International Journal of English Language Teaching, 14 (3),46-67, 2026
Print ISSN: 2055-0820(Print)
Online ISSN: 2055-0839(Online)
Website: https://www.eajournals.org/
Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

Translation Technology Curricula in Jiangsu Province, China: A Textual Analysis of 28 Master of Translation and Interpreting (MTI) Training Programs

LI Zi[1]
Faculty of Foreign Languages, Huai'an University, Jiangsu, China, 223000
Email: lizi@hau.edu.cn

doi: https://doi.org/10.37745/ijelt.13/vol14n34667 Published November 22, 2026

Citation: Zi L. (2026) Translation Technology Curricula in Jiangsu Province, China: A Textual Analysis of 28 Master of Translation and Interpreting (MTI) Training Programs, *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 14 (3),46-67

Abstract: *Training programs are the institutionalized expression of a degree program's educational goals and learning process, offering an observable textual basis for examining curriculum design. This study analyzes the training programs of all 28 Master of Translation and Interpreting (MTI) authorized institutions in Jiangsu Province, China, building a course-level database of 778 records through uniform coding. The analysis identifies 109 instances of translation technology courses, 30 of them compulsory; every institution offers at least one such course. Technology courses concentrate in computer-aided translation and in localization and translation project management (66 instances, 60.6%), whereas machine translation and post-editing, corpus and terminology work, and audiovisual translation remain limited; AI-related courses appear at ten institutions and have entered compulsory course groups. Against AI-era industry requirements, the configuration shows structural gaps in coverage, in compulsory–elective balance, and in content renewal; the study proposes course-level quality assurance pathways.*

Keywords: translation technology; Master of Translation and Interpreting; curriculum system; Jiangsu province; artificial intelligence

INTRODUCTION

The Master of Translation and Interpreting (MTI) degree, established in China in 2007, has become a main pathway for producing high-level applied translation professionals. According to the 2026 Report on the Development of China's Translation Industry issued by the Translators Association of China, 374 Chinese institutions offered the MTI degree by 2025, of which 312 had enrollment plans. In Jiangsu Province, MTI provision has expanded steadily since Nanjing University was approved as one of the first pilot institutions in 2007; after ten new authorization points were added in 2024, the province now hosts 28 MTI institutions, ranging from comprehensive and teacher-training universities to science and technology, finance and economics, and agriculture and forestry institutions, with authorization dates spanning 2007 to 2024. Taken together, these features make Jiangsu a provincial

[1] LI Zi was born in Jiangsu, China in 1982. She is currently a professor in the Faculty of Foreign Languages, Huai'an University, Jiangsu, China. Email: lizi@hau.edu.cn.

sample for examining how curricula respond to industry change amid the expansion of MTI education.

Training programs are the institutionalized answer to what kind of translators to train and how; course titles, credits, contact hours, compulsory or elective status, and course-group structures are concrete textual material for observing the curriculum system and its institutional design. Artificial intelligence technologies epitomized by large language models are reshaping the task structure and talent demand of the language services industry; the technological turn of translation and changes in human–machine relations have posed new requirements on the competence structure of translation graduates, providing a reference for examining MTI curricula.

This study takes the training programs of the 28 MTI institutions in Jiangsu Province as its object of analysis, examines the overall picture of the provincial curriculum system and the configuration of technology courses in the AI era, and further discusses course-dimension pathways for training quality assurance. It addresses four research questions: (RQ1) What is the overall picture of the curriculum system of the 28 MTI institutions in Jiangsu Province? (RQ2) What patterns appear in the number of technology course instances, institutional coverage, category distribution, and course attributes, and what descriptive differences exist across development stages and institution types? (RQ3) Referring to research on industry demand and translator competence frameworks, what structural deficiencies does the current configuration of technology courses exhibit? (RQ4) Based on these findings, what course-dimension pathways for quality assurance can be formulated at the provincial level?

Existing research on MTI curriculum systems has mainly adopted national sample surveys, syllabus analyses, or single-institution case studies; full-population textual analysis of provincial training programs remains to be developed. This study incorporates all 28 institutions into a single sample framework, with unified coding and descriptive statistics at the institutional and course levels, to enrich provincial-scale research on MTI curricula. The applicability of the conclusions is limited by the completeness of the materials and the coding conventions. The study also offers a horizontal reference for MTI institutions revising their training programs, and provides an evidence base for provincial education authorities and relevant professional degree steering committees guiding newly authorized institutions, sharing course resources, and monitoring processes.

