



A Journal of Culture, English Language, Teaching & Literature

ISSN 1414-3320 (Print), ISSN 2502-4914 (Online)

Vol. 25 No.2; December 2025

Copyright © Soegijapranata Catholic University, Indonesia

Adopting the TRC Model to Enhance Students' Revision Competence in Translation Classes

¹ Arso Setyaji, ²) Rahmawati Sukmaningrum, and ³Faiza Hawa

^{1,2,3}English Education Study Program, Faculty of Language and Art Education,
Universitas PGRI Semarang, Indonesia

¹arsosetyaji@upgris.ac.id, ²rahmawatisukma@upgris.ac.id, ³faizahawa@upgris.ac.id

Adopting the TRC Model to Enhance Students' Revision Competence in Translation Classes

¹ Arso Setyaji, ²) Rahmawati Sukmaningrum, and ³Faiza Hawa

¹arsosetyaji@upgris.ac.id, ²rahmawatisukma@upgris.ac.id, ³faizahawa@upgris.ac.id

^{1,2,3}English Education Study Program, Faculty of Language and Art Education, Universitas PGRI Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract: Translation revision is one of required competences for learners who intend to become translators as their professional choice. It becomes an important step in translation workflow. This competence should be owned by translators or aspiring translators. Unfortunately, revision competence is almost never given in translation class. Almost all courses in translation focuses on the students' competence in translating, but ignores the competence of revising translated text. This study, therefore, applied a learning form named TRC (*Translation Revision Competence*) model in translation class of Universitas PGRI Semarang that will equip students in translation competence. To verify the hypothesis about the nature of TRC, this study used a pretest - posttest design, with an experimental group and a control group. To collect the data needed in this research, researchers used assignments, documents and questionnaires. Based on the calculation of the paired sample T-test in this research, the results of Sig. (2-tailed) were 0.001 where the results were smaller than 0.050 (<0.050). As the initial hypothesis of the study set by the researcher where if Sig. (2-tailed) <0.050 then the hypothesis is accepted, the researcher concludes that there is a significant difference in the quality of the revised text of students/participants who received TRC training compared to those who did not receive TRC training. From these results, it is concluded that the TRC model has a positive impact on the level of quality and ability to revise students' translated texts in the Translation class.

Key words: TRC model, translation class, revision competence

Abstrak: Untuk memverifikasi hipotesis tentang sifat TRC, penelitian ini menggunakan desain pretest - posttest, dengan kelompok eksperimen dan kelompok kontrol. Untuk mengumpulkan data yang diperlukan dalam penelitian ini peneliti akan menggunakan penugasan, dokumen dan kuesioner. Berdasarkan penghitungan T-test paired sample dalam penelitian ini, didapat hasil Sig. (2-tailed) sebesar 0.001 dimana hasil tersebut lebih kecil dari 0.050 (< 0.050). Sebagaimana hipotesis awal penelitian yang ditetapkan oleh peneliti dimana jika Sig. (2-tailed) < 0.050 maka hipotesis diterima maka peneliti menyimpulkan bahwa terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan dalam kualitas teks revisi mahasiswa/peserta yang mendapatkan pelatihan TRC dibandingkan dengan mereka yang tidak mendapatkan pelatihan TRC. Dari hasil tersebut disimpulkan bahwa TRC model mempunyai dampak yang positif terhadap tingkat kualitas dan kemampuan merevisi teks terjemahan mahasiswa di kelas Translation.

Kata kunci: model TRC, kelas translation, kompetensi revisi

INTRODUCTION

Translation revision is defined as reading a human translation to identify features of translation text or draft that fall short of what is acceptable and make any needed corrections and improvements (Hansen, 2009; Kunzli, 2017; Mossop, 2014; Rasmussen, & Schjoldager, 2014). It becomes a compulsory component in translation process. The revision competence, therefore, should become the prerequisite of a professional translator. There is no doubt that revision is an important part of translator's competence. This statement is in line with Mossop's statement as cited in (Li, 2022), that the skill of revising or justifying changes is vital for translation students in order to acquire the revision competence which highlights revising skills rather than retranslation. Although translation revision is less studied than other areas of translation studies, it has gained more popularity in recent years. Some scholars gave their own definition to translation revision. However, most of them (Hansen, 2009; Kunzli, 2017) believed that translation revision involves bilingual examination of the target language content against source language content for its suitability for the agreed purpose, which is much different from the process of transferring message from source language into target language.

