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1. Introduction

Distance education is a growing phenomenon in Swedish universities and university colleges. The Swedish Agency for Networks and Cooperation in Higher Education recently presented a report (4:2007) with findings that the number of full-time students studying via distance education in Sweden has increased dramatically in the last three years. In one year alone, from 2005 to 2006, 1000 more students chose to study distance courses at Swedish higher education institutions. According to even more recent reports (Universitetsläraren 8/2008:20), 25% of all students in higher education now study by distance; and at two institutions, 70% of the students choose distance studies. Currently, approximately 89,000 students in Sweden are studying by distance.

With the rapidly rising numbers of distance students in Sweden, the question is what new demands these distance students might have and how—and if—these online courses are meeting the demands. As seen above, the increases have been dramatic in a short period of time, meaning that it has been difficult to gauge the distance students’ performance in any formal sense as there have not been substantial numbers of students in higher education in Sweden previously, meaning that longitudinal studies have not been possible up to now. Now when the numbers of distance students are stable enough, and even rising, it is possible to consider the long-term effects of distance education both for the student and for the higher education institutions and thus attempt to find patterns in this area of education. These studies can start on the course level.

One distance course being offered at a university college in Sweden is included on a G1 Entry Level course, Language Structure, a 7.5 ECTS credit course taught at Högskolan Dalarna (HDa) (note that “G1” refers to the entry level courses studied during the first or sometimes the second term of a subject). Consistent with national trends, at this university college, the percentage of students choosing to study distance courses has increased, more specifically from only 4% in 2003 to 22% in 2006, which in number of students translates to
an increase from 218 full-time students to 1188 within three years (Forsberg, 2007:47). While less than a fourth of all students at HDa choose distance, the percentage of language students is actually much higher. For example, two thirds of the students who applied to study English at the G1 Entry Level at HDa for the Spring 2008 term chose to study by distance (according to the department course administrator in October of 2007). In the Autumn term of 2007, the Language Structure course, a proficiency course, consisted of two modules: grammar and translation. This particular study will focus on this distance course in comparison to the parallel campus course. Focusing on the Language Structure course as one example of a distance course, a review of final exam results reveals that of all the students who have taken the course since it was offered as a distance course (3 terms, from Autumn 2006 to Autumn 2007), a higher percentage of distance students than campus students have passed the final exams in grammar and translation; and a higher percentage of passing distance students than campus students have earned a VG (pass with distinction grade) on those exams. The table below shows the compiled results from the first two terms.

**Table 1: Results from previous terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autumn 2006</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>7 = 35%</td>
<td>5 = 25%</td>
<td>8 = 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>5 = 56%</td>
<td>3 = 33%</td>
<td>1 = 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2007</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>6 = 35%</td>
<td>7 = 41%</td>
<td>4 = 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>11 = 46%</td>
<td>7 = 29%</td>
<td>6 = 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This would seem to indicate that not only are the distance students managing their studies, but they may be managing them better than the campus students, although this is only an observation at this point.

Two possible reasons exist to explain this difference: one is that the distance students start out as better students with higher levels of proficiency skills and the other is that the distance teaching methods result in greater levels of improvement among students. In order to investigate the differences between campus and distance groups, the results for each group from the Autumn 2007 Language Structure course translation module were compared. The aim of this essay is to determine if students do improve their English proficiency when they participate in an online translation course and if this improvement can be measured as greater than the improvement of the students who take the same course as a campus course. In order to achieve this aim, the role of translation in proficiency courses is examined and the distance learning environment is investigated.

2. Background

2.1 Translation in proficiency teaching

A survey of the course content for the general English entry level courses offered by each of the 14 state universities and 22 state university colleges in Sweden, as presented in Appendix 1, reveals that translation is currently a part of most first level English language courses. (Course information accessed from the 36 individual websites on 07.11.28.) Three independent postgraduate programs and nine independent higher education institutions offering specialized programs were not included in this survey. The courses considered for this survey were the general English courses; and specialized courses, such as English for teachers and English for Special Purposes, were not included.

Of the 22 English fulltime courses offered, 15 (68%) of them include translation. However, only two of the translation courses are considered to be separate modules within a
course and then for only 2.5 or 3 credits (approximately 10% of the entire course). The other courses include it in the general English course with no separate credits given for translation work. The majority of the translation work is done in connection with studies in grammar (nine of the courses), general writing (two courses), or vocabulary and oral proficiency (two courses). Although translation is still being used in proficiency courses, the amount of actual translation work for the students is unclear from the syllabi provided on the websites as is the direction of translation exercises (that is, are the students translating to or from English?).

Seven of the entry-level English courses, or 32%, do not include translation at all, according to their syllabi. Despite this, the majority of beginner English students at Swedish universities will be expected to translate as part of their proficiency training. Two universities that do include translation as part of the general course also offer it as a separate, single subject course for 7.5 credits.

This inclusion of translation with proficiency courses is not new. Translation has traditionally been included in second language learning with the Grammar-Translation method, which involves learning vocabulary as well as grammar rules and has its emphasis on written language (Yule 1993: 152-3). The method existed as far back as the 1700’s with the study of classical languages, but continued as the favoured method when modern second language teaching became more common (Tornberg 2000: 27). While many might now claim the method to be outdated and newer methods based on communicative approaches, with a focus on relevant functions of language and a greater acceptance of language errors, are often advocated (Yule 1993: 154), translation, which includes translating a text and then having it marked for errors/mistakes, is nonetheless still being used in many second language learning environments, as seen above. Indeed, while some theorists reject Explicit Formal Instruction—meaning grammar and subsequently translation teaching—as undesirable and perhaps even harmful for second-language learners (SLL), others claim that learners who do receive explicit correction in writing and grammar tasks do indeed perform better than their
learner peers who do not (James 1998: 243-244). Furthermore, Fathman and Whalley (1990 in James 1998: 246) propose six arguments for the rightful place of correction in language teaching:

1) Grammar correction does lead to improved texts.

2) Second-language learners want grammar correction.

3) Correction is not detrimental to learning (i.e. does not cause anxiety or misunderstanding).

4) Correction especially benefits weaker learners who may not know how to self-correct.

5) Correction can be made at a level correlated to the level of seriousness of the error/mistake.

These views of the place of correction in language teaching are in line with translation exercises and marking in the course at Högskolan Dalarna, where correction is done at both the individual level and the whole class level. Whole class correction exercises are especially helpful for learners (Fathman and Whalley 1990, also in James 1998: 251). Learners’ errors/mistakes, as noted in translation exercises, can help a teacher both evaluate and plan teaching in four ways: they can indicate how difficult the task is for the learner, they can indicate whether or not learning is taking place, they can indicate what the individual learner’s interlanguage is, and they can indicate how the teacher should assess the student (Murray 2002: 188). The role of the third point here is considered key.