LITERATURE REVIEW

MTI Curriculum and Translation Technology Teaching in China

Domestic research mainly involves three interrelated questions, reviewed in turn below: how the MTI curriculum system reflects the positioning of a professional degree, how translation technology courses are configured and implemented, and what new requirements AI development poses for teaching models and translator competence.

Curriculum Design, Training Orientation, and Institutional Differences

In the early years of the MTI degree, curriculum surveys became an important way of examining the state of professional degree development. Wen and Mu (2009) surveyed eight MTI programs in China and compared them with two overseas institutions, an early attempt to examine Chinese curricular configuration against an international reference. Cao (2012) extended the scope to 16 institutions, noting that some MTI courses were barely distinguishable from academic-degree courses and that curricular structures were unbalanced with insufficient institutional features. Ma (2012) further surveyed the training programs of 23 institutions, nine from the first authorization batch and fourteen from the second, and thus covered the first two authorization batches. Wei and Cao (2021) approached the question from students' academic development, examining the process and outcomes of full-time MTI training and showing that learning engagement and academic experience beyond the curriculum also affect training quality. These studies show that curriculum surveys can present the institutional design of MTI programs in terms of training objectives, course structures, and institutional differences, but their samples were all formed at specific developmental stages and cannot substitute for an examination of current institutions.

Curriculum research is also closely related to the specialized and professional orientation of the MTI degree. Mu and Wang (2011), after distinguishing the training objectives and models of the academic Master of Arts and the MTI, emphasized realizing the MTI's professional character through curriculum design. Miao and Wang (2010), drawing on occupational trends in the translation industry and the competence requirements of professional translators, discussed the alignment of training programs, curriculum systems, and teaching principles. Together, these studies suggest that comparisons of course numbers or titles cannot be divorced from training objectives, and that whether technology courses enter the curriculum should be understood within the overall competence design of a professional degree.

As the types of institutions widened, institutional differences and implementation conditions attracted increasing attention. Through a comparison of domestic and foreign curriculum design, Wang and Huang (2013) discussed the principles and basic structure of MTI curriculum design at science and technology universities, providing a reference for analyzing the relationship between disciplinary background and curricular features. Drawing on training and interview materials from local institutions, Zheng (2019) discussed curriculum and training issues and characterized the development of MTI education in China as a process from start-up through rapid expansion to quality enhancement and standardization; this account provides background for understanding the program documents of institutions authorized at different stages, although the exact stage boundaries need to be delimited in relation to the research sample. Yang (2016) examined university–enterprise cooperative teaching, discussing cooperation mechanisms, instructor selection, teaching content, course quality, and team stability. That strand of research concerns the organizational conditions of course implementation; its conclusions cannot be verified directly from training program texts, but they caution the present study to distinguish "institutional arrangements in program documents" from "actual operational effects"

when interpreting indicators such as university–enterprise co-constructed courses.

Translation Technology Curriculum Systems and Course Configuration

Research on translation technology teaching in China has expanded from the construction of single courses to the discussion of curriculum systems. Combining teaching practice, Yu and Wang (2010) discussed the design orientation, teaching plans, and practical problems of a computer-aided translation course, offering practical experience for introducing technology courses into MTI programs. Proceeding from the technology application process of the language services industry and comparing domestic and foreign courses, Wang (2013) constructed a translation technology curriculum oriented to industry demand. That study extended technology teaching to multiple stages beyond computer-aided translation and is an important reference for the present study's delimitation of technology courses; the six-category coding scheme used here, however, is an operational adaptation based on the course titles and course-group structures found in the Jiangsu programs, not a direct copy of that classification. Focusing on the "Translation Project Management" course, Wang (2014) discussed curriculum design, staffing, teaching methods, assessment, and resource construction. The study further shows that technology-related courses also train project-process and organizational management competences.

On the configuration side, Li et al. (2013) surveyed the provision of computer-aided translation courses at 159 pilot MTI institutions using website information, and proposed a "project-integrated" teaching concept. Wang et al. (2018) investigated translation technology teaching at 249 MTI institutions nationwide through questionnaires and interviews, identifying problems in teaching awareness, curriculum systems, teaching resources, and specialist staffing. As these studies show, existing research has addressed "which institutions offer technology courses" and "how technology courses are organized," forming a relatively macro-level understanding through national surveys. Rather than namely confirming that technology courses receive attention, the present study examines their categories, modes of textual presentation, and course attributes within a full provincial sample.