Revision can be viewed from two different angles; the first procedure is other's revision where translator is trained to do the revision of another translated text. The second procedure is self-revision where a translator revises his/her own translated text. Both competences are equally essential and require attention within the translator's curriculum (Mossop, 2014; Robert, 2008; Scocchera, 2017). To put it briefly, the translator starts the revision process of having a deeper comprehension of the document than the reviser. The translator's ability in making connections, comprehend what was first misconstrued, piece together the puzzle, assure consistency, and remove redundancies is a result of his/her previous interactions with the source text during the rough-draft translation. Therefore, self-revision is a crucial step in the translation process that entails much more than merely making sure nothing was overlooked (Ali, Polledo & Harmer 2018; Galiano, 2016).

The focus of this study is to contribute college students in self-revision competence using TRC model. With this aim, we would like to begin with a preliminary remark. The one is the term revision itself, since the use of this term is usually inconsistent, such as proofreading, reviewing, editing, revision, revising, checking, and self-revision. This inconsistency often cause confusion among scholars (Scocchera, 2017). For the purpose of this study, the term revision refers to self-revision which is understood as checking translation text in standard, comparing or cross checking the translation against the source language by the translator her/himself. The translator here means respondents or students in Translation class who are involved in the study.

Many studies concerning the issue have been revealed by many scholars and researchers (Alves & Vale, 2011; Hansen, 2009; Robert, 2008; Scocchera, 2017). They summed up that publications in translation revision might belong to either empirical or theoretical studies. Empirical studies of revision are divided into: study of translation product, study of revision competence and teaching, study of relationship between process and quality, and participant-based study. Additionally, theoretical studies are divided into: specific aspect of revision (parameter, terminology, key concept, methodological aspect, field of translation revision process, translator training concept, and revision translation teaching or training, and acquisition of revision competence.

Practical suggestions for reviser training activities given by (Scocchera, 2017). From the experimental research during a short-term course, students' overall attitudes and background skills

toward revision process were examined, as well as their development of revision competence and the effectiveness of teaching material and techniques. In addition, Liang (2021) investigated the impact of students' initial translation skill toward their translation and revision skills. As a result, she found out that an excellent translator trainee is also excellent in revision skill and vice versa. She also stated that the correlation is mostly in lexical and grammatical errors in initial translation rather than the source text.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Terminology: Translation and Translation Revision

Translation and translation revision are closely related processes, but they serve distinct purposes. Translation refers to the act of converting text from one language to another, ensuring that the meaning, tone, and style are preserved in the target language. It requires a deep understanding of both the source and target languages, as well as the subject matter. Translation revision, on the other hand, involves reviewing and refining the translated text to ensure accuracy, clarity, and fluency. While translation focuses on the initial transfer of meaning, revision addresses issues like grammar, syntax, cultural nuances, and overall readability, ensure that the final product is polished and aligns with the intended message.

It is true that translators and revisers attempt to balance their professional interests while carrying out their duties; these interests include the expectations of the client, the author, and the reader (Li, 2022). Successful communication between the author and the reader is the goal shared by both the translator and the reviser. They make sure that the translated text they create is clear, concise, complies with target language standards, readily interpreted, and includes pertinent information for the reader.

However, revision is much more than just having "another set of eyes" reading the material after it has been translated. Revisers' job is to review the material that the translator has translated into the target language and make necessary corrections based on a comparison of the source and target texts' grammatical and stylistic features, in compliance with the standards of contemporary, natural language (Allman, 2006; Kasperavičienė & Horbačasuskienė, 2020). The goal of revision is to create a text that, after revisions, is content-accurate, grammatically sound, comparable to the original, suitable for the recipient to process, and print-ready. However, it should be noted that even in cases where revisers are completely competent, they do not start revision with the same understanding of the source text as the translator, unless they have thoroughly read the document beforehand (Alves & Vale, 2011).

