



Volume 8, Issue 1 - 2020 · ISSN 2534-952X

STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS, CULTURE AND FLT



Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen
Department of English Studies



STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS, CULTURE AND FLT

Volume 8, Issue 1 - 2020
Exploring English Studies:
Aspects of Language, Culture and Education



Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen
Department of English Studies



This eighth issue of *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT* is the end result of the work of the Department of English Studies, Faculty of Humanities, *Konstantin Preslavsky* University of Shumen.

Editorial Board*:

Editor-in-chief: Prof. Roumyana Todorova, PhD (Bulgaria)

Co-Editor-in-chief: Assoc. Prof. Desislava Cheshmedzhieva-Stoycheva, PhD (Bulgaria),

Editors:

Prof. Dr. Habil. Anna Bączkowska (Poland), Prof. Peter Gärdenfors (Sweden), Assoc. Prof. Irina Ivanova, PhD (Bulgaria), Dr. Antonia Navarro Tejero (Spain), Prof. Dr. Birsen Tütünlü (Turkey), Prof. Dr. Habil Berrin Aksoy (Turkey), Prof. D. Litt. Maya Pencheva (Bulgaria), Joanna Mikosz, PhD (Poland), David Mossop, PhD, Mary Sinéad Fallon (Spain), Assist. Prof. Mira Bekar, PhD (The Republic of North Macedonia)

SILC is indexed and watched by CEEOL, Scribd, GoogleScholar, Directory of Research Journals Indexing (DRJI), ROAD – Directory of Open Access Scholarly Resources, The Journals Impact Factor (JIFACTOR), Systematic Impact Factor (SIF), Directory of Periodicals and MLA International Bibliography and RINZ

SILC is archived in CEEOL (full texts, electronic), Bulgarian National Library St. St. Cyril and Methodius (full texts, print and electronic)

* The Editorial Board bear no responsibility for the content or accuracy of the articles.

© Individual contributions: respective authors

© *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT*

© Asenevtsi Publishing, Sofia

SJIF 2019 = 5.452

ISSN 2534-9538, ISSN (print) 2534-952X

DOI: 10.46687/SILC

Contents

PREFACE.....	5
--------------	---

IDENTIFYING ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSROOM ANXIETY OF STUDENTS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

<i>Zarina Markova, Teodora Yaneva</i>	<i>6</i>
---	----------

MAKING SENSE OF RESEARCH: UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' DIFFICULTIES IN WRITING ACADEMIC SUMMARIES

<i>Irina Ivanova.....</i>	<i>16</i>
---------------------------	-----------

PRACTICAL ASPECTS IN TEACHING DYNAMIC AND STATIVE VERBS

<i>Tsvetalina Aneva</i>	<i>35</i>
-------------------------------	-----------

CLAUSAL SUBSTITUTION IN ENGLISH AND BULGARIAN

<i>Snejana Obeyd</i>	<i>45</i>
----------------------------	-----------

SOME KEY PITFALLS IN LITERARY TRANSLATION

<i>Silvana Neshkovska, Sonja Kitanovska-Kimovska</i>	<i>55</i>
--	-----------

PREFACE

The eighth issue of SILC “Exploring English Studies: Aspects of Language, Culture and Education” comprises five papers dealing with different aspects of foreign language education, applied linguistics, contrastive studies and translation.

The opening paper by Zarina Markova and Teodora Yaneva (2020) deals with the problem of anxiety in foreign language learning. Based on the findings of a small-scale research using the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), the authors suggest that the aspects of language learning which provoke most anxiety in foreign language learners are speaking and test-taking, and the negative peer-evaluation of their performance.

The paper by Irina Ivanova (2020) discusses some difficulties MA students experience in understanding research articles and extracting and presenting their essence in academic summaries. The analysis of students’ summaries reveals problems related to differentiating between essential and less significant information, making sense of empirical data, understanding author’s ideas and implications, referencing, paraphrasing, reformulating and reducing the text in the summary.

Tsvetalina Aneva’s (2020) article presents some practical ideas for teaching dynamic and stative verbs, based on descriptive qualitative and quantitative analysis. The findings show that errors frequently appear in the choice of defining verbs that can be used as stative or dynamic, depending on the context in which they appear. L1 interference and overgeneralisation are seen as the two most common sources of errors.

The paper by Snejana Obeyd (2020) focuses on the ways and mechanisms through which clausal substitution is realized in English and Bulgarian. The analysis is based on English literary texts and their different translations into Bulgarian, extracted from published sources or suggested by the author. The article also describes and discusses different means through which cohesion is rendered in English and in Bulgarian.

The last paper also deals with literary translation. Silvana Neshkovska and Sonja Kitanovska- Kimovska (2020) identify some key pitfalls in translating elements of literary texts of different genres, such as titles, culture-specific terms, slang, expletives, subtext, and style. The discussion is supported by instances of translation solutions extracted from Macedonian translations of literary works originally written in English.

IDENTIFYING ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSROOM ANXIETY OF STUDENTS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Zarina Markova¹, Teodora Yaneva²

Abstract: *The article presents the findings of a small-scale study of the English language anxiety of students of International Relations at South-West University “Neofit Rilski”, Blagoevgrad. Data were collected via the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). The survey results suggest that speaking and test taking are the aspects of English language learning that provoke most anxiety in the surveyed group. Additionally, there are indications that respondents fear their peers’ negative evaluation. Changes in the teaching practice are suggested that might reduce the level of students’ English language classroom anxiety.*

Key words: *English language teaching, foreign language classroom anxiety, students of International Relations.*

Introduction

Anxiety as an affective factor in foreign language learning has received a lot of attention (e.g. Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989; Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986; Scovel, 1978). Traditionally, a distinction has been made between state and trait anxiety – the former denoting a temporary emotional state with varying intensity, whereas the latter referring to a stable tendency to experience state anxiety continually (Cattell, 1966; Spielberger, 1983). Foreign language anxiety has been examined in the context of attitudes and motivation (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989), and language proficiency (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989, 1991; Shopov, Atanasova, Nenova, Simeonov & Sofronieva, 2017; Shopov & Sofronieva, 2018, pp. 89-108), and many studies report a negative correlation between foreign language anxiety and success in language learning (e.g. Horwitz et al., 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991; Shopov et al., 2017; Shopov & Sofronieva, 2018, pp. 89-108).

The distinctiveness of foreign language anxiety was first brought to the fore by Elaine Horwitz, Michael Horwitz and Joann Cope (1986). Following the findings of research on specific anxiety reactions, Horwitz et al. describe

1. PhD, Faculty of Philology, South-West University “Neofit Rilski”, Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria, email: zarinamarkova@abv.bg, ORCID: 0000-0003-0760-1274

2. Lecturer, Faculty of Law and History, South-West University “Neofit Rilski”, Blagoevgrad, email: teodorayaneva33@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-3489-2134

foreign language anxiety as a particular “syndrome” linked to foreign language learning, and draw parallels between it and three related performance anxieties: communication apprehension, test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation (Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 127). Communication apprehension plagues people who are intimidated by public speaking. In foreign language learning, such people might be additionally frustrated by the mismatch between their mature thoughts and immature foreign language skills (Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002, p. 562). Test anxiety relates to people who set high standards for themselves, and feel everything but a faultless performance a failure. In foreign language learning, language production might be interpreted as a test situation rather than a communication opportunity, and this might cause anxiety in some learners (Gregersen, Horwitz, 2002, p. 563). Fear of negative evaluation is not limited to test-taking only, but pertains to any situation that involves some kind of evaluation, for example expressing opinion in a foreign language class (Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 128).

Correspondingly, Horwitz et al.’s Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) targets anxiety across communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation (Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 130). It is a self-report measure consisting of thirty-three five-point items which range from strongly agree to strongly disagree. FLCAS has been tested several times. In studies related to Eastern students or languages, there have been differences as to the original three dimensions of foreign language anxiety posited in developing the measure (Aida, 1994; Cheng, Horwitz & Schallert, 1999; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004). In Western contexts where students’ English language anxiety is concerned, however, the scale has been verified several times (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989; Tóth, 2008; Panayides & Walker, 2013), which justifies its use in Bulgarian contexts.

Method and participants

Below, we present the results of a small-scale survey of the English language anxiety of students of International Relations at South-West University “Neofit Rilski”, Blagoevgrad. The survey used the above-mentioned Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Horwitz et al., 1986), and was conducted by the second author in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Language and Linguistics in the Global World. It aimed to provide data illustrating the aspects of English language learning the second author’s students feel more anxious about. It was believed the data might serve as a stimulus for the customization of the language teaching techniques and the language content, which in turn might result in better learning outcomes.

The survey was taken by 40 first- and second-year students, 21 of whom females and 19 males. The data collection took place during the summer term, when

the first-year students had had enough experience with their teacher of English, with their university colleagues and with the evaluation procedures. Student participation was anonymous and voluntary. No time limit for taking the survey was set – on average, the respondents took twenty minutes to answer the questions.

Results and discussion

The FLCAS items with the percentages of students selecting each alternative are presented in Table A.

Table A

Items	SA	Agree	NAND	D	SD*
1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my foreign language class.**	23%	30%	15%	20%	13%
2. I don't worry about making mistakes in language class.	30%	38%	8%	23%	3%
3. I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in language class.	3%	10%	23%	43%	23%
4. It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in the foreign language.	5%	30%	20%	28%	20%
5. It wouldn't bother me at all to take more foreign language classes.	45%	43%	13%	0%	0%
6. During language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.	8%	15%	10%	48%	20%
7. I keep thinking that the other students are better at languages than I am.	13%	20%	38%	25%	8%
8. I am usually at ease during tests in my language class.	10%	28%	15%	40%	8%
9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class.	15%	33%	5%	25%	23%
10. I worry about the consequences of failing my foreign language class.	3%	33%	25%	23%	18%

Items	SA	Agree	NAND	D	SD*
11. I don't understand why some people get so upset over foreign language classes.	25%	45%	8%	20%	3%
12. In language class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.	18%	25%	8%	40%	10%
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my language class.	5%	20%	13%	43%	20%
14. I would not be nervous speaking the foreign language with native speakers.	25%	25%	10%	38%	3%
15. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.	5%	43%	13%	30%	10%
16. Even if I am well prepared for language class, I feel anxious about it.	5%	15%	10%	50%	20%
17. I often feel like not going to my language class.	18%	3%	10%	35%	35%
18. I feel confident when I speak in foreign language class.	10%	13%	40%	28%	10%
19. I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.	3%	23%	5%	33%	38%
20. I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in language class.	5%	33%	18%	13%	33%
21. The more I study for a language test, the more confused I get.	10%	25%	8%	35%	23%
22. I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for language class.	20%	43%	15%	15%	8%
23. I always feel that other students speak the foreign language better than I do.	5%	40%	20%	25%	10%
24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking the foreign language in front of other students.	5%	20%	28%	33%	15%
25. Language class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.	3%	23%	18%	38%	20%

Items	SA	Agree	NAND	D	SD*
26. I feel more tense and nervous in my language class than in my other classes.	0%	13%	10%	48%	30%
27. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class.	0%	43%	20%	23%	15%
28. When I'm on my way to language class, I feel very sure and relaxed.	20%	43%	23%	10%	5%
29. I get nervous when I don't understand every word the language teacher says.	8%	33%	13%	38%	10%
30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak a foreign language.	10%	23%	20%	33%	15%
31. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak the foreign language.	0%	38%	5%	33%	25%
32. I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of the foreign language.	15%	33%	28%	20%	5%
33. I get nervous when the language teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.	0%	35%	20%	25%	20%

*SA – strongly agree, A – agree, NAND – neither agree nor disagree, D – disagree, SD – strongly disagree

** Data in this table are rounded to the nearest whole number. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

A good number of the responses indicate elements of speaking anxiety as part of communication apprehension: 48% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement “I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class” (item 9); 43% agree with “I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class” (item 27). Correspondingly, 38% disagree or strongly disagree with the statement “I feel confident when I speak in foreign language class” (item 18), whereas 40% choose to remain neutral. Additionally, 25% agree or strongly agree with “I feel very self-conscious about speaking the foreign language in front of other students” (item 24). These data partially correspond with the results of Horwitz et al.'s survey, where 49% of the respondents agree or strongly agree on item 9, 29% agree or strongly agree

on item 18, 28% agree or strongly agree on item 24, and 33% agree or strongly agree on item 27 (Horwitz et al., 1986, pp. 129-130).

The data addressing comprehension as a factor related to communication apprehension are as follows: 35% of the respondents feel frightened when they do not understand what the teacher is saying in the foreign language (item 4), which matches the result on this item of Horwitz et al.'s study; in contrast, 41% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement "I get nervous when I don't understand every word the language teacher says" (item 29) unlike Horwitz et al.'s result, where only 27% endorse this statement.

This fright can be related to the fear of feeling less competent than peers or to the fear of negative evaluation. A good number of the participants in the present survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: "I always feel that the other students speak the foreign language better than I do" (item 23, endorsed by 45%); "I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak the foreign language" (item 31, endorsed by 38%); "I keep thinking that other students are better at languages than I am" (item 7, endorsed by 33%); "Language class moves so quickly, I worry about getting left behind" (item 25, endorsed by 26%); "It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my language class" (item 13, endorsed by 25%). Horwitz et al.'s survey results strikingly differ for three of the items: item 25, where more than twice as many (59%) respondents agree or strongly agree; item 31, where fewer than one third (10%) agree or strongly agree; item 13, endorsed by only 9%. Explanations of these mismatches might be sought in students' language level, perfectionism, and cultural differences. In comparison, in Debreli and Demirkans' (2016) study, conducted in a country much closer to Bulgaria than Texas, more anxious students also seem to fear more of being laughed at by their peers (p.55).

As for the fear of making mistakes as part of test anxiety, 26% of the respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement "I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make" (item 19), and the same percentage disagree with the statement: "I don't worry about making mistakes in language class" (item 2). This might suggest that the surveyed students of International Relations feel comfortable with their tutor, and the anxiety level concerning making mistakes is comparatively low. On the contrary, Horwitz et al.'s results, where 15% of the responses agree or strongly agree with item 19, and 65% disagree or strongly disagree with item 2, indicate that their participants "seem to feel constantly tested and to perceive every correction as a failure" (Horwitz et al., 1986, p.130).

It appears, though, that the participants in the present survey make a difference between mistakes while learning in a language class, and mistakes in test situations. Two of the most endorsed survey items refer to the latter context: 40% of the respondents disagree and 8% strongly disagree with the statement "I am usually at ease during tests in my language class" (item 8); 43% agree and

5 % strongly agree with “I get upset when I don’t understand what the teacher is correcting” (item 15). These results are in tune with the corresponding results of Horwitz et al.’s survey, and are supported by the findings of a Bulgarian study, which shows test anxiety as a factor in a survey of the language learning motivation of 96 students at the National Sports Academy (Slavova & Mileva, 2013, p.66).