AI-Driven Teaching Models and Competence Requirements

Recent research has shifted from general technology teaching to AI-driven transformation of translation education. Wang and Liu (2021) discussed the connotation and manifestations of the "technological turn" of translation and the changes in human–machine relations it entails, providing a theoretical perspective for understanding the role of technology in translation activity. Wang and Xie (2024) examined how large language models are applied in the design, implementation, and assessment of translation teaching, attending to both innovation and the problems involved in such applications. Wang and Liu (2025), tracing the evolution from machine translation post-editing (MTPE) to artificial-intelligence post-editing (AIPE), proposed redefining translator competence, innovating curriculum systems, raising technological literacy, and strengthening ethical awareness.

These studies have broadened the discussion of translation technology courses beyond software

operation to human–machine collaboration, quality judgment, process organization, and ethical responsibility. However, competence claims and teaching model proposals at the theoretical level do not amount to corresponding curricular arrangements at the institutional level. The present study therefore treats AI-related research as a backdrop for interpretation. It then uses training program texts to examine how such changes are concretely reflected in the course provision of Jiangsu MTI programs, without inferring from a few new course titles that overall curricular reform has been accomplished.

Research on Translation Technology Curricula Abroad

Research abroad includes syllabus-corpus analysis and course design, surveys of teachers and programs, classroom research, and the construction of competence and ethics frameworks. These methods answer different questions—what curriculum texts say, how teaching is implemented, and what graduates should be able to do—and the three should not be conflated.

Syllabus Analysis and Course Design

Syllabus analysis provides verifiable material for identifying institutionalized course content. Sánchez-Castany (2022) took the 994 syllabi of Spanish undergraduate Translation and Interpreting programs in the 2019–2020 academic year as a corpus, combining qualitative thematic identification with quantitative statistics to examine the distribution of technology content across courses. The study shows that technology content may be embedded in general translation courses rather than existing only in courses with explicit technology titles; this finding cautions that name-based coding cannot capture implicit or embedded technology content. Plaza-Lara (2022) content-analyzed the syllabi of translation project management courses in programs of the European Master's in Translation (EMT) network, including 67 courses from 52 programs on the basis of an initial review of 85, and discussed how project manager competence is reflected in courses. As that study did not analyze compulsory or elective status, its findings mainly inform the present study's understanding of course content and competence statements and cannot serve as a direct basis for comparing course attributes.

Unlike syllabus-corpus studies, Doherty and Kenny (2014) took a statistical machine translation course as their object, reporting its needs analysis, syllabus design, implementation, and evaluation, attending to how translators participate in machine translation workflows. Its value lies mainly in demonstrating the design process of a technology course from needs analysis to teaching evaluation, rather than in cross-institutional textual statistics. Together, these studies show that syllabi can serve both as descriptive material for course configuration and for concrete course design, but their units of analysis and evidential functions differ.

Technology Teaching, Quality Assessment, and Teacher Cognition

Implementation research supplements the teaching processes that textual analysis cannot cover. Rothwell and Svoboda (2019) compared two rounds of EMT network surveys on tool and technology teaching in 2012 and 2017, which received 50 and 55 responses respectively, with 17 institutions participating in both rounds; the results show an expansion and professionalization of tool teaching.

The authors also cautioned that respondents may over-represent programs with more advanced technology teaching, so the survey results cannot be taken directly as the average level of all programs. This caveat means that overseas surveys are cited only to trace trends in technology teaching, not to infer the general state of curricula in different countries or regions.

Moorkens (2018) turned a comparison of statistical and neural machine translation into a classroom exercise, bringing translation adequacy, post-editing time, and error classification into learning activities, and showing that machine translation teaching can integrate quality assessment with post-editing practice. The study is a design and discussion of a classroom exercise rather than a controlled experiment; its significance lies in providing a way of organizing teaching, not in proving the general performance of a machine translation system from the behavior of a small number of students. Rico and González Pastor (2022) collected qualitative data from 17 translation teachers at the University of Valencia through 25 open-ended questions and conducted a thematic analysis. None of the participating teachers reported having received formal training in machine translation; some confused machine translation and translation memory with post-editing and revision; most supported the classroom use of machine translation, while some expressed reservations. The study reflects the perceptions and training needs of a particular group of teachers and cannot be generalized to translation teachers abroad as a whole.

