*

### Suggested Citation:

Dogan, A. (2011). Learning approaches and study habits of conference-interpreting students. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 42, 29-44.

### Abstract

*Problem Statement:* There is a correlation between the final grades of conference-interpreting students and their study habits and learning approaches, namely surface, deep and strategic approaches.

*Purpose of the Study:* The purpose of this study is to evaluate the responses of the conference-interpreting students given to the Learning Approaches and Study Habits Inventory, ASSIST, in accordance with their final grades in the conference-interpreting course. Of the three approaches, "surface approach" refers to rote learning, "deep approach" means learning by developing an understanding of the subject matter, and "strategic approach" is a combination of the first two.

*Method:* A descriptive method is used, where the data is collected by a self-report inventory.

*Findings and Results:* There is a significant correlation between the final grades of the students and the deep-learning approach. The students who attained high scores through the deep approach have high final grades in interpreting. No significant correlation was found between the strategic approach and the final grades. Most of the students preferred the strategic approach, and a bit fewer of them preferred the deep approach, while the fewest of them chose the surface approach.

*Conclusions and Recommendations:* Conference-interpreting students mostly prefer the strategic learning approach, followed by the deep approach, with little difference in the grade results. The surface approach, on the other hand, is not preferred by most students. However, in the strategic approach, they can use both surface and deep approaches according to the situation, which means they are flexible enough to switch from one to

---

\*Assoc.Prof.Dr. Hacettepe University, Faculty of Letters, Ankara- Turkey  
aymildogan@gmail.com

another. The students receiving high grades from their exams also rate higher in their deep approach preference. It is recommended that the abovementioned inventory be administered to both professionals and students to see the difference between them. Furthermore, other profession-based inventories should be developed to be administered along with ASSIST. Conference-interpreting students are different from other students in processing information; this quality should be considered while developing such instruments.

*Keywords:* Conference-interpreting, deep learning approach, strategic learning approach, surface learning approach, ASSIST (Approaches and Study Skills Inventory for Students)

Conference-interpreting is a mediating process that takes place on a vast number of topics at a great number of venues with a wide variety of personalities, comprised of such people as speakers, audience members, organizing committee, press members, etc. This multidimensionality is not only a satisfaction factor for the interpreter but also a distress factor. It is a satisfaction factor in that it may be enjoyable to work with different types of people having different cultural backgrounds, peculiar discourses and idiosyncratic expressions, talking and acting on different subject matters in a variety of places ranging from a palace to a handcraft atelier. These are only the external factors affecting the interpreter; however, there are the internal factors as well, which can only be mentally enjoyed by the interpreter but can hardly be observed. As a cognitive activity, interpreting is very challenging, requiring high-level skills such as management of memory, knowledge, comprehension, time, prosody, and discourse. Special training is necessary for novice interpreters to improve their skills, competencies and performances. This training is of a tripod nature: a) training of the subject field and terminology; b) training of the mental substructure such as memory training, comprehension and anticipation; c) and training of interpreting skills. Thus, the student interpreter is expected to have developed in advance efficient learning approaches and effective study habits to get ready for interpreting. In this study, their learning approaches and study habits will be evaluated in accordance with the final grades they received from the conference interpreting course.

Learning approaches and study habits have long been the concern of educationalists, but they became much more popular when the active learning principle came into being. As Beatty (2004:5) states, active learning helps develop much more solid, integrated, useful understanding of concepts and their interrelationships and applicability. In addition, Beatty underscores the importance of understanding rather than recall, reasoning rather than answers. Following the studies explicating what active learning is, inventories were developed to measure how much the students were involved in active learning. Approaches and Study Skills Inventory for Students (ASSIST) (Tait, Entwistle & McCune, 1998) is one of those inventories. Concepts of deep and surface approaches to learning, used in this inventory, have been adopted by the educationalists. Later, another concept was

introduced as “strategic approach to learning,” which has also been included in this inventory (see Entwistle, 1991, p. 201).

The deep approach includes the intention to understand, critically evaluate the topic, conceptually organize, compare and contrast (Entwistle and Waterston, 1988), be intrinsically motivated and interested in the content of the task, and propose new ideas to previous knowledge and concepts relating to everyday experiences (Chin & Brown, 2000, p. 130). Also involved in the deep approach is students’ tendency to search and discover their inner selves while learning and developing new ideas. This includes metacognitively possessing self-regulation in their own learning, which is already an aspect of inner experience (Aharony, 2006). Case and Gunstone (2003, p. 55) state that the students choosing deep-approach have the intention of understanding; thus, they have more sophisticated learning outcomes compared to surface learners.

