GAMES AS AN APPETISER FOR LITERARY TRANSLATION IN THE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING CLASSROOM

ANAMARIA CARAMANGIU

PhD Student
University of Alicante, Spain
E-mail: anamaria.caramangiu@ua.es

Abstract: *The practice of teaching languages has evolved tremendously over the last century and continues to do so, backed by disciplines such as neuroscience and psychology and catalysed by the spread of new technologies. This is especially evident when we look at methodologies, instructional materials and attitudes in the classroom. On the one hand, teachers and students alike have shifted from an overreliance on textbooks to the occasional use of multimedia materials (at first simply as a form of enrichment in the behavioral sense of the word) and then to employing computers and even mobile devices as a common practice. On the other hand, learning activities have become more interactive, dynamic and, more importantly, student-centred. Language instructors are becoming more and more concerned with students' needs and wants, as well as their motivation. As a consequence, games and gamification have become more common in lessons for students of all ages. The current paper includes a brief case study on the use of games in the Translation and Interpreting classroom, concretely in Romanian language classes, as a means to prepare a literary translation activity in lower level groups (pre- and lower- intermediate), as well as a short inquiry on students views on the utility of such practices.*

Key words: translation studies, Romanian, language learning, foreign languages

*

Introduction

At the turn of the millennium, the image of a standard language classroom was quite different from that at the beginning of the twentieth century, due to exciting new developments in language learning theories and teaching, backed by disciplines such as neuroscience and psychology, and this rapid evolution has continued up to the present, catalysed by the spread of new technologies and social changes. This is

especially evident when we look at methodologies, class materials and attitudes in the classroom. Indeed, in just a few decades many classrooms have shifted from an overreliance on books and printed material (occasionally aided by some form of multi-media information, which was simply viewed as an enrichment or entertainment of sorts) to an ever-growing presence of computers and even mobile devices. Learning activities have become more interactive, dynamic and colourful, and, more importantly, student-centred and instructors nowadays are more concerned with students' needs and wants, as well as enhancing their motivation. Thus, games have become a common element in lessons for students of all ages.

The current paper constitutes a case study on the use of games in the Translation and Interpreting classroom, concretely in Romanian language classes, as a means to prepare a literary translation activity in lower level groups (between A2 and B1, according to the European Framework for Languages), accompanied by a short inquiry on students´s views on the utility of such practices, carried out prior to the lesson described in this study in the same groups that the lesson was designed for. The paper aspires to contribute to the field of teaching Romanian as a foreign language, by applying principles of game-based learning and creating examples of activities for adults, as well as to the area of translation studies by contributing to the discussion on the kinds of materials and methodologies that would be appropriate for language teaching as a part of *Translation and Interpreting* (hereinafter T&I) university programmes.

A framework for our discussion is provided by means of the literature review below, which connects elements related to second language acquisition and the peculiarities of the language instruction for T&I. In addition, some contextual information regarding the T&I students programme in which the case study was carried out is provided, along with a description of the lesson to which the described game-based activities belong to. The next section describes the methodology used and provides other relevant information about the case study, along with the results and discussion.

1. Literature review

Game-based learning is consistent with Krashen's influential concept of language acquisition which included the *Acquisition-Learning hypothesis* (distinguishing thus between two processes: *acquisition*, a natural and subconscious one and *learning*, a formal, conscious one) and the *Affective Filter hypothesis* which validates the influence of *affective variables* on second language acquisition, which can be applied to any other language acquisition process, such as the acquisition of third and fourth languages by translation students. Therefore, the learners' success or failure is affected by factors such as motivation, self-confidence, anxiety and certain

personality traits (extroversion and introversion).

On the other hand, occasionally working with carefully selected but unadapted literary texts even in lower level course texts allows for the development of language skills that go basic language for social interactions, in line with Jim Cumming´s language skill model (2000), which distinguishes between Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Linguistic Proficiency (CALP). This model uses a striking metaphor by describing languages as icebergs, which have a small visible tip (BICS abilities and knowledge:social vocabulary, familiar contexts, general language, social interactions) and a larger, hidden part (CALP), applicable to the T&I Romanian learners in the following ways: specialised vocabulary (e.g: literary, medical, legal, etc.), analysis, translation and interpreting tasks, use of academic language in the classroom, aiming for higher registers and concepts from other fields of knowledge (that imply multiple levels of cognitive processing).