Competence, Ethics, and Teaching Frameworks in the AI Era

In the field of legal and institutional translation, Prieto Ramos (2024) revised a descriptive framework of translator competence, drawing on professional materials such as interviews, translation volume data, and job description analysis, with questionnaire validation involving 474 translation professionals from 24 international organizations. The revised framework incorporates information retrieval, terminology management, machine translation, and post-editing into an interrelated competence structure alongside language, subject, strategic, and professional management competences. The study is strongly domain-specific; it provides evidence for understanding the integration of technology and professional competence, but its conclusions apply first of all to the context of legal and institutional translation.

Combining a translation technology competence model, ethics literature, and an analysis of 30 translation technology course syllabi, Ramírez-Polo and Vargas-Sierra (2023) discussed ethical issues such as data, professional values, sustainability, representation, equity, and market. In the syllabi they examined, ethical competence was not explicitly or adequately reflected, and the authors proposed a model for integrating ethical competence into translation technology teaching. The study suggests that evaluating technology courses should not focus only on tool operation but should also attend to data protection, bias, transparency, and professional responsibility; however, findings from that syllabus sample cannot be transferred directly as evidence about ethics teaching in Jiangsu institutions.

Pym and Hao (2025) discussed needs analysis, teaching methods, classroom activities, and assessment

for integrating generative AI, machine translation, and translation memory tools into language learning and translator training, and advocated an understanding of technology's capabilities and limits through classroom exploration. The EMT Competence Framework 2026 (European Commission, 2026), published by the European Master's in Translation network, lists digital and technological competence as one of five interdependent competence areas, covering machine translation and large language model literacy, the selection and evaluation of tools and workflows, post-editing, data and terminology management, and the ethical responsibilities of technology use. The framework also stresses the importance of language and cultural competence, thematic knowledge, and professional judgment, showing that technological competence does not replace linguistic and translation competence. These competence and teaching frameworks provide references for the analysis below of the content coverage of Jiangsu MTI technology courses; however, their institutional environments and purposes differ from the present sample.

Summary and Research Positioning

Existing research offers multiple perspectives for understanding MTI curricula, including professional orientation, industry demand, course content, and teaching implementation. Training programs can reflect institutional curricular arrangements but cannot show whether courses are delivered as planned or support inferences about staffing levels and learning outcomes. Syllabus analysis can present teaching content, whereas program surveys and classroom research reveal implementation processes. Competence frameworks describe what translators need to master but cannot substitute for the observation of curricula at concrete institutions. National surveys help capture general trends but present within-province differences only to a limited extent; single-institution or single-course studies can analyze instructional design in depth but can hardly speak for a whole region. In this study, research on industry tasks and competence frameworks serves only as interpretive references: they do not replace a survey of the language services industry in Jiangsu, nor do they constitute a uniform standard for judging the quality of individual programs.

Compared with existing research, what this study seeks to add is course-text evidence at the provincial scale: it brings the training programs of all 28 Jiangsu institutions into a single framework, focusing on the categories and attributes of technology courses.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Analytical Units

This study takes the training program texts of the 28 MTI institutions in Jiangsu Province as its corpus, codes every course through a uniform procedure, and combines textual analysis with descriptive statistics at the institutional and course levels.

By "training program text" the study means the MTI training program formulated and published by an institution; the scope of analysis covers the course provision tables and the directly related statements

of training objectives, course structure, and training stages. Course titles, credits, contact hours, course attributes, course groups, and university–enterprise co-construction labels visible in the texts constitute the basis for coding; information that the texts do not present in a stable form—actual course delivery, enrollment numbers, staffing, and classroom processes—is not part of the evidence base of this study.

"Curriculum system" is used in this study as an operational concept, referring to the overall course structure presented in a training program and its articulation with practice stages, including total credits and program length, the organization of degree and non-degree courses or of compulsory and elective courses, practice stages, and university–enterprise co-constructed courses. It reflects the institutional design of the curriculum; it is not identical with training quality as such and does not directly represent course implementation.

"Translation technology course" refers to a course whose teaching content consists of translation technology knowledge, tools, workflows, or related language-services organizational forms, rather than a course that merely uses technical texts as translation material. Drawing on Wang's (2013) industry-oriented classification of the translation technology curriculum, and on the course titles and course-group structures actually observed in the Jiangsu sample, this study develops a six-category coding framework, an operational adaptation for the present study rather than a direct copy of that classification.

The study works with two analytical units. At the institutional level, the 28 institutions constitute the population, supporting coverage and group comparisons; at the course level, course entries listed in the programs are the basic unit for course identification and attribute statistics. The same course offered repeatedly in different directions within one institution is counted once; courses with identical titles at different institutions are counted separately. "Course instances" in what follows refers to course entries formed under these rules and is not equivalent to the number of classes actually taught.

