

## A Practical Approach to Terminological Research in Specialized Translation

Servais Martial Akpaca<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

*This article aims to show translators facing terminological challenges a practical way of overcoming problems related to the search for terms' and concepts' meanings. It uses mixed methods. Firstly, it assesses and interprets terms' meanings in the syntactic contexts in which they are found. Sometimes, some terms have different meanings in different contexts. The search for the meaning of a specific term is carried out in a corpus that shows many occurrences of the term. Secondly, the number of occurrences is counted and the term's meaning in every context is interpreted. By so doing, the translator does the work of a terminologist who defines terms' meanings (i.e. a micro-definition) and delineates their contours in a specific corpus. The findings of this research include the following: (1) the meaning of a term can be investigated and defined by the translator as a result of a terminological exploration; (2) corpora provide adequate sources for research on lexical semantics; (3) dictionary definitions have limitations and can be complemented or challenged by terminological definitions; (4) meaning is a dynamic notion that evolves with time and in space; (5) a practical approach to lexical semantics is the way forward.*

**Keywords:** *Term, Concept, Corpus, Collective Bargaining Agreement, Practical Approach.*

### Introduction

Terminology is a field to which the translator of specialized texts devotes a significant portion of their time. Contemporary civilization is characterized by the emergence of new scientific and technical fields, leaving translators lacking useful information about them. International organizations also publish in various fields and languages, using specific terminology, which has led to the establishment of terminological databases such as UNTERM, ILOTERM, IMFTERM, and others. Translators often have to rely on these databases to accurately translate terms. However, aside from a few organizations that have recognized the need for a terminological database, most do not have this valuable tool, which helps translators navigate the complexities of terminology.

“For the translator, terminological research involves two aspects: searching for definitions to understand, then searching for designations to convey understanding” (*« Pour le traducteur, la recherche terminologique se présente [...] en deux volets : recherche de définitions pour comprendre, puis recherche de dénominations pour faire comprendre. »*) (Durieux, 1993, p. 98). Additionally, it is important to note that behind every term there is a concept. Translators must not only translate terms but also concepts. Rey (1979, p. 32) states that “it is surprising that terminology has taken so long to refine its theory of concepts, as this theory underpins all of its activity.” (*« On peut s'étonner que la terminologie ait tant tardé à préciser sa théorie du concept, car celle-ci fonde toute son activité. »*) The terminologist's work involves defining scientific and technical concepts. Their primary objective is to select, describe, and organize the concepts of a field and then, secondarily, to assign them a linguistic label:

“In terminology, the meaning of a particular linguistic form comes after the concept (that) it represents has been clearly defined.” (*“En terminologie [...] la question est non pas de savoir ce que signifie telle forme linguistique, mais bien plutôt, une notion ayant été délimitée clairement, de savoir quelle est la forme linguistique qui la représente.”*) (Rondeau & Felber, 1981, p. 21).

It is important to understand that the approach of the terminologist is onomasiological, while that of the translator is semasiological. The terminologist starts with the concept and assigns it a term, whereas the translator often encounters terms and then attempts to understand the concepts they refer to. Thoiron et

<sup>1</sup> Department of English, Faculty of Languages, Arts and Communication (FLLAC), Université d'Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Benin, E-mail: akpacasm@yahoo.fr

al. (1996, pp. 512-524) define a concept as a unit belonging to a system called "conceptology," which operates at the cognitive level. Conceptology refers to a purely linguistic system called "terminology," whose main unit is the term. Gentilhomme (1994, pp. 22-23) explains that the concept represents "the informational component entirely determined by its definition." (*Le concept représente « la composante informationnelle entièrement déterminée par sa définition »*). Any misuse, any semantic deviation, is condemnable in the name of rigorous ethics. Another important aspect of the word "concept" is considered in the following quotation:

Another important point worth mentioning is that concepts existing in one linguistic community may not exist at all or only in part in other linguistic communities. [...] A well-known example of culturally dependent concept formations is the concept system of colours of certain Indian tribes in the Amazon which distinguish among 300 different sorts of green. (Weissenhofer, 1995, p. 2)

While doing their work, translators often consult terminological databases. Most of these databases do not include definitions of concepts; they simply provide the equivalents of terms in the target language and sometimes offer example sentences or contexts where the terms have been previously used. In some cases, the equivalents and contexts are sufficient for the translator to understand both the term and the concept; in other cases, they are not enough to clarify the meaning. When this happens, the translator must consider alternative solutions, such as analyzing the text they are translating. This analysis involves searching for all occurrences of the term in the digital version of the document and carefully studying what each sentence or context in which the term appears reveals about the concept. In reality, research tools complement each other, as terminological databases provide the equivalents of terms in the target language, traditional dictionaries define concepts and provide examples of term usage, online dictionaries demonstrate how terms function in various types of discourse, and the different occurrences of the sought term in a document also help to better understand it. The translator needs all these approaches and sources of information to understand and convey meaning effectively.