1.1. Gamification and Game-Based Learning

Games can be used at any stage of a lesson (lead-in, content development, skill practice, review, etc.) and are usually employed in order to promote interaction or student involvement, attract attention to certain language elements and tend to yield positive results because of triggering emotion and drawing students' attention. They may introduce learning goals, specific contents, practical language, or even elicit feedback from learners. The complexity of the games used (which does not have to be in any way correlated with students' language levels or ages) can range from very simple to intricate activities. The advantage of play in the classroom (and other life-like activities simulated during lessons, such as contextualised dialogues that require a problem to be solved through communication) is that they have the potential of re-activating skills and prompting behaviours that are otherwise dormant in more passive formats such as lectures: they foster problem solving, competition and many more. These elements engage students and boost motivation, which renders games quite valuable from a pedagogical standpoint.

However, it might be useful at this point to distinguish between *gamification* and *game-based learning*, which can be easily confused (Moore-Russo, D.; Wiss, A., & Grabowski, J.: 2017). The first is the enrichment of traditional incorporation of game elements such as score systems, team-names, turn-taking, badges and so forth into traditional and existing learning activities for the purposes of fostering motivation and pupil engagement. Thus, a set of common activities such as grammar exercises or reading comprehension activities can be *gamified* by means of a prize, badge system or diploma, which rewards learners after completing the task or achieving a certain score and can even bring about competition or a sense of comradery. Game-based

learning, on the other hand, requires language instructors to create class activities with game characteristics and principles, turning any exercise into a game in itself.

Authors like Vandercruysse, Vandewaetere, & Clarebout (2012) remind us that most games include at least some of the following elements: a set of rules, a clear goal, competition, problem solving, a defined type of interaction and feedback, a story and fun. To make a game pedagogical, teachers should select those elements that support their intended learning objectives for the lesson.

1.2. The Translation and Interpreting (T&I) classroom

Students who are enrolled in T&I academic programmes have been examined, mostly because translation and interpreting academic programmes are, themselves, a novelty of the twentieth century, despite the documented existence of translators and interpreters throughout history (sometimes trained and knowledgeable and others forced by circumstances to assume this role).

In recent decades, discussions around the teaching and study of English as a foreign language, it has been argued that future translator and interpreter´s learning needs are not the same as those of general learners, but rather closer *English for Specific Purposes* Carrasco Flores (40-47) and therefore should benefit from materials focused on the target situations, as language instructors should create materials adapted to the specific needs of students (39-44). More than a decade earlier, Cañado and Almagro, had summarised the main differences between *English for General purposes* and *English for Specific purposes* by highlighting the high motivation of the learners and the connection between the academic experience and the workplace context. Therefore, it seems only logical to extrapolate these observations to any language taught in a T&I programme, including *D languages*, despite the little attention and actual classroom time they typically receive. If we connect these observations with Krashen´s guidelines, we can further infer that the so-called *comprehensible input* should be as contextualised as possible, which makes standard language textbooks or introductory language courses seem quite limited if the aim is to train potential translation professionals. Furthermore, bearing in mind the afore-mentioned analogy to *languages for specific purposes*, authors like Hutchinson and Waters characterise the latter not as ¨product¨, but ¨an approach¨ (quoted by Carrasco Flores 41). Cook, a researcher who focuses on language teaching methodologies, confirms this view (325–43) and nuances the difference between internal and external goals for language teaching (the first being more related to the educational aims of the class, such as fostering thinking skills and communication goals and the latter more connected to the uses of language outside the classroom, like as providing concrete information in a specific context). In other words, it is important for teachers in more specialised courses to have both an instrumental view of language learning (for non-linguistic goals, the achievement of ´real world´ and professional objectives

by the learner by using specific linguistic competences), while in a general language course the goals are generally linguistic (e.g. the development of oral competence or a wide range of vocabulary)