Materials and Coding Framework

This study takes the training programs of the 28 Jiangsu institutions as the basis for coding. The institutions differ in course classification and presentational conventions; uniform extraction and coding rules were therefore developed; the original course titles and remarks were retained; no missing information was guessed.

Coding proceeds in two steps: a binary decision on whether a course qualifies as a translation technology course, and, for courses coded "yes", the assignment of one primary category. Table 1 presents the six categories with typical course titles from the sample.

International Journal of English Language Teaching, 14 (3),46-67, 2026
Print ISSN: 2055-0820(Print)
Online ISSN: 2055-0839(Online)
Website: https://www.eajournals.org/
Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

Table 1. Coding framework for translation technology courses

Code	Category	Core scope with sample course titles
A	Computer-aided translation (CAT)	CAT tools and related software applications, e.g. "Computer-Aided Translation", "Python and CAT", "CAT Software and Applications"
B	Machine translation and post-editing	Machine translation, post-editing, and combined workflows, e.g. "Intelligent Translation Theory and Practice", "AI-empowered Post-editing", "MT+CAT+PE Translation Practice"
C	Corpus and terminology	Corpus and terminology base construction and application, or language data analysis, e.g. "Corpus Translation Technology", "ICT Bilingual Corpus Construction and Application", "Auditing Corpus Construction"
D	Localization and project management	Localization, translation project management, technical communication, language services management, and translation industry standards, e.g. "Translation Project Management", "Localization Industry Translation", "Technical Writing", "Translation Professional Education"
E	Audiovisual translation	Subtitling and other audiovisual translation technologies, e.g. "Audiovisual Translation"
F	Other translation technology related	Generic courses identifiable only as translation or language technology that fit none of the above five categories

Within category F, a subcategory "F-AI" marks AI-related courses such as "AI-assisted Translation", "Special Topics in AI Translation", and "General AI Literacy"; in the six-category distribution these count toward F and are reported separately when AI courses are discussed. Category D adopts a broad process-and-management scope: courses such as technical writing or industry standards need not involve software operation, and their inclusion in D serves to present the institutional configuration of language-services process-related courses; it does not imply that all technology categories involve the same degree of technological content.

Three rules support consistent judgment. First, courses that use technical texts as translation material—such as "Sci-tech Translation", "Technical Text Translation", or "Engineering Technology Translation"—are excluded, since they train domain-text translation competence rather than translation technology; courses that teach the production and communication of technical content, such as technical writing or technical communication, are assigned to category D under the operational definition. Second, courses whose titles indicate only "translation technology" or "language

technology" without further specification are assigned to F and flagged as generic, without conjecture about their undisclosed content. Third, a course spanning several categories receives one primary category according to the first clearly identifiable core content in the title, with composite content retained in the remarks—for example, "Computer-Aided Translation and Corpus Applications" is coded A with a note that it contains category C content, and "CAT Translation Practice" is coded B with a note that it combines CAT and post-editing. The single-primary-category rule avoids double counting but compresses the information carried by composite courses, making the remarks indispensable when interpreting the statistics.

Each course record includes the institution, course title, credits, contact hours, course attribute, course group, technology-course flag, category code, coding status, and remarks; entries with ambiguous titles, unclear attributes, or textual gaps carry a "pending verification" flag rather than being filled in by common-sense inference. A course offered in more than one direction within an institution is recorded once: for example, where an institution offers "Translation Project Management and Practice" in both its English and Japanese translation directions, it is counted as one course.

Coding Procedure and Inter-coder Reliability

Coding proceeded through text preparation, initial coding, checking, and peer verification. Course and training-stage information was extracted institution by institution; technology courses were identified and primary categories assigned according to the coding manual; institution counts, course counts, and category results were cross-checked. The process yielded 778 course-level records for the 28 institutions.

To examine coding consistency, a colleague was invited as a second coder. The verification sample comprised 86 courses selected through stratified sampling, accounting for 11.1% of the 778 records. The second coder judged independently on the basis of the coding manual and sample information, without access to the first coder's decisions, covering both the binary judgment of whether a course qualifies as a translation technology course and, where both coders answered "yes", the assignment of its primary category.

Before reconciliation, the two coders agreed on 85 of the 86 binary judgments (raw agreement of 98.8%), with Cohen's kappa at 0.9625; for the 16 courses judged to be technology courses by both, 15 received the same primary category (category agreement 93.8%). The two disagreements concerned the classification of one institution's "Technical Text Writing" and the primary category of another institution's lecture series "Translation Industry Standards and Translation Technology (8 sessions)"; on review against the coding manual, both were assigned to category D.