While second-language learners learn a new language through many different methods, some theorists claim that one aspect of their learning is the same: while learning the new language, they develop their own interlanguage (IL), which is described as “the half-way position between knowing and not knowing the target language (TL)” (James 1998: 3). Crystal further defines it as “the linguistic system created by someone in the course of learning a foreign language, different from either the speaker’s first language or the target language being acquired” (2003: 239). The interlanguage approach, which is linked to the Error Analysis approach to linguistics, involves a teacher analysing the learner’s output errors only in relation to the language he produces—not in relation to his/her first language (L1). Instead, how the
learner speaks or writes is analysed on its own right as his/her interlanguage and thus a picture of the learner’s current competence in the TL (James 1998: 3, 5, 7). SLL researchers find Error Analysis interesting for three reasons: “they tell the teacher what needs to be taught […], how learning proceeds, [and give the student an opportunity to] test their hypotheses about L2” (James 1998: 12). A more thorough analysis of SLL writing could be made if one were to practice performance analysis, and describe not only the errors and mistakes, but also the language that does follow the TL standards (Ellis 1994: 46). However, this present study will focus on how the learners deviate from the TL language when producing a written text and the resulting scores they earn on marked texts. “Scores they earn” refers to the number of points the students lose on a translated text for each error/mistake (See Appendix 2 for more details on the point system for marking translated texts for this course). Thus, the focus is on the final results of their new written text, analysed as their own interlanguage text and not how well they might write in the TL.

Translation exercises do provide writing exercise; and learners’ writing will likely contain errors and mistakes, as compared to the target language and how native speakers (NS) write it, allowing teachers an opportunity to examine deviations. The terms must first be defined: “Errors are assumed to reflect, in a systematic way, the level of competence achieved by a learner […] in contrast to] mistakes which are performance limitations that a learner would be able to correct” (Crystal 2003: 165). In other words, the SLL does not know what the correct TL form is when s/he produces an error, but a mistake could easily be corrected if the learner is made aware of it. Corder, a strong proponent of Error Analysis, further described the difference as errors being “failures in competence” while mistakes are “failures in performance” (1967,1971 in James 1998: 78). Furthermore, errors may be classified as one of the following: “errors of omission (where some element is missing), errors of addition (where some extraneous element is present), errors of selection (where the wrong item has been chosen), and errors of ordering (where the elements are in the wrong order)” (Murray
Language errors or mistakes were previously considered to be the results of learners not trying hard enough or learners not being subjected to enough language drills, but more recent research notes that that there is actually a pattern to the learner’s errors and mistakes (Mitchell 2004: 15). Second-language learners tend to go through a series of stages in their TL production and likewise their stages of errors/mistakes, causing theorists to claim the systematicity of language; although it should be noted that there is still variability, both for the individual learner’s language and between different learners (Mitchell: 16-17). (Note: For the purposes of this study, both the terms error and mistake will be used as it is not certain which of the two the participants in the study are making.)

In order to improve their second language, most learners need to practice producing that language by using their own interlanguage, as described above, either in writing or orally. Swain (1995:128 in Mitchell 2004:174) proposes with the Output hypothesis that learners benefit from practice in three ways:

- The ‘noticing/triggering function, or what might be referred to as the consciousness-raising role
- The hypothesis-testing function
- The metalinguistic function, or what might be referred to as its ‘reflective’ role

Based on this theory, one can argue that translation exercises offer an ideal opportunity for practicing the target language. Following the above points proposed by Swain, students first become aware of their own level of proficiency when faced with a text in their native tongue which will be translated into the target language (TL) Then they can try their own solutions for translating the text in their own words in the TL. Finally, they are able to analyse the text in light of their own interlanguage, as well as discuss the text and the various translation solutions with their classmates and the teacher. Thus, translation from the mother tongue (MT) into the TL can be included in second language teaching, as it is in Sweden; and, according to George (1972: 180 in James 1998: 13), translation is not as detrimental to language learning as one might expect since the Grammar-Translation method went out of fashion. Indeed, in line with
the Output hypothesis, translation exercises offer learner opportunities for “reflecting on the TL, noticing its features, and their degree of complexity and familiarity to the learner, […] and noticing and reflecting upon the relations between unknown TL features and their known MT near-equivalents” (James 1998: 13).

In writing exercises, second-language learners reflect on and notice features and differences when they must make grammatical choices in the target language, unlike with listening or reading exercises (Mitchell 2004: 21). Contrastive analysts would claim that the choices Swedish learners make when writing in English will contain certain, predictable errors/mistakes based on the Swedish language (Mitchell 2004: 38). However, most theorists reject this claim and Error Analysis theorists have shown the contrary to be true: learners’ errors/mistakes do not tend to mostly come from their first language (Mitchell 2004: 38). Instead, Error Analysis can be taken to the next level and one can view learner errors as part of their interlanguage. As mentioned above, researchers proposing the interlanguage theory claim that learners follow a certain system of stages of development in their learning and that this learning is dynamic (Mitchell 2004: 39) and not language specific.

However, language transfer, defined as “the influence of a person’s first language on the language being acquired” (Crystal 2003: 471), is unavoidable; and thus it is expected that Swedish learners of English will have some Swedish influence on their English language production. The significance of this transfer has been somewhat debated over the years, with behaviourist theorists considering the first language to be full of “bad habits” affecting the second language while the interlanguage theorists considered the role of the first language less important than the patterns of the interlanguage (Mitchell 2004: 19). Still, a few others have continued to advocate Contrastive Analysis, as mentioned above, in which all errors that could possibly be produced by a SLL are defined based on the SLL’s native tongue (James 1998: 4).

The conclusion here is that the views on error/mistakes may be the reason translation is still currently a part of entry level English language studies at most Swedish universities and
colleges, including the focus of this present study, Högskolan Dalarna, despite the debated role of translation in proficiency courses. A modified version of the Grammar-Translation method is currently applied in the Language Structure course at Högskolan Dalarna, where this study takes place. The traditional Grammar-Translation method in Sweden has had the following elements: teaching in Swedish, prescriptive grammar, translation of literary texts but an emphasis on sentences constructed only for the purpose of grammar practice, and the use of texts as the main form of grammar teaching (Tornberg 2000: 27-8). The course at Högskolan Dalarna, however, is taught in English, allows for descriptive grammar, and uses a variety of texts rather than focussing on only one genre. The course is also based heavily on student discussions (both oral and written) of current usage of language as well as the allowance for varieties and pragmatic issues with the added benefit of oral proficiency practice as pronunciation is heard and practiced in real conversations. Contrastive elements are discussed and problems in translation are presented, as well as brief introduction to the dichotomy between word-for-word and sense-for-sense translations. Group work is also an essential part of the Language Structure course at HDa, both online in distance seminars and forums and on campus in class seminars. Having students translate a text together has many benefits, including allowing students to learn from each others’ strengths, to consider their own solutions, and to feel at ease with peers (Hubscher-Davidson 2007: 3). More details on the translation module follow in the discussion of distance education.