2. Context

2.1. The programme and students

We move on to providing some context about the students and programme whom the survey included in this paper was applied to and for whom the lesson and game-based learning samples described were designed. The students are Spanish residents and nationals, all of whom are native or bilingual speakers of Spanish and some even in Catalan and Valencian. They are enrolled in Romanian courses as part of their Translation and Interpreting studies at the University of Alicant. The 4-year programme includes 4 languages, as anticipated in the introductory section: an *A language* (Spanish or Catalan), a *B language* (English, French or German), **a** *C language* (again English, French or German) and finally, a *D language* (which can be chosen from the following: Romanian, Russian, Arabic, Chinese or Italian). Romanian has been available as a *D language* since 2005. For the *D language* courses, groups are constituted exclusively on the basis of enrollment and no placement test is required. In the current decade, Romanian groups have typically had an average of 10- 20 students a year. The programme includes six consecutive subjects which are available (distributed over to six semesters), organised into 2 sets of courses: mandatory *Language Courses* (1-3) and optional *Language and Translation* courses. Although the six subjects are not formally linked to levels established by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), we will reference such levels in this article for descriptive purposes. Statistically speaking, the presence of second generation migrant students from (at least partially) Romanian-speaking backgrounds is common enough but not usually representative in numbers, as 1-2 such students may enroll in each group (with the exception of the academic years between 2021 and 2023 when there has been none). Their participation will naturally contribute to the existence of different initial levels as well as different learning needs. For these Romanian-speaking students some priorities observed in the classroom and discussed in other articles are: enhancing vocabulary, creating a framework of grammar knowledge, learning to use different registers, avoiding and correcting Spanish calques/loan translations and addressing misperceptions of their own level and abilities).

Using the concepts detailed in the literature review, we can state that classroom language practice in Romanian classes should include *meaningful interaction* (Krashen´s language theory) which comes closer to the realities of the T&I

profession, in any possible way (by simulating translation tasks, mediation using written texts, reading and writing tasks that are conducive to more complex competences relevant to the profession, etc.) carefully select texts, perhaps even avoiding that certain contents that are too general or are not particularly relevant or helpful with regards to translation training goals, all the while also considering measures that can minimise anxiety situations. Aware of the fact that usually learners belonging to the same group or course cannot all be at the same level of linguistic competence at specific moment in time, Krashen proposes that natural communicative input is the key to designing a language syllabus, which should provide each learner with added content or knowledge, in accordance with their current stage of linguistic competence.

Also, following the line of the complex learning needs of future translators we can discuss accompanying writing skills and reading comprehension (two of the four pillars of standard language courses nowadays) by grammar and vocabulary notions that foster quick text analysis and original translation solutions when translating, as well any other elements or practices that promote specific skills for T&I, which range from research skills to the ability of easily grasping concepts belonging to other or new areas of knowledge and being exposed to a wide variety of text types, writing styles and topics even in lower level courses. Traditional approaches to *D languages* in the programme in question usually devote the first 3 semesters (language courses 1-3) to contents and activities meant to ensure the acquisition of BICS skills (with an expectation of the B1 level as the maximum level), whereas the following 3 semesters (language and translation courses 1-3) allow for an evolution towards the acquisition of CALP (and require an *upper intermediate* level or, whenever possible, an *advanced* level, i.e. B2-C1). Ironically, given the structure of the translation studies to which the students in the groups belong, they are expected to develop CALP at the end of six semesters in which they have four hours of language training on a weekly basis (compared with five years as traditionally believed). This, of course, constitutes an additional challenge for both students and instructors and can only be tackled with additional effort and individual work from learners (which is not always something teachers can count on). In addition, we could speculate that university students possess a certain ¨basic¨ knowledge and understanding of certain specialised concepts belonging to fields such as science, law and institutions, and so on. However, even with such optimistic premises in mind, the project is still didactically challenging.

Lastly, in a previous study we have determined that our students typically perceive the following aspects as strengths or advantages when studying Romanian: Latin-based vocabulary, similar sentence structure to Spanish and Catalan/Valencian and similar morphology in general (verb tenses, two common genders and etc.)