In the surface approach, students focus on memorizing the main elements to avoid failure during interpreting and to minimize the burden of information. According to Entwistle and Waterston, students chase disorganized study habits, and there is the intention to reproduce information in compliance with externally imposed task demands (1998, p. 259). As Ramsden (2003) stated, “surface approaches have nothing to do with wisdom and everything to do with aimless accumulation of knowledge. They belong to an artificial world of learning, where faithfully reproducing fragments of torpid knowledge to please teachers and pass examinations has replaced understanding” (p. 59). This approach includes rote learning the selected content without understanding it (Biggs, 1993, p. 6), extrinsic or instrumental motivation, memorization of discrete facts, reproduction of terms and procedures through rote learning, and processing a task in isolation from other tasks and real life (Chin & Brown, 2000, p. 112). In addition, Aharony (2006) states that in surface learning, there is almost no use of meta-cognitive skills. This is understandable, because metacognition refers to developing cognition over cognition (i.e., thinking about thinking), which is a high-level cognitive process and requires special training to be developed (Doğan, Arumi & Mora-Rubio, 2009, p. 70). It is generally seen that fear of failure is an important factor in choosing the surface approach (Maya, Shreemathi, Krishna & Ramnarayan, 2004, p. 2), an observation that is important for the students of interpreting. Their self-reports show that they have more fear of failure in their booth performance than their class performance.

It is also observed that students who adopt deep-approach learning may also prefer surface learning at a particular time in their learning process and vice versa. Therefore, rather than claiming a dichotomy approach, Aharony (2006) claims a dynamic approach where students can move from deep into surface learning and vice versa. This approach is also called *strategic approach* by Ramsden (2003). Students in strategic approach seek to maximize their grades by strategic management of their time and intellectual resources in line with the perceived criteria for high grades (Entwistle & Waterston, 1998, p. 259). It is the observation of the author of this article that sometimes the students who target the highest grades study in such a way that it

helps them achieve their goals, so they resort to both deep approach and surface approach, which is defined as the strategic approach.

Conceptual mapping of components of ASSIST illustrates that deep approach encompasses the intention to seek meaning for oneself and the interest in ideas. The person develops understanding by relating ideas if s/he governs a holistic approach, or prefers using evidence if s/he governs a serialist one. For a surface approach, the sublevels can be as follows: Intention to cope minimally with course requirements, syllabus-bound focus on minimum requirements, fear of forgetting and routine memorising. A strategic approach, on the other hand, encompasses the following: Intention to achieve the highest possible grades, alertness to studying and monitoring studying, time management and organized studying (Entwistle, 1997).

Table 1 below demonstrates the approaches of students to studying and their use of a computer respectively. Three learning approaches are analyzed with respect to two parameters, namely "intention" and "study habits." It is seen that intention and study habits differ from one approach to another.

Table 1  
*Approaches to Studying and Students' Use of a Computer (Foster and Lin, 2007)*

	<i>Deep</i>	<i>Surface</i>	<i>Strategic</i>
<i>Intention</i>	To understand	To complete task	To obtain highest possible grades
<i>Study habits</i>	To process the educational content for its meaning: - engaging in vigorous interaction with content - relating new ideas to previous knowledge - relating concepts to everyday experience - relating evidence to conclusions - examining the logic of the argument	To process the educational content at an informational level: - focusing on requirements - memorizing information needed for assessments - failing to distinguish principles from examples - treating a task as an external imposition - focusing on discrete elements without integration - failing to reflect on purpose or strategies	To process the educational content for the purposes of maximizing reward: - focusing on maximizing grades - organizing time and distributing effort to the greatest effect - ensuring conditions and materials for studying appropriately - using previous exam papers to predict questions - being alert to cues about marking schemes

Multidimensional and multidisciplinary training and the cognitive requirements of interpreting help students develop certain study skills and adopt certain learning approaches. The three learning approaches mentioned above, namely surface, deep and strategic approaches, are under question in this study. Thus, *the purpose of this study* is to find the learning approaches and study skills of the interpreting students, and determine if there is a correlation between the learning approaches and study skills of the students and their final grades.

#### *Problem Statement*

There is a correlation between the final grades of conference-interpreting students and their study habits and learning approaches, namely surface, deep and strategic approaches.

### *Research Questions*

1. Which approach and study skills do the conference-interpreting students prefer in their learning?
2. Is there a correlation between the deep-learning approach and study skills and the school grades of the conference-interpreting students?
3. Is there a correlation between the surface-learning approach and study skills and the school grades of the conference-interpreting students?
4. Is there a correlation between the strategic-learning approach and study skills and the school grades of the conference-interpreting students?