2.2 Distance education and language learning

A presentation of general distance teaching practices as well as the aims and goals of distance education in language teaching is necessary before an analysis and comparison of the distance and campus groups in the Language Structure course at HDa can be made. Although the prevalence of distance courses may be a fast-growing trend in higher education in Sweden, as presented in the introduction, the phenomenon of learning by distance is anything but new.
Students were choosing distance courses already at the end of the 1700’s, with the popularity of correspondence schools leading to university courses by the end of the 1800’s (Holmberg 2003:9). Although distance courses still tend to be text-based (Holmberg 2003: 52), the forms of and possibilities for teaching have developed greatly with the advancement of technology, most notably the computer (Holmberg 2003: 60) and broadband.

Students choosing distance education do so for a variety of reasons, including family and employment circumstances, but more often than not because of the attractiveness of the flexibility of distance studies (Holmberg 2003:11). This is true even at Högskolan Dalarna where many students are on parental leave of absence, living abroad, or taking a part-time leave of absence from work in order to complete a course. When asked to evaluate the distance learning experience, learners in one study overwhelmingly chose flexibility as the main advantage (Felix 2001: 337).

Despite the prevalence of distance education, the research in the field is not so extensive as might be expected and tends to be unreliable and even contradictory (Felix 2001:301-302). Holmberg (2005: 61), while acknowledging that there are numerous independent variables for individual learners in the distance learning environment, also maintains that a weakness of distance research is that it has tended to ignore the experience of the learner, claiming that “the student’s attitudes to and involvement in the distance learning process have largely been overlooked.” The main question seems to have always been: is there a difference in the achievement levels of the distance and campus student? In an attempt to answer this, educators have looked to media comparison studies, in which they compared outcomes for the “same” course taught using a different medium: by distance or in a traditional classroom (Conger 2005:1). Media comparison studies have remained popular, albeit criticized for unreliability due to multiple factors influencing student outcome, throughout the last century. Most have actually found that there is no statistically significant difference between the two methods.
Distance education generally has two forms: “one-way traffic,” which means a prepared presentation of course materials, or “two-way traffic,” which means there is interaction between the individuals in the learning environment (e.g. teacher-learner or learner-learner) (Holmberg 2003:89). Beyond this interaction, one distance education theorist, Moore, maintains that the physical separation of teacher and learner, as is the norm for distance education, is not as important to student success as the “transactional difference,” which refers to the “communicative and psychological distance between learners and teachers” (Holmberg 2005:58). There are two variables in this transactional difference: the experience of dialogue for both the teacher and the learner and the experience of how structured the course is. In other words, do the learners have access to this two-way traffic as described above and how well-planned is the course? (Holmberg 2005:58) Garrison, in another theory of distance education, also emphasises the role of interaction between the learner and the teacher, maintaining that the previous view of distance education as an independent activity for the distance learner has now shifted to a “paradigm [which] places much greater emphasis on interaction and the construction of knowledge” (Holmberg 2005: 60). Indeed, it has been recognized that isolated learners tend to fail to complete distance courses (Zhang 2005: 790).

According to Wible, et al (2001: 299), however, it is not enough for the distance environment to be interactive. Stressing the importance of a new design for second language learning online, all of the following aspects are important for successful distance programmes: an interactive structure; a learning platform which enables saved written content and written discussion between participants; and flexibility for teachers to design and present their own material. Thus Wible, et al, focus on not only patterns of communication but also the practical aspects of distance education.
2.3 A distance and a campus translation course

At Högskolan Dalarna, where this study is done, translation is included in the Language Structure course, as explained above; and represents an example of “two-way traffic”. The course has a distance and a campus option and the students who chose these two options were the subjects of this study. Descriptions of the course methods as well as a comparison of the distance methods with the campus methods for the same module follow.

The distance translation course was taught in the Autumn term 2007 from weeks 36 to 42. The campus translation course was taught from weeks 37 to 42. The present study was completed during this Autumn term, 2007; and at that time, the course consisted of two parts: grammar, which was 6 credits, and translation, which was 1.5 credits. (The course has since been modified to include phonetics.) All students on this course study the same grammar module. In order to participate in the translation module, students need to have a working knowledge of Swedish. Otherwise, they take an alternative module in English text work. This study only focuses on the students who took the translation module for Swedish-speakers.

The campus translation course has four seminars. The course is introduced with a short lecture and seminar on the general problems of translation and the specific problems of translating Swedish to English. Students then translate one or two texts in preparation for each of the following three seminars. These texts are found in the course compendium created for the class and include literary texts, adapted newspaper texts, and sentences created specifically for the course. At the seminars, the students are divided into groups of 3-5 students each and given a section of the Swedish text to transcribe into English on to an overhead film. These overhead texts are then presented to the rest of the class for discussion. Contrastive elements, difficulties in word choice or grammatical structures, and style and register are covered during these whole group discussions. In addition, two prepared texts are handed in to the teacher for marking. These marked translations are then returned during a seminar. The teacher goes through the text and the students are given an opportunity to ask questions.
The distance translation course runs for five weeks. The course is taught using the learning platform called Fronter as well as the platform for synchronous seminars online called Marratech. Fronter is used for online written forum discussions and for presenting course material. During the first week of the distance course, students watch an online lecture about the general problems of translation and the specific problems of translating Swedish to English. The students then have sections of texts to translate and post on the Fronter forum, with each of four seminar groups given a specific section. They are expected to read all the other students’ translations and to respond with questions or comments to at least two of their classmates’ work, either from their own group or from another group. They have forum work for four weeks after the first introduction week. The second and fourth weeks the students meet the teacher in a synchronous seminar in a Marratech room online. During these seminars, the texts are discussed for contrastive elements, difficulties in word choice or grammatical structures, and style and register, similarly to the campus course. The differences between the campus and the distance course formats are that the Marratech groups are smaller and that the students have not created a section of text together in a small group but rather have presented their own individual work for the others prior to the seminar. The distance students also hand in two translations that are marked by the teacher for mistakes. These texts are discussed during the synchronous seminars and are also addressed in an online lectures and/or forum contributions by the teacher.