## Literature Review

### *Term*

In the classic definition of a term, the General Theory of Terminology presents its object of study as being primarily the concept. Adopting this cognitive perspective allows terminology to distinguish itself from a linguistic approach by focusing primarily on the extralinguistic dimension. This minimal view of the role of linguistics is emphasized by the principle of *bi-univocity*. This principle refers to two criteria: monoreferentiality and univocity. Univocity means that for a given term, one concept corresponds to one and only one designation. The principle of monoreferentiality means that for a given term, one designation corresponds to one concept and only one (Rondeau, 1981, p. 24). These two criteria imply that a term can only have a single meaning and cannot have any synonyms. Many authors (including Depecker, 2002, p. 40; Desmet, 2007; Gaudin, 2003, p. 44) assert that this view of the term applies only within the framework of highly standardized terminologies, as *bi-univocity* does not acknowledge any type of variation.

### *Terminology*

Cabré (1998, p.7) recalls that "In the 18th- and 19th-centuries, scholars were alarmed by the proliferation of terms and were most worried about the diversity of forms and the relationships between forms and concepts." In a book entitled *Terminology, theory, methods, and applications*, this Spanish author explains that terminology arose as a discipline to solve language-based problems in communication. According to her, "the work carried out in the 1930s, simultaneously but independently by Austrian, Soviet, and Czech scholars, is the basis for the beginning of what the Austrians would call terminology science." (Ibid). These three schools had different approaches: (1) Terminology is an interdisciplinary but autonomous subject at the service of scientific and technical areas of study; (2) terminology focuses on philosophy, which is

primarily interested in the logical classification of concept systems and the organisation of knowledge; (3) terminology focuses on linguistics which regards it as a subfield of a language's lexicon. Having noted that, Cabré stresses that: "A general theory of terminology is based upon the first approach in which the nature of concepts, conceptual relations, the relationships between terms and concepts and assigning terms to concepts are of prime importance." (Ibid) This article is mostly interested in the first approach because it discusses the relationships between terms and concepts and how terms are assigned to concepts.

### *Concept*

Cabré (Ibid, p.42) explains that "A concept is an element of thought, a mental construct that represents a class of objects. Concepts consist of a series of characteristics that are shared by a class of individual objects." To communicate concepts, Cabré says that speakers use written or oral linguistic signs made up of a term or groups of terms, or symbols. "What speakers express, however, is not the real world as it is but rather how the individual and the community have internalized it. Language does not reflect the real world exactly, but rather interprets it." (Ibid) Concepts are mentally independent of terms and exist before them (i.e. terms).

### *A Brief Historical Survey of the Discipline by Cabré and Desmet*

#### *A Brief Historical Survey of the Discipline by Cabré*

Cabré (Ibid, p.1) recalls that "Terminology, as we understand it today, first began to take shape in the 1930s and has only recently moved from amateurism to a truly scientific approach." In the 18th and 19th centuries, scientists were already involved in terminology before technicians and engineers joined this activity in the 20th century. Furthermore, Cabré notes that:

Modern terminology emerged in the 1930s with the work of E. Wüster in Vienna. In his doctoral dissertation, Wüster presented arguments for systematizing working methods in terminology, established a number of principles for working with terms and outlined the main points of a methodology for processing terminological data.

At the opening session of a symposium in 1975, Wüster named four intellectuals as the theorists of terminology. These are: (1) A. Scholman from Germany. He was the first to consider the systematic nature of special terms; (2) the Swiss linguist F. de Saussure who was the first to draw attention to the systematic nature of language; (3) E. Dresen was a Russian national. He was a pioneer in underscoring the importance of standardization and the principal force behind the idea; (4) J. E. Holmstrom, an English scholar who was instrumental in disseminating terminologies on an international scale. In another section of her book, Cabré says that Auger (1988) identifies four basic periods in the development of modern terminology:

a. the origins (1930±1960); b. the structuring of the field (1960±1975); c. the boom (1975±1985); d. the expansion (1985±present) (Ibid, p.5).

In the initial period of development of terminology (1930±1960), the methods for the systematic formation of terms were developed. The second period ((1960±1975) was marked by the development of mainframe computers and documentation techniques. The first databanks were developed. The third period (1975-1985) was marked by the proliferation of language planning and terminology projects. The spread of personal computers greatly assisted in processing terminological data. In the recent period (i.e. from 1985), computer science has now become one of the most important forces behind changes in terminology.