2.2. The lesson design

The present case study focuses on a lesson built around a literary translation task in a lower level group of Romanian learners, which required an adapted approach due to the following reasons, which will be detailed below:

a) low language level and heterogenous progress and language development per skills.
b) the presence of ¨aparent native/bilingual students¨.
c) The unusual nature and complexity of the task compared to the rest of the previous assignments.
d) The risk of illicit practices, such as the use of automatic translation tools and artificial intelligence.

With regards to the previous list, we need to elaborate on each item, starting with the issues regarding the heterogeneous student population and their level of Romanian at the time the lesson was to be carried out. Firstly, the students belonged to groups enrolled in *Language* courses (done in the first three semesters of the programme), which corresponds to a language curriculum no higher than B1 (in reality a range between a low A2 and B1 levels), therefore, not a enough for lengthy or elaborate reading comprehension exercises and translation assignments (or in other words, insufficient for texts requiring CALP language skills). Secondly, the groups contained several students of Romanian descent who had never studied Romanian in a formal setting but spoke it at home (5 in total, approximately a third of the analysed population) and can generally be characterised by a BICS-like dominion of the language. As can be expected, previous class activities had demonstrated that this segment of the student population displayed a higher language level compared to their Spanish peers in general, especially in terms of comprehension and natural communication. On the other hand, certain peculiarities must be noted, for instance: a relatively reduced academic or ¨intellectual¨ vocabulary and, consequently, difficulties in reading comprehension if the topics or concepts were more complex than typical B1 texts, flawed writing (grammar and spelling mistakes) and a tendency to loan translations and Spanish-sounding structures and expressions. In a nutshell, these students generally fall under the category of fluent BICS language users, lacking a certain proficiency and not attaining CALP levels.

At the same time, regarding the final task, it was part of a real translation order which accompanied a university project involving visual arts and literature and it was meant as a preview of sorts for future courses (namely the *Language and Translation* series) and a challenge for all students due to both the literary nature of the text and vocabulary employed (which included words and nuances that were not quite accessible in their own language). In other words, it was not a typical activity and, therefore, designed as a form of enrichment for the module. Moreover, it would be the students´ first encounter with a formal *reverse translation* (also known as *back*

translation) assignment in Romanian classes, which is usually intimidating for students, as it involves translating from Spanish (their native/everyday language) to the target language. In addition and not to be ignored, there was a real concern that, given the obvious complexity of the task at hand, the possibility of it being carried out individually in class or at home without prior preparation and class aid could have involved a high risk of illicit practices (which have become more and more common in universities everywhere), such as the use of automatic translation or AI tools, which would automatically sabotage the whole endeavour.

Therefore, **the following decisions were made:**

1. the preparation of the final tasks would require clarifying the topic and meaning of the literary text

2. the advanced or interesting vocabulary used in the original Spanish text would be discussed and worked on previously, with the help of ¨licit¨ translation tools and resources, such as recommended monolingual and bilingual dictionaries, synonym lists or translation forums

3. the use of AT and AI tools will be guided (recommended only for specific short structures and after steps 1 and 2) and some ethical considerations will be made (copyright, privacy, student and translator's ethics, etc.).

As a consequence **the structure of the lesson** became clear:

(I) Introduction to the topic ((issues related to the LGBT community) **and context** of the original text, in this case a poem (real university project involving visual arts and literature) by means of a group discussion and preview of the text in question while scanning for key vocabulary related to the topic (carried out in Romanian with the exception of very specific clarifications).

(II) Games based on advanced or interesting words in the source text (previously selected by the teacher) **meant to elicit possible translations and/or definitions** of these words in Romanian

(III) Reading comprehension: reading the source text and discussing the possible meaning and intentions (in Romanian), as well as anticipating main translation difficulties (most likely lexical)

(IV) Games meant to help build a vocabulary bank in Romanian that would be useful in the translation process

(V) Translation, stage 1 (creating parallel variants, in groups or pairs, ideally mixed pairs in terms of language level)

(VI) Discussion (based on the drafts produced): identifying mistakes or confusions in each variant, disregarding inadequate terms, discuss difficulties encountered, assessing textual properties of the target texts produced and discussing whether the texts obtained are readable and can stand alone)

(VII) Translation, stage 2 (discussing available options and decisions taken by each team/pair, comparing alternate translations of certain structures, proposing new solutions where possible and creating a final group translation to be provided as their contribution to the project.