Both the campus and the distance groups are given a translation exam, which is at the same time as the grammar exam. None of the students are allowed to use dictionaries and all students write the exam by hand. The campus students take the exam under the supervision of a test administrator, usually in a lecture hall, at one specific exam time. The distance students must find an exam supervisor where they live (although a few choose to take the campus exam and come to Dalarna to do so). In Sweden, typical exam sites with supervisors include learning centres (lärcentrum), other universities, libraries, and adult or elementary schools. Outside of
Sweden, typical exam sites include embassies, offices of the consulate, other universities, libraries, Church of Sweden premises, and even police stations. The distance students are encouraged to take the exam as close to the actual time of the campus students, although variations by one day before or after are accepted. The exam supervisors send the completed distance exams to the course teachers, either by fax or by regular mail. Campus students collect their marked exams in the teachers’ offices. Distance students receive a scanned or posted copy of their exams.

The above illustrates the format of one distance language course in comparison with the corresponding campus course. Distance education can, however, have many forms. The results of language teaching in the distance learning environment can also vary. This present study will look at one distance course in comparison with a campus course.

2.4 Hypotheses

While the reasons for including translation in the Language Structure course might be clear from the above review of the role of translation in proficiency courses and the methods for adapting translation teaching at this level to a distance learning environment are also clear, the outcomes of the combination of the two are not. More specifically, the possible differences between the outcomes for distance and campus students have not been properly studied. They have only been observed. As shown in the theoretical background above, distance education is a viable option for language studies. The question is if the students on distance courses do indeed improve and furthermore, if they then improve at a rate that is greater than their counterparts in a campus course. As the aim of the essay is to determine if students do improve their English proficiency when they participate in an online translation course and if there is a difference between the distance and campus groups of the same course, the following hypotheses are made:
1) The participating students’ English language writing proficiency, as measured by their results (number of errors/mistakes) on a take-home exam which requires translating a short literary text and four weeks later on a written exam which requires translating a real newspaper text, will improve after completing a translation course. This improvement will be measured as a significant difference between the number of mistakes on the first text and the exam.

2) There will be a significant difference in the improvement of the participating distance and campus students who are studying the same course material and translating the same texts. This difference in improvement will be measured as a significant difference between the number of mistakes on the first text and the exam.

3. Methodology and data

The participants in this study are from the G1 Entry Level Language Structure course, 7.5 credits, in the English Department at Högskolan Dalarna during the Autumn term 2007. On campus, 19 students took the Swedish-English translation, while the parallel distance group included 18 students. Students from previous terms who were re-taking the course as well as students who only took the translation exam as a make-up exam were not included in this study as the objective was to study the teaching methods and student results from this one term.

All campus and distance students were informed of the aim of the study as well as requested to participate, with information about this being a voluntary participation. The distance students were informed of the material disclaimer and the research during their first Marratech seminars (the class was divided into three seminar groups). They were then sent a group e-mail explaining the form again. After about one week, a reminder was posted in the Fronter room. Nine students signed and returned the material disclaimer, allowing for further analysis of their writing samples. The campus students were informed of the material disclaimer and the research during their first campus seminar. The forms were passed out and
the students could return them to the teacher before leaving the classroom. Fourteen students signed and returned the form. Thus, the two groups for comparison of Text 1 and the final exam are 19 campus students and 18 distance students, with one group of 14 campus students and one group of 9 distance students giving permission for specific analysis of their texts.

The data for this study are also from the G1 Entry Level Language Structure course. For each group (campus and distance), the following data collection was completed:

1) In each group, the students’ translations of the first text, the take-home exam requiring a translation of a short literary excerpt from a novel by the Swedish author Henning Mankell (see Appendix 3 for text and suggested translation), were marked according to the course compendium scale (see Appendix 2). Errors/mistakes were calculated in total number for the text. This first marked text serves as the baseline for each participant’s English proficiency at the start of the course.

2) In each group, the students’ translations of the final translation exam, a short adapted text from a travel article in the Swedish newspaper Dagens Nyheter (see Appendix 4 for text and suggested translation), were marked according to the course compendium. Errors/mistakes were calculated in total number for the text.

3) In each group, the students’ results for the final grammar exam were collected. The scores were charted for comparison to the translation exam.

Using this data, the analysis was conducted as illustrated in the table below.
Table 2: The Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Distance group</th>
<th>Campus group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 36</td>
<td>Translation Text 1 (mailed to teacher)</td>
<td>Translation Text 1 (handed in at seminar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marked for errors and mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each student’s individual baseline established.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group differences analysed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 42</td>
<td>Grammar exam (taken at different locations with different exam supervisors)</td>
<td>Grammar exam (taken at same time with same supervisors on campus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marked for errors and mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each student’s individual improvement analysed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group differences in total scores analysed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The errors/mistakes in this study are tallied according to how many points are lost for each and not in the number of actual mistakes. The scale used for tallying is found in the translation compendium for this Language Structure course. It includes a list of common errors/mistakes in translation (See Appendix 3, How translations are marked). This document is presented to students at the beginning of the course, with the explanation that grammar errors/mistakes considered to be gross include various verb problems and word order problems. Spelling, word choice, genitives and plurals are some of the problems that are considered to be minor. This indicates to the students that their application of grammar skills is weighed more than their vocabulary skills.

Thus, using the data above, the following analyses were made:

1) The differences in number of points lost for errors/mistakes for each individual student, as measured in a comparison of errors/mistakes made in the two translated texts (Text 1 and Text 2) as well as comparison of the two exams.
2) The differences between the two groups on both the translated texts and the two exams.

The statistical application used for this study is the Mann-Whitney $U$ test. The null hypothesis—that is, that the campus and distance groups will have the same distribution with no significant difference between their scores on the two pairs of translated texts—was tested using the Mann-Whitney $U$ test. If the null hypothesis is accepted, then with 95% accuracy (or .05 level of significance) the sample comparisons cannot be viewed as different populations. The table used for the calculation of the $U$ critical values was found in Eason (1989: 526). In order to determine if the differences truly are significant or if the differences can be attributed to other variables, the Mann-Whitney $U$ test was chosen because of the following considerations (based on the Decision Chart in Chalmers 1989: 51):

1) The analyses were based on differences between two samples.
2) The analyses were based on only two samples for each comparison.
3) The analyses were based on unmatched pairs and measured at interval levels.
4) The analyses were based on fewer than 25 measurements and these were not normally distributed.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

The table below shows the overview of the results used for analysis. An explanation of the information follows: A= Campus group; B= Distance group; and Text 1 (take-home exam) and Text 2 (translation exam) = The figures represent the total number of points each student lost for errors on the first text (take-home exam) and on the second text (translation exam). This analysis follows some of the steps of Error Analysis: detecting the errors, locating the errors, and describing the errors (James 1998: 97). However, the resulting analysis will not then determine why the errors/mistakes were made, but rather compare the rate of errors/mistakes
produced by the two subject groups. The focus will also be on the results and not the teaching methods per se.