## **Method**

### *Sample*

The sample of the study are the thirty-three, final-semester conference-interpreting students of a four-academic-year translation and interpreting education. Thirty-seven of them are from the English Department, whereas three of them are from the French Department, attending the English class. The ones from the French Department are the students of a double-language diploma, taking courses in both languages, French and English. These three students responded to the questionnaire in consideration of the English Department but also adding notes at the sides of the pages in consideration of the French section as well. The population are final-year interpreting students.

### *Research Instruments*

1. A 5-point Likert Questionnaire, ASSIST, investigating the students' study habits is administered to the final-level students. ASSIST is adapted to the Turkish language by Prof. Dr. Senemoğlu (Hacettepe University Dept. of Educational Sciences). As stated in Senemoğlu (2009), during the adaptation process, first the inventory was translated from English into Turkish by five persons; then a translator with excellent command of both languages back-translated the Turkish version into English. Then both versions were checked again in terms of compatibility. Later, both versions were administered twice to the same group after a 15-day interval. The participants were the students of the English Language and Literature Departments in Turkey.

The correlation coefficient between the English and Turkish versions was .82, which roughly indicates that there is a high compatibility between the English and Turkish versions.

2. The interpreting scores of the students: These scores include two interpreting midterm exam scores, one term-paper, and class performance and participation scores.

*Procedure*

1. The whole class of students who have just completed their undergraduate study are chosen as the subjects of the study.
2. Their final grades are calculated. These grades include the midterm grades, term paper and class presentation grades, so the result is a summative score.
3. By email, ASSIST is sent to all the subjects.
4. Responses to ASSIST are collected in Excel format.
5. Below-mentioned data analysis methods are used to find the answers to the research questions.

*Data Analysis Methods*

Frequencies, percentages, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient are the data analysis methods facilitated in this study. T-test is also used to see if the difference between the approaches is significant. As one of the approaches was chosen by only a few students, correlation is not applied to that one. The SPSS program is used to carry out the analyses.

**Findings and Results**

Below are the findings of the analyses carried out. The students of interpreting who were in their final semester were tested with respect to their final grades, learning approaches and study habits. The below table demonstrates the group frequency and percentage.

Table 2

*Group Frequency and Percentages*

Learning Approach	Frequency	Percentage
Deep	13	39,4
Surface	3	9,1
Strategic	17	51,5
Total	33	100,0

Table 2. shows that 39.4% of the students ( $f=13$ ) make use of deep approach learning, 9.1% of the students ( $f=3$ ) surface approach, and 51.5% of the students ( $f=17$ ) strategic approach. Therefore, the answer to research question one is that the strategic approach is most often used by the students, followed by the deep approach. Very few students prefer only the surface approach. At this point, it is important to note that the strategic approach is comprised of both the surface approach and the deep approach. Thus, we can say that the students are using both the surface and deep approach as they deem fit.

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics of Final Grades Regarding Learning Approaches*

Learning Approach	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Deep	13	84.85	9.05
Surface	3	81.00	2.65
Strategic	17	85.41	8.76
Total	33	84.79	8.43

Table 3 shows that the mean score of the 13 students who facilitate the deep approach is 84.85 with a standard deviation of 9.05; the mean score of 17 students who facilitate the strategic approach is 84.41 with a standard deviation of 8.76; finally, the mean score of the three students who facilitate the surface approach is 81 with a standard deviation of 2.65. It appears that the surface approach group is more homogeneous, but this can be considered misleading, as  $f=3$ , perhaps due to the fact that  $n=33$ . The deep-approach group is a heterogeneous one, followed by the strategic-approach group.

Table 4

*Correlations Between Final Grades And Learning Approaches*

Learning Approach	Correlation
Deep	0.36*
Strategic	0.24

\* $p < 0.05$

Table 4 demonstrates that there is a high correlation between the scores of the students facilitating the deep-learning approach and their final grades. The correlation between the final grades and the strategic-learning approaches are not found significant. Since  $n$  for the surface approach users is found to be very few, instead of variance analysis, it is decided that a t-test will be administered with two approaches, namely the deep and the strategic approaches, to determine if there is any significant difference among the final grades of the students when comparing the deep and strategic learning styles. The results of the t-test demonstrate that there is no significant difference ( $t=0,12$ ;  $p > 0,05$ ). The type of the learning approach does not have an effect on the final grade.