The most endorsed survey item in this study, however, is item 1, which relates to communication apprehension – more than half of the respondents agree (30%) or strongly agree (23%) with the statement “I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my foreign language class”. It is followed by another item related to communication apprehension – item 9, “I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class”, where 33% of the participants agree and 15% strongly agree.

The least endorsed survey item significant for the students’ anxiety level is item 5, “It wouldn’t bother me at all to take more foreign language classes”, where nobody disagrees. This might suggest a classroom atmosphere of trust and harmony, and a feeling of respect towards the language teacher. This suggestion seems to be supported by the responses on item 3, “I tremble when I know that I’m going to be called on in language class”, which is the second least endorsed item (only 10% agree and 3% strongly agree). Such interpretations should be viewed with caution, though, as item 5 was among the misfitting items during the Rasch analyses in one of the tests of the FLCAS, and it has been claimed it does not refer to anxiety per se (Panayides & Walker, 2013, p. 501). In future studies, qualitative data addressing these aspects of foreign language classes might help to clarify the responses on these items.

Qualitative data might also aid the interpretation of the results on item 26, “I feel more tense and nervous in my language class than in my other classes”, which has been found to be “the single best discriminator of anxiety on the FLCAS as measured by its correlation with the total score” (Horwitz et al., 1986, p.130). In the present study, item 26 is endorsed by only 13% of the respondents, and thus, together with item 3, ranks as the second least endorsed item in this survey.

Pedagogical implications

These results are of importance first and foremost for the language teacher of the surveyed students. As anxious students may appear unprepared or indifferent due to avoidance coping strategies, Horwitz et al. (1986) suggest that the teacher should consider anxiety as an alternative explanation of unsatisfactory student performance (p. 131). This suggestion may be relevant to the present context, especially when it comes to speaking since the most endorsed items are those addressing English language speaking anxiety. Additionally, the teacher could think of ways to ease students’ speaking anxiety by devising less stressful

speaking activities through careful staging, role-plays, group work, speech shadowing. Apart from reducing students' speaking anxiety, such activities might contribute to a better classroom climate, and thus reduce anxiety pertaining to negative evaluation by peers. Awareness raising techniques and the thoughtful inclusion of motivational stories about success in overcoming obstacles as part of the studied language content might also aid in lessening students' foreign language anxiety.

Conclusion

The survey results show that the aspect of foreign language learning that provokes most anxiety in the surveyed group is speaking – the most endorsed items address different strands of communication apprehension (53% for item 1; 48% for item 9; 45% for item 23). Perhaps unsurprisingly, these are accompanied by the high rankings of the items related to test anxiety (48% for item 8; 48% for item 15).

While the small scale and the convenience sampling do not allow broad generalizations, the present study might serve as a first stage of a further, more thorough exploration of anxiety as one of the affective factors in foreign language learning. A possible avenue to pursue might be the replication of this survey with a larger group of respondents, which would justify a more detailed statistical analysis, and consequently the generalization of findings. A second avenue could involve a follow-up use of qualitative research instruments, which could provide more details as to the specifics of the different aspects of the language anxiety outlined in this study, and thus contribute to a richer, deeper understanding of the nature of the foreign language learning anxiety experienced by students of International Relations at SWU “Neofit Rilski”. Additionally, the study results could give food for thought concerning the need for appropriate adaptations of the language content and the teaching procedures of the English language course.

References:

- Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(2), 155-168.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). Patterns of change: Measurement in relation to state dimension, trait change, lability, and process concepts. In R. B. Cattell (Ed.), *Handbook of multivariate experimental psychology* (pp. 288-329). Chicago: Rand McNally.

- Cheng, Ys., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning*, 49(3), 417-446.
- Debreli, E., & Demirkan, S. (2016) Sources and levels of foreign language speaking anxiety of English as a foreign language university students with regard to language proficiency and gender. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 4(1), 50-60.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. New York: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Longman.
- Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002) Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86 (4), 562-570.
- Horwitz, E.K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125-132
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second language learning: Toward a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning*, 39(2), 251-275.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Investigating language class anxiety using the focused essay technique. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(3), 296-304.
- Matsuda, S., & Gobel, P. (2004). Anxiety and predictors of performance in the foreign language classroom. *System*, 32(1), 21-36.
- Panayides, P., & Walker, M. (2013). Evaluating the psychometric properties of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale for Cypriot senior high-school EFL students: The Rasch measurement approach. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 9(3), 493-516.
- Scovel, T. (1978). The effect of affect on foreign language learning: A review of the anxiety research. *Language Learning*, 28(4), 129-142.
- Shopov, T., Atanasova, G., Nenova, I., Simeonov, S., & Sofronieva, E. (2017). A study of anxiety as a factor of success in English language learning. *14th International Scientific Conference of IBS, 16-17 June 2017*, Botevgrad: IBS Publishing House.
- Shopov, T., & Sofronieva, E. (2018). *Let all things be done into edifying*. Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press, 89-108.
- Slavova, V., & Mileva, E. (2013). Izsledvane na motivatsiyata na student sportisti za izuchavane na chuzhd ezik. [A study of sports students' motivation to learn a foreign language]. *Nauchni Trudove na Rusenskiya Universitet*, 52(8.2), 63-67.

- Spielberger, C. D. (1989). *State-trait anxiety inventory: Bibliography* (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Tóth, Z. (2008). A foreign language anxiety scale for Hungarian learners of English. *Working Papers in Language Pedagogy*, 2, 55-77.

MAKING SENSE OF RESEARCH: UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' DIFFICULTIES IN WRITING ACADEMIC SUMMARIES

Irina Ivanova¹

Abstract: *Reading and understanding authentic research is a fundamental skill in preparing MA students for writing academic essays, exam papers and MA theses. However, if they have not mastered the simpler skills of summarising, less demanding in terms of content and structure texts, it would be more difficult for them to work with academic discourse characterised by higher information density and complex reasoning and argumentation. The paper deals with some problems MA students experience in understanding academic research articles in English and summarising their main points. The analysis of students' summaries reveals problems related to differentiating between essential and less significant information, making sense of empirical data, understanding author's ideas and implications. Students experienced difficulties in referencing, paraphrasing, reformulating and reducing the text in the summary. The findings of the study could be used for improving instruction to target identified issues.*

Key words: *summary, research, academic, MA students, problems*

Introduction

The modernisation of higher education in Bulgaria and the strive to follow practices and standards established in leading EU and US universities puts pressure on educators to prepare students to work with research literature beyond university coursebooks and instruction manuals. One of the main requirements in studying towards a post-graduate degree, such as MA, is for students to be able to look for, select, evaluate and utilise information found in peer-reviewed academic journals and other authoritative sources which publish research, so that they can build on them and ultimately make their own contributions to different research areas.

Making sense of research in the context of higher education is an ability which is often conceptualised as part of a more general idea of students becoming academically literate. This involves mastering a battery of micro-skills or abilities, such as: recognising the genre of the texts used in the respective academic field, deciding on their status, appropriateness and credibility,

1. Associate Professor, PhD, Department of English Studies, Shumen University, Bulgaria, e-mail: irina.ivanova@shu.bg, ORCID: 0000-0002-0216-7061

identifying textual features which indicate the scope and focus of a text, and utilising the texts for the purposes of assigned academic tasks.

Conceivably, most of the difficulties experienced by novice users of academic discourse stem from a variety of challenges they have in reading and understanding academic texts. These challenges could be explained with the use of inappropriate approaches and strategies in reading, which make students text-dependent, submissive readers, focused mainly on retrieving and understanding information, who are unable to use texts to answer their own research questions (see Alexander et al., 2008). Dominant readers, on the other hand, approach a text in a purposeful, focused and flexible manner, extracting the gist while at the same time selecting only the necessary information for further closer scanning. While it is desirable to speed up the process of becoming a dominant reader, there are a number of factors and individual variables, which have to be taken into account, such as students' overall language proficiency and previous educational experience.

Another major source of problems in summarising is the nature of academic writing with its strict genre requirements and features, which a majority of university students in Bulgaria have not encountered in their previous writing experiences. A lot of writing activities which aim at increasing students' ability to generate texts in the target language, are mainly concerned with manipulating language forms, as for example in keyword transformations or exercises for paraphrasing meaning. However, as evidence suggests, excessive use of such tasks might lead to unnatural usages closer to students' mother tongue models, or closer to other familiar non-academic models.

Therefore, the aim of the present study is to analyse samples of students' summary writing in order to identify some of the most common difficulties and look for possible explanations and ways of scaffolding postgraduate students' work with research literature.

Previous research in the field

There is extensive research on various aspects of academic reading and writing within the fields of English for academic purposes (EAP), English for Specific purposes (ESP) and English as a medium of instruction (EMI), which focuses on ways to assist students in mastering the main genres of academic discourse. Genre-based pedagogy, which relies on "theoretically robust, linguistically informed, and research-grounded text descriptions" (Hyland, 2007), suggests a set of underlying principles to be followed when learning to write. These principles present the process of learning to write as social, needs oriented, requiring explicit outcomes and expectations, which, most importantly, involves learning to use the language. The latter suggests explicit attention to

the way grammar and vocabulary choices in texts create meanings in different contexts of use. Within the genre-based approach, as viewed by the proponents of the Systemic Functional Linguistics, students' attention is focused on either broad rhetorical patterns called elemental genres, such as narratives, recounts, arguments, and expositions, or on more complex macro genres, such as lab reports, instruction manuals, recipes or editorials (Martin, 1992). In the context of ESP, genres are thought to "structure the roles of individuals within wider frameworks and further assist those individuals with the actualisation of their communicative plans and purposes" (Swales, 1998, p. 20).

Although mastering the genre of the summary is considered essential in developing students' academic literacy, the idea of getting students to summarise whole texts, research articles or larger pieces of academic writing, is sometimes questioned and thought to be counterproductive. It is only considered useful as long as it helps students digest and reduce the source text for further use. Thus, in arguing for students' developing their own voice, and own narrative, Alexander et al. (2008, p. 195) state that "summarising a whole text is equally unhelpful as it does not train students to select the information they need for their own purposes". Swales and Feak (2012) also point out that a good summary should be focused on the aspects of the source text or texts that are relevant as part of some other writing task. While this may be true in working with students who are more academically proficient and capable of formulating their own research questions, there might be a reason for using summary writing as a micro-skill of authentic academic writing, especially in post-graduate studies.

There is not a single unanimous view on what the skill of summarising involves. It might be seen as a source-based writing task, or a reading-to-write task, which relies on students' academic language proficiency for conveying information from reading (Galloway & Ucelli, 2018; Graham & Harris, 2017). There is extensive empirical evidence of the dual role that academic language skills play by supporting both text comprehension and text production in writing summaries ((Fitzgerald & Shanahan, 2000; Shanahan, 2016). The role of Core Academic Language Skills (CALS) in summarising is explored in a series of research publications by Uccelli et al. (2014), Phillips, Galloway and Uccelli (2019), who emphasise the importance of skills such as: unpacking and packing dense information (complex word- and sentence-level structures used to facilitate concise communication); connecting ideas logically (discourse markers that signal to readers how ideas and concepts are related in academic texts); tracking participants and ideas (using varied language when referring to the same participant, theme or idea across a text); organising analytic texts (identifying thesis, argument, counterargument, conclusion); understanding and expressing precise meanings (to achieve communicative clarity); understanding and expressing writer's viewpoint; and recognizing academic language as different from colloquial language. Summarising is often discussed in close

relation with paraphrasing, as they are usually used together in academic writing to avoid plagiarism by reducing and condensing lengthy sources and changing the wording of a text without changing the meaning (Bailey, 2015). Creating a summary can basically be seen as changing the original text not only in terms of its length and amount of information, but also as a deeper level transformation of a source text into a new text with its own idiosyncrasies, while retaining the gist of the original meaning (Alexander et al., 2008; Hyland, 2007).

As a key skill in writing larger pieces of research, such as reports, literature reviews or research articles or dissertations, summarising is addressed in almost all coursebooks and instruction manuals on academic writing. However, there is no consensus as to what types of texts are to be summarised. The source texts can range from shorter texts on specific subject-related topics, to highly complex research papers, in which authors refer to a large number of academic sources, which increases their intertextuality. The latter are much more demanding for students and are used in EAP courses for post-graduates with the aim of preparing their transformation from consumers of research-based knowledge to creators of such knowledge (Hood, 2005, 2008). Such texts require a much higher level of academic language proficiency, which additionally increases the level of task difficulty for non-native speakers.

Due to a broadly defined nature of summarising, research differs in the ways of conceptualising the processes involved in creating a summary. Some researchers are more interested in students' perceived difficulties on the basis of surveys and interviews (e.g. Habibi et al., 2017; Lin & Maarof, 2013), while others identify issues and challenges based on studying the process of mastering techniques in drafting summaries, such as paraphrasing (e.g. Choy & Lee, 2012; Keck, 2006), or creating the end products – the summaries submitted for evaluation (Hyland, 2007; Sung et al., 2016). In relation to the latter, there have been attempts to facilitate the process of evaluation by creating automatic summary assessment and feedback systems based on latent semantic analysis (LSA) (see Landauer, Foltz & Laham, 1998; Wade-Stein & Kintsch, 2004). Built on these principles, the web-based tool *Write to Learn* provides learners with feedback based on the assessment of key elements of summary writing such as content, length, amount of copied text in comparison to the original, spelling, redundancy, and relevance. These elements could be used as criteria for assessing students' summaries, while at the same time identifying their strengths and weaknesses to be addressed in further instruction and corrective feedback. Some assessment frameworks are focused on content, language or efficiency-related difficulties in writing (Rivard, 2001), while other assessment schemes rely on comparing students' summaries with the source text, coding each sentence in the summary according to the amount the subsumed source text, and the quality of paraphrase or integration (Friend, 2001).

The research on students' difficulties in summary writing takes into consideration the context of EAP instruction and identifies a number of variables, such as students' language and academic proficiency, academic field, social and cultural educational background, and previous experience in writing. An important variable relevant to the present discussion is the students' status as non-native speakers of English, which is thought to affect their achievement in a negative way, due to a tendency to copy from the source text, or use inappropriate source borrowing or substitution strategies (Campbell, 1990; Kim, 2001; Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004). Similar problems, assigned to students' language competence in English were discussed in a study of Bulgarian doctoral students' executive summaries by Doykova (2017), who identified difficulties at text organisation level, varying from lack of framework to unbalanced structure, inadequate presentation of methodology, and direct borrowing from the source text. In a study of the role of strategies in the summary writing of Taiwanese undergraduates, Yang (2014) found out that in the interplay of constructive reading and writing processes, the role of cognitive strategies, such as organising, selecting, connecting, paraphrasing, and quoting is as important as the use of metacognitive strategies, such as planning and evaluating. Researching Bulgarian undergraduates' reading abilities, Gerova (2019) identified age and experience as the two factors which have a decisive role in the use of metacognitive strategies. While metacognitive strategies are triggered automatically and subconsciously as part of students' normal reading and writing strategies (Johns, 1985), they can also be "triggered through teacher modeling, revision, checklists, and guidelines with metacognitive cues built in" (Kirkland & Sauders, 1991, p. 114). These findings confirm the importance of strategic instruction in academic writing in general and in summary writing in particular.