Table 3: Overview of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>A1 Text 1 Take-home exam</th>
<th>B1 Text 1 Take-home exam</th>
<th>A2 Text 2 Final Exam</th>
<th>B2 Text 2 Final Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>25.26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>median</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mode</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 The level of improvement for each individual student

The level of improvement for each student was measured in a comparison of the scores of errors/mistakes made in the two translated texts as well as the scores/grades on the two exams.
The graph above illustrates the differences between the first translated text, Text 1 represented by the blue bars, and the final translation exam for the campus group, represented by the red bars. From this chart one can see that most of the students lost fewer points in the second translation task and thus produced a “better” text. The exceptions to this general trend for the campus students are students #4 and #19, who each lost more points on the exam than they did on the first text. This seems like a clear improvement on the part of the group; and when the Mann-Whitney U test was applied to the scores, the difference was indeed found to be significant. (See Appendix 5 for full analysis.) The Null Hypothesis, $H_0$, is rejected; and the alternative hypothesis, $H_1$, is supported. With 95% certainty, one can say there is a significant difference between the two texts. Although the figures are not as accurate as the Mann-Whitney U test, the following calculations do support the same results as the test did. The campus students’ average test score improved by nearly 15 points, their median score dropped 13 points, and their mode dropped even more, 21 points.
Table 4: Campus results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>calculation</th>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>25.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>median</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mode</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, there seems to be a clear improvement on the part of the distance group, as illustrated in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2: Distance Scores on Text 1 and Text 2

Here, similar to the campus group, only a few students performed worse on the exam than on the homework text: students #5, #7, #16. When the Mann-Whitney $U$ test was applied to the scores, the difference was indeed found to be significant. (See Appendix 5 for full analysis.) The Null Hypothesis, $H_0$, is rejected; and the alternative hypothesis, $H_1$, is supported. With 95% certainty, one can say there is a significant difference between the two texts. Also like the campus group, the following values improved. As seen in Table 5 below, the average score improved by nearly 8 points; the median improved by 11.5 points; and the mode dropped 9 points.
Table 5: Distance results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 The differences between the two groups on both the translated texts and the two exams.

The following graph shows the distribution of the results for Text 1, the homework text (Appendix 3), shown for each group. The students are not numbered as in the previous charts, but are graphed in ascending order to show the range of scores. This is necessary to complete the Mann-Whitney U test. Based on this simple graph, one might assume that the campus group performed significantly worse than the distance group. The analysis results follow below.

Figure 3: Text 1 comparison

The above graph shows the distribution of the results for text 1, the homework text (Appendix 3), shown in ascending order for each group. Based on this simple graph, one might assume
that the campus group performed significantly worse than the distance group. The analysis results follow below.

The graph below shows the distribution of the results for the translation exam (Appendix 4), shown in ascending order for each group. Based on this simple graph, one might assume that the campus group and the distance group had similar performances, although the highest number of points lost might skew the results. The analysis results are found below.

**Figure 4: Comparison of exams**

The Mann-Whitney *U* test (Appendix 5) was applied to the scores both for the campus and the distance texts 1 and for the campus exam and the distance exam. The Null Hypothesis, H$_0$, again stated that there is no significant difference (95% level) between the results on the two pairs of texts, while the alternative hypothesis, H$_1$, stated there will be a significant difference between the results for the campus group and the distance group. H$_0$ is supported. The alternative hypothesis, H$_1$, is rejected. With 95% certainty, one cannot say there is a significant difference between the two pairs of texts. This does not support the hypothesis presented for this essay. A discussion of the results follows.
Although the Mann-Whitney \( U \) test indicates that the differences between the two groups are not significant, as expected, there are still differences in how the two groups work. Vygotsky’s Socio-Cultural Theory, with a focus on interaction in language learning, offers a relevant approach to the analysis of the differences between the two groups. In Socio-Cultural Theory, the emphasis is on “learner activity and involvement […] rather than on factors that are completely in the learner’s head” (Saville-Troike 2006: 111). Both the distance students and the campus students engaged in “scaffolding” activities, meaning that they collaboratively worked on solving the problems of translating the texts, offering each other either oral or written feedback to individual texts. The distance group could then read, consider, and decide to respond to with agreement or disagreement or possibly another solution. Although scaffolding usually refers to spoken language and Ellis (1994: 122) points out that studies of scaffolding in the classroom are rare, one could argue that the Fronter forum work produced by the distance students is indeed a form of scaffolding, especially in light of the definition of scaffolding as “…when peers collaborate in constructing language which exceeds the competence of any individual among them” (Saville-Troike 2006: 112). This is exactly what the distance students do when they respond to each other on the forum and what the campus students do when they discuss a text and decide collaboratively on a suggested translation—the latter representing a more traditional view of scaffolding. The difference here would be that the distance students have more time to reflect on the other students’ work and to consider their own response. Furthermore, referring back to Swain and the Output hypothesis (in Mitchell 2004: 175), the distance students might engage in more “metalinguistic talk between peers” (Mitchell 2004: 175) because they not only read more examples of possible solutions to the texts than the campus students when they read Fronter forum contributions, but they also have the opportunity to first reflect on these solutions before discussing them with the rest of their group in a Marratech seminar. Some examples follow below.
Example 1

Hi,
Some comments. (God, I still don’t like this commenting. It makes me feel like a bitch.)
5. About “hazardous”, look at what I wrote to C.
8. You might want to change this sentence a bit, since you first used “one” as a translation for Sw “man”, but after that you used “his”.
9. It gets strange when you write “…who operate smaller buses that direct themselves to backpackers…” The pronoun “that” seems to refer to smaller buses, as do the reflexive pronoun “themselves”. That makes it sound as if it’s the buses who act on their own, trying to find travellers...
Best,

In this example, the student writing the forum response to another student’s text first offers encouragement and uses humour to assure the student that she (the writer) doesn’t really know any more than anyone else (by calling herself a “bitch”). The student writing the response then goes on to itemize a few errors/mistakes, and uses a modal verb You might want to change this sentence a bit to express the possible need for a change in the text, as opposed to a certainty that one student is more correct than the other.

