

Lesson 3: Applying Theories in MAST Steps

Part B

Verbalizing Text

When facilitating a discussion of text, you should move the participants from lower-level to higher-level thinking. For example, you could start out with questions of a factual nature (who, what, when) and progress to those requiring analysis and evaluation. The list of verbs on the next two slides may be helpful in designing discussion questions for a particular passage. Facilitators can also call attention to key words in the passage.

This type of discussion may take place not just during a designated discussion time, but throughout the day as the facilitator interacts with the translators. As they become more independent, the translators should take over leading this discussion with less and less input from the facilitators, in accordance with the scaffolding and ownership principles.

The goals of discussion are to solidify understanding of the text and to stimulate translators to think critically about it and to take responsibility for the translation task. Facilitators should allow and encourage ideas, different views, and even different contexts, but should encourage and lead groups to reach consensus on the meaning of text and how to translate key words.

Lower Order Thinking Verbs

The list of words shown on the slide are typical of verbs used in discussion for the three lower order thinking levels, progressing through factual information such as *list* or *cite*, to verbs that demonstrate understanding like *summarize* or *explain*, to application verbs such as *use* or *demonstrate*.

Higher Order Thinking Verbs

The list of words on this slide are typical of verbs used in discussion for the three higher order thinking levels, progressing from analysis verbs such as *categorize* or *test*, to synthesis verbs like *compose* or *rearrange*, to those that require evaluation such as *conclude* or *recommend*.

Reaching Consensus

A group decision is usually harder to reach than an individual one, because all members of the group must agree, or reach consensus, on the outcome. When all members of the group feel that they have been listened to with respect, they may be able to accept an outcome that is not their first choice if it is acceptable to the others. No one should be forced to accept an outcome to which they are strongly opposed.

Reaching consensus requires that group members trust one another. Do not allow anyone to ridicule another and ensure that all members are equally heard.

There are many techniques for reaching consensus, including the process depicted on the next slide.

Step 1 – Brainstorm solutions without evaluating.

Step 2 – Group similar solutions if possible.

Step 3 – Discuss pros and cons of each solution; discard any that are not feasible.

Step 4 – Have each individual rate a solution from 0 (strongly opposed) to 5 (strongly agree).

Step 5 – Have each person who rated it 3-5 explain why, then the 1-2 ratings, then 0, if any. People are allowed to change their rating at any time if persuaded by the others.

Step 6 – Discard solutions that have any 0 ratings.

Step 7 – Find out if any of the higher-rated solutions are acceptable to all.

Step 8 – Repeat steps 4-7 to get consensus on which is the best.

Exercise: Facilitating Effective Discussions

Formulate and write down at least 6 questions about the book of Philemon: 3 lower-order-thinking (LOT) questions and 3 higher-order-thinking (HOT) questions. You can refer to the list of LOT and HOT verbs on previous slides to help you. Click Continue when you are finished.

Chunking

At this point the translators have read and discussed the complete portion of scripture to be translated for the day, so they should understand it and have the big picture in mind. The next two steps, chunking and blind drafting, are designed to enhance the naturalness of the translation in a way that word-for-word translating cannot do.

According to chunking theory, only small chunks of a larger concept can be retained in short-term memory. Facilitators should encourage individual translators to divide the day's scripture into chunks according to what they will be able to remember once the source text is closed. This should be the largest manageable piece that they will be able to retell or rewrite in the target language without referring back to the source text.

The size of a chunk varies according to the complexity of the material and the abilities of the translator. For some, a chunk may be a complete story or parable, while others may be able to remember only parts of that same story. For passages with deep theological content, a chunk may be one verse or even part of a verse.

Blind Drafting

The blind drafting step is based on input/output theory.

Now that the translators each have a manageable portion of scripture that they understand (comprehensible input), the next step is to close the source text and write out (or record, if oral) a draft of the text as quickly as possible.

At this point, certain barriers could affect the ability of the translator to produce the desired output. These barriers include decreased motivation, low self-esteem, and stress or anxiety.

Hopefully the first two barriers have been removed by the facilitator's use of praise and feedback to increase motivation and self-esteem. The blind draft step is designed to remove stress by emphasizing speed over accuracy, thus removing some performance anxiety. The translator should write quickly, naturally, and without worry.

The goal of this step is to get a natural-sounding translation down on paper (or recorded).

Self-Checking

Now that the translator has quickly captured the main ideas of the scripture in draft form, the next step is to compare the draft with the original text, looking for details that may have been forgotten. The translator can then add the details to the draft.

During this self-checking step, the translator can also check for and correct any grammatical errors.

Self-checking allows the translator time to improve the draft that was quickly done before. Because the translator self-checks the draft, the sense of ownership over the final outcome is enhanced, thus further fueling motivation. The facilitator may help during this step, and further response is given in the next step, peer checking.

Peer Review (Content Checking)

When the translator is satisfied that all details are included and that the draft is grammatically correct, the work should be exchanged with another speaker of the target language. The translators then check each other's work for accuracy (comparing with the original text) and grammar.