In line with those statements, Li (2022) viewed translation revision as a full rereading of translated text for accuracy and language quality, with each sentence being compared to corresponding part of source text, 'quality control' is then used to refer to less-than-full revision. He also suggested that there should be a clear distinction between editing and translation revision. Editing is a process of reading a text that is not a translation or treated as translation process to spot problematic passage, and then making or recommending any corrections or improvements that are needed to meet some standards of quality. On the other hand, translation revision refers to as a process of full rereading of translated text with the purpose of increasing the translation quality and level of accuracy. In addition, the process of editing can be done by a non-translator. Meanwhile, the translator revision must be done by a translator.

There are several basic principles in revision translation (Galiano, 2016; Hansen, 2009; Li, 2022). They can be summarized as the followings:

1. Revision translation cost effectiveness, which employs the relationship between necessity, usefulness, effectiveness and cost.
2. Minimal corrections: the reviser is supposed to modify the translation text as little as possible and the result of revision text is not a retranslated one.

Revisers, therefore, only alter the finished product and do not actually write a new translation text. They may offer suggestions, proofread the content and fix the mistakes. The revision text is grounded in the target text, which the revisers address from a broader perspective, considering the text as a whole, rather than a micro level (Hansen, 2009; Liang, 2021). Derived from several sources, the table below illustrates the distinction of translator's and reviser's role (Alves & Vale, 2011; Hansen, 2009; Mossop, 2014; Scocchera, 2017):

**Table 1:
The Role of Translator and Reviser**

Aspect	Translator	Reviser
Main activity	a. Creating a text in different language b. Creating equivalence	a. Evaluating a translated text b. Checking equivalence
Starting point	Text of the Source Language (SL)	Text of the Target Language (TL)
Strategy	a. Local (sentence by sentence) b. Bottom-up c. Micro-level	a. Global (whole text) b. Top-down c. Macro-level

Table 1 indicates the different role between translator and reviser. It can be stated that the role of reviser is merely evaluating the draft translation rather than creating the new one. The connection between the translator and reviser, indeed, when the translator completed his/her work and submit the target text, the reviser's talent may also prove helpful in post editing process. According to Mossop (2014), revisers are primarily responsible for fixing grammatical, linguistic, and misunderstanding problems made by translators. If any mistakes left in the target text, therefore, it is about the content. In order to have greater positive impact, indeed, revisers must do all essential corrections. In addition, when revising, revisers should do it for consistency; if they choose to make changes to the text (e.g., replacing, adding, or deleting something), they should do it consistently throughout. To sum up, revisers must understand that the majority of newly discovered mistakes in the draft translation are from their needless and arbitrary edits (Galiano, 2016; Liang, 2021; Robert, 2008).

B. TRC Model Training

The application of a Translation Revision Competence (TRC) model in the classroom is an effective way to enhance the skills of translation students, as well as provide them with critical

insight into the professional process of translation. This model can be used to guide students in both translating and revising texts, with a focus on improving their accuracy, quality, and professionalism.

The following are steps to apply the Translation Revision Competence (TRC) model in the classroom (Li, 2022; Mossop, 2014):

1. Introducing the TRC Model:

- a. Defining key components; in this stage the teacher emphasizes skills such as accuracy, coherence, consistency, clarity, and style. Students need to understand these elements as they relate to both translation and revision.
- b. Explaining the role of revision; in this stage teacher emphasizes that revision is not just a mechanical task of checking for errors but an essential part of producing high-quality translation. This includes looking at the functional, cultural, and linguistic adequacy of the translation, and students need to understand this concept.

2. Pre-Translation Exercises:

- a. Context analysis; before translation, students should analyze the source text, considering its context, purpose, and target audience. Understanding the text's function will help guide both the translation and the revision.
- b. Terminology research; teacher encourages students to gather resources, glossaries, and references to ensure correct and consistent terminology from the outset.