In terms of the games used, all of them were to be played in pairs or teams and their content and goals are detailed in the table below:

Games based on **advanced or interesting words in the source text** meant to elicit **possible translations** or definitions in Romanian	➢ Online game: *Wheel of fortune* - game created on https://spinthewheel.app/ using a pre-selected list of words. Students take turns in translating or defining the words assigned by the game ➢ Game using paper-support : *Puzzle* - students must match words written on small paper cards in Spanish and Romanian (round 1: possible equivalents in the two languages and round 2: opposites in Romanian)
Games for **building a potentially useful vocabulary bank in Romanian (synonyms, derived words, etc.)**	➢ Online game: word search in Romanian based on a pre-set lists prepared by the teacher on educaplay.com ➢ Game using paper-support : *Puzzle* - students must match words with prefixes and suffixes, creating derivations belonging to same word family

Classroom observation during and after the game-based activities confirmed an increased sense of motivation and engagement of the students and also a positive change in the pace of the class as a whole.

3.The study carried out

As mentioned in the previous sections of the paper, the article includes a brief study on student perception regarding the use of games in the Translation and Interpreting classroom, concretely in Romanian language classes as a means to prepare a literary translation assignment in lower level groups (pre- and lower- intermediate), carried out with on the same population to which the afore-mentioned lesson was taught, prior to the actual

didactic activities. The aim of the study was to acquire insight into students' views on this kind of didactic tool in order to have a broader perspective on their viability.

3.1. Methodology

The present study has used the quantitative method, relying on a survey administered prior to the classroom activities mentioned in this article, administered to 13 students (belonging to two different groups, whose levels and curriculums are consecutive in the programme). As a peculiarity, 5 of the 13 participants were second generation migrants, i.e. Romanian students born and or raised in Spain, but it was considered that this was not a reason to exclude them from the study as they possess limited knowledge and are in little contact with the academic and literary world in Romania or Moldova. In fact, it is often typical for this type of students to enrol in the courses in order to (re)connect with the Romanian language and culture. The purpose of the survey was to investigate the students´ opinion and with regards to the utility of games in the T&I classroom, in general, and in Romanian classes, in particular and their attitude towards such a proposal before actually putting the planned activities in practice. In addition, two of the questions aimed to detect whether pupils identified literature as a meaningful type of content or topic when it came to learning grammar and vocabulary. The surveys included statements and questions in Spanish (also displayed on the board in Romanian), which respondents had to answer using multiple choice answers (first set of two questions) or mark according to a Likert scale (second set of five), anonymously online (using a Google Forms link).

As follows, we include the survey questions and statements in the two available variants, as well as their translation to English, with the mention that the questions referring to the type of courses in which frequent games may be employed did not include the subject matters related to interpreting, which have been left out on purpose due to their already interactive and practical nature:

RO	ES	EN
RO 1.Care din următoarele subiecte ar fi practic pentru a exersa sau învăța noțiuni de gramatică prin diverse activități? (este posibil mai mult de un răspuns) *cultură și artă, știri, literatură, tehnologie, altul (specifică)* 2.Care din următoarele subiecte ar fi practic pentru a exersa sau învăța vocabularul tipic pentru	**ES** 1.¿Cuál de los siguientes temas sería útil para practicar o aprender conceptos gramaticales a través de diversas actividades? (puedes elegir más de una respuesta) *cultura y arte, noticias, literatura, tecnología, otro (especifica)* 2.¿Cuál de los siguientes temas sería útil para practicar	**EN** 1.Which of the following topics would be useful for practicing or learning grammar concepts through various activities? (You may choose more than one answer.) *Culture and art, news, literature, technology, other (please specify)* 2.Which of the following topics would be useful for

nivelul acestei grupe?
cultură și artă, știri, literatură, tehnologie, otro(specifică)