## Discussion

The results of the analysis demonstrate that the most preferred approach is the strategic approach. The students who claim to be concerned with achieving the highest possible grades prefer to use the strategic approach. It should be noted that the students choosing the strategic approach use both deep and surface approaches

as they deem appropriate. In choosing the strategic approach, the major intention is to achieve the highest grades possible by adopting organized study methods and time-management, which is very important for interpreting students. Interpreting by nature is a task in which the interpreter has an ongoing struggle with time, both cognitively and in practice. Cognitively, the simultaneity, incrementality and immediacy of the input create hardships for the interpreter. In practice, there is hardship both before and after the interpreting process. Before the interpreting process, the interpreter is usually not given adequate time to get ready for the process, and there is usually a bulk of information to be studied. During the interpreting process, there is again time constraint to catch up with the speaker and to manage cognitive systems such as memory, comprehension, prosody, and anticipation, which should all be considered simultaneously most of the time. Therefore, time-management is a task that the interpreter should be competent to accomplish.

As we can see from the results of this analysis, the second approach that received a high score is the deep approach. It is interesting that the scores of the students adopting the deep approach have a high correlation with their final grades. This is very understandable in that these students mostly give importance to comprehending what they have read. They try their best to grasp what is told in the content. They have a bulk of information to get through, and these students relate the information they see to different resources, they focus on the concepts and their relations, and they process the information in their minds, trying to see the logic of it and the argument in it. Interpreting is a practice-bound profession in which the interpreter perform the task in real time, receiving feedback from the audience members or the speakers immediately; thus, the students are usually aware of the importance of enriching themselves cognitively and being competent in the delivery.

Within the context of study habits, a comparative study by Dogan and Kafadar (1998) on interpreting, psychology and medical students was conducted according to two parameters: strategy and non-strategy. In the first trial, the students in all the three groups were asked to use a mnemonic strategy to keep given items in their short term memory. In the second trial, the three groups were asked not to use any mnemonic strategy to keep the items in their memory. The aim of the study was to see if the students of the three departments could use mnemonic strategies to keep the items in their short-term memory. The results demonstrated that the medical students could use mnemonic strategies when they were asked to do so and could abandon using mnemonic strategies when requested. Considering the responses given in the interviews following the tests, it is possible to claim that this is due to their study habits, because they usually have a bulk of information to memorize, and to save time in study, they use mnemonics when memorizing. The case was different with psychology students. They do not encounter that much information to memorize. They usually do practice work, so they do not need to develop such a strategy. They could not use strategy when they were asked to do so. It was totally different with the interpreting students. They could use strategy when they were asked to do so; however, when they were asked not to, they could not help using it, because they were so much used to using strategies to process input information in a

very short while (Dogan & Kafadar, 1998). It is possible to infer that the nature of the discipline, the study habits of the students, their cognitive structuring, memory usage and learning approaches are all interrelated.

Interpreters make use of a wide range of materials from introductory leaflets, manual instructions from the internet, encyclopedias, newspapers, and oral and written speech texts and power point texts. Especially an efficient use of the internet is very important to process needed information in a very short time. Even name tags or any bit of information on the label of an object can be a source of information for the interpreter. The interpreter makes use of all sorts of resources that will help in information gathering. What is interesting about the students of interpreting is that they do not search for information just because the teacher asks them to do so but out of their own curiosity and need for success in the booth. They know experientially that if they miss a piece of information, they will not be able to perform well in the interpreting process; thus, the interpreting process itself is a source of motivation for the students. They need to search for different aspects of a subject matter to get an overall picture, and they need to learn the related terminology. They are well aware that even the terms to which they attribute minor importance may become very important during the interpreting process. Therefore, this triggers their curiosity and motivation to learn. Most of the time, they encounter the terminology and knowledge about the subject matter repeatedly, which causes them to transfer it to their personal repository. In this way, they can even establish a knowledge network of that particular information in relation to other relevant subject matters. This is what Biggs (1993, p. 6) called "personal commitment" to the learning process.

A surface approach is seen in very few students, as the students have preferred either a deep approach or a strategic approach. A deep approach shows a high correlation with final grades, which encompasses their performances in the classroom and in the exams and class presentation. Instead of a surface approach, some have chosen a strategic approach, which is a combination of deep and surface approaches. These students behave according to what seems appropriate.