Data Analysis and Scope of Interpretation

Institutional-level data describe credits, program length, course organization, practice requirements, and university–enterprise co-construction; course-level data count technology course instances,

institutional coverage, categories, and course attributes. Given the differing credit structures and course-group conventions across institutions, comparisons rely mainly on course instances, institutional coverage, and course attributes, with credits used only as auxiliary description and never equated across institutions.

With reference to Zheng's (2019) account of MTI development stages and the authorization years in the sample, the institutions are grouped into a pilot stage (authorized 2007–2010; 11 institutions), an expansion stage (2011–2014; 2 institutions), and a quality enhancement stage (2015 and later; 15 institutions). The sample is further divided, on the basis of overall disciplinary profile, foreign-language tradition, and MTI orientation, into two groups: five comprehensive or normal universities with a strong foreign-language tradition, and the remaining 23 science, technology, and industry-characteristic institutions. The groupings are used for description only, and no causal inference is drawn.

FINDINGS

This section answers RQ1—RQ3 on the basis of the training program texts of the 28 institutions and 778 course-level records, examining credits and program length, course organization, professional practice, and university–enterprise co-construction. Institutions define total credits, course credits, and training-stage credits differently; the analysis is therefore limited to information explicitly stated in the texts: countable indicators are reported with their distributions, and no simple high-low ranking is made. The results reflect the institutional design presented in training program texts, not the actual implementation of courses and practice.

The Overall Picture of MTI Curricula

Across the 28 programs, credit requirements range from 32 to 49, with nine institutions clustering at 38 credits. Twenty-five programs specify program length: 17 require three years, seven require two years, and one allows a flexible 2.5-year program, while the remaining three state no explicit requirement. Course organization follows three main conventions— "compulsory, elective, and training stages", "degree and non-degree courses", and "course groups with credit floors"—which may be combined within a single program. Some institutions preserve student choice through elective credit floors, but the scope of course groups and credit conventions is not uniform; no province-wide compulsory-to-elective ratio is therefore computed, and actual course-choice freedom is not compared. Because statistical conventions differ, these figures describe program requirements only and are not used to compare training load or course quality.

Professional practice is an important component of MTI programs, yet practice requirements in the sample are expressed not only in credits. Some institutions require an off-campus placement of more than three months together with a practice translation of no fewer than 150,000 Chinese characters; others assign six credits to professional practice or practice translation. In terms of organization and

assessment, the program texts also provide for supervision jointly by faculty and industry advisers, placements based at practice bases or joint training platforms, and assessment through practice reports or practice summaries. These elements reflect an institutional intention to extend practice training from course credits toward process management.

This study counts only courses and lectures explicitly labeled in the course tables or remarks as university–enterprise cooperation, jointly taught, co-constructed, or delivered by industry instructors, whereas cooperation with internship bases is not counted. On this basis, nine institutions list 23 relevant course instances or lectures, in forms including jointly delivered courses, jointly built and co-taught courses, and lecture series given by industry instructors. The co-construction labels show that industry participation has entered some course arrangements, but they cannot establish the hours contributed by companies, how students participate, or what teaching effects result; questions of cooperation mechanisms, instructor selection, and course quality require investigation through teaching archives and interviews.

In summary, the 28 MTI programs in Jiangsu differ considerably in credits and program length, course organization, practice requirements, and industry participation. Thirty-eight credits is a relatively common requirement, but credit calibers are not uniform; three-year programs are most common, with two-year and flexible systems alongside; course organization conventions are often combined within a single program; and practice requirements involve credits, placement duration, translation volume, and output assessment simultaneously. University–enterprise co-constructed courses are visible in the texts but concentrated in a limited number of institutions.

Coverage and Distribution of Translation Technology Courses

The texts of the 28 institutions yielded 109 instances of translation technology courses. The six categories are distributed unevenly: Category D (localization and project management) and A (computer-aided translation) together account for 66, or 60.6% of all technology courses, whereas categories B, C, E, and F each contribute eight instances or fewer; the F-AI subcategory contributes 18 instances across ten institutions.