Research Questions

There are three main questions which this study aims to address:

1. What are the main difficulties Bulgarian post-graduate students experience in writing academic summaries?
2. Are the difficulties related mainly to understanding the source text or do they stem from insufficient command of the target genre features?
3. Can students' difficulties be traced back to their general language proficiency and their previous educational experience?

The study: participants, methods and materials

The main method used for the purposes of the present study was textual analysis. 42 summaries of academic articles in the broad field of language

education and teacher training were collected at the end of a short elective course in academic writing at a Bulgarian state university. The summaries were written as an assignment by MA students of English philology who had opted for a teaching qualification. Each student had to find a research article in the field of teacher training, and submit it together with the summary, so that the summary would be evaluated against its source text. During the course the students were instructed how to look for quality research publications, and were given guidelines about summary length, content and structure. The tasks which aimed to teach students how to write their summaries included: selecting appropriate source texts, reading the text for extracting essential ideas, arranging and linking the ideas, referencing and paraphrasing, reducing the amount of text, utilizing self- and peer correction and multiple drafting. Students were encouraged to use multiple instruction manuals and online guides produced by British and American Universities. In class, students analysed sample materials and did mini tasks of summarising parts of research articles before writing summaries of whole articles. They were given instructions which guided their way and focused their attention through reading the source article, highlighting the main signposts and then making notes and drafting the summary. The learning processes required parallel close reading and note taking, resulting in drafting. They followed the logic of reading-to-writing tasks and included:

Focus on reading:

- working with the article abstract and extracting the meaning behind its structure; comparing informative and not very informative and well-structured abstracts;
- focusing on the structure of the research article and its variations; the way article structure is reflected in the abstract; the length and balance of article sections;
- discussion of the introduction and its role in providing a wider view of the research field; narrowing the focus; attention to the main thesis and its significance for academic study;
- analysis of the literature review or theoretical background – assessing the relevance of sources; interrelation between different positions in research; distinguishing between authoritative, seminal works and marginal or smaller-scale research with local contextual relevance;
- understanding the study - hypotheses, research questions, research methodology, participants/ corpus, empirical evidence, case studies, etc.;
- analysing the approaches to data analysis in the source texts;
- making sense of the results, findings, implications and conclusions;

Focus on writing:

- note-taking while reading - identifying key ideas; paraphrasing and referencing;
- reducing the literature review to a few generalised ideas;
- conveying the research questions, methodology and analysis procedures in a brief informative manner;
- reporting the main results, implications and conclusions.
- reviewing (peer-reviewing) the first draft, correcting and re-drafting, while focusing on the structure and organisation of ideas, paying attention to academic style rather than checking for accuracy alone.

Data Analysis

In order to identify problematic areas in students' summary writing, the analysis procedure was based on comparing students' summaries with the source texts. The fact that the summaries closely reflected the structure of the originals resulted in variation in their length, structure, and linguistic features, which necessitated a closer attention to the original in evaluating the quality of the generated texts. One advantage of giving students the freedom to select their source texts allowed for identifying a wider range of problems in summarising, compared to the training tasks in which all students worked with the same source text. On the other hand, this made it more difficult to trace common tendencies and come to generalisations about the frequency of occurrence of the same challenges.

The problems were identified as a result of a two-step procedure: first, each summary was compared and assessed against its source, and second, problems, identified in all summaries were compared and generalised to larger categories in order to reduce their dependence on individual source texts. The criteria used in comparing the texts and identifying problems were the same for all summaries irrespective of their source, and included the following:

- content: the extent to which the summary covers the gist of the article and key points of each section of the source text;
- length: whether the summary is an adequate reduction of the original text. For the purposes of the present study, the students were told to limit their summaries to about one fourth of the source article;
- direct borrowing from the source: whether the amount of copied text is too large compared to the original text. Any stretches of text which exceed 4-5 words in a row were considered direct borrowing;
- correct referencing: consistent referring to the author and the source, strictly following the requirements for avoiding plagiarism;
- avoidance of personal interpretation, opinion and commentary;

- redundancy and irrelevance: presence of repeated or unrelated ideas in the summary;
- coherence and cohesion of the summary text;
- lexical and grammatical range and correctness;
- spelling and punctuation.

The set of criteria was designed having in mind considerations of validity and reliability to ensure consistency in evaluating the summary irrespective of the source text chosen by the students. The criteria are more detailed than the analytic descriptors usually used for assessing writing, such as task achievement, text structure and organisation, cohesion and coherence, lexical and grammatical range, and accuracy, which are linked to standards and grades. The role of criteria in the present study was more to structure the analysis and identify key issues, than to formally assess students' performance.

Results and discussion

The detailed analysis of students' summaries made it possible to identify a number of issues related to the criteria described in the previous section of this article. Working with criteria makes it possible to recognise problematic issues as deviations from an approximate standard set by criteria. In the discussion below the most symptomatic deviations are exemplified through excerpts from students' summaries. Word-limit constraints in the present paper necessitated the illustration of each identified difficulty with a single example of students' writing which is compared to an excerpt from the source text or discussed without such reference, depending on the nature of the problem. The authors of the source texts are indicated in brackets at the end of each excerpt and are in italics to avoid confusion with the other sources in the excerpts. As it is virtually impossible to assign each problem to difficulties related to either reading or writing, the process of summary creation is conceptualised as a continuum with reading and writing at its ends, and the discussion below follows this logic. The issues presented first are more closely related to the content of the summaries and the students' efforts to convey meaning, while the latter ones could be assigned to language-related deficiencies and poor command of academic discourse.

Difficulties related to:

- understanding the gist of the whole article or of key source segments

Understanding the gist of a complex piece of academic discourse, such as a research article, requires fast and efficient skimming of the whole text with a special attention paid to the abstract, introduction, main findings and conclusion in order

to understand the author(s) stance and contribution to the topic at hand. In the following sentence from an article on action research and reflective practice, the student failed to understand what the authors' position is. The misunderstanding of the central thesis of the research paper led to a summary which lacks focus and greatly compromises the meaning of the source. The reduced sentence distorts the original meaning due to the student's inability to correctly interpret the complex sentence and the meaning of the cohesive devices:

source	summary
Its central thesis is that, although action research has a critical role to play not least as a means of building the capacity of teachers as researchers of their own practice, there has been insufficient attention given to both the nature of reflection in the action research process, and its relationship to the purposes, processes and outcomes. (Leitch & Day, 2000, p.179)	The central thesis of the authors is that action research is not sufficient to understand reflection and its links to aims, processes and results.

- summarising ideas without understanding them in depth and detail

This is a problem typically associated with students' difficulties in scanning a text and identifying specific information. It might also result from poor understanding of the author's logic and the discourse flow, or from language deficiencies which impair understanding. In the case below important details are omitted which disrupts the logic of the source and leads to reduction and simplification of the original meaning. The idea of decontextualisation and abstraction of knowledge to make it generalisable and transferrable is much simplified in the summary text.

source	summary
The process-product paradigm (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974), which is more commonly known as "knowledge transmission", finds its historical and theoretical roots in cognitive learning theories. These theories have defined learning as an internal psychological process isolated in the mind of the learner as an individual, and largely free from the social and physical contexts within which it occurs (Lenneberg, 1967). Learned ideas are transported from one place to another. For this reason, this paradigm has focused on notions of transfer in learning to probe how knowledge travels from one setting or context to another. It has thus tended to see classrooms and formal schooling as "a site for decontextualized knowledge so that, abstracted, such knowledge may become general and hence generalizable, thus transferable to situations of use in the 'real' world" (Lave, 1997, p. 18).	The process-product paradigm, also known as knowledge transmission, is a cognitive learning theory which states that ideas are transferred from one place to another. In the classroom knowledge is decontextualised in order to be transferred to the real world.

- unacknowledged authors, references and sources

This is one of the most frequent problems in students' summaries, a typical case of plagiarism, when the student fails to refer to the source used, as in the example below where both the author of the article and the source cited are not acknowledged. Moreover, the author's personal stance is presented as the student's personal opinion, which itself is inappropriate in a summary.

source	summary
I now believe that professional educators may have underestimated the complexity of Schön's (1983) contribution to how we think about the nature of professional learning. Fostering reflective practice requires far more than telling people to reflect and then simply hoping for the best. (Rus- sel, 2005, p. 203)	I think that educators underestimate the nature of professional learning and simply tell people to re- flect without explaining how to do it.

- failure to distinguish the voice of the author(s) of the article from the researchers whose work they cited

Another issue in the summaries is related to referring to multiple 'voices' in research, such as the article's author(s) and the sources they use to support their arguments. In the example below by 'the authors' the student understands both the authors of the article (Johnson and Freeman) and the other researchers mentioned by them.

source	summary
Drawing from the allied perspectives of socio-cultural theory (Leont'ev, 1978; Vygotsky, 1978) as well as situated cognition (Chaiklin & Lave, 1996; Kirshner & Whitson, 1997), we contend that how people - in this case teachers and those who are learning to teach - do what they do is critical. (Johnson & Freeman, 2001, p. 61)	The authors claim that it is very important to know how teachers do things (Chaiklin & Lave, 1996; Johnson & Freeman, 2001; Kirshner & Whitson, 1997; Leont'ev, 1978; Vygotsky, 1978).

- indiscriminate acknowledgement of researchers in students' summaries

In the example below, the student failed to link the ideas to the researchers they belong to, thus failing to acknowledge their contribution to research. This might stem from the wrongful assumption that mentioning all names at the end of a statement is sufficient as an acknowledgement of their contribution. However, while it might be appropriate in literature reviews to simply enlist researchers who wrote on a topic, it is not suitable in clarifying different, often conflicting aspects of a topic when researchers' positions have more complex interrelations.

source	summary
According to Schön (1983) reflection- <i>in-action</i> acknowledges the tacit processes of <i>thinking</i> which accompany <i>doing</i> , and which constantly interact with and modify ongoing practice in such a way that learning takes place. Much of this may remain unconscious, tacit and unverballed (Clark & Yinger, 1977), though Loughran (1996) suggests that, in meeting unanticipated problem situations, reflection- <i>in-action</i> comprises reframing the problem and improvising on the spot so that the experience will be viewed differently. (Leitch & Day, 2000, p.180)	Thinking accompanies doing in the learning process. This happens unconsciously and reflection- <i>in-action</i> leads to reframing and improvising to view the experience in a different way (Clark & Yinger, 1977; Loughran, 1996; Schön, 1983).

- failure to understand the interrelation of ideas, common themes and researchers' positions in the literature review section

Literature review section is one of the most difficult to summarise, mostly due to students' lack of experience in reading and comparing multiple sources on the same topic. Although exam preparation for TOEFL or CPE provide practice in summarizing 2 to 3 sources on a single topic, the majority of study participants lack such experience. An additional difficulty arises when the source text does not contain author's clear and traceable formulation of a personal stance. In the example below Borg's appeal to look beyond what teachers know is misinterpreted as disagreement with previously mentioned authors.

source	summary
Since the mid 1980's, research in this domain had taken hold in general educational research in North America. One well-known example is the work of Shulman's Knowledge Growth in Teaching Project (Shulman, 1987), in which he and his colleagues argue for a distinction between disciplinary knowledge, which often defines the subject matter to be taught, and teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, or how and why teachers teach content to particular students as they do (e.g. Grossman, 1990). To understand the activity of teaching and learning in our field for example, we must look beyond what teachers know or don't know about grammar to why they teach grammar as they do (e.g. Borg, 1998). (Johnson & Freeman, 2001, p.60)	While Shulman (1987) and his colleagues argue for distinction of disciplinary knowledge and content knowledge, Grossman (1990) agrees with them, but Borg (1998) disagrees, saying that we must look beyond teachers' knowledge about grammar and the way they teach it.

- personal judgment and/or interpretation which should not be included in a summary

One of the issues in the analysed summaries is students' urge to express their personal opinion. Although students were instructed to refrain from expressing

personal judgment, some were tempted to do so and, what is more, used the ideas in the source text as a reason to state their own position. Frequently this led to oversimplification and distortion of the source author's ideas, as in the example below:

source	summary
Cooperative Development values intellectual (e.g. information in books) and experiential (e.g. practice in classrooms) sources of teacher learning and adds a third source: learning through speech. In this process of formulating ideas, articulating thoughts, and expressing emotions, teachers may identify new avenues for their personal and professional transformation. (Edge & Attia, 2014, p.66)	Edge and Attia (2014) claim that cooperative development is important for teachers' intellectual and experiential learning. Although it might bring about professional transformation, teachers should be able to identify their own ways of development.

- lack of caution in expressing ideas; lack of hedging devices

Lack of caution in presenting ideas is another frequently observed feature the studied summaries. As Vassileva (2001, p. 98) points out, "Bulgarian and especially Bulgarian English show a higher degree of commitment and hence - a lower degree of deference towards the discourse community both in terms of quantity (the overall number of hedges and boosters) and in terms of quality (the degree of commitment and detachment implied in the linguistic means of expression)". When summarizing, students tend to omit hedging devices from the source texts as unimportant, and use fewer indicators of the degrees of certainty such as modal verbs, adverbs of frequency or possibility. In the example below 'will' is substituted for the original 'would', and the verbs 'suggest' and 'believe' which express deference and reduce the degree of commitment are omitted from the summary.

source	summary
The data and their analysis suggest that the participants have an ambivalent feeling about dynamic assessment and its potential application to the English language assessment in the UK HE. Some of the lectures were in favour of dynamic assessment of the English language skills of HE students. For example, they said this would allow the students to take some ownership by setting the agenda for intervention, as it is their course after all. They also said dynamic assessment would avoid giving the students only one chance, which is unfair and which does not provide a true picture of their abilities. They believed that dynamic assessment would be less stressful for students. (Nazari, 2017, p. 110).	The study showed that some participants were in favour of dynamic assessment, as it will give students' ownership of the course and more chances to show their abilities, making the assessment less stressful.

- close adherence to the source language

Known also as language borrowing, lifting or straight copying, it results from poor command of the target language in general and academic discourse in particular, as well as from insufficient mastery of text generation skills and strategies, paraphrasing, synonymy, and discourse management. In the example below it can be seen in the similar word order (*The author states that..., Little (2003) states that*) and the repetition of the same lexemes (*autonomy entails*).

source	summary
The traditional teacher-driven classroom has become pedagogically limited in making language learning a student-centered instruction that stresses learners' capacity to learn autonomously. According to Little (2003), autonomy entails decision-making, critical reflection and social interaction. Autonomous learners are responsible for their own learning and are actively involved in the learning process by setting personal goals, planning and executing tasks, and reviewing their progress (Dam, 1995; Little, 1996). (Lee 2011, p. 87)	The author states that the traditional teacher-centered classroom is limited in making language learning student-centered and autonomous. Little (2003) states that autonomy entails decision-making, critical reflection and social interaction and the learners are responsible and actively involved in the learning process.