3. Translation Assignment:

- a. Initial drafting; the teacher asks students to translate a text while focusing on fluency and comprehension, without worrying too much about perfection in the first draft.
- b. Encouraging self-revision; after the first draft, the teacher asks students to assess their work based on the TRC model. They should also pay attention to areas like tone, register, and terminological accuracy.

4. Revision Techniques:

- a. Peer revision: in this stage students are made into pair and teacher let them revise each other's translations. The teacher also provides specific criteria for revision, such as fluency, naturalness, consistency, and the preservation of the original meaning.
- b. Instructor feedback: the teacher provides detailed feedback on the drafts, focusing on both the translation and the revision process. Offer suggestions on how to refine their choices, improve flow, and ensure accuracy.
- c. Focus on common issues: the teacher teaches students to revise translations for recurring problems such as mistranslations, awkward phrasing, false cognates, and cultural inaccuracies.

5. Incorporating advanced revision skills:

- a. Revising for different registers: in this stage, students should be encouraged to adapt translations according to the formal or informal tone required by the target audience.
- b. Cultural adaptation: students are assigned to revise the translation to ensure it fits the target culture. This involves assessing metaphors, idiomatic expressions, and culturally significant references.
- c. Revising for clarity and style: the teacher taught students to rewrite parts of the translation for better clarity, readability, and stylistic accuracy. The revision should also aim for consistency in terms of linguistic style.

6. Reflection and self-assessment:

After completing their revision, students should assess how their work has improved. Reflecting on their own revisions helps them internalize the revision process and build better self-awareness in their translation work.

7. Stimulating professional practice:

- a. Real-world tasks: in this stage teacher simulates real-world translation and revision scenarios. For example, present students with a challenging translation task and require them to submit both their initial draft and a revised version with an explanation of changes made.
- b. Mock deadlines: in the classroom, set deadlines for both initial drafts and revisions, simulating a professional environment where translators must work efficiently and deliver polished translations.

There are some benefits of applying the TRC Model. They can be elaborated as the followings:

1. Improving quality of translation: by focusing on revision as a critical skill, students are encouraged to produce higher-quality translations.
2. Development of analytical skills: students learn to approach translation critically, identifying issues in their own work and addressing them.
3. Professional preparation: The revision process mirrors the work of professional translators who must revise their translations to meet client expectations, cultural nuances, and linguistic requirements.
4. Encourages critical thinking: revising requires students to think critically about language use, stylistic choices, and cultural relevance.
5. Collaborative learning: peer review and feedback foster collaboration and allow students to learn from each other's strengths and weaknesses.

Integrating the Translation Revision Competence model into the classroom allows translation students to develop essential skills in both translating and revising texts. By focusing on a structured process of self-assessment, peer revision, and instructor feedback, students gain a deeper understanding of how to improve their translations, meet professional standards, and produce high-quality, culturally and contextually accurate translations.

METHOD

To verify the hypothesis about the nature of TRC, this study used a pretest-posttest design, with an experimental group and a control group. To collect the data needed in this study, the writers used test instruments (pretest and posttest revision task) for product analysis. In addition, another questionnaire containing translation quality assessment instruments was also given to translation raters who were used to measure the quality of revised texts produced by students.

Subjects of this study were seventh year students in undergraduate English Education study program who had already had two practical courses on translation where they were trained revision procedures as well. They were all native speakers of the target language with English as their first foreign language. There were 60 students enrolled as participants in this study. They were divided into 2 group; the experimental group and control group. The experimental group consisted of 30 participants, who were tested before and after attending training on revision and editing procedure using TRC model. The control group consisted of 30 participants, who participated in pretest and posttest without training on revision and editing. Revision and editing training last 4 weeks (4 hours/week). Students in training receive both lectures and practical assignments on translation revision. In short, all participants are translation revision trainees and not professional translators or revisers. Although the ideal hypothesis of this kind of research must be tested with professionals, the writers in this study chose to use English Education student participants in the Translation class with the aim of measuring the level of training effectiveness in novice translators or prospective translators. However, in further research, professionals will be included.