3.Ești de acord cu următoarea afirmație?"Jucarea unui joc tematic în fiecare săptămâna ar fi utilă pentru cursurile de română ca limba D"
Extrem, Moderat, Deloc

4.Ești de acord cu următoarea afirmație? "Jucarea unui joc tematic în fiecare săptămâna ar fi utilă pentru lecțiile de la limbile A, B sau C"
Extrem, Moderat, Deloc

5.Ești de acord cu următoarea afirmație? "Jucarea unui joc tematic în fiecare săptămâna ar fi utilă pentru cursurile de traducere? (directă, inversă, specializată)":
Extrem, Moderat, Deloc

6.Ești de acord cu următoarea afirmație? "Jucarea unui joc tematic în fiecare săptămâna ar fi utilă pentru cursurile mai teoretice"
Extrem, Moderat, Deloc

7.Ești de acord cu următoarea afirmație?: "Jocurile pot fi utile ca activități de învățare la cursuri universitare, în general"
Extrem, Moderat, Deloc

o aprender el vocabulario típico del nivel de este grupo?
cultura y arte, noticias, literatura, tecnología, otro (especifica)

3.¿Estás de acuerdo con la siguiente afirmación: "Jugar a un juego temático cada semana sería útil para las clases de rumano como lengua D".
Totalmente de acuerdo, Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo, Totalmente en desacuerdo

4.¿Estás de acuerdo con la siguiente afirmación: "Jugar a un juego temático cada semana sería útil para las clases de lenguas A, B o C".
Totalmente de acuerdo, Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo, Totalmente en desacuerdo

5.¿Estás de acuerdo con la siguiente afirmación?: "Jugar a un juego temático cada semana sería útil para las clases de traducción (directa, inversa, especializada)".
Totalmente de acuerdo, Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo, Totalmente en desacuerdo

6.¿Estás de acuerdo con la siguiente afirmación?: "Jugar a un juego temático cada semana sería útil para los cursos más teóricos (por ejemplo)"
Totalmente de acuerdo, Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo, Totalmente en desacuerdo

7.¿Estás de acuerdo con la siguiente afirmación?: "Los

practicing or learning vocabulary typical of this group's level?
culture and art, news, literature, technology, other (specify)

3. Do you agree with the following statement?: "Playing a themed game each week would be useful for Romanian as a D language classes".
Strongly agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Strongly disagree

4.Do you agree with the following statement?: "Playing a themed game every week would be useful for language classes A, B, or C." *Strongly agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Strongly disagree*

5. Do you agree with the following statement?: "Playing a themed game every week would be useful for translation classes? (direct, reverse, specialized)." *Strongly agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Strongly disagree*

6. Do you agree with the following statement?: "Playing a themed game each week would be useful for the most theoretical courses (for example)." *Strongly agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Strongly disagree*

	juegos pueden ser útiles como actividades de aprendizaje en los cursos universitarios, en general". *Totalmente de acuerdo, Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo, Totalmente en desacuerdo*	7. Do you agree with the following statement?: "Games can be useful as learning activities in university courses in general." *Strongly agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Strongly disagree*

3.2. Results and discussion

The results of the survey are detailed as follows, along with observations on the answers obtained.

The first 2 questions attempted to check whether, when presented with a variety of topics, students identify literature as useful for language practice and this was confirmed by a majority of the answers: for Q1 (related to grammar learning and practice), an overwhelming 12 students included literature in their choice while for Q2 (focused on vocabulary) 9 (out 13) did so. Therefore, this feedback highlights the value of literature as a source of language learning in the students's minds.