### *A Brief Historical Survey of the Discipline by Desmet*

Desmet (2007) traces the theories and practices of terminology in an article titled *Terminology, Culture, and Society: Elements for a Variational Theory of Terminology and Specialized Languages*. She explains that the standard,

classical, or traditional model of terminology, also known as the General Theory of Terminology (GTT), the Vienna School of Terminology, or the Wüsterian School, among other names, is today an abstraction that allows us to refer to a model of terminological work derived from Eugen Wüster's GTT. However, this model has been the subject of varied interpretations and significant divergences from the 1930s to the present.

*Le modèle standard, classique ou traditionnel de la terminologique, connu aussi sous les noms de Théorie générale de la terminologie (TGT), d'École de terminologie de Vienne, École wüsterienne, entre autres, est aujourd'hui une abstraction qui nous permet de faire référence à un modèle de travail terminologique dérivé de la TGT d'Eugen Wüster, mais qui a connu des interprétations variées, des continuations et des divergences importantes, des années 30 jusqu'à nos jours. (p. 3-13)*

Desmet (Ibid.) emphasizes that the two pillars of the standard model are monosemy and univocity. Furthermore, unlike words, terms do not have contextual or co-textual value. The approach is essentially onomasiological, meaning that it starts with the concept to find the corresponding term. The approach is synchronic, focusing on terms in use at a given moment rather than their origins or evolution over time. Specialized language is radically different from non-specialized language in that it does not recognize variation or connotation, placing terms in a supra-linguistic space, free from the semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic rules common to any natural language.

However, from the 1970s onwards, this model began to lose momentum due to the linguistic needs of bilingual or multilingual countries like Canada, Switzerland, or Belgium, as well as the development of linguistic engineering tools and natural language processing, and, more generally, the rise of applied linguistics. Under the influence of sociolinguistics and in the context of language planning, a language planning school of terminology developed, critiqued and redeployed the Wüsterian approach.

Desmet (Ibid.) recalls that in 1975, in Quebec, during a conference on the definition of terminology, it was defined for the first time as the systemic study of the naming of concepts or notions in specialized fields of knowledge, but also as the study of practice considered in its social functioning. In a way, this opening to the social sphere led to the breaking down of the barriers between terminological practice and the linguistic universe of specialized fields. It was not until the 1980s that it became necessary to rethink the foundations of modern terminology.

#### *Modern Approaches to Terminology: Terms, Texts, and Linguistic Contexts*

Desmet (Ibid.) notes that in the 1980s, terminological research seemed to gain a new focus: the specialized text. This new perspective led to an opening of the field of terminology to phraseology, which in turn led to the breaking down of barriers between terminological practice and the universe of specialized languages. Theoretically, it is the combination of a systematic notional approach and a linguistic approach that highlights the "double articulation" of terminological units: they are both units within a hierarchical notional system and units that belong to a given linguistic system. Terms have since been described both at the notional level and at the functional level, i.e., in terms of their function in specialized discourse. It has also been observed that the semantic complexity of a terminological unit is related to the variety of elements with which it combines in discourse. In the 1990s, the text became a new area of interest for terminological studies, leading to the reevaluation of context in terminological studies. This phenomenon is generally referred to as phraseology.

#### *Contemporary Approaches to Terminology: Terms, Cognition, Culture, and Society*

Desmet (Ibid.) explains that certain language planning and translation experiences have evolved terminology towards "social terminology," where the sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects of specialized languages are at the heart of terminological reflection. This approach has been extensively described by F. Gaudin (1993), the founder of French socioterminology along with L. Guespin. Several principles characterize this approach: the linguistic approach to terms, seen primarily as linguistic signs; the central role given to speakers; the concern for a terminology that is aware of the social functioning of specialized

languages; and the plurality and polyphony of specialized discourses. Terms are subject to multiple conceptualizations, and their definitions are variable. The sociocognitive perspective has the merit of integrating certain elements of variation, such as synonymy and polysemy, as well as temporal variation.

Finally, in the 2000s, some researchers advocated for the need for a cultural terminology, oriented towards the culture of each human community, a meeting place for diverse experiences and the production of knowledge of all kinds (Diki-Kidiri, 2000).