As mentioned above, interpreters are curious people with the feeling of responsibility and self-control, so they should be open to newcoming information every time. It is sometimes the case that in this profession, interpreters are exposed to a very large amount of information in a very short span of time, so they may sometimes not be able to find time to go into in-depth questions; they sometimes do not care about the topic in its entirety but only concentrate on what they need. For terminology usage and for subject-field comprehension, they may rely on their rote learning, as they are exposed to a great amount of information both during interpreting and even shortly before interpreting; it is important they not forget after the interpreting process is completed what they have learnt. Thus, a face-saving surface approach may also be valid for interpreters in addition to the deep approach.

As far as interpreting is concerned, we can exchange high grades with high performance. Interestingly, the students of interpreting are usually not after what grade they got, but how well they performed mainly due to the fact that their performance is witnessed by the other students and the teacher. Therefore, it is a

matter of embarrassment for the interpreting student if the performance is not satisfactory. Yet, naturally, at the end of their performance, the students are given grades, but the effect of grades on the student remains secondary to that of a satisfactory performance. This may also arise from the fact that the stress of the booth performance in interpreting surmounts all the other stress factors. The fact that no correlation exists between their final grades and their choice of a strategic approach demonstrates the situation well enough. Students get ready for the performance in whatever way they can to ensure they do well in the booth. They try to achieve the highest performance level (i.e., the grade), which is why they make use of time and materials in the best way possible. Accordingly, they make effective use of the teacher's criticism on their performances, and they are alert about critical issues that will help them perform better. However, they both study deeply and treat the subject matter like a student who has the choice of a surface approach. Perhaps this is the underlying reason why there was no correlation between the final grades and the strategic approach in this case study.

In his Mastery Learning Model, Bloom (1971) underscores the importance of three variables affecting the teaching and learning processes, and finally the success of the student: a. Cognitive entry behaviours, b. Quality of the education, and c. Motivation. Cognitive entry behaviours refer to the critical behaviours that act as a manifestation of the expected knowledge level that is brought into the educational environment. Quality of the education refers to all the facilities, staff and equipment and curriculum provided by the institution. Finally, motivation is the student's preparedness and willingness to receive all that is provided. As can be inferred from this classification, the school is expected to provide some sort of service and equipment, the student is expected to be eager to facilitate the use of it and acquire some knowledge and skills, which will be the entry behaviours of the next grade. Biggs, in supportive of these variables, states that students' motivation and the strategies they adopt during the education process correlatively affects the type of learning approach they prefer (Biggs, 1993, p. 16).

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

Analysis of the results demonstrates that there is a significant correlation between the final grades of the students and the students adopting a deep-learning approach; no correlation is found with the mostly preferred approach, the strategic one. The students who got high scores from the deep approach have high final grades; however, the scores of the ones who have chosen surface and strategic approaches have not been affected by their choices. Most of the students have preferred the strategic approach (51.5%) and a bit fewer than them have used the deep approach (39.4%), while only a few have chosen the surface approach (9.1%). This means that most students applied the principles of the deep approach, because even the strategic approach includes the deep approach. Thus, the result is the sum of these two approaches.

It is necessary to note that conference-interpreting students need to use all three sorts of learning approaches depending on their goal. If they are to get ready for a

new topic in a short while, they can proceed with a surface approach, which enables them to practise rote learning without needing much time and to minimize the burden of new information. As mentioned above, the fear factor is important in choosing the surface approach. Even though surface learning is not a preferred and recommended style in education, it can sometimes be advantageous in interpreting conditions when time is very short to process the bulk of information. In this case, it is recommended that only expert interpreters undertake the deal, not the novice interpreters, because expert interpreters may transfer their skills to process new information and use their background knowledge to overcome the challenges of a new situation. On the other hand, the deep approach is also very important, because it requires personal commitment to the learning process. The students develop understanding as to the importance of having a large-scale repository of information and terminology, besides the professional interpreters. They do not refrain from undertaking research and keeping glossaries to make their task easier for the future. In time, they start to enjoy to learn new topics in detail and expand their vocabularies. Finally, the strategic approach encompasses not only the features of the surface approach but also those of the deep approach, which means that the students resort to whatever approach they need during the whole interpreting process.

It is recommended that the inventory be administered to a larger group comprised of both professionals and students in order to determine the difference between them. Another self-report inventory may be coupled with ASSIST to receive more information about the subjects' preferences. In addition, ASSIST is developed according to a general-student profile, so all the related literature refers to the studentwise mindset; yet, the literature on interpreting shows that novice interpreting students and expert interpreters are different from the students of other fields due to their information processing. For this reason, profession-based instruments can be developed to make more precise assessments concerning the competence and performance levels of both novice and expert interpreters.