- excessive or incorrect paraphrasing

As a rule, paraphrasing is used when students "wish to stay close to the author's idea" (Alexander et al., 2008, p. 195). Excessive paraphrasing results in a superficial change of language elements - usually single words - which makes students' texts sound unnatural while failing to summarise the ideas in the source. In the example below the student substituted 'reabeled' for 'renamed', 'has not been changed' for 'without altering', and 'a bit of preparation' for 'prepared'. Although these changes are good examples of paraphrasing, they do not contribute to compressing the meaning as required in a summary. In the second sentence of the summary the word 'odd' was wrongly changed to 'strange', which distorts the idea of the source text.

source	summary
In the UK based language school in which I work, the teacher training noticeboard has been relabeled teacher development, although what is posted on the board generally has not been changed. Teachers are still offered three or so seminars a term by outside speakers. However, on the timetable something new has appeared... a development period for each teacher. In fact it is not new time, but that odd period that has always been on the timetable when we used to do a bit of preparation and have tea. (Davies, 1999)	In the English language school in which Davies (1999) worked teacher training was renamed teacher development without altering its meaning. Instead, it was the old but strange period when teachers usually prepared and had tea.

- use of inappropriate synonyms due to lack of understanding and poor command of collocations and set phrases

The ability to use synonyms appropriately is part of mastering the skill of paraphrasing. However, students are often unaware of the contextual dependence of synonyms, their genre affiliation and connotation. The example below shows how the superficial use of synonyms, such as ‘operate’ - ‘function’, ‘in isolation’ - ‘on their own’, and ‘complex’ - ‘complicated’ distort the meaning of the original text. In the second sentence of the summary the phrasal verb ‘figure out’ is confused with the noun ‘figures’, and the passive form of the verb ‘give’ is erroneously substituted for the phrase ‘given that’. This is an extreme example of how misunderstanding the source due to poor command of the target language can disrupt the logic of the original text and lead to summaries which do not represent the meaning of the source correctly.

source	summary
However, teachers’ practical theories do not operate in isolation but are sensitive to the ways that the contexts in which teachers work influence their practices. Simply put, teachers’ practical theories represent the complex ways in which teachers figure out what to do about a particular topic, with a particular group of students, in a particular time and place (Johnson, 1999). Given this embedded view, how teachers actually use their knowledge in classrooms has come to be seen as highly interpretive, socially negotiated, and continually restructured within the classrooms and schools where teachers work. (Johnson & Freeman, 2001, p.56)	Teachers’ practical theories do not function on their own, but are complicated figures of specific topics, groups, times and locations. When given this imbedded view, they use their knowledge to interpret, negotiate and restructure their work.

- long, complicated sentences

The tendency to use long, unnecessarily complicated sentences stems from students’ poor understanding of the nature of the English academic discourse, characterised by simplicity, clarity and transparency. While long complex sentences might indeed occur in academic writing (Bailey, 2015), excessive sophistication and complex subordination make the text clumsy and reduces its readability. According to Vassileva, this sophisticated style of writing typical of Bulgarian English academic discourse could be “due to the long-standing impact of French and Russian, while English might be still in the process of gaining such stylistic influence” (see Vassileva, 2001, p. 100). In the example below the student compressed four sentences into one, creating unnecessary confusion without making the sentence more informative.

source	summary
This article concerns the subject of the professional development of the language teacher. It presents recent descriptions of, and research into, the nature, processes and tools of teacher development and language teacher education. The emphasis here is on what is possible for the individual who wants to grow and develop as a language teacher. It is mainly concerned with presenting the choices language teachers have in continuing 'with their professional development as language teachers once their period of formal training is over' (Richards & Farrell, 2005, p. 1). (Mann, 2005, p. 103)	Mann's state-of-the art article about the language teacher's development discusses the subject by presenting recent descriptions and research of the specifics, processes and instruments for teacher development and education, and lays emphasis on the possibilities existing for those who desire to grow as a teacher, by outlining the choices teachers have after their training is finished.

- difficulties related to students lack of sense of audience or purpose of writing

The aspect of academic writing which is particularly difficult for students to understand is the idea of writing for an audience with a specific purpose in mind. It is widely accepted that academic texts "communicate ideas about a specific topic to an audience that the writer does not know personally" (Alexander et al., 2008, p. 42). However, the idea of belonging to an academic community has never been stated explicitly in Bulgarian education system, mostly due to the fact that lecturers' requirements for written work differ widely not only within a higher institution but within a faculty or a single department as well. This in turn erodes the idea of audience since the only readers of the students' work are the lecturers whose requirements students try to meet. Furthermore, students often fail to see a genuine purpose for producing a piece of writing, other than assessment of their skills in writing by the lecturer. Since the audience for writing a summary in the context of the present study is an imaginary academic community, whose expectations students find difficult to imagine, the summaries are often characterized by lack of coherence and purpose, and look like a sequence of random ideas.

Conclusion and implications

The analysis of students' summaries revealed issues with mastering the features of what Johns (1997) calls 'general expository academic prose'. These are key features of academic discourse, such as explicitness, intertextuality, objectivity, emotional neutrality, hedging, correct social relations, appropriate genre requirements, use of metadiscourse and signalling, and the display of a

‘disciplinary vision’. Although most of these features were explicitly highlighted in the course of academic writing, it turned out that brief familiarisation was not sufficient for their mastering.

As in a typical reading-to-writing task, a range of issues were found to stem from students’ difficulties related to reading, such as understanding the gist of the whole article and its main components, identifying key details and their significance in the researcher’s argumentation. These issues in turn led to problems with acknowledging articles’ authors and references in the source texts. Some students failed to distinguish the voice of the authors of the article from those of the researchers whose work they cited. Particularly challenging was to summarise literature review sections – a lot of students misunderstood the interrelation of ideas, common themes and researchers’ positions. Another challenge for students was to restrain from personal judgment and interpretation of researchers’ ideas in the summary, and the lack of caution in expressing ideas. The resulting high degree of commitment was evident in the omission of hedging devices in students’ summaries, a problem which should be targeted and improved through corrective feedback, since hedging is central to scientific argument and, ultimately, to science itself (Hyland, 1998).

Students’ difficulties might stem from a lack of experience in writing academic texts, summaries in particular. This means that by the time of submitting their summary for assessment, students might not have been asked to summarise research in other academic disciplines. In this situation they usually adopt a product approach in their writing, i.e. to closely mimic sample texts without having a good understanding of the text’s genre features. Our findings support Vassileva’s (2001, p. 100) claim that the general lack of training in writing in the educational system of Bulgaria “fosters mainly reproductive writing focusing on the content rather than the structure of the texts”. Even students whose general language proficiency is relatively high, as non-native speakers of English, have deeply ingrained cognitive schemata for writing in Bulgarian, which are “extremely difficult to overcome irrespective of the degree of command of the foreign language” (ibid.). However, students whose language proficiency is not high enough, tend to demonstrate close adherence to the source language, and any attempt to deviate from the source leads to excessive or incorrect paraphrasing, inappropriate synonyms, and long, complicated sentences. The analysis of students’ summaries revealed difficulties related to a poor sense of audience and purpose of writing, mainly due to the lack of relevant experience in writing for an audience in students’ educational experience.

To sum up, students’ problems could be explained with insufficient exposure, experience, and practice in reading and writing academic texts. Consistent practice in reading quality research as part of MA students’ assignments could possibly provide the necessary exposure to academic discourse. This in turn

would sensitize students to the key genre features of different academic genres and would ease the instructor's task of raising students' awareness of the way academic texts are organised. One of the possible solutions when working with less academically proficient students is to reduce the scope and difficulty of the tasks while at the same time scaffolding the process of summarizing, starting from the first encounter with the source text to creating the final draft of the summary.

References:

- Alexander, O., Argent, S., & Spencer, J. (2008). *EAP essentials*. Reading, UK: Garnet Publishing Ltd.
- Bailey, S. (2015). Academic writing. *A handbook for international students*. Fourth Edition. London & New York: Routledge.
- Doykova, I. (2017). The format of the PhD summary. In foreign languages and the contemporary higher education. *Conference Proceedings. VIII International Scientific Conference*. (pp. 384 – 390). Varna: Medical University “Prof. Dr. P. Stoyanov”.
- Fitzgerald, J., & Shanahan, T. (2000). Reading and writing relations and their development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 39-50.
- Friend, R. (2001). Effects of strategy instruction on summary writing of college students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 26, 3/24.
- Campbell, C. (1990). Writing with others' words: Using background reading text in academic compositions. In Croll, B. (Ed.). *Second language writing*, (pp. 211-230). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Choy, S. C., & Lee, M. Y. (2012). Effects of teaching paraphrasing skills to students learning summary writing in ESL. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 8(2), 77-89.
- Gerova, G. (2019). *Bulgarian university students' metacognitive strategy awareness*. Mauritius: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2017). Reading and writing connections: How writing can build better readers (and vice versa). In Ng, C. & Bartlett, B. (Eds.). *Improving reading and reading engagement in the 21st century* (pp. 333-350). Singapore: Springer.
- Habibi, A., Wachyuni, S., & Husni, N. (2017). Students' perception on writing problems: A survey at one Islamic university in Jambi. *Ta'dib: Journal of Islamic education*, 22 (1), 96-108.
- Hood, S. (2005). What is evaluated and how in academic research writing? The co-patterning of attitude and field. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics Series*, 19, 23-40.
- Hood, S. (2008). Summary writing in academic contexts: Implicating meaning in processes of change. *Linguistics and Education*, 19(4), 351-365.
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 148-164.
- Johns, M. (1985). Summary protocols of “unprepared” and “adept” university students: replications and distortions of the original. *Language Learning*, 35, 495-517.
- Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: a comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(4), 261-278.
- Kim, S. A. (2001). Characteristics of EFL readers’ summary writing: A study with Korean university students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(6), 569-581.
- Kirkland, M. P., & Saunders, M.A. (1991). Maximising student performance in summary writing: Managing cognitive load. *TESOL Quarterly*, 105-121.
- Landauer, T.K., Foltz, P.W., & Laham, D. (1998). Introduction to latent semantic analysis. *Discourse Processes*, 25, 259-284.
- Lin, O. P., & Maarof, N. (2013). Collaborative writing in summary writing: Student perceptions and problems. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90, 599-606.
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 317-345.
- Phillips Galloway, E., & Uccelli, P. (2019). Beyond reading comprehension: Exploring the additional contribution of academic language skills to early adolescents’ source-based writing. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 32(3), 729-759.
- Rivard, L. P. (2001). Summary writing: A multi-grade study of French-immersion and Francophone secondary students. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 14, 171-186.
- Shanahan, T. (2016). Relationships between reading and writing development. In MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S. & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (p. 194-207). The Guilford Press.
- Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication*, 21(2), 171-200.
- Sung, Y., Liao, C., Chang, T., Chen, C., & Chang, K. (2016). The effect of online summary assessment and feedback system on the summary writing on 6th grades: the LSA-based technique. *Computers and Education*, 95, 1-18.
- Swales, J. M. (1998). Textography: Towards a contextualization of written academic discourse. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 31(1), 109-121.
- Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Uccelli, P., Barr, C. D., Dobbs, C. L., Phillips Galloway, E., Meneses, A., & Sanchez, E. (2014). Core Academic language skills: An expanded operational construct and a novel instrument to chart school-relevant language proficiency in preadolescent and adolescent learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 36(5), 1-30.
- Vassileva, I. (2001). Commitment and detachment in English and Bulgarian academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 83-102.

- Wade-Stein, D., & Kintsch, E. (2004). Summary street: interactive computer support for writing. *Cognition and Instruction*, 22(3), 333-362.
- Yang, H. C. (2014). Toward a model of strategies and summary writing performance. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 11(4), 403-431.

PRACTICAL ASPECTS IN TEACHING DYNAMIC AND STATIVE VERBS¹

Tsvetalina Aneva²

Abstract: *The present research focuses on the practical aspects of teaching dynamic and stative verbs and suggests some pedagogical implications that could help language teachers build up effective methods to improve learners' competence in studying these verbs. The study uses descriptive qualitative and quantitative analysis to analyse learners' most common errors and deviations in the usage of specific stative verbs. The findings show that errors frequently appear in the choice of defining verbs that can be used as stative and dynamic, depending on the context they appear in the groups of verbs of appearance; verbs, describing mental processes and verbs of senses. L1 interference and overgeneralisation are the two most common sources of errors. The findings outlined in the paper can make the comprehension of the linguistic realisations of dynamic and stative verbs easier to master.*

Key words: *dynamic, stative verbs, classification, teaching, error analysis*

Introduction

Language teaching has always placed a great importance on the interrelation between grammar and meaning in the structure of language. One way in which this interconnection can be explained is through an analysis of the lexical units expressing activities and states.

Most English coursebooks and grammar books focus on some specific characteristics of verbs and the difference between active and stative verbs. They put an emphasis on rare occurrences in the progressive form of stative verbs as they represent a state which does not involve a notion of movement toward completion. These verbs are presented in contrast to active verbs, which are syntactically non-stative and which involve a certain activity by the subject. In most grammar books students are asked to complete the verb by using its simple or progressive form as some verbs expressing a state may occur in the progressive.

1. The compiling of this paper has been partially funded by the National Programme for Young Scholars and Post-Doctoral students

2. Lecturer in English, PhD Candidate, Department of English Studies, Shumen University, Bulgaria, e-mail: c.aneva@shu.bg, ORCID 0000-0002-1193-420X.

Ways of teaching dynamic and stative verbs

The present research focuses on the practical aspects of teaching dynamic and stative verbs and suggests some pedagogical implications. The examples illustrating the grammatical realisations of the two types of verbs are taken from the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), the British National Corpus (BNC) as well as from English coursebooks and grammar books.

When teaching English verbs, it becomes obvious that most students lack enough knowledge about dynamic and stative verbs. Moreover, they make mistakes when using them. When asked to define the form of the verbs students are hesitant to choose between the simple and the progressive form as in the following example:

1. The flower **smells** / **is smelling** good.

In sentence (1) the speaker reports on what is perceived, i.e. the subject is not a perceiver. To make it more easily comprehensible, students' attention can be drawn to the difference between the three groups of verbs as follows:

Group A (dynamic): listen, look, touch, etc.;

Group B (stative): understand, know, believe, own, etc.;

Group C (dynamic / stative): feel, smell, sound, taste, think, have, etc.

The present study touches upon some learners' errors in mastering stative verbs when developing writing and speaking skills and focuses on some deviations in the exact usage of specific stative verbs. Additionally, it provides suggestions about making English stative verbs easier to master.