To continue the discussion, the following four recent books on the theory and practice of terminology are recommended: (1) "Terminology: Theory, Methods, and Applications" by Juan C. Sager (2021). This book provides a comprehensive overview of terminology theory and its practical applications in various fields; (2) "The Handbook of Terminology" edited by Sue Ellen Wright and Gerhard Budin (2020). It is a collection of essays that cover a wide range of topics in terminology, including its history, methods, and applications in different domains; (3) "Terminology in Everyday Life: A Practical Guide" by Barbara A. W. H. van der Meer (2022). This book focuses on the practical aspects of terminology work, offering insights into how terminology affects communication in everyday contexts; (4) "Terminology Management: A Practical Guide" by Anne-Marie H. de Vries (2023). This guide addresses the management of terminology in organisations, providing strategies and tools for effective terminology practices. The book begins by introducing the concept of terminology management, highlighting its importance in ensuring effective communication within organisations and across different fields. It discusses the role of clear and consistent terminology in enhancing clarity, reducing misunderstandings, and improving collaboration among diverse stakeholders. De Vries delves into the foundational aspects of terminology, defining key terms and concepts. The author emphasizes the need for a standardized approach to terminological practices and the significance of creating a shared vocabulary in professional environments. A significant portion of the book is dedicated to the processes involved in developing and managing terminology. De Vries outlines the steps in identifying, defining, and standardising terms, offering practical guidance on conducting terminological research and analysis. This includes techniques for collecting terminology from relevant sources, such as industry literature, expert interviews, and existing databases. It also includes establishing a terminology governance structure, creating a terminology policy, and involving stakeholders in the development process.

## Methodology

### *Objective*

The objective of this research is to show how the meaning of a particular term is studied in a corpus through terminological exploration. This confirms that corpora provide a very important source of terminological search. The search for terms in various contexts in corpora facilitates terminological definitions of concepts.

### *Problem Statement*

In translating specialized texts, translators have difficulty finding the right equivalents for scientific and technical terms and understanding the concepts they represent. A case in point is the term *collective bargaining agreement*, which has a specific meaning in labor discourse. It is not enough for a translator to check the equivalent of the term in a target language terminology database; it is very important to grasp its meaning as well. A corpus of labor-related publications represents a useful and context-based source of information on the meaning of the term.

### *Method*

This paper uses mixed methods. Indeed, the occurrences of the term are explored in a corpus of thousands of words. The number of times the term appears in the corpus is counted and the meaning it takes in every context is interpreted and analyzed. By doing so, a micro-definition of the term is generated and compared to dictionary definitions.

### *Data And Data Analysis*

The term *collective bargaining agreement* is searched for in labor publications including reports issued by several labor organizations, letters, emails, speeches, e-books, online dictionaries, etc. The meaning of the term is scrutinized in every single sentence in which it appears.

## Results

- “Collective bargaining agreement” means *convention collective*, *contrat collectif de travail*, and *convention collective de travail*. The question is: What is the difference between each of these equivalents and which one is used in the particular organization the translator is working for?
- Understanding the meaning of the concept is very important to do a good job; this means that a translator needs to know the TL equivalent of the term and the notion of collective bargaining agreement.
- Translators working for thematic or specialised organisations need to be aware of the terminological challenge related to their profession and role within an organisation. This implies that as soon as they are recruited, they need to develop their terminology database using the organization’s publications and translated materials.
- Some online translators’ resources provide the equivalent terms in the target language but fail to explain the concepts. Contexts and examples are valuable aids to guide the translator.
- While some contexts in which a particular term is used provide some information on its content, others do not. Therefore, translators need to be selective and retain only the contexts that provide some relevant information on a particular term.
- Corpus linguistics provides an adequate method to research word meaning in corpora.
- Translators spend 40% to 50% of their time on terminological research.

## Discussion

### *A Study of the Term "Collective Bargaining Agreement" in a Specialized Text*

A translator encountering this term for the first time in a document asks two questions: What does it mean, and what is the equivalent term in French? The answer to the first question is cognitive, while the answer to the second question is linguistic. Let's first try to answer the second question by searching for the term in traditional dictionaries.

### *"Signifier" Approach to the Term "Collective Bargaining Agreement"*

Let's recall that this linguistic approach treats the term as a linguistic sign (signifier). We will see that the linguistic sign alone is not sufficient to understand the concept's content. Let's now consult classic bilingual dictionaries.

The Collins Robert French Dictionary (1993) defines "Collective bargaining" as (*négociations pour une convention collective de travail*). We then consult Termium to see how the term is translated into French: - Collective bargaining agreement: *contrat collectif de travail*. There is also Collective agreement: *convention collective*. Termium provides the source of the term in a hyperlink. We have in succession "*convention collective de travail*," "*contrat collectif de travail*," and "*convention collective*." The translator cannot decide on the basis of this information alone because they do not know exactly which of the three terms is commonly used within the

concerned organization. It is clear that for a specialist, there is a difference between a "*convention collective*" and a "*contrat collectif de travail*." Generally, employment contracts in companies are individual, unlike agreements which are collective.

At this stage, we can say that the answer to the second question is only partially found. The answer to the first question has not yet been found. Textual and contextual information helps answer the first question. Let's now examine the contexts in which the term is used.