## References

- Aharony, N. (2006). The use of deep and surface learning strategies among students learning English as a foreign language in an Internet environment. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. The British Psychological Society, 76, 851-866.
- Beatty, I. (2004). Transforming student learning with classroom communication systems. Retrieved Aug. 12 2004, from *EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research* <http://www.educause.edu/LibraryDetailPage/666?ID=ERB0403>.
- Biggs, J. (1993). What do inventories of students' learning-process really measure? A theoretical review and clarification. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 63, 3-19.

- Bloom, B.S., Hastings J.T. & Madaus, G.F. (Eds.). (1971). *Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning*. New York:McGraw Hill.
- Case, J. & Gunstone, R. (2002). Metacognitive development as a shift in approach to learning: An in-depth study. *Studies in Higher Education*, Carfax Publ. Co., 27(4).
- Case, J. & Gunstone, R. (2003). Going deeper than deep and surface approaches: a study of students' perceptions of time. *Teaching in Higher Education*. Carfax Publ. Co., 8(1).
- Chin, C. & Brown, D.E. (2000). Learning in science: A comparison of deep and surface approaches. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 37(2), 109-138.
- Dogan, A., Arumi, R. M. & Mora-Rubio, B. (June 2009). Metacognitive Tools in Interpreting Training: A Pilot Study. *Journal of Faculty of Letters*.Vol. 26, Number: 1, 69-84
- Dogan, A. & Kafadar, H. (1998). Mütercim Tercümanlık Bölümü öğrencilerinin kısa süreli bellek düzeyleri [Short term memory levels of the students of Translation and Interpretation Department]. *Çeviribilim ve Uygulamaları [Journal of Translation Studies]*. Ankara: Bizim Büro, 197-207.
- Entwistle, N. J. (1991). Approaches to learning and perception of the learning environment. *Higher Education*. Nederlands:Kluwer Academic Publishers, 22, 201-204.
- Entwistle, N. J. (1997). *The approaches and study skills inventory for students (ASSIST)*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburg Center for Research on Learning and Instruction.
- Entwistle, N. J. & Waterston, S. (1998). Approaches to studying and levels of processing in university students. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 58, 258-265.
- Foster, J. & Lin, A. (2007). Approaches to studying and students' use of a computer supported learning environment. *Education for Information*. IOS Pres.,25, 155-168.
- Martyn, M. (2007). Clickers in the class-room: An active learning approach. *Educause Quarterly*, 2.
- Maya, S.S., R., Krishna, A. & Ramnarayan, K. (2004). Learning approaches, learning difficulties and academic performance of undergraduate students of physiotherapy. *The Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice (IAHSP)*, 2(4).

- Prosser, M. & Trigwell, K. (2006). Confirmatory factor analysis of the approaches to teaching inventory. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. The British Psychological Society, 76, 405-419.
- Ramsden, P. (2003). Learning to teach in higher education. In T.F.N. Laird, R. Shoup, G.D. Kuh, M.J. Schwarz. Effects of discipline on deep approach to student learning and college outcomes. *Researches in Higher Education*, 49, pp.469-494). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Senemoğlu, N. (2009). College of education students' approaches to learning and study skills (*in process*).
- Tait, H., Entwistle, N. J, & McCune, V. (1998). ASSIST: A re-conceptualization of the approaches to studying inventory. In C. Rust (Ed.), *Improving students as learners* (pp.262-271). Oxford: Oxford Brooks University.