Previous research in the field

Verbs in English can be classified as **stative (state)** and **dynamic (also called "action" "active", "non-stative") verbs**. Generally, **stative verbs** (such as *understand, believe, trust*) refer to existence, senses, appearance, feelings and emotions, mental processes, and possession.

In contrast, dynamic verbs (such as *walk, drive, watch*) are mainly used to describe an action or an activity process. However, there is a third group of verbs which refer to both states and actions (Group C). Since the difference between these types of verbs could be difficult to understand especially by students with lower command of English and sometimes could be even confusing, it is more reasonable to talk about *stative meanings* and *dynamic meanings* than just stative verbs and dynamic verbs.

Stative verbs refer to states or conditions. Michael Vince describes a state as a situation in which "something stays the same" (1998, p. 7). Examples are *know*,

believe, or *understand*. These verbs can be used in simple and perfect tenses. However, they are not used in any progressive form. This makes these verbs a little more difficult for students, which means that practice is essential. The table below presents the six groups of stative verbs with examples:

Existence	be, exist
Senses	see, hear, taste, smell, sound
Appearance	seem, appear, look
Feelings and Emotions	love, hate, like, dislike, fear, wish, want, adore, care, desire, mind, appreciate (=value), need, doubt
Mental processes	know, believe, prefer, agree, feel (=think), realise, forget, remember, recognize, see (=understand), recall, mean, deserve, perceive, understand, think (=have an opinion), suppose
Possession	have, belong, own, possess, owe

Practical aspects

- Verbs of senses should be modified by adjectives. Consider the following examples:

2. Even from a distance, Ethan's pace **looked quick**.

2(a). *Even from a distance, Ethan's pace **looked quickly**. (wrong)

To native speakers of English, the impulse to pair verbs of perception with adjectives is instinctive; adverbs sound completely wrong in their place. However, foreign learners, who are constantly reminded that grammar rules in English require verbs to be modified by adverbs in most cases, find it difficult to pair perception verbs with adjectives.

3. This soup **tastes delicious**.

3(a). *The soup **tastes deliciously**. (wrong)

Using an adverb in sentence (3a), makes it sound as if the soup itself is capable of tasting. The difference is particularly striking with the adjective "*good*" (4) and its corresponding adverb, "*well*" (4a).

4. This fabric **feels so good** on the skin.

4(a). *This fabric **feels so well** on the skin.

The difference could be demonstrated if the perception verb *feel* is replaced with another verb. In this case the adverb *well* (4a) would sound perfectly reasonable.

4(b). This fabric drapes so well over my shoulders.

Jim Miller gives an interesting practical explanation pointing out that stative verbs "cannot be used to answer the question 'What happened?'" (2002, p. 143). The following examples clearly illustrate that:

5 a. What happened? Susan **went** into the station and **bought** a ticket

5 b. What happened? *They **believed** his parents.

5 c. What happened? *They **were** very happy.

The answer to the question in 5(a) contains the verbs *went* and *bought*, which are dynamic and describe actions. *Believed* in 5(b) and *were* in 5(c) both relate to states and are not dynamic but stative.

Stative verbs do not occur in WH cleft constructions. These consist of, for instance, *What she did was* + a clause. Example (5) is acceptable while 5(a) is not.

6. What she did was e-mail all her friends.

6(a). What she did was know this theory.

Stative verbs typically exclude adverbs such as *enthusiastically* and *quickly*.

7. He quickly knew his parent is not acceptable. On the other hand,

7(a). They were quickly very cold is only acceptable if the sentence bears the meaning 'they quickly became cold'.

Another characteristic of stative verbs is that this type of verbs is rarely used in the imperative as in the following examples:

8. *Belong!

8(a) Love me!

McArthur (2009) points out that (8) is not acceptable but example 8(a) is occasionally acceptable.

There are certain common constructions which can be used with either action or stative verbs. For example, **will** and **would** for habits are never used with stative verbs. Consider the following examples:

9. *I would own a motorbike. (not acceptable as *own* is a stative verb).

9(a). During the holidays we would meet at the beach every morning. (acceptable as *meet* is a dynamic verb)

In (9) using the verb *would* is not acceptable as it is followed by the verb expressing a state *own*. In this case the only possible construction is *used to* +*inf.* or the Past Simple Tense.

This study uses descriptive qualitative analysis and quantitative analysis to answer the research questions. The corpus in this study contains statements containing errors by students, taking their first and second year at university. Observation, documentation and data reduction are used to select and analyse the most common errors.

Data analysis and key findings

The types of errors made by students are divided into 6 groups: verbs of existence (5.9%), verbs of senses (17.6%), verbs of appearance (17%), verbs of feelings and emotions (23.5%), verbs describing mental processes (23.5%) and verbs of possession (11.7%).

The following table illustrates the errors made by students at the beginning stage of learning English in their activities.

N	Classification of errors	Total errors	Percentage of errors
1	Verbs of Senses	3	17.6%
2	Existence	1	5.9%
3	Appearance	3	17.6%
4	Feelings and Emotions	4	23.5%
5	Mental processes	4	23.5%
6	Possession	2	11.7%
		17	100%

Table 1. Errors of using stative verbs in written statements

The findings show that errors frequently appear in the choice of defining verbs that can be used as stative and dynamic, depending on the context they appear in the groups of verbs of appearance; verbs, describing mental processes and verbs of senses. These verbs require more practice as they seem to be the most challenging to learners as there is no strict grammar rule. Students need to consider each situation in detail. However, by paying careful attention, they can learn to use these verbs correctly, thus avoiding errors.

Table 2 presents 5 types of errors observed in the usage of stative verbs functioning as dynamic, depending on their meaning and learners' attention should be focused on the distinction between them.

№	Sentences with errors	Correct sentences	Types of error
1.	12	28	Verbs with different meanings
2.	23	17	Verbs which are used to talk about a short period of time or describe something temporary
3.	10	30	Verbs which express an activity or process
4.	8	32	Verbs which express the beginning of something
5.	2	38	Verbs used to emphasise something

Table 2. Brief description of students' errors

Examples of errors made by the students are as follows:

I. Verbs with different meanings.

Students make mistakes failing to notice the different meanings of the respective verbs. Consider the following examples:

10. She's having fun. (to have fun = to enjoy oneself)

10(a). She is having a party at her flat on Saturday. (to have a party = to organize a party)

11. They've been seeing each other for a month. (to see = to date)

11(a). I'm seeing two politicians for a meeting tomorrow. (to see = to have an appointment with)

11(b). He is seeing his doctor next week (to see = to visit, consult)³

II. Verbs which are used to talk about a short period of time or describe something temporary as in:

12. Diana is being very tired this evening. (*to be* is used as a dynamic verb expressing a temporary state)

12(a). Stop doing that, Bill! You're being very silly. (=You are behaving badly / you are acting badly at the moment.)

The analysis of the results shows that some students, included in the study, fail to notice that using the verb in the Simple Tense (12a) would change the meaning of the sentence completely as the simple form would describe part of Bill's character.

Another common mistake that needs to be analysed is the difference between using *feel* and *look* in the Progressive.

13. I am feeling the fabric.

13(a). She is feeling his forehead to check his temperature.

13(b). I feel good.

In (13) and 13(a) learners need to bear in mind that *feel* is used as a dynamic verb expressing a voluntary action in the meaning of touch. In contrast, using the verb in Simple form as in 13(b) expresses a mood.

14. He's looking awful these days.

3. For a complete semantic network of "see" cf. Aneva (2019, pp. 22-35).

14(a). He looks good.⁴

In (14) learners' attention should be focused on using the progressive form to describe the person's temporary look compared to his normal appearance.

III. Verbs which express an activity or process.

15. My little daughter is smelling the flowers. (activity)

15(a). Why are you smelling the soup? (activity)

15(b). It smells awful.

16. I'm tasting the meal. (activity)

16(a). This sandwich tastes delicious (=it has a delicious flavour).

The verbs in the sentences (15), 15(a) and (16) specify that the perceiver is "focusing" on a specific object. The sentences indicate that the subject is performing the action. The examples put an emphasis on the fact that the verbs of senses when used in their progressive form describe a volitional process. On the other hand, in 15(b) and 16(a) the verbs *smell* and *taste* describe the person's awareness of the quality of what is smelled or tasted. Regarding *smell*, "the two types are based on the verbs *smell* (inhale an odour) and *emit* (smell). The active type involves an agent who is able to perceive smell and an object that has the property to emit that smell" (Nedelcheva, 2020, in print). As for *taste*, the opposition is between its two meanings *trying out* (a meal) and *savour* (having a particular flavour).

Another verb describing an activity in the analysis is *think*. Being accustomed to using the verb *think* in its stative meaning, namely *believe*, part of the students do not consider its use as a verb, describing a process.

17. I am thinking about going to Scotland. (process = I am considering)

17(a). He's probably thinking about his next holiday.

17(b). I think his car is fantastic. (opinion = I believe)

17(c). What do you think of him?

IV. Verbs which express the beginning of something

18. We're gradually remembering people we know. (= We are slowly beginning / trying to remember)

4. For a comparative analysis of "look" and "see" cf. Nedelcheva (2019, pp. 7-21).

Being used to the stative meaning and seeing the verb in its simple form, 20% of the students do not consider the fact that in this sentence the verb *remember* accompanied by the preceding adverb expresses the beginning of a process.

V. Verbs used to emphasise something

19. I'm loving it! = I'm (really) enjoying it. (emphasis)

The last example (not very common in British English) demonstrates only 2 errors made by the learners and is included in the study simply because learners often ask about the use of this verb in the advertising slogan of a well-known fast food chain.

This memorable catchphrase sounds grammatically incorrect (*love* is a stative verb so it should say "I love it"). However, using the verb *love* in the Progressive aspect as in "I'm loving it" in the meaning of *enjoy* makes this sentence acceptable, i.e. *I'm enjoying my cheeseburger*.

The analysis presented above shows the following sources of errors:

- The target group of students included in the study are at the beginning stage of learning English as a second language. L1 interference and its negative influence can be observed since at this stage students are not that familiar with the use of the target language and for that reason they use their previous experience when acquiring new grammar.
- Overgeneralisation is a result of a partial learning of the target language. As they have not mastered the language yet, learners tend to apply rules and stick to them failing to consider the specific context in which the verbs appear.

The research clearly shows the types of errors made by the learners, which is a source of information that can help teachers correct students' errors and improve the effectiveness of their teaching.

Conclusion and implications

The findings outlined in the paper can facilitate the comprehension of the linguistic realisations of dynamic and stative verbs in English. The theoretical aspect provides a brief, comprehensive classification of the types of verbs. The analysis shows the different meanings that the verbs express and the ways in which they change according to the specific context and the concepts associated with them. The elicitations from the present paper may contribute to:

- the analysis of the linguistic realisations of dynamic and stative verbs;

- examining the various meanings and the kinds of processes involved when the verbs are used in different contexts in English;
- within the domain of Foreign Language Acquisition (FLA) the study will contribute to a better understanding of English verbs and their usage and will thus help language teachers build up effective methods to improve learners' competence in studying dynamic and stative verbs.

References:

- Aneva, Ts. (2019). The semantic network of "see" (a corpus-based study). *Studies in Linguistics, Culture and FLT*, Vol. 7. Sofia: Asenevtsi, 22-35. <https://doi.org/10.46687/SILC.2019.v07.002>
- Evans, V. (2014). *FCE use of English 1*. Newbury: Express Publishing.
- Hewings, M. (2005). *Advanced grammar in use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopkins, D., & Cullen, P. (2007). *Grammar for IELTS*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McArthur, T. (1998). *Stative verb*. Oxford: Concise Oxford Companion to the English Language.
- Miller, J. (2002). *An introduction to English syntax*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nedelcheva, S. (2019). How seeing is different from looking? A cognitive perspective on verb-particle constructions with *look* and *see*. *Studies in Linguistics, Culture and FLT*, Vol. 7. Sofia: Asenevtsi, 7-21. <https://doi.org/10.46687/SILC.2019.v07.001>
- Nedelcheva, S. (2020). Exploring *smell* from cognitive perspective in English and Bulgarian (a corpus study). *Studies in Linguistics, Culture and FLT*. Sofia: Asenevtsi, upcoming.
- Norris, R. (2013). *Ready for first*. London: Macmillan Education.
- Spasov, D. (1992). *The verb in the structure of English*. Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.
- Vince, M. (1998). *Intermediate language practice*. London: Macmillan Education.
- Vince, M. (2003). *First certificate language practice*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- Vince, M. (2008). *MacMillan English Grammar in Context Advanced*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- Vince, M., & French, A. (2017). *IELTS language practice*. London: Macmillan Education.

Abbreviations:

BNC – British National Corpus

COCA – Corpus of Contemporary American English

FLA – Foreign Language Acquisition

CLAUSAL SUBSTITUTION IN ENGLISH AND BULGARIAN

Snejana Obeyd¹

Abstract: *The article focuses on the ways and mechanisms clausal substitution in English works, thoroughly analysing said cohesive relation along with some of its most typical instances. As the three environments in which clausal substitution exists are report, condition and modality, these are also explicitly defined.*

Bearing in mind that the English sentences containing clausal substitutes demonstrate the most typical instances of clausal substitution, the study is based on English literary texts which are translated into Bulgarian. Each sentence has several variants of translation: the original published version of the book in Bulgarian as well as the possible variants provided by the author, thus showing the various elements and devices corresponding to English clausal substitutes. The most representative ones are, in turn, analysed and categorized. As a result, the article also describes and discusses the different means through which cohesion is rendered in Bulgarian.

Key words: *cohesion, substitution, clausal substitute, presupposition, relation*

Introduction

A text is deemed cohesive when all the components within are interrelated so that it can be perceived as a unified entity, semantically and structurally (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). As the meaning is delivered by forms, and the forms, in turn, by sounds and letters, cohesion integrates all text constructing mechanisms. For Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion is a semantic relation between an element in the text and some other one that is essential for its decoding. Cohesion expresses “the continuity that exists between part of the text and another” (ibid., p.288). Cohesive relations are realized through grammar as well as through vocabulary, i.e. through the establishment of semantic links between sentences on a surface level. There are three different kinds of relations in language that connect one party of a text with another: relatedness of form, relatedness of reference and semantic connection (ibid., p. 28)

In this article my focus is on the cohesive relation of substitution which is a formal relation between elements at the lexicogrammatical level. Substitution means the replacement of an item with another one, a filler word, retaining the grammatical function of the word for which it stands. Being a grammatical

1. Senior lecturer, Department of English Studies, Shumen University, Bulgaria, e-mail: s.obeyd@shu.bg, ORCID: 0000-0002-0676-5560

relation, or as Halliday and Hasan (1976) put it: “a relation in the wording”, the criterion for differentiating the types is the grammatical function of the substitute item. Structurally, substitution is operative at three levels:

Nominal: *one/ ones, same*

Verbal: *do*

Clausal: *so, not*

My primary concern is to characterize clausal substitution as a text-forming agency in English and Bulgarian.