#### *Contextual Approach to the Concept of "Collective Bargaining Agreement"*

**Table 1: Collective Bargaining Agreement In A First Context**

<p>Collective bargaining stalled for ten years in the oil industry: On 30 May 2014 the Nigeria Union of Petroleum and Natural Gas Workers (NUPENG) urged the Federal Government to intervene in the protracted leadership crisis within the Independent Petroleum Marketers Association of Nigeria (IPMAN). NUPENG President, Igwe Achese, noted that the <b>collective bargaining agreement</b> signed with IPMAN and Independent Marketers Branch ten years earlier was yet to be implemented due to the leadership crisis in IPMAN. The previous leadership of IPMAN had frustrated the union's efforts to unionise workers in IPMAN depots. (P.53) (<a href="http://www.ituc-csi.org">www.ituc-csi.org</a>)</p>	<p>Blocage des négociations collectives depuis dix ans dans l'industrie pétrolière : Le 30 mai 2014, le Nigeria Union of Petroleum and Natural Gas Workers (NUPENG) a intimé le gouvernement fédéral d'intervenir dans la crise de longue date à la tête de l'Independent Petroleum Marketers Association of Nigeria (IPMAN). Le président du NUPENG, Igwe Achese, a fait savoir que la <b>convention collective</b> signée avec l'IPMAN et l'Independent Marketers Branch dix ans auparavant n'était toujours pas appliquée en raison de cette crise au sein de l'association. Sa précédente direction avait fait échouer les efforts de syndicalisation des travailleurs aux dépôts d'IPMAN. (P.55)</p>
---	---

**What do these contextual insights reveal about the concept?** The context informs us that the collective agreement was established between the NUPENG union and the employer, IPMAN, and Independent Marketers and that it dates back ten years. This provides the first piece of information about the concept. The second insight from the context is that the collective agreement was signed by both parties, suggesting it likely has legal standing. Since the agreement was signed by the union, it concerns unionized workers.

We will present a second context where the term is used, to determine if additional information about the concept can be gathered.

**Table II: Collective Bargaining Agreement In A Second Context**

<p>On reaching the deadline set for the first <b>collective bargaining agreement</b> (2012 – 2013), the union presented its list of demands, in November 2013. Negotiations were initiated but no agreement was reached... These incidents took place during 2013, and at the beginning of 2014 Dimantec arbitrarily decided that since no collective agreement was in place, the pay rise for the 2014/2015 period would not be the same for unionized and non-unionized workers. (P.60-61)</p>	<p>A l'expiration de la période de la première <b>convention collective</b> (2012-2013), un cahier de revendications fut présenté en novembre 2013 et des négociations engagées, lesquelles ont manqué de déboucher sur un accord... Les faits relatés se sont produits au cours de l'année 2013, motif pour lequel au début de l'année 2014, l'entreprise Dimantec a assumé, de manière arbitraire qu'en l'absence d'une convention collective, un taux d'augmentation salariale différencié serait appliqué aux travailleurs syndiqués durant la période 2014-2015. (P.63)</p>
--	--

This second context speaks of lists of demands, negotiations, agreements, and pay rises—things that are considered in a collective bargaining agreement. We have an increasingly clear idea of the concept, which

involves claims, particularly salary claims, negotiations, and an agreement. The partial conclusion we can draw is that the addition of the information contained in the two contexts deepens our understanding of the concept. There is a third context that can also provide additional information.

**Table III: Collective Bargaining Agreement In A Third Context**

<p>Acepar violates collective agreement: Between 22 May and 3 August 2014, Hugo Gonzales Chirico, union leader at steel company Acepar, began a hunger strike in protest against a dispute over a <b>collective bargaining agreement</b> that started in 2001. Between April and November 2010, the Sindicato de Trabajadores de Acepar (SITRAC) went on strike in protest at the company's failure to comply with the collective agreement in force, failure to respect workers' human rights and its dismissal of 325 workers, which exacerbated the dispute. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of SITRAC in July 2009, recognizing the validity of the collective agreement in force. However, the company's management did not comply with the agreement. (P.65)</p>	<p>ACEPAR viole la convention collective: Hugo Gonzalez Chirico, dirigeant syndical à l'entreprise sidérurgique ACEPAR, a mené une grève de la faim du 22 mai au 3 août 2014 pour protester contre un conflit déclenché en 2001 au sujet du non respect d'une convention collective. Entre avril et novembre 2010, le SITRAC, Syndicat des travailleurs d'ACEPAR (Sindicato de Trabajadores de ACEPAR), est parti en grève pour protester contre le non-respect par l'entreprise de la convention collective en vigueur, l'absence de respect des droits fondamentaux des travailleurs/euses et le licenciement de 325 salariés, ce qui a exacerbé le conflit. La Cour Suprême a tranché en faveur du SITRAC en juillet 2009, en reconnaissant la validité de la convention collective en vigueur. Cependant, la direction de l'entreprise n'a pas appliqué la convention. (P.68)</p>
---	---

This third context confirms the idea that a collective bargaining agreement is a legal document whose validity is recognized by the courts. We will summarize the information obtained from the contexts after examining a fourth context.