### **Konferans Çevirmenliği Öğrencilerinde Öğrenme Yaklaşımları ve Çalışma Alışkanlıkları (Özet)**

*Problem Durumu:* Konferans çevirmenliği birbirinden farklı dil ve kültüre sahip insanlar arasında, büyük bir yer çeşitliliği ve konu değişkenliği unsurlarının etkisi altında gerçekleştirilen bir iletişim aracılığı hizmetidir. İnsan çeşitliliği konuşmacıların yanı sıra, organizasyon komitesi, izleyiciler, basın görevlileri gibi çok geniş bir yelpazedeki çeşitliliği kapsar. Herbirinin ayrı telaffuzu, kişiye özel söylem biçimi ve üslubu vardır. Buna ek olarak, çevirmenin karşısına çıkan konular da çok çeşitlidir. İnsanoğlunun aklına gelip de konferans konusu olmuş her konu çevirmenin çevireceği metin kapsamına girer. Bu değişkenliğe hazır olmak ve çeviride başarılı olmak çevirmenin önceden bilişsel altyapısını kuvvetli kurmasıyla mümkündür. Bu noktada çalışma alışkanlıkları ve öğrenme yaklaşımları devreye girer. ASSIST-Öğrenciler için Yaklaşımlar ve Çalışma Alışkanlıkları Envanteri öğrenme yaklaşımları ve çalışma alışkanlıklarını ölçen bir envanterdir. Derin, yüzeysel ve stratejik yaklaşımlar bu envantere yerini almıştır. Konferans çevirmenleri çok kısa bir süre içinde bilgilenebilmek için birçok kaynaktan yararlanırlar. Konferans çevirmeni bilir ki, önemsiz gözükken en küçük bilgi birimi bile çeviri sürecinde çok önemli bir şeydir. Bu kaygı durumu onun hem merakını hem de hazırbulunuşluk düzeyini canlı tutar. Bu tür bir öğrenme süreci kişinin kendini bilgiye adanması olarak tarif edilmektedir. Bu yaklaşıma derin yaklaşım denir. Derin yaklaşımda, kişi okuduğunu gördüğünü anlama niyetindedir, konunun kavramsal örgütlenmesi, bilginin kıyaslanması ve

karşılaştırılması, genişlemesine okunması, değişik kaynakların birbiri ile birleştirmesi, fikirlerin başkalarıyla tartışılması, bilginin daha geniş bilgi bütünüyle bağlantısının kurulması önemlidir. Derin yaklaşımla öğrenmenin yanı sıra, öğrencilerde gözlemlenen yüzeysel yaklaşımla öğrenme de vardır. Çevirmenler için kimi zaman durum şudur ki, aniden büyük miktarda bilgiye maruz kalırlar ve çok kısa bir süre içinde hazır olmak zorunda olduklarından derinlemesine çalışmaya, konuyu kendi bütünlüğü içinde değerlendirmeye vakitleri olmayabilir, sadece kendi işlerine yarayacak bölümüne konsantre olurlar. Terminoloji ve konu alanı açısından belleklerine güvenirler ama çeviri süreci bittiğinde bu öğrendiklerini tamamıyla unutabilirler. Bu durum özellikle tecrübesiz çevirmenlerde görülür. Bunun yanı sıra, derin yaklaşımı benimseyen öğrenciler kimi zaman yüzeysel yaklaşımı da tercih ediyor olabilirler. İkisinin birlikte kullanıldığı yaklaşıma stratejik yaklaşım adı verilir. Bu yaklaşımda öğrenciler notlarını yükseltmek ve zamanlarını ve entellektüel kaynaklarını stratejik olarak yönetebilmek için kimi zaman derin kimi zaman da yüzeysel yaklaşımı benimserler.

*Araştırmanın Amacı:* Bu araştırmanın amacı mütercim tercümanlık öğrencilerinin öğrenme yaklaşımlarını ve çalışma alışkanlıklarını belirlemektir. Bu amaçla aşağıdaki sorulara yanıt aranmıştır:

1. Konferans çevirmenliği öğrencileri öğrenmelerinde hangi yaklaşımı benimsemektedirler?
2. Öğrencilerin final sonuçlarıyla derin öğrenme yaklaşımları arasında bir ilişki var mıdır?
3. Öğrencilerin final sonuçlarıyla yüzeysel öğrenme yaklaşımları arasında bir ilişki var mıdır?
4. Öğrencilerin final sonuçlarıyla stratejik öğrenme yaklaşımları arasında bir ilişki var mıdır?

*Araştırmanın Yöntemi:* Araştırmada betimsel yöntem kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemini Mütercim Tercümanlık son sınıfını henüz bitirmiş olan 33 öğrencidir. Bunların 3 tanesi Fransızca Bölümünden katılıp derslere İngilizce devam etmiştir. Evren Mütercim Tercümanlık Bölümü son sınıf öğrencileridir. Araştırmada a. Öğrencilerin çalışma alışkanlıklarını ve öğrenme yaklaşımlarını test etmek üzere 5-li dereceleme ölçeği olan ve Türkçe'ye adaptasyonu Prof. Dr. Nuray Senemoğlu tarafından yapılan ASSIST ölçeği kullanılmıştır. b. Ayrıca öğrencilerin final geçme puanları kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada işlem şöyle yürütülmüştür: a. Son sınıftan mezun olmuş öğrenciler bu çalışmanın denekleri olarak seçilmişlerdir. b. Geçme notları hesaplanmıştır; geçme notları, iki vize, sınıfa katılım ve sınıf içinde performans

ve dönem ödevi notlarının ortalamasından oluşmaktadır. c. ASSIST bu öğrencilere eposta yoluyla ulaştırılmıştır. d. Yanıtlar Excel formatında istenmiştir. e. Aşağıdaki çözümleme teknikleri kullanılarak veriler çözümlenmiştir. Verilerin çözümlenmesinde, SPSS programından yararlanılarak ortalama, standart sapma, frekans, yüzdelik Pearson Çarpım Momentler Korelasyon Katsayısı gibi teknikler kullanılmıştır..