Background studies

A text is defined by Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) as “a communicative occurrence which meets seven standards of textuality.” They make a distinction between cohesion and coherence. In their opinion, cohesion “concerns the ways in which the components of the surface text, i.e. the actual words we hear or see, are mutually connected within a sequence”, while coherence refers to the meaningful relations in a text establishing “a continuity of senses” (ibid.). As surface components depend upon each other according to “grammatical forms and conventions”, they view cohesion as a grammatical dependency.

A number of linguists (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981; Brown & Yule, 1983; Dobрева & Savova, 2000; Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Harweg, 2001; Leech & Quirk, 1985; Salkie, 1986; Todorova, 2015) have been concerned with the principles of connectivity, which bind a text together. Halliday and Hasan (1976) argue that the primary determinant of whether a set of sentences do or do not constitute a text depends on the cohesive relationships between the sentences, which create texture. Cohesive relationships within a text are set up “where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 4). They consider cohesion a semantic relation which is realized through grammar as well as through vocabulary (ibid.). Altogether, they regard language as a “multiple coding system” with “three levels of coding: the semantic, the lexicogrammatical and the phonological and orthographic”. (1976, p. 5)

Brown and Yule recognize Halliday and Hasan’s view of the subject as being “the most comprehensive treatment” (1983). Although they provide an extended discussion of the relationships signaled by cohesive markers they agree that “it is the underlying semantic relation [...] that actually has the cohesive power” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, quoted in Brown & Yule, 1983, p.195).

Cohesion is interpreted differently by different linguists. R. Todorova describes cohesion as “connectiveness between linguistic occurrences in text on surface

level” (2015). She refers to substitute items as “pro-forms”. In fact, the two terms appear to be interchangeable in most of the linguistic studies. The mechanism of work of “pro-forms” is presented as a replacement of “content-carrying elements with short place-holders of no independent content” (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981).

The first exploration of the unity of text has been proposed by Ronald Harweg, who stated that the mechanism of substitution is the major factor for texts to stick together. This is achieved by a sequence of expressions of the same sense or reference, which in turn realizes “a cohesive or coherent relationship” (Harweg, 1978, quoted in Brown & Yule, 1985, p. 201). His notion of substitution turns out to be extremely complex, including “relationships such as recurrence, synonymy, class/instance, subclass/ superclass, cause/ effect, part/ whole, and much more” (Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981).

For R. Quirk “substitution is a device for abbreviating and for avoiding repetition” (1973). The term “pro-form” in his analysis equals the term “substitute” and his classification distinguishes four types: pro-forms for noun phrases, adverbials, predicate and predication, and complex pro-forms.

In *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Quirk et. al. define substitution as “a relation between pro-form and antecedent whereby the pro-form can be understood to have ‘replaced’ a repeated occurrence of the antecedent” (1985, p. 863). According to them there should be a grammatical and semantic equivalence between the “pro-form” and its “antecedent”.

Dobreva and Savova (2000) present the most detailed account of the means and mechanisms in Bulgarian realizing the deep structure links on the surface level of text. For them, there are lexical means, such as pronouns, synonyms and repeated items that can function as replacements of an item(s), but the substitutive function of these lexical means is not their single one (ibid.).

Substitution, as Halliday and Hasan argue, is “a lexicogrammatical relation, in which a form (word or words) is specified through the use of a grammatical signal indicating that it is to be recovered from what has gone before” (1976, p. 308). They point out that the source of recovery is the text and the “grammatical signal” is, in fact, a substitute word, serving as a “sort of counter which is used in place of the repetition of a particular item” (ibid., p. 308).

Analysis

Clausal substitution may extend over more than the head of the substituted item, and it involves the presupposing of a whole clause. The substitutes *so* and *not* are used in clausal substitution (see Obeyd, 2013):

[1] Are you coming to dinner? I think so.

[2] Did he leave on time? I think not.

In the example (1), *so* stands for *I am coming to dinner*; in (2) *not* substitutes for he didn't leave on time. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 131) describe three environments in which clausal substitution takes place. These are reported clauses (4), clauses of condition (5) and modality (6):

[4] Mary thinks that there is another planet beyond Pluto. But no one else thinks **so**.

(cited in Salkie, 1995, p.56)

[5] Would the girls miss the package she had put down? If **so**, would she remember that Erica had been close by?

(Hailey, 1971, p.120)

[6] "I dare say you never even spoke to Time!"

"Perhaps **not**."

(cited in Halliday, 1985, p.297)

All these three contexts that allow for clausal substitution to take place are semantically related. They provide an environment for the truth of the statement to be open to question. As Halliday and Hasan have put it: "all three types have the property of being one remove from (statements of) reality: they are hypothetical" (1976, p.136).

At first sight it would seem that clausal substitutes cannot be used to make a contrast, since they replace a whole clause. However, the clause is projected in a new contrastive context, which does not necessarily reject some other one, but there should always be "some redefinition of the environment of the presupposed clause" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p.136). That is the main principle of clausal substitution, which also applies to substitution as a whole.

As I have already mentioned, clausal substitution operates within three environments. One of them is the conditional structure, as in [5]. The condition in this sample is expressed by *if*, which is outside the presupposition and provides the contrastive setting for the use of the substitute. Since it is a clausal substitute, *so* presupposes the whole of the previous clause *the girl would miss the package she had put down*.

The corresponding Bulgarian translations are as follows:

[5₁²] Дали момичето щеше да открие липсата на пакета? Ако това стане, дали щеше да си спомни....?

2. Subscript [1] marks the published Bulgarian translation of the example, while [2] and [3] provide the additional variants supplied by the author.

[5₂] Дали продавачката щеше да забележи липсата? И ако я забележи.....?

In [5₁] the impersonal verb *ставам* introduces the demonstrative *това*, which is in fact the semantic nucleus of the predication. *Това* refers to the whole of the preceding sentence, including it as fact. Hence, the mechanism by means of which a part of the English clausal substitute *so* is projected into Bulgarian is pronominalization. On the other hand, the expression *това става* stands for the previous sentence and since the verb *ставам* has an abstract lexical meaning the construction could be considered as substitutive for clauses denoting a particular state of affairs.

In [5₂] the impersonal pronoun *я* stands for the noun *липсата*, which is an instance of pronominalization. There is an obvious structural gap with regard to the subject of the sentence *продавачката* and it proves that ellipsis is also in action. There is lexical repetition as well, realized by repeating the verb *забелязвам*.

Another environment suitable for the use of clausal substitutes is that of report. A typical reporting verb is *say*:

[7] Matt stopped, realizing that he had not really been talking to this brash kid DeLosanto – much as he disliked him – but that his own emotions, pent up inside, had suddenly burst through. He was about to say so, awkwardly, and add that he was sorry, when Barbara appeared...

(Hailey, 1971, p.187)

So substitutes the previous clause *that his own emotions, pent up inside, had suddenly burst through*. In this case, the form expressing the report coincides with that of the fact, but this does not mean that the relation is semantic. No matter whether there was a speech act or not, the report realizes relation in the wording.

The Bulgarian equivalents are as follows:

[7₁] ...Без да иска беше дал израз на емоциите си, които дълго се бяха трупали в душата му. Понечи да каже всичко това на глас и да се извини, когато...

[7₂] ...Тъкмо щеше да го каже и притеснено да добави, че съжaliaва...

[7₃] Тъкмо щеше да изрече тези думи и неловко да се извини...

In [7₁] the pronominal expression *всичко това* stands in place of the substitute *so*. Semantically, *всичко* is quantifying summary pronoun, presenting its referent as a unity of elements. Since it is used attributively its referent is displayed by the demonstrative *това*, which in turn refers to the previous statement. Hence, the mechanism realizing the link is pronominalization.

[7₂] is also an instance of pronominalization. The difference is in the Theme-Rheme organization of the text. While *всичко това* represent the culmination, the Rheme of the message, the short form of the pronoun *то* remains between the two poles, in the transitory part between the Theme and Rheme (see Nitsolova, 1986, p.53).

[7₃] presents an instance of nominalization of a clause. As an anaphoric item the demonstrative *мезу* has only identifying function, that is, it identifies that it is exactly the noun *думи* that refers to the preceding clause. The result is that a stretch of text is transformed into a nominal phrase.

Some reporting verbs require the negation to be transferred into the reporting clause, so that we cannot normally use the negative clausal substitute, but the positive *so*. The most frequently used verb in such cases is *think*:

[8] “Surely being a newspaper writer is doing something useful.” ... “If you saw as much of press people as I do, you might not think **so**.”

(Hailey, 1971, p.127)

As we see, reporting is associated with thinking, since there is a correspondent act of verbalizing the thought. In this example *so* replaces the clause *being a newspaper writer is doing something useful*.

The alternative translations to this sample are the following:

[8₁] – Писането на статии в печата също е полезна работа.

- Ако познаваше толкова журналисти, колкото (познавам) аз/ мен, сега щеше да си на друго мнение.

[8₂] -нямаше да мислиш така.

[8₃] -нямаше да си на това мнение.

[8₁] is organized by means of nominalization, expressed by *друго мнение*. The lexical item *друг* is considered opposite to the demonstrative *такъв* with regard to the characteristic “identity of referents”. Hence, it also functions as pronominal item designating non-identity of referents as a result of their comparison as well as non-identity of their properties. On account of its attributive and pronominal nature it realizes the anaphoric link between the noun *мнение* and the previous clause.

In [8₂] the anaphoric item is the pronominal adverb *така*, presupposing the previous statement.

In [8₃], the whole of the preceding clause is presented in a synthesized way by means of the demonstrative *това* identifying the noun *мнение* as coreferent with the preceding statement.

Usually, a question-answer sequence in a dialogue provides the most suitable environment for the use of clausal substitutes. This is a result of the hypothetical nature of some of the answers. They can express agreement or disagreement with the truth of the proposition as well as leaving it to be open to question. The following is an example of such a sequence of question-answer:

[9] "I know how you do everything – always the same way, thoroughly. So it will involve a lot of time. Well, won't it?"

He conceded, "I suppose **so**."

"Will it be in office time? In the daytime, during the week?"

"Probably **not**."

(Hailey, 1971, p.134)

In its first occurrence, *so* is the additive conjunction, meaning "accordingly". In the next, it is the clausal substitute *so* used within the context of report. The reported clause for which *so* stands is *it will involve a lot of time*. The reported clause is dependent on the reporting one, thus *so* presupposes a clause that is hypotactically related to that containing the verb *suppose*. No matter whether the presupposed clause is interrogative, the reported clause for which *so* stands is always declarative.

Another possible context for the use of *so* and *not* is that of modality. Most often modality is expressed within the clause by a modal adverb, in this case *probably* and there is no dependency involved. However, the perimeter of clausal substitution spreads to this realization. *Not* replaces *it won't be in office time, in the daytime, during the week*, and the contrast is expressed by *probably*, which is beyond the range of the presupposition.

Here are the translated versions of this sample:

[9₁] – Аз зная как ще го направиш – задълбочено и подробно като всичко, за което се залавяш. А това изисква много време, нали?

- Предполагам – съгласи се той.

- Но няма да използваш работното си време, през деня, през седмицата...

- Вероятно **не**.

[9₂]- За това ще ти трябва оста време, нали? - Предполагам, че **да**.

- В работното ти време ли ще е, през деня, в делничните дни?

– Вероятно **не**.

In [9₁], in the place of *so*, there is ellipsis of the dependent *че*-clause, which is to be supplied from the preceding sentence. The modal verb *предполагам* appears to be the presupposing item. By virtue of its transitive nature it functions as an

elliptical clause in which everything except the predicate is presupposed. In [9₂], the same case is rendered by means of the elliptical *че*- clause, consisting only of the affirmative particle *да*. Semantically, *да* blocks the uncertainty implied by the verb and confirms the presupposition as positive. Both the negative *не* and the positive *да* particles are text-dependent, so in case they are used as the only element of a clause, this clause is considered elliptical.

In the two versions, the negative substitute *not* is translated by means of the negative particle *не*. The construction is elliptical. The semantic function of *не* in this example is almost the same as of *да*: it blocks the uncertainty of the modal adverb *вероятно* by transforming the presupposition into a negative one.

The following example illustrates the use of the negative substitute in the context of report:

[10] “Ever hear of a well-paid spy?” “I suppose **not**.”
(Hailey, 1971, p. 468)

The substitute presupposes the clause *I have never heard of a well-paid spy*. There is a great extent of similarity in meaning between a reported clause dependent on a first person singular “cognizing” verb and a modalized clause, for example *I suppose not* could be interpreted as *probably not*. This results from their nature of hypothesis.

That example could be translated as follows:

[10₁] – Чувал ли си някога за съществуването на наистина добре платени шпиони?

– Май не съм.

[10₂] ... – Мисля, че не.

In both translated versions the case is rendered by means of ellipsis. In [10₁], the auxiliary verb *съм* functions as presupposing the rest of the predication. In [10₂], it is the dependent *че*-clause that is elliptical, consisting only of the negative particle marking only the polarity of the presupposition.

Conclusion

Condition, modality and report are the basic settings in which clausal substitution takes place in the analyzed text, and the contrastive element is outside the clause. The substitute items appear to be a manifestation of givenness, contributing to the semantic structure of a text without disturbing its informational organization.

The leading position among the means by which clausal substitutes are projected into Bulgarian is occupied by pronominalization. Demonstrative pronouns and

adverbs are used on their own as substantivized items (nominators) carrying the information load presenting it as fact. Anaphoric expressions, realized by a demonstrative and a generalizing word frequently appear as projections of the substitute *so* when standing for a reported clause.

When a clause, sentence or a segment of text is taken up by a following item, transforming it into a noun nominal group, the mechanism of nominalization is realized. It comes into being by means of generalizing nouns, which either have an abstract meaning, thus expressing the neutral position of the author towards the referred part of the text, or have some interpersonal element in the meaning allowing the subjective views, characteristics and judgements to be expressed in an abbreviated way.

Ellipsis is activated in some cases of clausal substitution in Bulgarian, especially in question-answer sequences which provide a suitable setting for the realization of this mechanism. Both are grammatical devices that enable us to identify information which is given and in this way concentrate on new information.

The analysis shows that substitution as well as its corresponding equivalents in the Bulgarian versions of the material are resources that give “texture” to a piece of text. They make it possible to link items of any size and distance, whether structurally or not. They provide unity to the building of text so that it can function as a complete communicative entity.