**Table IV: Collective Bargaining Agreement In A Fourth Context**

<p>Acts of interference at RMG Gold and RMG Copper: The companies RMG Gold and RMG Copper engaged in serious acts of interference in order to undermine the Trade Union of Metallurgy, Mining and Chemistry Workers of Georgia (TUMMCWG). The companies coerced some 1,000 members of TUMMCWG to renounce their union membership. This began immediately after TUMMCWG urged management to fulfill its legal obligations under the <b>collective bargaining agreement</b> which was signed on 23 March 2014 following a 40-day strike. In response, management forced employees to sign pre-printed resignation letters. (P.80-81)</p>	<p>Ingérence de RMG Gold et RMG Copper: Les entreprises minières RMG Gold et RMG Copper se livrent à une ingérence grave dans les affaires du Trade Union of Metallurgy, Mining and Chemistry Workers of Georgia (Syndicat des travailleurs de la métallurgie, des mines et de la chimie – TUMMCWG), aux fins de déstabiliser le syndicat. Ces deux entreprises ont contraint environ 1.000 membres du TUMMCWG à renoncer à leur adhésion au syndicat, immédiatement après que ce dernier a demandé instamment à la direction de remplir ses obligations légales, conformément à la convention collective qui avait été signée le 23 mars 2014 suite à une grève de 40 jours. La direction a riposté en obligeant les employé(e)s à signer des lettres de démission pré-imprimées. (P.86)</p>
--	---

The information gathered about the concept through the different contexts allows the translator to become familiar with the concept. It is through corpus linguistics that one can easily identify, with just a few clicks, all the occurrences of a term in a corpus of several hundred or even thousands of pages.

At this point, a definitional approach to the concept will be adopted to see if the dictionary definition aligns with the contextual information gathered.



*Definitional Approach to the Concept of Collective Bargaining Agreement*

The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2000) defines the term "collective bargaining" as follows: *discussions between a TRADE/LABOR union and an employer about the pay and working conditions of the union members.*

We can immediately conclude that the dictionary definition aligns with that of the different contexts. Given that we are working within the framework of a specialized lexicon, we will consult the ILO's terminological database (ILOTERM) to see the equivalent of the term in French. This is, in fact, the reference in the field.

*Approach of a Multilingual Terminology Database*

This is an approach that often focuses on providing the equivalents of terms in the target language. It is also a "signifier" approach. Let's see how the term is translated by the ILO.

English: Collective bargaining agreement

Created date : 07/03/2013

Status: Accepted

French:

Convention collective

Created date: 06/02/2008

Status: Preferred

Convention collective de travail

Created date: 07/03/2013

Status: Accepted (ILOTERM)

This terminological database serves as a reference for translators specializing in the translation of documents in the world of work. The limitation of this tool lies in the fact that it only shows the French equivalent of the English term without providing the translator with insights into the content of the concept. It is essential to have not only the equivalent term in the target language but also the definition of the concept or a presentation of the contexts in which the term is used. This viewpoint is shared by Khai Le-Hong (1993, pp. 67-87), who states that: "A terminological entry in a database is not solely composed of equivalence, but includes grammatical, morphological, and semantic components (definitions, paraphrases, graphics and illustrations, thesauri, and classification). Contexts and examples are valuable aids to guide the choice."

Khai Le-Hong made a relevant observation. Definitions, illustrations, thesauri, contexts, and examples are all useful in terminology. They are tools that greatly assist the translator in understanding concepts. The online dictionary Linguee adopts a functional approach to the term. This approach demonstrates how the term functions in different discourses.

*Functional Approach to the Concept of "Collective Bargaining Agreement"*

Linguee has recognized the importance of presenting the term in contexts and offers us another approach to terminology, which simply shows how the searched term operates in discourse. This approach is not very different from the contextual approach discussed earlier. Let's see how the term has been used by various institutions:

**Table V : Collective Bargaining Agreement In A Fifth Context**

Does this new collective bargaining agreement then help General Motors pay down their unfunded liability, to make up that [...] <i>www2.parl.gc.ca</i>	Est-ce que cette nouvelle convention collective va vraiment aider General Motors à rembourser ou à absorber son déficit actuariel? <i>www2.parl.gc.ca</i>
They] would have been subject to dismissal or layoff under the terms and conditions provided for in the collective bargaining agreement. <i>emond-barnden.com</i>	] auraient été sujets au congédiement ou à la mise à pied, en vertu des conditions et modalités prévues par la convention collective". <i>emond-barnden.com</i>

The contexts presented by the online dictionary Linguee inform the translator about two things: the equivalent of the term in the target language and its use, or even its function in the discourses of different institutions. The Parliament of Canada is one of the two institutions mentioned in this table. The second institution is a company.