*Araştırmanın Bulguları:* Tablo 2.'ye göre öğrencilerin %39,4 derin yaklaşım kullanmış, %9,1'i yüzeysel yaklaşımı tercih etmiş, ve %51,5'u stratejik yaklaşımı tercih etmiştir. Sonuçlar göstermektedir ki, öğrencilerin yarısından biraz fazlası stratejik yaklaşımı, yarısına yakını derin yaklaşımı, sadece birkaç tanesi yüzeysel yaklaşımı benimsemektedirler. Tablo 3'e göre derin yaklaşımı benimseyen öğrencilerin ortalaması 84,85; standart sapması 9,05'dur; stratejik yaklaşımı benimseyen öğrencilerin ortalaması 84,41; standart sapması 8,76; ve son olarak yüzeysel yaklaşımı benimseyen ortalaması 81; standart sapması da 2,65'dir. Tablo 4'e göre derin yaklaşımla öğrenen öğrencilerle onların final puanları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki saptanmıştır. Final puanları ile stratejik yaklaşım arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmamıştır. Sadece yüzeysel yaklaşımı tercih eden öğrencilerin sayısı çok az olduğu için korelasyon çalışmasına katılmamışlardır. Derin yaklaşım ile stratejik yaklaşımın t testi ile sınanmış ve öğrencilerin final puanları ile öğrenme yaklaşımları arasında anlamlı bir fark çıkmamıştır ( $t=0,12$ ;  $p>0,05$ ). Öğrenme yaklaşımı türünün hangisi olduğu öğrencinin final puanları üzerinde herhangi bir etkiye sahip değildir. Yani, öğrenme yaklaşımı ne olursa olsun final sonuçları bundan etkilenmeyecektir.

*Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Öneriler:* Analiz sonuçları öğrencilerin final notlarıyla, derin öğrenme yaklaşımını benimseyen öğrenciler arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olduğunu göstermiştir. En çok tercih edilen yaklaşım olan stratejik yaklaşım ve en az tercih edilen yaklaşım olan yüzeysel yaklaşım ile final notları arasında hiçbir ilişki bulunamamıştır. Derin yaklaşımdan yüksek puanlar alan öğrencilerin final notları da yüksektir ancak yüzeysel yaklaşımı ve stratejik yaklaşımı benimseyen öğrencilerin notları, öğrencilerin söz konusu seçimlerinden etkilenmemiştir. Öğrencilerin çoğu stratejik yaklaşımı, daha azı ise derin yaklaşımı benimserken; yalnızca çok küçük bir kısım yüzeysel yaklaşımı tercih etmiştir. Bu durum, öğrencilerin derin yaklaşım ilkelerini diğerlerine oranla daha çok uygulayabildiğini gösterir ki, zaten stratejik yaklaşımın içinde derin yaklaşım da bulunmaktadır. Yüzeysel yaklaşımın düşük frakansta olması bu yaklaşımın tek başına tercih edilmediğini gösterir; yoksa, stratejik yaklaşım grubu hem derin hem de yüzeysel yaklaşımı gereksinimlerine göre birlikte kullanabilen grubu temsil etmektedir. Envanterin, profesyonel ve öğrenci olmak üzere iki ayrı gruba da uygulanarak

aradaki farka bakılması önerilir. Buna ek olarak, ASSIST'in yanı sıra daha fazla bilgi vermesi amacıyla geliştirilecek bir başka kendini anlatım ölçeği ek olarak verilmeli. ASSIST'le ilgili yazın okunduğunda dil tamamıyla genel öğrenci mantığını ortaya koymaktadır; ancak, kanımca gerek öğrenci gerekse profesyonel olsun konferans çevirmenleri, bilgi işleme özelliklerinden ötürü diğer öğrencilerden daha farklılar, yapılacak çalışmalarda bu özelliğin gözetilmesi ve onların durumunu daha net ortaya koyacak araçlar geliştirilmesi önerilir.

*Anahtar Sözcükler:* konferans çevirmenliği; derinlemesine öğrenme yaklaşımı; stratejik öğrenme yaklaşımı; yüzeysel öğrenme yaklaşımı; ASSIS