Example 2

Student 1
6. On the other hand, Australia has very much for the holiday-maker that worries about deadly animals. But the risk of being eaten by a crocodile or bitten by a poisonous spider is infinitesimal.
This time I changed the original text a bit more than I did before. The first part of number 6 is, in my opinion, the most difficult sentence to translate.

Student 2
Hi, Was it "det mesta" in sentence 6 that you found difficult? I found it very hard to find appropriate English words for that. Best,

Student 1
Hello!
I think your translations are really good and as always you’ve included long comments and explanations to your word choices. Concerning your question about what I considered difficult in sentence 6 you were right, “det mesta” kept me awake a few nights… I like the solution you came up with: ”a great deal to offer”. I also think that “exceedingly small” was a good translation of “försvinnande liten”.
Best regards!
In this example, the students discuss the difficulty of the text, offering—again—encouragement to one another, agreement on the especially tricky parts, and support for the solutions found for the translations. Note the friendly greetings.

Example 3

**Student 1**
I think you have done the translations very well. You wrote "people" in sentence 5 (15) and I think that was a really good way of translating it. Your explanation to why you did it was good. I didn’t even think about it even though the question was to think about the word "man". It is so easy to just translate the sentence and not think about the time etc
One other thing that I am wondering is that why did you put a comma in "human rights, now"?

**Student 2**
Thanks for your comments.

About "human rights, now" I thought maybe it should be easier to read when there is a comma, because then there is no risk anyone should read wrong and read human right now - människa just nu....It was just a thought... Best

Again, this example presents the encouraging tone between students, offering praise and initiating discussion.

A further development in the Output hypothesis, described above, finds that if learners are “pushed”, then they are more likely to produce better results than those learners who are not (Mitchell 2004: 175). Again, this may be the case with the distance group as they are required to produce more individual writing than the campus group, meaning they were forced to produce more output—both their own writing and their comments to others. Although Mitchell (2004: 176) does point out that there are many researchers who doubt the reliability of the Output hypothesis and other researchers have found that students do not even like to use discussion boards and chats for distance interaction (Zhang 2005: 801), it is worth investigating if there is a correlation between the distance methods and the final exam results. If the distance students were “pushed” to perform better, does this also mean that the distance students who participated more in the discussions earned a higher score on the final exam? The distance group was required to use the Fronter learning platform online for their forum discussions and for accessing course material. One can assume that a student would manage
the course better if s/he actually spent time in Fronter, and the question is then if the number of visits to the Fronter room had an effect on each student’s exam results. This would need to be investigated from a statistical point of view before any such claims can be made. Thus, each student’s number of visits was compared to the student’s final exam result in order to determine if there was a correlation between them. For a negative correlation, every unit increase in one variable (Fronter visits) would result in a proportional decrease in the other variable (number of errors/mistakes on the exam) (Best 1993:298).

**Figure 5: Fronter activity**

The scattergram below shows the distribution of the exam scores in relation to each student’s number of visits to the Fronter room. The correlation coefficient was calculated to be -0.37. This means that the correlation between Fronter visits and exam scores can only be deemed as low (according to the chart in Best 1993:308), although it should be noted that there is one outlier. The coefficient of determination, where $-0.37 = r$ and $r^2$ = the coefficient of determination, was also calculated in order to determine what percentage of variance is not explained by predicator variable, which in this case means the percentage of variance in exam
scores not related to the variable of visiting the Fronter room. This value was calculated as .14, meaning that 86% (1 - r²) of variance in exam score is due to other reasons. Therefore, it is most likely that other factors are determining the exam scores, such as gender, year of study start, and age. However, because correlation is not necessarily equated with causality, there is still a possibility that frequent Fronter activity does indeed result in fewer errors/mistakes and that could be the subject of further study.

**Figure 6: Correlation between Fronter activity and exam results**

Other factors may have played a role in the learner outcomes presented in this study. Holmberg (2005: 7) recognises that affective variables can determine the success or failure of a language learner and furthermore maintains that “for the distance language learner, it is perhaps affective variables—beliefs, motivation, anxiety— that are of greater relevance, because their effect on learning may be intensified in an independent context.” In the present study, these variables were not taken into account, but it should be acknowledged that they may have played a role in the success or failure of the learners, and perhaps especially the distance students. Other reasons for the differences to take into consideration include the students’
demographics, especially age, gender, and year of study in higher education, as well as personality and general aptitude.

Although the grammar exam itself was not analysed as part of this study, the comparison of the final exam grades for the two groups is of interest because the students were studying grammar and translation concurrently and one would expect the two scores to reflect a correlation. A scattergram for the campus group and a scattergram for the distance group can be found below. Note that the grammar exam had a possible perfect score of 100 points and a passing score of 60, while the translation exam had a possible perfect score of 0 errors/mistakes so the expected correlation would be negative. The correlation coefficient for the campus group’s translation and grammar exams is calculated to be -0.77, which indicates a substantial negative correlation. As the grammar score totals increase, the translation score totals decrease, meaning a higher score on the grammar exam is related to fewer points lost on the translation exam. The coefficient of determination is .59, meaning that 59% of the variance in translation exam scores can be predicted using the grammar scores and 41% will be attributed to other factors. Likewise, as seen on the scattergram for the distance exams, the correlation coefficient for this group is -.73, indicating a substantial negative correlation between the grammar exam scores and the translation exam scores. The coefficient of determination is .53, meaning that 47% of the variance between the two exam scores will be attributed to other factors than the other exam score. Thus, the correlation is higher for the campus group.
Figure 7: Campus exam results

Campus Exams

-0.77

Figure 8: Distance exam results

Distance Exams

-0.73
5. Summary and conclusion

The aim of this essay was to determine if students improve their English proficiency when they participate in an online translation course more than students who take the same course as a campus course. The hypotheses are presented again below with a discussion following each.

1) The participating students’ English language writing proficiency, as measured by their results (number of errors/mistakes) on a practice literary text and four weeks later on a written newspaper text exam, will improve after completing a translation course. This improvement will be measured as a significant difference between the number of mistakes on the first text and the exam.

This hypothesis is supported, as calculated by the Mann-Whitney U test with the results presented above.

2) There will be a significant difference in the improvement of the participating distance and campus students who are studying the same course material and translating the same texts. This difference in improvement will be measured as a significant difference between the number of mistakes on the first text and the exam.

This hypothesis is rejected, as calculated by the Mann-Whitney U test with the results presented above.