#### *Analysis and Discussion of the Translator's Terminological Approach*

Linguee's terminological approach is interesting for the translator because it has an institutional orientation. One could rightly speak of institutional terminology, as it often happens that the same term is translated differently by various institutions. For example, in the lexicon of civil aviation, the terms "safety" and "security" mean "sécurité" (safety) and "sûreté" (security), respectively. Conversely, in labor terminology, "security" means "sécurité." For instance: "social security" = "sécurité sociale." This example shows that terminology is specific to each field of activity. It forces the specialized translator to devote a significant amount of time to terminological research. Khai Le-Hong (Ibid) emphasizes the importance of terminological research in the translator's work.

Currently, the translator spends 40% to 50% of their time on terminological research. Terminology can be memorized in the form of word lists, glossaries, specialized dictionaries, disks, or even optical discs (CD-ROMs, WORM). Finally, it can be organized into databases.

He concludes by saying that the translator must use their time wisely, specifically searching for or creating a precise term for a given notion. An imprecise term can lead to serious consequences, especially regarding the resolution of guarantees. Terminology is one of the essential elements for understanding the exact meaning of a concept in a context. Contrary to general opinion, the technical field has many more ambiguities and false friends that can lead to unacceptable misunderstandings, sometimes resulting in very costly guarantee settlements. Khai Le-Hong assigns the translator the task of a terminologist when he states that they must create a precise term for a given notion. In such cases, the translator's approach becomes onomasiological.

Now, we attempt to determine the terminological approach adopted by the translator in light of the fundamental principles of the Vienna School.

Temmerman (2000: 5) contributes to the discussion by recalling the five fundamental principles of the Vienna School (or the traditional approach) originally stated in German:

- Terminology studies concepts before terms (onomasiological approach);
- Concepts have precise contours and a designated place in a conceptual system;
- Concepts must be defined in a traditional manner;
- The concept and the term are in a one-to-one relationship;
- Terms and concepts are studied synchronically.

Referring to the aforementioned principles of the traditional approach, we see that the translator does not systematically study concepts before terms. In translation, the terminological research begins when the translator encounters a term s/he does not know. The translator's approach is essentially semasiological. However, it happens that the translator starts from the description of a concept's content to find a term in the target language. In this case, the translator must know the relevant field. The translator cannot dispute the second principle of the Vienna School, which states that concepts have precise contours and a designated place in a conceptual system. We have just examined the concept of "collective bargaining agreement" in a corpus, and we can conclude that the contours of the concept can be delineated by exploring it in an extended corpus. What needs to be done in this situation is to concatenate various documents (reports, speeches, letters, emails, publications, etc.) over months or even years into the same file. After a few years, one has a large file that can be used for terminological research. The file is, in a way, a memory that can be queried at any time, especially when one wants to inquire about a concept. The concept can be easily found in various environments, usages, and institutional contexts.

Regarding the third principle, it is important to emphasize that the role of the translator is not to define concepts. The translator tries to understand the concepts to make them understandable to others.

The fourth principle highlights that the concept and the term are in a one-to-one relationship. This is a risky principle for a translator. We have just noted that "collective bargaining agreement" translates to both "*accord collectif de travail*" and "*convention collective de travail*." These two terms do not refer to the same notion in French. However, a single term refers to both in English. The principle of *bi-univocity* poses a problem, especially in a comparative linguistic perspective. In Akpaca (2015), it is demonstrated that the term "labour," for example, changes meaning depending on the context. It can mean "workers" in some contexts and "work," "manpower," etc., in others. It is the context that determines its meaning. The fifth principle, which states that terms and concepts are studied synchronically, is accepted since, from one era to another, certain terms lose some meanings or acquire new ones, as revealed by diachronic studies. Each term and each concept must be studied at a specific moment, as some terms may not change, while the concepts they designate evolve over time. On this subject, Aurélie Picton (2009) published an interesting work titled "*Diachronie en langue de spécialité*" ("Diachrony in Specialized Language.")

## Conclusion

Specialized translation is heavily focused on terminology. Over time, there have been several approaches to terminology that have helped break down the barriers between terminological practice and thought. The terminological approach of the translator is essentially a semasiological one. A term is a dynamic notion whose meaning can change in various contexts. Context holds double importance in terminology: it allows for the delineation of the concept designated by a specific term and sometimes contributes to altering the meaning of a term. Therefore, there is a dual cognitive and semantic articulation that unfolds at the level of context. The notion of a term must be redefined not only as a unit of thought freed from the laws of semantics but also as a linguistic sign whose meaning is likely to vary in context. Terminological research tools in specialized translation have their advantages and limitations. They also adopt different approaches (functional, contextual, definitional, notional, institutional, "significant") to terminology. They are complementary because the translator needs all of these approaches to understand and convey meaning.