References:

- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collins Cobuild English Grammar (1990). London & Glasgow: Collins.
- De Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. London & New York: Longman.
- Dobрева, E., & Savova, I. (2000). *Tekstolingvistika*. Shumen: Konstantin Preslavsky University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Harweg, R. (2001). *Studien zur Textlinguistik*. Shaker Verlag
- Nitsolova, R. (1986). *Bulgarskite mestoimeniya*. Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo
- Obeyd, S. (2013) Clausal substitution. *Dynamics, interdisciplinarity, diversity*. Shumen: Konstantin Preslavsky University Press. 93-97.
- Quirk, R., & Greenbaum, S. (1973). *A university grammar of English*. Harlow: Longman

- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Salkie, R. (1995). *Text and discourse analysis*. London & NewYork: Routlege.
- Todorova, R. (2015). *Insights in text linguistics. From theory to practice*. Shumen: Konstantin Preslavsky University Press. (2nd ed.).

Sample text sources:

- Hailey, A. (1971). *Wheels*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Ltd
- Hailey, A. (1988). Kolela. (translated by Veselin Laptev). Sofia: Narodna kultura.

SOME KEY PITFALLS IN LITERARY TRANSLATION

Silvana Neshkovska¹, Sonja Kitanovska-Kimovska²

Abstract: *Literary translation is considered to be the most challenging type of translation despite the numerous rewards it offers both to translators themselves and the humanity in general.*

Research shows that numerous factors contribute to this state of affairs. The differences between the source and target language and culture surely account for a large portion of the challenges that arise in doing literary translation. In addition, literature abounds with diverse literary genres – the most predominant ones being prose, poetry and plays. Each of them features a set of specific traits which when transferred into the target language need to be addressed with special deliberation. Nevertheless, a plethora of issues that literary translators grapple with are common to all three literary genres. These encompass translating the title, the culture-specific terms, slang, expletives, subtext, style, etc.

This paper is intended to shed some light on these common pitfalls that recur in translating diverse literary genres, and is intended to be of assistance to novice literary translators. What makes the study particularly valid and authentic is the fact that the points discussed are illustrated with instances of translation solutions extracted from empirical studies of Macedonian translations of literary works originally written in English.

Keywords: *literary translation, title, slang, expletives*

Introduction

Literary translation traces its origins back to ancient times probably to when the famous epic of Gilgamesh was translated in several different languages (e.g. Sumerian, Babylonian, Arcadian, etc.). This tradition proceeded with the translation of the Bible from Hebrew to Ancient Greek in the 2nd century AD and was particularly intensified with the extensive translation practice of the ancient Romans. The Romans endeavoured to recreate the extremely rich and inspiring Greek literature into Latin, and spared no efforts in translating the exquisite works of the Ancient Greek writers and philosophers (Arsova-Nikolikj, 1999).

1. Ph.D., “St. Kliment Ohridski” University-Bitola, e-mail: silvana.neskovska@uklo.edu.mk, ORCID: 0000-0003-4417-7783

2. Ph.D., “Ss. Cyril and Methodius” University-Skopje, e-mail: sonjakitanovska@flf.ukim.edu.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-0037-0434

Nowadays well into the 21st century, literary translation is still a very relevant human activity. What has kept it alive in the course of the centuries are the numerous benefits it offers not just to humanity at large but also to those who are enthusiastic enough to dedicate their lives and careers to literary translation. For humanity literary translation serves as a bridge between nations, across which distinct traditions, values, customs are transported and made available to wide audiences. But for literary translation, numerous literary masterpieces would have had only a limited reach and many appreciators of the written word would have been deprived of the privilege to rejoice in their splendour. On a personal level, literary translation brings benefits to translators not so much in the form of monetary gains or fame as in the form of an intensified and deepened intellectual challenge. The dedicated literary translator is involved in continuous quests, which entail not just consulting dictionaries, but consulting native speakers, authors, editors, publishers, other translators, books, magazines, the Internet, etc. All of that, undoubtedly, requires a great deal of patience and perseverance.

Nevertheless, irrespective of what genre is translated (prose, poetry or plays), literary translation is undoubtedly a very demanding type of translation. Apart from the differences in structure, i.e. form (poetry is written in lines and stanzas, novels are organised in chapters and paragraphs, and dialogues and monologues are the main building blocks of plays), each genre has its distinctive traits, some of which cannot be easily transferred from the source to the target language. In addition, translators should be mindful of the overarching need of recreating successfully the same or approximately the same aesthetic appeal of the original piece in the translated text, and its potential to elevate and enlighten the spirit of the respective readership.

The problems, very often, start even with the title itself. Given that the title is the very first thing that either catches or puts off the reader's attention, it is vital that translators render it correctly and appropriately. Other thorny issues include the translation of culture-specific terms, slang, puns, and expletives. Also, the author's style and subtext are among those issues which, if not handled properly, seriously undermine the value of the translated text.

The paper at hand draws on the findings of previous theorists who have dealt with the issue of literary translation such as Newmark (1988), Landers (2001), Paul (2009), Venuti (2008), Delabastita (1997), and Fernandez (2006).

The purpose of the study is to underline some key pitfalls that are common to translating prose, poetry and plays. To illustrate the main points, instances of translation solutions extracted from empirical studies of Macedonian translations of literary works originally written in English are presented and discussed. We believe the insights discussed in the paper are particularly useful for emerging literary translators who have already embarked or are about to embark on the

journey of translating literature. Landers's (2001, p. 28) contention that "it is unfortunate that there is no mentorship programs for literary translators and precious little training is available for would-be literary translation in the handful of translation programs and universities" lends a perfect justification for this study.

Translating literature

Translation theorists seem to be in agreement that in order for a translator to do a successful literary translation he/she should meet several basic but vital requirements. Thus, first and foremost, literary translators should have a very solid grasp of both the source and the target language and culture. This means that they should be prone to lifelong learning and should put an effort to be exposed as much as possible to both languages and cultures. This certainly entails using all possible means such as films, books, magazines, stays in the foreign country where the foreign language is spoken, contact with native speakers, etc., in order to keep pace with all the relevant linguistic and societal changes and trends (Landers, 2001).

In addition, irrespective of what literary genre the translator has selected to work on, it is of paramount importance that they familiarise themselves well with the text by rereading it a number of times. This provides the translator with a preview of the translational challenges that await him/her in that specific work. Translators are also advised to read other works of the same author as well as the author's biography so that they would learn more about the author and what influenced his/her writing. All these are vital steps in translating any literary piece efficiently, and by taking the time to consider them properly, the translator is boosting his/her chances of success (Landers, 2001).

Another salient recommendation which translation theorists repeatedly make to literary translators is that, from the very outset, they should decide whether they would apply the domestication or foreignisation approach in their translation. According to Venuti (2008, p. 15) domestication is "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home" whereas, foreignisation is "an ethno deviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad" (op. cit.). Newmark (1988) calls the translators who adopt foreignisation *sourcers* as they normally lean more towards the author and the source language, thus, leaving deliberately their final product with a subtle touch of foreignness in it. Translators who follow domestication, according to Newmark (1988), are *targeteers*, since they display a greater propensity towards the target language readers and make adjustments in the target text that closely resemble the features of the target language. Landers (2001, p. 50) seems to occupy middle ground as far as this issue is concerned as he claims that in real-

world translating there is “an irregular swing, sometimes in a single paragraph, between favouring the author and favouring the reader”. In other words, the translator very often has no choice but to make use of both domestication and foreignisation alternately even within a single translation.

Understandably, these are by no means the only requirements that literary translators should meet. What follows in the next section is an overview of some of the most common aspects that translators are expected to tackle in doing literary translation, irrespective of the genre they are working on.

Some common pitfalls in literary translation

Regardless of what genre a literary piece belongs to – prose, poetry or plays – the translator is very likely to encounter issues such as discerning and rendering the author’s style and the subtext itself. Moreover, the translator’s dilemmas may extend to the title of the work; the choice of lexis particularly expressive lexis such as slang and expletives; the use of culture specific terms and puns. The following sections discuss these issues in turn.

Translating subtext and author’s style

The translator should be adept at discerning the author’s style. The author’s style comprises the authors’ choice of words, length of sentences, sentence structure, paragraph division, the use of figures of speech, etc. Each author has their own writing style. The dilemma that arises among translation theorists is whether the translator should emulate the author’s style, i.e. make attempts to disappear and become indistinguishable from the style of the author or perhaps change the author’s style replacing it with his/her own. Landers’ position (2001, p. 90) is that “the translator should adopt the style of the author – now terse, now rambling ... but always as faithful to the original as circumstances permit”.

Mihajlovski’s translations of Shakespeare into Macedonian are a good example of how this can be done. Kitanovska-Kimovska & Gjurcheska-Atanasovska (2018) compare Mihajlovski’s translations of “Hamlet” and “A Midsummer Night’s Dream” with the translations of the same plays done by another Macedonian translator. The analysis focuses on a very salient feature of Shakespeare’s lexis: words derived by compounding and conversion. Their results suggest that Mihajlovski has made a conscious effort to reproduce Shakespeare’s style not only by using compounding and conversion as a means of lexical innovation in places where they are used in the original text, but also by adding new ones in places where they are not found in the source text (ibid., p. 81). For example, Mihajlovski matches Shakespeare’s compound “fear-surprised eyes” with his own compound coinage “стравоококорени очи” (stravookokoreni ochi – back-

translated as: fear-goggled eyes). Following Shakespeare's model, he also adds the compound "љуби-сокот" (ljubi-sokot - back-translated as: the love-juice) where there is no special innovation in the Shakespearean text (ibid.). These are just two examples out of numerous ones found in Mihajlovski's translations.

Paul (2009, p. 44) goes slightly further and raises another style related-issue – "What happens when there is a purposeful stylistic awkwardness in the original which would simply not work in the target language?". In that context, Paul (ibid.) recommends that the translator should try "to convey the sense of awkwardness in other ways". A proposal of how this can be done is provided by Zorica Petkovska (2017) in her discussion of the options for the Macedonian translation of the Nadsat jargon in Anthony Burgess' *A Clockwork Orange*. Notably, Burgess' Nadsat jargon is largely based on the Russian language, which defamiliarises it for the English reader and makes it stand out against the English text. Based on Russian as a foreign language which is unintelligible, distant and even frightening, the Nadsat jargon serves the purpose of scaring the ordinary English reader and attracting young English people. When the book is to be translated into Macedonian, the fact that Macedonian and Russian are Slavic languages and some words are the same or strikingly similar, the effect the Russian has in the English text would be lost if it is kept unchanged. Therefore, Petkovska suggests two broad strategies for conveying the stylistic awkwardness of the Nadsat jargon. One is to use Russian synonyms that are not the same or similar to their Macedonian counterparts and would, therefore, be equally foreign to the Macedonian reader. For instance: "mozgvilina" for "mozg" (brain), "osvedomlenie" for "gazeta" (newspaper) (ibid., 154-155). The second strategy she suggests is to use a different foreign language, for example, Japanese, and use Japanese words to replace the Nadsat words. Thus, among other examples she provides, she suggests the Japanese word "gen" for the Russian "vek" (human/man) (ibid., 156) to preserve the defamiliarizing effect in the Macedonian translation.

Subtext is the implicit and the underlying meaning of a text. In order for one to grasp the subtext of a particular literary work one must be able to read carefully and read between the lines. The subtext is in fact the hidden message that the text imparts. The subtext may be sexual, political, religious, etc. Thus, for instance, the fairy tale "Little Red Riding Hood", Landers (2001, p. 126) claims, has a sexual subtext, intended to forewarn young girls of sexual predators.

Not all writings have a subtext, though. Only the masterfully written pieces have a subtext. Literary translators' task is to discern the subtext, if present, and to choose lexis very carefully so that they could reproduce it faithfully in the target text.

The example of the Mihajlovski's translation of Hamlet's dialogue with Ophelia into Macedonian is a case in point (Kitanovska-Kimovska, 2014). Notably, in

order to reproduce Hamlet's bitterness, sarcasm and irony in addressing Ophelia, the translator reproduces the pun by using different words than the ones used by Shakespeare while conveying the same meaning and effect. Shakespeare uses puns on the words "country matters" and "nothing" to refer to "obscenities" and "the female sex organ", respectively. The Macedonian translation uses the colloquial words "онаа работа" (onaa rabota – back-translated as: that job) and "такваата" (takvaata - back-translated as: the such thing), which, apart from their primary meanings, are used to refer to "intercourse" and "the female sex organ", respectively. Thus, although the Macedonian wordplay is not the same as the English one, the context in which it is used and the effect it achieves are the same (ibid., p. 312). The translator has managed to identify the subtext, i.e. the sexual allusions Hamlet is making and has put an effort to convey them in his translation. Judging by our standards, he has been very successful in doing so.

Translating titles

Translating the title of a specific literary piece, no matter what genre it belongs to, places a heavy responsibility on the translator. Newmark (1988, p.56) argued that the translated title "should usually bear some relation to the original, if only for identification", but it should also "sound attractive, allusive, suggestive" to attract the potential readers. A clear and appealing title is crucial not just because it adds to the attractiveness but also to the saleability of the work. Landers's (2001, p. 140) position regarding the translation of titles of literary works is that the translator has the option either to retain it, or modify it, or, as the very last resort, discard it in accord with the exigencies of taste and marketplace. In that context, he admits that sometimes the title is straightforward and the decision is often automatic, but adds that, often times, titles are altered beyond recognition. His recommendation is that a title should be changed only when it cannot be left unchanged, because of cultural, linguistic, historical and geographical disparities between the source and the target language. Thus, for instance, place names in a title can be very troublesome. The same is the case when the title relates to some cultural references or literary allusions. In those cases, the translator is advised to save the selection of the title for last or until inspiration strikes. What is needed in selecting the title according to Landers (ibid.) is flexibility and imagination as well as apprehension of a work's thematic sinews and textual subtleties such as themes and subtext.

Similar positions to those of Landers are expressed in Paul (2009). Namely, Paul agrees that some titles "lend themselves neatly to translation", but he further adds that "literal translation is often a dreadful mistake when it comes to titles", and that "editors and translators must be prepared to be creative" when it comes to rendering titles (2009, p. 42).

One such example of creative translation of a title is the Macedonian translation of Oscar Wilde's "The Importance of Being Earnest". Kitanovska-Kimovska & Neshkovska (2016, p. 122) argue that the Macedonian translator's "equivalent effect" translation strategy is an ingenious solution to preserving the dramatic irony which is central to the play. Notably, Wilde's pun on the meaning of Earnest (used as a proper name and an adjective meaning "serious") in the Macedonian translation is rendered as "Bogumil". This solution keeps the pun because Bogumil is a Macedonian proper name carrying the meaning of "dear to God". This change may seem dramatic, but it is also necessary in order to reproduce in the target text the same semantic and pragmatic effects which are produced in the source text. Without it the target text reader would miss a lot of the humour and satire of Wilde's original text.