QUESTION 1 (USEFUL TOPICS/ GRAMMAR)	ANSWER	No.
	LITERATURE (YES)	12
	LITERATURE (NO)	1

QUESTION 2 (USEFUL TOPICS/ VOCABULARY)	ANSWER	No.
	LITERATURE (YES)	9
	LITERATURE (NO)	4

The following three questions (Q3-5) inquired on the students' perception of weekly games being a useful practice in their lessons. In Romanian classes this approach was strongly confirmed by a majority of 10 students, whereas for the main languages they are specialised in (for example *Spanish, English, French)* this idea was strongly supported by 9 students. The same number for strong agreement is replicated when asked about translation classes. Interestingly enough, this latter category is also characterised by almost a quarter of the participants disagreeing with the utility of frequent games during this particular type of course (usually taught in two sessions, one being a lecture devoted to theoretical concepts and translation theories and the other one consisting in a translation workshop, at the University in question).

QUESTION 3 (WEEKLY GAMES/USEFUL FOR ROMANIAN CLASSES)	ANSWER	No.	%
	Strongly agree (1)	10	77
	Neither agree nor disagree (2)	3	23
	Strongly disagree (3)	0	0

QUESTION 4 (WEEKLY GAMES/USEFUL FOR A, B o C LANGUAGES)	ANSWER	No.	%
	Strongly agree (1)	9	69
	Neither agree nor disagree (2)	4	31
	Strongly disagree (3)	0	0

QUESTION 5 (WEEKLY GAMES/USEFUL FOR TRANSLATION CLASSES)	ANSWER	No.	%
	Strongly agree (1)	9	69
	Neither agree nor disagree (2)	1	8
	Strongly disagree (3)	3	23

Although for language courses both results were favourable to games as a didactic tool of frequent use, a question arises: why is there a slight difference between their *D language* (in this case Romanian) and their *A, B* and *C* languages? This distinction may be influenced by the numbers of courses offered for each category (and implicitly, hours) as *D languages* are only granted one subject per semester (4 hours weekly) and studied later. Therefore, we may speculate that the first and more dominating languages are perceived by the students as somewhat more serious and important (compared to the *D language*) and, therefore, less compatible with a game-based approach. This seems to be reinforced by similar numbers for *translation courses* (available for combinations of those main languages). Lastly, coming back to *language courses*, if we admit that, by the time< our undergraduates start studying their *D language* as *beginners*, they are already *intermediate* or *advanced* in the other foreign languages in their profile, especially if these are commonly studied in schools (like English and French), it may be that games are likely considered less effective for those higher levels.

The next set of questions were more general, referring to the applicability of games in more theoretical courses and in university teaching, in general. Frequent games still appear to be quite welcomed for theoretical contents, but this attitude is even more obvious when applied to university studies in general.

QUESTION 6 (WEEKLY GAMES/USEFUL FOR THEORETICAL CLASSES)	ANSWER	No.	%
	Strongly agree (1)	10	77
	Neither agree nor disagree (2)	3	23
	Strongly disagree (3)	0	0

QUESTION 7 (GAMES/USEFUL FOR UNIVERSITY COURSES)	ANSWER	No.	%
	Strongly agree (1)	12	92
	Neither agree nor disagree (2)	1	8
	Strongly disagree (3)	0	0

Conclusions

The answers collected from the survey administered conveys the idea is frequent games is consistently welcome by more than two thirds of the participants in all the course types (language, translation, theoretical courses) taught in the Translation and Interpreting classroom, except for the Interpreting courses, which have been purposefully left out of the survey due to their already interactive and

practical nature. The student responses seem to reveal a positive attitude towards game-based learning and anticipate the impact of these activities on their motivation and focus on the translation task.

As the survey also included two questions related to the use of literature in Romanian classes, it can be said that this feedback demonstrated that students actually acknowledge the value of literature as a source of language learning.

Classroom observation during and after the game-based activities confirmed an increased sense of motivation and engagement of the students and also a positive change in the pace of the class as a whole, as well as the success of these activities in preparing the student for the actual reading and translation tasks, both mentally (by providing focus and practical language tools) and emotionally, as the assignment did not seem to create a sense of stress among the students.