Table 2. Categories, coverage, and attributes of translation technology courses

Code	Category	Instances	Institutions	Compulsory	Elective
A	Computer-aided translation (CAT)	17	16	4	13
B	Machine translation and post-editing	8	5	1	7
C	Corpus and terminology	8	7	1	7
D	Localization and project management	49	22	10	39
E	Audiovisual translation	1	1	1	0
F	Other translation technology (excluding F-AI)	8	8	3	5
F-AI	of which: AI-related courses (subcategory of F)	18	10	10	8

Note: F-AI conceptually belongs to category F; it is listed separately to highlight AI content, while the six primary categories remain A–F.

Across institutions, one lists the most technology courses (12), seven of them compulsory; others list ten, nine, and six, and three institutions list five each. Institutions with larger technology provisions devote more course slots to technological content, but course-group structures, credit conventions, and the granularity of course titles differ across institutions, so the number of instances alone cannot support judgments about teaching quality or the level of technology training.

Course Attributes and Course-Group Placement

Of the 109 instances, 79 are explicitly marked as elective and 30 as compulsory; compulsory technology courses are found at 18 institutions, while the other ten programs set no compulsory technology course, nine of them listing electives only. The category composition of compulsory courses differs from that of all technology courses. Category D contributes the largest number of compulsory instances (ten), covering project management, localization, technical communication, and industry standards; category A contributes four compulsory instances across four institutions; category B has a single compulsory instance, the other seven being elective; categories C and E have one compulsory instance each, each at a single institution; and the F-AI subcategory contributes ten compulsory instances, showing that some institutions have incorporated AI content into compulsory courses, though coverage remains partial.

Institutional-level variation is equally clear. Among the 18 institutions with compulsory technology courses, one lists seven, one lists three, four list two, and the remaining twelve list one. Thus, "technology courses listed in a program" and "technology courses set as compulsory" are not the same

phenomenon. Elective courses create learning opportunities but do not oblige every student to engage with the content; course attributes are therefore an important dimension for understanding the level of institutional assurance behind technology courses.

In terms of course-group placement, technology courses are distributed across professional compulsory or degree course groups, professional electives, public courses, and tool-laboratory groups. Some institutions place several technology courses in degree core or related compulsory groups; some list "Language Technology, Intelligence, and Translation", "Technical Text Writing for Translation", or "Translation Industry Standards" as professional compulsory courses; and the public compulsory online courses of one institution show that AI content can also enter the public course layer. These placements reflect different ways of articulating technology content with professional training and general education and cannot be reduced to the presence or absence of a stand-alone technology course.

Descriptive Comparisons by Development Stage and Institution Type

Table 3 presents the configuration of technology courses by development stage, using the operational groupings described above. Technology course volume rises across the three stages, and compulsory provision is concentrated in the quality-enhancement stage, which contributes 20 of the 30 compulsory instances. F-AI courses are absent from the pilot-stage programs, and the three expansion-stage F-AI instances all come from a single institution, whereas the 15 quality-enhancement stage F-AI instances are distributed across nine institutions.

Table 3. Technology course provision by development stage

Stage	Instances	Institutions with technology courses	Compulsory instances	Institutions with compulsory courses	F-AI instances (institutions)
Pilot (2007–2010)	37	11	6	4	0 (0)
Expansion (2011–2014)	9	2	4	2	3 (1)
Quality Enhancement (2015 and later)	63	15	20	12	15 (9)
Total	109	28	30	18	18 (10)

By institution type, the five comprehensive or normal universities with a strong foreign-language tradition yield 13 technology course instances in total (a mean of 2.60 per institution), while the 23 science, technology, and industry-characteristic institutions yield 96 instances (a mean of 4.17), including 26 compulsory instances. F-AI courses appear only in institutions grouped as science, technology, and industry-characteristic; this correspondence is noted, but with 28 institutions in total, no further inference about institution type is warranted.

Structural Gaps Relative to AI-Era Competence Requirements

The sample of training programs from the 28 institutions reflects three structural deficiencies.

First, course coverage of machine translation, post-editing, and audiovisual translation is limited. The eight category B instances are distributed across five institutions, seven of them elective; category E comprises a single instance at a single institution. Compared with the sustained attention that competence research pays to machine translation, post-editing, and technology-mediated workflow judgment, these courses have not achieved broad coverage in the programs of most sampled institutions. Meanwhile, whether audiovisual translation warrants a stand-alone course depends on institutional orientations, and course titles alone cannot establish whether institutions have formed content articulation among machine translation principles, post-editing, and AI applications.