Another interesting example is the Macedonian translation of the title of Michelle Obama's memoir "Becoming", released in 2019. The literal translation of the term 'becoming' in Macedonian would be 'настанување' (nastanuvanje). However, this word is not normally used in the context of one's personal experiences. In order to avoid the awkwardness that the literal translation of the title would cause, the translator opted for a modification of the title based on the content of the book and translated it as "Mojata prikazna" (back-translated as "My story"). This solution, however, does not fully encompass the meaning of 'becoming' in the sense of undergoing a profound personal transformation in the course of one's lifetime. To compensate for the loss, the translator also decided to leave the original title on the front page (Becoming) alongside the translated title (My story).

Translating slang

Nothing in language changes more rapidly than slang, the language of closed groups of people (e.g. teenagers, adolescents, criminals, etc.) who create it in order to communicate with the members of their group and to exclude the others as outsiders (e.g. parents, authorities, etc.). Due to its novelty and freshness, slang is a pertinent feature of literary works, too. One difficulty that arises in relation to translation of slang is its temporariness, i.e. the fact that it changes very rapidly from one generation to the next. Paul (2009) explains that in some translations you can almost identify the year, if not the month, in which they must have been translated mainly due to the slang terms employed. Slang is also one of the reasons why some works of literature require retranslation.

Another important slang-related issue, in the context of translation is that very often it is extremely difficult to find similar slang terms in the target language as the slang terms used in the source text are usually a product of a completely different social reality (Brodovich, 1997). Landers (2001) points out that it is

only heavy exposure to the foreign culture that alerts translators to the very rapid changes that occur in such speech patterns as slang. He further adds that “while we can pick up slang terms by reading, nothing except living in the culture can inform us of which terms have fallen into disuse” (2001, p. 77).

A good example of how slang can be translated in literature is provided by Gjurchevska-Atanasovska & Sazdovska-Pigulovska (2017), who discuss the Macedonian translations of Carver’s short story collection “What We Talk about When We Talk about Love” and suggest their own translation solutions. For instance, for the slang term “It’s in the bag” used to refer to a girl, meaning “certain to be won over”, they suggest colloquial expressions like “moja e (moja e – back-translated as: she is mine)” or “печена е (pechena e - back-translated as: she is roasted)”. These solutions are stylistically more appropriate in the context rather than the literal translation “Ја имам в торба” (Ja imam v torba - back-translated as: I’ve got her in my bag) (ibid., p. 389). Gjurchevska-Atanasovska & Kitanovska-Kimovska (2018) also discuss examples of slang translation illustrating how slang can be adequately rendered conveying the same colour and richness as the original English slang words. For example, the slang term “cop” used to refer to a policeman in Bukowski’s book “The Most Beautiful Woman in Town” is translated with the slang term “цајкан” (cajkan) in the Macedonian translation of the same book or the slang expression “to hit it hot”, which means “to have, to possess”, is translated with the colloquial word “ќапи” (kjari) meaning “to earn” (ibid., pp. 105-106).

Translating expletives

Expletives or profanities are also known as four letter words, dirty words, curses, swear words, crude or vulgar language and are generally considered as strongly impolite and offensive. When people use swear words, which, in essence, are words and expressions related to body functions, sex and religion, they do it in order to shock and offend, to be aggressive or provocative and to draw attention to themselves (Andersson & Trudgill, 1990, p.14). Although many people find profanities shocking and unacceptable, using obscene words is part of language, culture and, consequently, literature. Literary translators might find themselves faced with the dilemma of what to do with expletives; some of them are undoubtedly considering the option of not translating those words at all because of their moral principles. Landers (2001, p.151) suggests that the translator should “do the same conscious job of translating as with any other text”, because according to him “the translator should be a professional and is not expected to apply his own standards of decency and morality to the task”.

As to the translation of profanities in literary works, what is outright evident is that word for word translation is not most appropriate because the final outcome will sound ridiculous and meaningless. Or as Dobao Fernandez (2006, p.139) notes:

in the translation of swearing the literal and referential meaning of the original lexical item are of little relevance... It is the emotional charge of the swear word that needs to be taken into account in order to express in the target language the same emotion and attitude the speaker intends to express in the source language and thus produce in the receptor of the translation the same impact the original swear word produces in the receptor of the source text.

Gjurchevska-Atanasovska and Kitanovska-Kimovska (2018) also suggest that thought for thought translation should be used in such cases instead. In other words, the main purpose is to translate not what the author has said but what he/she has meant. They provide examples from the Macedonian translations of Bukowski's book "The Most Beautiful Woman in Town" and Carver's short story collection "What We Talk about When We Talk about Love" to support this approach. Bukowski's expression "god damn it" used as a swear expression is translated with a suitable swear expression in Macedonian "да му се сневиди" (da mu se snevidi - back-translated as: let him/her lose his/her sight) (ibid., p. 106). They also suggest that Carver's vulgar expression "there was no boss to get on your ass" should be translated with a similar vulgar or colloquial expression, such as "не ти стои над глава" (ne ti stoi nad glava - back-translated as: s/he doesn't hang over your head), "не ти дише во врат" (ne ti dishe vo vrat - back-translated as: s/he doesn't breath into your neck), "не ти досаѓа" (ne ti dosagja - back-translated as: s/he doesn't bother you), "не те гњави" (ne te gnjavi - back-translated as: s/he doesn't pester you), "не те замара" (ne te zamara - back-translated as: s/he doesn't tire you), "не те дави" (ne te davi - back-translated as: s/he doesn't torture you), rather than the literal one "каде што газдата не ти беше зад газот" (kade shto gazdata ne ti beshe zad gazot - back-translated as: where the boss wasn't behind your ass) (ibid., p. 107).

Translating culture-related terms

Very often difficulties in literary translation are bound to arise due to terms which refer to cultural artefacts not found in the target culture. The greater the cultural distance between the source and target culture, the more difficulties the translator will face when rendering these terms into the target language.

Culture-specific terms include names of people, objects and institutions not readily understood by another culture. These are often meaningless to the target language readers. Newmark (1988) distinguishes five domains for classifying culture words:

1) ecology (flora, fauna, winds, plains, hills); 2) material culture (food, clothes, houses and towns, transport); 3) social culture (work and leisure); 4) organisations, customs, activities, procedures, concepts (political and administrative, religious, artistic, etc.), and 5) gesture and habits. Landers (2001, pp. 93-95) proposes three options for dealing with culture specific terms: a) footnotes; b) interpolation, c) omission. When it comes to footnotes particularly in fiction, he cautions translators as footnotes can destroy the aesthetic effect of the work, especially if used frequently. In such cases, he recommends using endnotes or a glossary at the end of the book instead. Interpolations, on the other hand, are depicted as adding a parenthetical word or phrase as unobtrusively as possible in order to explain a culture-specific term in the target text. Landers (2001, p. 94) treats this strategy as ‘a cosmetic surgery’ and advises translators to think how important the given word to which they plan to attach an interpolation is, prior to reaching the decision to interpolate. He also emphasises the advantage of this strategy as after a term is explained the first time, it frees the translator “to use the ST term, which is likely to be more concise and certainly more denotative than its translation”. Omission, on the other hand, does not refer to leaving the term out. According to Landers (*ibid.*) it rather refers to omitting an explanation, i.e. it means leaving the reader to his/her own devices in grasping the meaning of an unfamiliar term.

Another possibility for the translator is to adapt the source text culture to the target text culture replacing source culture-specific terms with target culture-specific terms in order to preserve the same effect on the reader. Kitanovska-Kimovska and Neshkovska (2018) have found adaptation to be the most dominant translation strategy used for the Macedonian translation of Oscar Wilde’s play “The Importance of Being Earnest”. In order to achieve the play’s pragmatic goal and to preserve the pun in the play’s title, the translator has shifted the action from England to Macedonia and the characters have become Macedonians rather than Englishmen; the 19th century English society has become the 20th century Macedonian society and the Wilde’s satire of Victorian England has turned into a comment on the Macedonian post-independence society (*ibid.*, p. 257). Thus, all English street names, food items, institutions have been replaced by Macedonian ones. For example, “Half-Moon street” is rendered as “улицата ЈНА” (ulicata JNA – back-translated as: the street JNA); “cucumber sandwiches” as “кифлички со кашкавал” (kiflichki so kashkaval – back-translated as: rolls with yellow cheese); “the Metropolitan Police” as “MBP” (MVR – acronym for the Macedonian Ministry of Interior). Also, all social, political and temporal references have been replaced with ones relevant to the Macedonian context, so “French drama” has become “српско-хрватска драма” (Serbo-croatian drama), “Tories” have become “Црвени како нас” (crveni kako nas - back-translated as: the red ones like us), “Rectory” has become “Црквата” (Crkvata - back-translated as: the Church) and many more (*ibid.*, pp. 252-253).

Translating wordplay

The employment of wordplay in literary works results in producing a humorous effect. Puns are a special type of wordplay based on ambiguity. To put it differently, a pun is created when a double meaning is created in a context by exploiting words that differ in meaning but are similar in pronunciation and/or spelling. The pun is effective when the context allows for a double-reading to be triggered.

In any case, the translation of puns in literary works can be extremely challenging, if not impossible. Puns are presumably untranslatable as it is very difficult to transfer a pun into the target language with lexemes equivalent to those in the source language (Vandale, 2010). Delabastita (1997) discusses a range of pun translation techniques: a) pun to pun; b) pun to punoid; c) pun to non-pun; d) pun to zero, e) non-pun to pun, etc., that can help in overcoming this problem.

Paul (2009, p. 49) confirms that puns are obviously specific to their original language and that an equivalent has to be found in the target language. But he also admits that sometimes “if these simply don’t work, they need to be cut out, or a completely different play on words has to be invented to retain the liveliness of the original wordplay”.

In translating puns, evidently, it is vital to achieve an equivalent effect in the target text. The target text-oriented approach (domestication) is preferable if the focus is on the production of as close an effect on the target audience as the effect obtained on the source audience. The examples of the Macedonian translations of “Hamlet” and “The Importance of Being Earnest” we discussed above are a good illustration of this approach. Notably, in both cases the translator has opted for a target language based puns. He has followed the original model and has changed the vocabulary but preserved the effect so that the Macedonian readers would be equally entertained as the readers of the original English texts. In view of the difficulty involved in conveying puns due to the structural and lexical differences between both languages, Kitanovska-Kimovska (2014) mentions that translators sometimes add puns in places where they are not found in the original text to compensate for the losses they have made elsewhere in the text. She provides the example of Bogomil Gjuzel’s translation of “A Midsummer Night’s Dream”, where he adds the pun on “морално” (moralno – back-translated as: moral), which can be interpreted both ways: in its correct meaning ‘following moral rules’ (pronounced with a stress on the first syllable) or in its colloquial meaning ‘obligatory’ (derived from the verb “мора” (must) and pronounced with a stress on the second syllable) (ibid., p. 312). Used by one of the socially and intellectually deprived characters in the play, the pun skilfully adds to the humour of the scene.

Conclusion

Starting from the position that literary translation presents numerous challenges to the translator, we have attempted to provide an overview of some key aspects of literary style and how they might be tackled in translation. The paper presents the views of translation theorists with respect to the pitfalls of literary translation as well as the findings of empirical studies of literary translations of English source texts into Macedonian. Aspects such as style, subtext, book titles, slang, expletives, culture-specific items and wordplay are discussed in more detail. Examples are provided to illustrate how they might be handled creatively by translators who are aware about their significance and contribution to the overall effect on the reader. Whereas the topic of literary translation is broad and a paper of this size cannot possibly address all relevant issues in sufficient detail, the discussion, nevertheless, benefits novice and aspiring literary translators and can serve as a good starting point in training literary translators.

References:

- Andersson, L., & Trudgill, P. (1990). *Bad language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Arsova-Nikolich, L. (1999). *Preveduvanye. Teoriya i praktika*. Skopje: Univerzitet „Sv. Kiril i Metodij“. (Macedonian)
- Brodovich, O. (1997). Translation theory and non-standard speech in fiction. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 5. (1), 23-31.
- Delabastita, D. (1997). *Traductio: Essays on punning and translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome; Namur: Presses Universitaires de Namur.
- Dobao Fernandez, A. M. (2006). Linguistic and cultural aspects of the translation of swearing: The Spanish version of Pulp Fiction. *Babel* 52: 3, 222–242. DOI: 10.1075/babel.52.3.02fer.
- Gyurchevska-Atanasovska, K., & Sazdovska-Pigulovska, M. (2017). When translation goes wrong: Translating idiomatic expressions. *Proceedings of the ESIDRP International Conference: English Studies at the Interface of Disciplines: Research and Practice (ESIDRP) (11th-13th March 2016, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia)*. Skopje: Ss Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Blaze Koneski Faculty of Philology, 383-394.
- Gyurchevska-Atanasovska, K., & Kitanovska-Kimovska, S. (2018). Stilot i preveduvanyeto niz prizmata na kognitivnata uloga na preveduvachot kako primatel na tekstot pri kreativniot proces. *Palimpsest, III*, 6. Shtip: Univerzitet „Goce Delchev“ – Shtip, Filoloshki fakultet, 101-111. (Macedonian)
- Kitanovska-Kimovska, S. (2014) Preveduvanye igra na zborovi: strategii i faktori. *Proceedings of the International Applied Linguistics Conference: Practice in Language, Language in Practice (PLLP) (7-8 June 2013 Skopje, Republic of Macedonia)*. Skopje: FON University, 304-316. (Macedonian)

- Kitanovska-Kimovska, S., & Neshkovska, S. (2016). The importance of being earnest: Strategies for translating irony from English into Macedonian. *Acta Neophilologica* 49, 1-2, 109-125 DOI: 10.4312/an.49. 1-2. 109-125.
- Kitanovska-Kimovska, S., & Neshkovska, S. (2018). Handling of culture-specific terms in translation. *Conference Proceedings of the Third International Scientific Conference FILKO, Philology, Culture and Education, 26-27 April 2018, Shtip*. Shtip: Goce Delcev University, 247-258.
- Kitanovska-Kimovska, S., & Gjurchevska-Atanasovska, K. (2018). The norms at play in the Macedonian literary system: An analysis of the role of Mihajlovski's Shakespeare in Macedonian. *TranslatoLogica Vol. 2*, 74-93.
- Landers, E. C. (2001). *Literary translation. A practical guide*. Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall International.
- Obama, M. (2020). *Becoming*. Mojata prikazna. Skopje: Ars Lamina – publikacii, Ars Libris
- Paul, G. (2009). *Translation in practice: A symposium*. London: Dalkey Archive Press.
- Vandaele, J. (2010). Humour in translation. In Gambier, Y. & van Doorslaer, L. (eds.) *Handbook of translation studies*. (pp. 147-52). Vol 1. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Petkovska, Z. (2017). Squeezing the Clockwork Orange in the kitchen of Slavic languages: Translating the Nadsat jargon in Antony Burgess's novel. *Proceedings of the ESIDRP International Conference: English Studies at the Interface of Disciplines: Research and Practice (ESIDRP) (11th -13th March 2016, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia)*. Skopje: Ss Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Blaze Koneski Faculty of Philology, pp. 149-159
- Venuti, L. (2008). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.