This provides not only a better draft, but also the opportunity for the translators to learn from one another as they collaborate on the outcome, especially if one of the parties is more expert in grammar or writing.

Checking Important Terms

The facilitator should have a list of important terms from the passage that was translated, so each should be checked as follows:

- Has the term been included?
- If the term is used elsewhere, is it translated consistently?
- Are the meanings of the terms clearly understood?

Important terms checking can stimulate some lively discussion among the translators. There may not be an exact translation for certain words and phrases, so translators need to reach consensus about how best to convey the meaning of the word. Once they have agreed on a meaning, they should translate the word or phrase consistently.

Initially the facilitator is very involved in checking important terms. However, as translators gain expertise they will gradually take over this function and perform it unaided, with the facilitator standing by to assist only if needed.

So you can see that aspects of ownership and scaffolding theories are both apparent in this step.

Using Value-Based Learning and Ownership/Motivation Principles

There are three principles in a MAST project that utilize value-based learning theory: time, ownership, and response. Click each picture to hear a description, then click Continue when you are finished.

-
-
- Time: Spend time in analytical discussion. It has been found that knowledge is gained through experiences that are meaningful to the learner and relate to a larger task. This knowledge is enhanced by interaction with others to discuss the experiences.
 - Ownership: Allow only the translator to make changes. This enables translators to have ultimate control over the final draft of their translation, thus increasing their sense of ownership and accountability.
 - Response: Elicit response to change by asking questions. In the role of facilitator, one of the most important techniques is asking good questions that stimulate thinking and suggest direction to the translator, but do not dictate what path to take.
-
-

All of these factors are designed to move translators from a controlled environment toward being free to make choices. As translators are allowed more choices, this increases their ownership of the task and thereby increases their motivation to complete it.

Exercise: Eliciting Response by Asking Value-Based Questions

The last lesson discussed value-based learning and presented several factors that increase motivation. These are listed on the slide.

Keeping these factors in mind, formulate and write down examples of good and bad questions that facilitators, when reviewing a draft, could ask translators in order to improve their translation. Click Continue when you are finished.

Examples of “Bad” questions:

The “bad” questions on the slide accuse the translator of being wrong, take the choice away, and eliminate the accountability of the translator. Asking these types of questions could make the translator feel belittled and demeaned, and they may feel that you are trying to take over their work because they are not capable.

Examples of “Good” questions:

The “good” questions on the slide encourage the translator to think more thoroughly about the choice of wording and to come up with alternatives. This gives the translator the power to make the decision about which wording to use and to actually make the change.

They should feel encouraged and valued when you ask this type of question. They won’t feel that you are taking over; in fact, their sense of ownership of the translated draft is actually enhanced.

Church Checking

If available, the church leader should check the translated materials in the following ways:

- Listen to it for naturalness and beauty.
- Compare to the source text for accuracy
- Consider this within the church functioning—does it meet the need?

This further involvement of the church enhances their ownership of the translation and helps to ensure its acceptance by the local body.

Verse-by-Verse Checking

The process for verse-by-verse checking begins by back-translating the draft into the source text language, which is then compared with the original source text for accuracy of meaning. The checker may perform deeper word studies of key words to ensure that their meaning is accurately translated within the context of the scripture passage.

Verse-by-verse checking by a MAST-trained individual helps to ensure the accuracy of the translation. Knowing that this detailed checking takes place gives the translators confidence that their translations will be accurate, thus helping them to relieve performance anxiety and produce comprehensible output (input/output theories).

Community Checking

In cases where you have a group of seven or more, you can set aside a period of time at the end of the day for the group at large (the community) to check the translations that have been done. This time, within 2 hours of sleeping, is a peak time for brain function, according to time principles of brain-based education. They can do this in a large group literature circle that includes an editing process.

Again the group reads the translation to check for naturalness and compares it with the source text for accuracy. They also discuss important terms and should come to consensus regarding what the key words are and how to translate them.

The community is responsible for further refining the translation as much as possible.

Summary

This lesson shows you how to apply the theories that you learned about previously to each step of the MAST process.

The Least Restrictive Environment theory and theories pertaining to individualized instruction enable you to assess the skills of participants and group them into teams for greatest effectiveness.

The Time Principles of Brain-Based Education influence the Worship/Prayer/Focus Time as, within a couple of hours of waking, individuals have a short period of instruction to bring their brains to a level of maximum functioning. The facilitator can also motivate them during this time, and indeed throughout the day, by giving sincere praise and encouragement.

Reading text can be done using either Sustained Silent Reading or Literature Circles. Then discussion helps to solidify understanding, with the facilitator guiding the discussion toward higher-level thinking (Bloom's Taxonomy) and using various techniques if needed to reach consensus.

Chunking theory is the basis for the chunking step, and blind drafting is done to eliminate stress according to input/output theory, resulting in more natural output.

Ownership and scaffolding theories influence all of the checking steps. The initial involvement of the facilitator is reduced as participants take increasing ownership of the process, which further enhances their motivation to succeed.

You have completed lesson 3.

To learn about the MAST experience, please **proceed to Part A of Lesson 4.**