Regarding the introduction of unadapted literary texts for reading and translation in lower level groups classroom observation seems to suggest it is a successful approach, when aided by certain adaptations and preparation activities meant to reduce pressure, enhance motivation and bridge the gap between the students´ current level of language development and a complexities of literary texts. For such purposes, game-based lead-in activities appear to both be favourably received by the students (as shown by the survey answers collected) and represent an effective solution. Finally, it is our hope that literary translation tasks, aided by game-based learning may provide students with new learning opportunities and enhanced motivation so as to direct the on their path of transformation from an *outsider* to the profession (as general language learner or, in a few cases, (quasi)native speaker or (quasi)bilingual speakers who have never studied the language in a formal and structured setting), operating at a superficial level of the language (social and familiar interactions) to an *insider*, meaning an empowered professional for whom Romanian is a potential working language.

<p style="text-align:center">*</p>

Bibliography:

Centre for Teaching Excellence, University of Waterloo. (n.d.). *Gamification and game-based learning.* https://uwaterloo.ca/centre-for-teaching-excellence/catalogs/tip-sheets/gamification-and-game-based-learning

Collier, Virginia. "Acquiring a Second Language for School." Washington, DC.: George Mason University, 1995.

"Constitución Española". *Boletín Oficial del Estado.* 1978, https://www.boe.es/legislacion/documentos/ConstitucionCASTELLANO.pdf.

Cummins, Jim. "Bics and calp." *Encyclopedia of language teaching and learning.* (2000): 76-79.

D'Andrés, Ramón. (1997). "Lingüística y sociolingüística en el concepto de dialecto (I y II)." *Contextos.* (1997): 67-108.

"European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages." *Council of Europe.* 2021, https://rm.coe.int/spainiria5-en-pdf/1680a15366.

"Grado en Traducción e Interpretación." *Universidad de Alicante.* 5 Apr. 2023, https://web.ua.es/es/grados/grado-en-traduccion-e-interpretacion/.

Krashen, Stephen. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning.* California: Pergamon Press Inc, 1981.

Moore-Russo, D., Wiss, A., & Grabowski, J. (2017). Integration of Gamification into Course Design: A Noble Endeavor with Potential Pitfalls. *College Teaching, 66*(1), 3–5.

"Plan de estudios del Grado en Traducción e Interpretación." *Universidad de Alicante.* 7 Apr. 2023, https://web.ua.es/es/grados/grado-en-traduccion-e-interpretacion/plan-de-estudios.htm.

Ryles, Andrea. The 5 Stages of Language Acquisition as determined by Stephen Krashen. Digital image. 8 Apr. 2023, http://culturalawarenesscourse.weebly.com/lesson-2.html.

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) Home Page. 3 Apr. 2023,
https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages.

Translation services – Requirements for translation services. ISO 17100:2015." *ISO.* 15 Apr. 2023,
https://www.iso.org/standard/59149.html.

Vandercruysse, S., Vandewaetere, M., & Clarebout, G. (2012). Game-based learning: A review on the effectiveness of educational games. In M. M. Cruz-Cunha (Ed.), *Handbook of research on serious games as educational, business, and research tools* (pp. 628–647). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

*

ANNEXES :

INFORMATION AND MATERIALS USED IN THE GAMES:
➢ https://es.educaplay.com/recursos-educativos/25827374-cuvinte_de_limbaj_literar.html)

➢ WORD LISTS:

1. haber	1. gol
2. hueco	2. insondabil
3. insondable	3. constrâns
4. asomarse	4. a se uita
5. constreñir	5. configurație
6. recoveco	6. ascuns

7. disyunción	7. întortocheat
8. abocada	8. deformat
9. cobijar	9. disjuncţie
10. triangulo escaleno	10. limită

➢ Source text (pending publishing as part of the *Escridar* project, by the University of Alicante)

I. POEMA SOBRE EL PROYECTO BIND, DE LYDIA PLAZA

La saeta lo traspasará, atravesará su cuerpo; la punta
reluciente saldrá por su hiel.
(Job 20:25)

dentro del vacío hay huecos
insondables

asómate
a la arquitectura constreñida
de mi columna

la configuración de un

cuerpo - recoveco
una disyunción

abocada a los límites

con / tener o trans / figurar

pueden ser las manos un refugio?
bésame el costado y
cobija este triangulo escaleno
atravesado en dos