There are several possible problems and weaknesses with this study. First, there are many independent variables which are not addressed in the analysis but which might have played a part in the success or failure of each student. For example, one would want to know why each student chose a distance or a campus course. The background of each student—such as which other languages are spoken by the student, what kind of academic background the student has, and which other course the student has previously taken or was taking at the time of the study—would also possibly provide information about his/her aptitude. For example, it is known that there is a difference between the average ages of campus and distance students in Sweden,
with 40% of distance students over the age of 34 while only 18% of campus students are older than 34 (Universitetslärraren 8/2008:20). This difference may affect the results of the students’ studies. Secondly, the distance students might just be more motivated in the first place—not necessarily have better proficiency. After all, they have chosen to take a distance course that in itself requires a high degree of independence and motivation. Further measures to investigate the profiles of distance students would be valuable to such studies. Thirdly, the amount of work the students completed for their grammar course will possibly affect how well they do in the translation course. The effects of the grammar course cannot be properly investigated in such a limited paper. Fourthly, whether or not the students were in an English-language environment (as not all students were actually in Sweden for the course) or not or even another language environment is not taken into account. Obviously if the student were experiencing strong English input from other sources, this could possibly affect their improvement in proficiency. Also, it is impossible to take into account other communicative aspects—as well as communicative abilities the students themselves may have already had—that might affect the students’ increase in proficiency. Finally, the number of courses taken by each student during the term studied is not taken into account. The students may have been taking only this one course or they may have been taking the fulltime English G1 course. They may also have been taking this course and then several other courses in other subjects. Translation exercises offer just one narrow aspect of language proficiency.

There are also weakness about the study itself, including the fact that the researcher conducting the study is the same as the teacher teaching the course, which obviously can allow for some unintended bias. There can be a weakness in the validity of the study due to the fact that the researcher also is the one marking the translation texts and exams and in retrospect, a second opinion or examiner would have prevented this problem. The two texts are also different and it is not certain that one text was or was not easier or harder than the other. The texts also are different genres and it is not clear if translating a literary text is easier or more
difficult than translating a newspaper text. Finally, the study cannot easily be replicated at Högskolan Dalarna, if at all, due to the nature of the translation assignments and exams. The text for the exam is understandably different each term and accepted solutions may vary according to the individual examiner.

This study was done on a very small population and offers some information about only a single distance course taught at one level at a small university college. This study does, however, spark interest for further investigations into distance education and more specifically language education taught by distance. The results indicate that the students in both groups do indeed improve in their English language proficiency. The results of the analysis also indicate that there was no significant difference between the two groups, campus and distance, and this is in line with much of the previous research. The demographics of the changing and rapidly growing distance student population in Swedish higher education have not been addressed in this study. What would also need to be addressed more clearly and with better definitions is the concept of language proficiency. One would need to know what is really being investigated when language proficiency is measured as well as if language proficiency can be measured the same way as the exams could be marked. It is not certain that the grades on the exams are truly correlated to proficiency. Further studies in this area as well as further studies in the area of language learning online in relation to this group are warranted. With the ever-increasing number of students in distance education in Sweden, this will be an interesting topic to follow.
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1. Appendix: Translation courses in entry level English at Swedish universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swedish University or University College</th>
<th>English G1</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>ECTS credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blekinge Institute of Technology</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborg University</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Kalmar</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlstads University</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karolinska institutet</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Institute of Technology (KTH)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linköping University</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luleå University of Technology</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund University</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Malmö</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Sweden University</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Mälardalen</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm University</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umeå University</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppsala University</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Växjö University</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Örebro University</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Mime and Acting</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Södertörn University College</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Opera</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm Institute of Education</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal College of Music</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal University College of Fine Arts</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Arts, Crafts, Design</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Gotland</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Skövde</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Halmstad</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Gävle</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Borås</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University West</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Kristianstad</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Dalarna</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Physical Education</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Film, TV, Radio, Theatre</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College of Dance</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Course information accessed from the 36 individual websites on 07.11.28.)
2. Appendix: Explanation of points for mistakes (from the compendium)

This is how translations are marked
The following list shows the number of minus points (i.e. the level of seriousness) for grammatical and lexical mistakes – G1 Entry-level.

- **Agreement** 3-5
  - *This plan work very well* 5
  - *There is* instead of *there are* with co-ordinated subjects 3

- **Word order** 5
  - VS
  - Sentence adverbs: *ideas which not always have been* 4
  - Unidiomatic placement of central adverbials 2-3

- **The verb phrase**
  - **Tense/Mood**
    - The present instead of the future 3
    - The present with *since/for* 4
    - The present perfect instead of the past 3
    - Faulty conditional 1-4
    - The passive: *the money collects by ...* (instead of *the money is collected by ...*) 4
  - **Verb paradigms**
    - Wrong regular form 2
    - Wrong irregular form 3
    - *Where* instead of *were* or vice versa 3
    - Multiple finite forms, e.g. *would had* 5
  - **Aspect**
    - Confusion of simple/continuous form 3
  - **Modal verbs**
    - The *do*-construction 4
    - Wrong use of emphatic *do*-construction 3

- **Verb complements**
  - I avoid to do it 4
  - I look forward to see you 4
  - I am aware of that this is wrong 4

- **The noun phrase**
  - **Noun paradigms**
    - Wrong irregular plural 3
    - Left out or wrong placement of genitive – ’s 2
    - Wrong use of determiner in generic noun phrases 3
    - Wrong use of indefinite article in classifying complements 2
    - Wrong use of the definite article with lakes, rivers, hotels, etc. 2
    - Confusion of countable/uncountable nouns 3
    - Singular determiner with plural noun, or vice versa 2
    - Wrong determiner 2
  - **Relative clauses**
    - *Who* instead of *which*, or vice versa 4
    - Confusion of restrictive/non-restrictive 2
    - Wrong use of *that* 2
- **Pronouns**
  - Wrong interrogative pronoun 2
  - Wrong possessive pronoun 2-3
  - Translation of Sw *som* in indirect interrogatives 2
  - *There* instead of relative *where* 2
  - Wrong existential construction 3
  - Wrong reference pronoun 3

- **Adjectives and adverbs**
  - Confusion of adjective and adverb 3
  - Wrong use of nominalized adjective 3
  - Confusion of attributive/predicative adjectives 2
  - Wrong comparative/superlative of adjective or adverb 3
  - Unidiomatic comparative/superlative of adjective or adverb 2

- **Vocabulary**
  - Wrong use of capitalization 1
  - Misspelling
    - 1-3 1
    - 4-6 2
    - 7-9 3
    - 10- 5
  - Vocabulary errors 1-3
3.1 Appendix: Text 1 Translation Course

Text 1 from Henning Mankell’s *Mördare utan ansikte*

Nånting har han glömt, det vet han med säkerhet när han vaknar. Nånting han har drömt under natten. Nånting han bör komma ihåg.