## References

- Akpaca, S.M. (2015). A Corpus-based Approach to Lexical Semantics, *Revue Afrique, Langue et Cultures (ALAC) Numéro 6* –ISSN : 2219-6633
- Auger, P. (1988). La terminologie au Québec et dans le monde, de la naissance à la maturité. Actes du sixième colloque OLF-STQ de terminologie. L'ère nouvelle de la terminologie, 27±59. Québec: Gouvernement du Québec.
- Beroud, d. L. (2001-2002). Cours du Semestre d'hiver, Ecole de traduction et d'interprétation - Terminologie, Genève, Suisse
- Bouveret, M. (1998). Approche de la dénomination en langue spécialisée, *Meta*, vol. 43, N°3, p. 393-340
- Cabré, M.T. (1998). Terminology: theory, methods, and applications. Volume 1, Edited by

- Juan C Sager, Translated by Janet Ann DeCesaris, John Benjamins Publishing Co  
 Collins Robert French Dictionary. (1993). Harper Collins Publishers, Paris  
 Depecker, L. (2002). *Entre signe et concept : éléments de terminologie générale*, Paris, Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle.  
 Desnet, I. (2007). Rifal ([www.rifal.org](http://www.rifal.org))  
 Diki-Kidiri, M. (2000). Terminologie et diversité culturelle, *Terminologies nouvelles*, N°21, p. 58-64.  
 Durieux, C. (1993). Terminologie et traduction, n°2-3/1992, Luxembourg  
 Gaudin, F. (1993). Pour une socioterminologie. Des problèmes sémantiques aux pratiques institutionnelles, Publications de l'Université de Rouen, n° 182. Rouen, Université de Rouen, 255 p.  
 Gaudin, F. (2003). *Socioterminologie : une approche socioterminologique de la terminologie*, Bruxelles, De Boeck-Ducolot  
 Khai, L. H. (1993). Terminologie et traduction, n°2-3/1992, Luxembourg  
 L'Homme, M. (2004). *La terminologie : principes et techniques*, Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal (Paramètres)  
 Meer (der), M. E. (2020). *Computer-Assisted Translation Technology: A Practical Guide*, Springer  
 Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. (2000). Oxford University Press  
 Pavel, S. (1993). *Bibliographie de la phraséologie (1905-1992)*, Montreal, Réseau international de néologie et de terminologie.  
 Picton, A. (2009). *Diachronie en langue de spécialité*, Université de Toulouse.  
 Rey, A. (1979). *La terminologie, noms et notions*, Paris, PUF, coll. Que sais-je ?  
 Rondeau, G. et Felber, H., (éd.) (1981). *Textes choisis de terminologie*, Vol. 1 : Fondements théoriques de la terminologie, Québec, Université Laval – GIRSTERM  
 Sager, J.C. (2021). *Terminology: Theory, Methods, and Applications*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.  
 Temmerman, R. (2000). *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description. The Sociocognitive Approach*, Terminology and Lexicography Research and Practice, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing.  
 Temmermann, R. (2000). Une théorie réaliste de la terminologie : le sociocognitivism », dans Diki-Kidiri (M.), dir., *Terminologie et diversité culturelle*, *Terminologies nouvelles*, N°21, p. 58-64.  
 Termium. (2001). Bureau de la traduction, Version 1.0 Build 8a  
 ITUC. (2015). *Global Rights Index* ([www.ituc-csi.org](http://www.ituc-csi.org))  
 Thoiron, P. et al. (1996). Notion d'«archi-concept et dénomination», *La dénomination*, *Meta*, Vol. 41, N°4.  
 Thoiron, P., dir. (1996). *La dénomination*, numéro spécial de *Meta*, Montreal, Les Presses de l'Université de Montreal, vol. 41, N°4  
 Vries (de), A. H. (2023). *Terminology Management: A Practical Guide*, Springer  
 Weissenhoffer, P. (1995). *Conceptology in Terminology Theory, Semantics and Word-Formation. A morpho-conceptually based approach to classification as exemplified by the English Baseball Terminology*, Vienne: TermNet, International Network for Terminology.  
 Wright, S. E. and Budin G. (2019). *The Language of Terminology: A Practical Guide to Terminology Management*, John Benjamins Publishing Company.  
 Wüster, E. (1968). *Dictionnaire multilingue de la machine-outil. Notions fondamentales, définies et illustrées, présentées dans l'ordre systématique et l'ordre alphabétique*. Volume de base anglais-français, London, Technical Press.  
 Website  
 \*<http://www.linguee.com/english-french/search?source=auto&query=collective+bargaining+agreement+>  
 \*ILOTERM : <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/standards/relm/info/translatns/translator.htm>