RESULTS

In this part, the researchers analyzed the students' scores from the experimental and control group by using normality test and t-test method. All data were marked by the computer and raw scores were carefully typed into the SPSS data table in order to gain the desired data. Findings of this research can be seen in the following tables:

Table 1:
The Distribution of Pre-test Score of Control Group

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest_control	30	35.00	70.00	52.0833	9.66400
Posttest_control	30	45.00	80.00	60.5556	8.51702
Valid N (listwise)	30				

The table above shows the comparison of the results obtained by students without TRC training. In the pre-test table, it shows that the average score of the pre-test is 52.08. Meanwhile, the average score obtained after the post-test is 60.55. The difference in the average score only increased by 8.47 points. The result implied that there was still improvement in control group, though that was not quite significant. After obtaining a score, the researcher calculated the mean of the experimental group with the results in the table 2.

Table 2:
Statistical Data of Pre-test Score of Experiment Group
 The result had been fed into SPSS (12.0) and analysed using independent T-test analysis.

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest_experimental	30	30.00	70.00	50.6944	10.49849
Posttest_experimental	30	75.00	92.00	86.9444	6.89490
Valid N (listwise)	30				

The next step is checking the normality of the data. It was done before the researchers conducted the calculation and test the hypothesis. This process was used to check whether the data were normal or not. Ho is accepted if Sig.value > 0,05. Otherwise, Ho is rejected if Sig.value < 0,05. The following table showed the statistic result of Normality Test of both the experimental group and control group:

Table 3:
The Result of Normality Test of the Experiment and Control Class

	Tests of Normality					
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pretest_control	.126	30	.164	.954	30	.144
Posttest_control	.147	30	.047	.950	30	.107
Pretest_eksperimental	.131	30	.123	.942	30	.060
Posttest_eksperimenta l	.147	30	.048	.950	30	.106

The end result of the output above showed a significance value that all data groups in this research are normally distributed because the significance value of the Shapiro-Wilk normality test for all variables is > 0.05.

Table 4:
The Result of T-Test Paired Sample

		Paired Samples Test						t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Paired Differences				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	Pretest_control - Posttest_control	-10.77778	15.49951	2.58325	-16.02206	-5.53350	-4.172	30	.001	

Pair 2	Pretest_eksperimental - Posttest_eksperimental	-44.44444	13.58454	2.26409	-49.04079	-39.84810	-19.630	30	.001
--------	---	-----------	----------	---------	-----------	-----------	---------	----	------

The paired sample statistics table showed the descriptive values of each variable. This statistic process was used to investigate whether the hypothesis of the research was accepted or not. Before drawing conclusion, there are several criteria in deciding the rejection or acceptance of the null hypothesis. The criteria are as follows:

1. The criterion for the rejection or acceptance of the null hypothesis is a level of significance .05 (95% confidence).
2. Ha: if sig. (2-tailed) < 0.050, there is a significant difference between participants who got the TRC model and those who did not get the TRC model.
3. Ho: if sig. (2-tailed) > 0.050, there is no significant difference between participants who got the TRC model and those who did not get the TRC model.

Based on the output of 2 pairs, the sig. (2-tailed) was 0.001 which is less than 0.050 (< 0.050). This result implied that there was a significant difference or considerable impact of the translation revision competence between students who got the TRC training and those who did not get the TRC training. The researchers, therefore, assumed that the TRC model is effective to increase students' revision competence.