Han försöker minnas. Men sömnen är som ett svart hål. En brunn som ingenting avslöjar av sitt innehåll.

Ändå har jag inte drömt om tjurarna, tanker han. Då skulle jag ha varit svettig, som om jag hade värt ut en feber under natten. Den här natten har tjurarna lämnat mig ifred.

Han ligger stilla i mörkret och lyssnar. Hustruns andhämtning är så svag vid hans sida att han knappt kan uppfatta den.

En morgon kommer hon att ligga död bredvid mig utan att jag marker det, tanker han. Eller jag. En av oss dör före den andre. En gryning kommer att innebära att en av oss blivit lämnad ensam.

Han ser på klockan som står på bordet intill sängen. Visarna skimrar och pekar på kvart i fem.

Varför vaknar jag, tanker han. I vanliga fall sover jag till halv sex. Det har jag gjort i över fyrti år. Varför vaknar jag nu?

Han lyssnar ut i mörkret och plötsligt är han aldeles klarvaken.

Nånting är annorlunda. Nånting är inte längre som det brukar vara.
3.2 Appendix: Suggested translation

Text 1 from Henning Mankell's *Murderer without a face*

He has forgotten something. He knows that for sure when he wakes up,
Something he dreamt during the night. Something he ought to remember,
He tries to remember. But sleep is like a black hole.
A well that reveals nothing about its contents.
At least I didn’t dream about the bulls, he thinks.
Then I would have been sweaty, as though I had broken a fever during the night.
The bulls left me alone last night.
He lies still in the darkness and listens. His wife’s breathing is so faint at his side that he can hardly hear it.
One morning she’ll be lying here dead beside me without me/my noticing it, he thinks. Or I will.
One of us will die before the other. One dawn will mean that one of us has been left alone.
He looks at the clock on the table by the bed. The hands shimmer and point to a quarter to five.
Why am I awake, he thinks. I usually sleep until half past five. I’ve done that for over forty years. Why am I awake now?
He listens out into the darkness and suddenly he is wide awake.
Something is different. Something is no longer as it usually is.
Translate the following text (adapted from a text in DN, May 2004, written by M. Holmgren) into good fluent English without any unnecessary deviations from the text. Remember that you may have to change the form of a given English word. **Write on every second line and do not give alternatives.**

Lissabon på spåret


I Graça försvinner Maria Sampaio in i ett hus med balkonger och blågrön fasad. På väg mot nästa kulle och den arabiska stadsdelen Alfama blir gatorna ännu trängre. Spårvagnen tar sig fram mellan gränderna på ett sätt som borde vara omöjligt.
On the right track in Lisbon

The best guide in Lisbon—tram Number 28—winds through the narrow alleys. Along the way, the passenger gets a glimpse of the city’s architecture, street life, and everyday happenings.

In Lisbon, where the biggest attraction is the city itself, tram #28 is the best guide through the oldest parts of the city. The route goes along the streets with beautiful houses, past old churches and restaurants, and through elegant shopping districts. The yellow trams are the faithful servants of the Portuguese capital. They have travelled up and down the steep hills since 1901.

The tram is packed on this Wednesday morning: four German tourists, a video-filming American, and elderly ladies on their way home with grocery bags. I am sitting next to the pensioner Maria Sampaio, who tells me that she has travelled on the #28 for more than 60 years. First to school in the 1940’s, then to work in a fish market, and now in order to visit her great-grandchildren.

The streets get narrower when we start going towards Graça. A happy dog is standing at a windowsill and his head almost reaches all the way out to the passing streetcar. When we get stuck in traffic once again, people come out of the shops to talk with the driver. A woman from a café gives him a cookie on a pink napkin.

In Graça, Maria Sampaio disappears into a house with balconies and a blue-green facade. On the way to the next hill and the Arabic city quarters, Alfama, the streets get even narrower. The tram makes its way between the lanes in a way that ought to be impossible.
5. Appendix: Mann-Whitney U test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samples in ascending order

A1= Campus Text 1
B1= Distance Text 1
A2= Campus Exam
B2= Distance Exam

Campus Text 1 (take-home exam) and Campus Text 2 (final exam)

\( H_0 = \) There is no significant difference (95% level) between the results on the campus text 1 and the campus final translation exam.

\( H_1 = \) There will be a significant difference between the results on the Campus Text 1 and the Campus final exam.

A1= Campus Text 1
A2= Campus Exam

N= 19
N=19

\( U_{A1} = 271 \)
\( U_{A2} = 90 \)

Critical value=113

Interval 248-113

\( H_0 \) is rejected.
The alternative hypothesis, \( H_1 \), is supported.
With 95% certainty, one can say there is a significant difference between the two texts.
Distance Text 1 (take-home exam) and Distance Text 2 (final exam)  

$H_0 =$ There is no significant difference (95% level) between the results on the distance text 1 and the distance final translation exam.  
$H_1 =$ There will be a significant difference between the results on the distance text 1 and the distance final exam.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B1= Distance Text 1</th>
<th>B2= Distance Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N= 18</td>
<td>N=18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_{B1}= 228$</td>
<td>$U_{B2}= 96$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical value=99  
Interval 225-99  
$H_0$ is rejected.  
The alternative hypothesis, $H_1$, is supported.  
With 95% certainty, one can say there is a significant difference between the two texts.

---

Campus Text 1 and Distance Text 1  

$H_0 =$ There is no significant difference (95% level) between the results on the campus text 1 and the distance text 1.  
$H_1 =$ There will be a significant difference between the results on the campus text 1 and the distance text 1.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1= Campus Text 1</th>
<th>B1= Distance Text 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N= 19</td>
<td>N=18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_{A1}= 221.5$</td>
<td>$U_{B1}= 120.5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical value=106  
Interval 236-106  
$H_0$ is supported.  
The alternative hypothesis, $H_1$, is rejected.  
With 95% certainty, one cannot say there is a significant difference between the two texts.
Campus Text 2 (final exam) and Distance Text 2 (final exam)

**H₀ =** There is no significant difference (95% level) between the results on the campus exam and the distance exam.

**H₁ =** There will be a significant difference between the results on the campus exam and the distance exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A₂ = Campus Translation Exam</th>
<th>B₂ = Distance Translation Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 19</td>
<td>N = 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uₐ₂ = 221.5</td>
<td>Uₜ₂ = 120.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical value = 106

Interval 236-106

**H₀ is supported.**

The alternative hypothesis, **H₁**, is rejected.

With 95% certainty, one cannot say there is a significant difference between the two texts.