DISCUSSION

Research findings suggested that TRC model gave positive impact toward students' translation revision competence. A detailed comparison for both groups' assessment result shown by table 4.6 (the result of T-test paired sample). It showed that Sig.(2-tailed) result = 0.01 which is < 0.050. With regard to similar result of Sig.(2-tailed) of two groups, the researcher also considered the difference result of mean score between control group and experimental group. There was a significant improvement in translation revision competence of students in experimental group (mean = 44,44). On the other hand, though there was an improvement in translation revision competence of students in control group, the result was not too significant (mean = 10,77). This difference suggested that the training of TRC has positive impact toward the students' revision competence. Due to the result of the statistics the researchers pointed that out there was a significant difference in revision competence between participants who got the TRC model and those who did not get the TRC model. This finding could be noteworthy for future development of different courses in translator training or courses, particularly in developing the revision competence of university students.

The TRC training's merit is also suggested by other researchers (Galiano, 2016; Hansen, 2009; Li, 2022; Liang, 2021; Robert, 2008). All of those researchers suggest that TRC model is valuable method to improve both translation and revision competence. They also suggested that a good translator should acquire the revision and post editing competence. To sum up, it is clear that in a university practical translation course, the curriculum should not only focus on translation competence, but also on revision competence. The current situation in translation industry requires the universities to adapt the challenge.

However, the finding also discovered that some participants in this research made 'under-revision' (failed necessary changes) and 'hyper-revision' (changes that do not make translations better or worse). The followings are the example of those phenomena:

Datum M02/P01:

Source Language:

Bulan adalah satu-satunya satelit alami bumi. Bulan merupakan objek paling terang kedua di langit setelah matahari. Satelit alami dari planet lain di tata surya terkadang juga disebut sebagai bulan.

Draft translation:

The moon is the only natural satellite of the Earth. The moon is the second brightest object in the Earth's sky after the sun. The natural satellite of other planets in the solar system are also referred to as moons.

Revised version:

The moon is the only natural satellite on the Earth. The moon is the second brightest object in the Earth's sky after the sun. The natural satellite of the other planets in the solar system are also referred to as the moons.

Revision made by the student in datum M02/P01 focused on the changes of prepositions. The changes, however, did not make the translation better than the draft translation.

Datum M22/P3:

Source Language:

Suhu di sebagian besar permukaan bulan terlalu ekstrem untuk keberadaan air atau es, berkisar antara maksimum 727°C (261°F) pada siang hari hingga suhu minimum -173°C (-279°F) tepat sebelum fajar bulan. Namiun, suhu di daerah yang terkena bayangan permanen di dekat kutub bulan mungkin selalu mencapai -220°C (-364°F).

Draft translation:

Temperature on most of the Moon's surface are too extreme for water or ice to exist, ranging from a maximum of 727°C (261°F) at lunar noon to a minimum of 173°C (-279°F) just before lunar dawn. Temperature in permanently shadowed areas near the lunar poles, however, may consistently be as low as -220°C (-364°F).

Revised version:

Temperature on most of the Moon's surface are too extreme for water or ice to exist, ranging from a maximum of 727°C (261°F) at lunar noon to a minimum of 173°C (-279°F) just before lunar dawn. Temperature in permanently shadowed areas near the lunar poles, however, may consistently be as low as -220°C (-364°F).

From data number M22/P03 above, the student carried out the revision process by removing the adverb (verb of action) 'ly' in two adjectives 'permanent' and 'consistent'. In the target language structure (English), that kind of revision made incorrect text. This is because in English

grammatical structure, to explain a verb must be accompanied by the adverb 'ly' (adverb of manner). In the source language (SL) sentence "*Namun, suhu di daerah yang terkena bayangan permanen di dekat kutub bulan mungkin selalu mencapai -220°C (-364°F)*" is translated into the draft translation as Temperature in permanently shadowed areas near the lunar poles, however, may consistently be as low as -220°C (-364°F). The sentence in the draft translation using word for word translation method has been assessed as correct by the rater even though it is a little stiff. In terms of meaning, the sentence already represents the entire meaning of the source language (SL). In other words, the sentence in the draft translation is correct. However, the sentence was revised into *Temperature in permanent shadowed areas near the lunar poles, however, may be consistent as low as -220°C (-364°F)* which contains the removal of the adverb of manner 'ly' which should describe the verb 'shadowed' and the noun verb 'be'. The revision process in the sentence was an unnecessary action because it resulted in the translation text becoming worse (under revision).

CONCLUSION

This study aims to investigate the quality of revision text of students who received Translation Revision Competence (TRC) training and those who did not receive training. To obtain data related to the differences in the quality of students' revised texts, researchers used 2 classes, each consisting of 30 students in the Translation class. Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that TRC training has a positive impact on students' revision skills. This can be seen from the quality of the revised text produced by students who received TRC training (experimental class) which has a higher average quality value compared to the average quality value of students who did not receive TRC training (control class). Based on the calculation of the paired sample T-test in this study, the results of Sig. (2-tailed) were 0.001 where the results were smaller than 0.050 (<0.050). As the initial hypothesis of the study that if Sig. (2-tailed) < 0.050 then the hypothesis is accepted, researchers conclude that there is a significant difference in the quality of the revised text of students/participants who received TRC training compared to those who did not receive TRC training. Researchers argue that TRC training is effective in improving the ability to revise translated texts for students.

REFERENCES

- Ali, L.C.C., Polledo, P.G. & Harmer, C. Revision: Parameters and practices within the translation industry. *Medical Writing*, 27(3), 21–24. <https://doi.org/10.24069/2542-0267-2018-3-4-139-143>
- Alves, F., & Vale, D. C. (2011). On drafting and revision in translation : a corpus linguistics oriented analysis of translation process data. *Translation: Corpora, Computation, Cognition.*, 1(1), 105–122. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.283500>
- Hansen, G. (2009). A Classification of Errors in Translation and Revision. In *CIUTIForum 2008 Enhancing Translation Quality Ways Means Methods* (pp. 313–326). <https://research.cbs.dk/en/publications/a-classification-of-errors-in-translation-and-revision/>

- Kasperavičienė, R., & Horbačasienė, J. (2020). Self-revision and other-revision as part of translation competence in translator training. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education*, 8(1), 117–133. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jolace-2020-0007>
- Kunzli, A. (2017). The Ethical Dimension of Translation Revision. An Empirical Study. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 8. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/ethical-dimension-of-translation-revision.-An-K%C3%BCnzli/5af01f6233156913fd86a862630e9a4c05de2f01>
- Li, Y. (2022). Translation Revision and Post-editing: Industry Practice and Cognitive Processes – BOOK REVIEW. *English Studies at NBU*, 8(1), 159–163. <https://doi.org/10.33919/esnbu.22.1.9>
- Liang, H. (2021). Initial translation interference to reviser trainees in English-LOTE translation revision tasks. *Translation and Interpreting*, 13(2), 92–108. <https://doi.org/10.12807/TI.113202.2021.A06>
- Mossop. (2014). *Revising and Editing for Translators. 3rd edition*. Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/edit/10.4324/9781315158990/revising-editing-translators-brian-mossop>
- Parra-Galiano, S. (2016). Translation Revision - Fundamental Methodological Aspects. *Interchange between Languages and Cultures: The Quest for Quality*, 5, 39–52. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321018251_Parra-Galiano_Silvia_2016Translations_revision_fundamental_methodological_aspects_and_effectiveness_of_the_EN_150382006_for_translation_quality_assurance_en_Jitka_Zehnalova_Ondrej_Molnar_y_Michal_Kuba
- Rasmussen, K. & Schjoldager, A. (2014). Revising Translations: A Survey of Revision Policies in Danish Translation Companies. *Journal of Specialised Translation*, 15. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/392821664_Revising_Translations_a_survey_of_revision_policies_in_Danish_translation_Companies
- Robert, I. (2008). Translation Revision Procedures: An Explorative Study. *Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies*, 1–25. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228668909_Translation_revision_procedures_An_explorative_study
- Scocchera, G. (2017). Translation Revision as Rereading: Different Aspects of the Translator's and Reviser's Approach to the Revision Process. In *Memoirs du livre* (pp. 1–17). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323175145_Translation_Revision_as_Rereading_Different_Aspects_of_the_Translator%27s_and_Reviser%27s_Approach_to_the_Revision_Process