Second, compulsory provision of technology courses is uneven. Although all 28 programs list technology courses, only 18 set compulsory technology courses and ten set no compulsory technology course. The broad coverage of categories A and D does not mean that every institution includes tools, workflows, or related management competences in the compulsory learning requirements of all students; at institutions offering only electives, whether students actually take such courses depends on course availability and individual choice.

Third, AI-related courses remain limited in coverage and concentrated in distribution. The 18 F-AI instances are distributed across ten institutions, leaving 18 institutions whose program texts show no identifiable AI course. By stage, 15 instances are distributed across nine quality-enhancement-stage institutions, the three expansion-stage instances all come from a single institution, and no F-AI course appears in the texts of the 11 pilot-stage institutions. These differences show that AI courses have appeared at institutions of different authorization cohorts without achieving province-wide coverage, and the absence of such courses from a program text does not imply that an institution teaches no AI content in practice.

Similarly, course titles and course-group information are insufficient to determine whether ethical content enters concrete teaching; judgments about actual teaching quality and student competence attainment require materials such as course syllabi, classroom observation, and teacher–student interviews.

In summary, the texts of the 28 institutions yield 109 instances of translation technology courses. Localization and project management, together with computer-aided translation, are broadly covered, whereas machine translation and post-editing, and audiovisual translation, are covered to a limited extent; the 30 compulsory technology course instances are distributed across 18 institutions, showing that being listed in a program and being required as compulsory do not fully overlap. Actual teaching and learning outcomes require examination in combination with other materials.

DISCUSSION

As shown above, the 28 institutions differ in credits and program length, course organization, professional practice, and technology course configuration. The texts reveal five observations: (1) listing technology courses in a training program is not equivalent to clear enrollment requirements for all students; (2) coverage of some technology contents remains limited; (3) course volume and attributes differ across development stages and institution types, so a uniform curriculum template cannot accommodate institutional orientations and disciplinary resources, and categorized curriculum development should proceed from training orientation; (4) existing university–enterprise co-constructed courses and translation volume requirements do not by themselves demonstrate training quality, and university–enterprise cooperation and professional practice need deep integration; and (5) the institutions authorized in 2024 have no graduates yet, so the implementation of their programs needs to be tracked with strengthened feedback. Curriculum improvement should be grounded in textual findings while taking institutional orientations, disciplinary resources, and student needs into account; uniform course titles, course counts, or credit templates are inappropriate, and institutions should instead develop mechanisms for continuous improvement.

IMPLICATIONS TO RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

From Competence Goals to Checkable Curricular Arrangements

As the findings on course attributes show, ten of the 28 institutions set no compulsory technology course; electives provide opportunities but do not automatically guarantee technology competence for all students. What needs to be guaranteed first, therefore, is not a uniform number of technology courses but an explicit correspondence among technology competence goals, course content, and student enrollment requirements.

When revising a program, an institution can first decompose technology competence goals into concrete learning outcomes—for example, the ability to select and evaluate appropriate translation tools, to perform machine translation post-editing and quality judgment, to manage terminology or corpora, and to understand project workflows, data norms, and professional responsibility—and then indicate which courses or modules carry each outcome, for which directions and students, whether they are compulsory or elective, and through what assignments or projects attainment is assessed. This moves provision from “technology courses exist in the program” to “every technology competence goal has an explicit curricular carrier.”

For institutions currently offering only electives, it is advisable to review, in light of orientations and actual enrollment, whether key technology content should become compulsory, restricted-elective, or embedded as modules in existing compulsory courses; institutions that already require technology courses need to check whether their content still matches training objectives rather than merely

retaining traditional course titles.

Clarifying the Competence Goals and Delivery of AI Courses

AI courses equally require explicit competence goals, teaching content, and assessment. Institutions should decide, on the basis of their own positioning, whether AI content takes the form of a stand-alone course or an embedded module, rather than simply adding courses with "AI" in their titles.

Strengthening Course Content through Syllabi and Faculty Development

Coverage of categories B, E, and F-AI remains limited (Table 2), and course titles alone cannot reveal instructional depth or whether content articulation has formed across courses. Institutions can conduct syllabus reviews around existing courses, clarifying the relations among prerequisite knowledge, tool and workflow training, quality assessment, project tasks, and learning evaluation. Machine translation and post-editing courses in particular should avoid teaching only tool operation or only technical principles. Doherty and Kenny (2014) show that bringing technological content into translator training must be adapted to students' knowledge base and course objectives; Moorkens (2018) shows that translation evaluation, post-editing, and error analysis can be turned into concrete learning activities. These studies can inform syllabus design, but their specific content still needs to be adjusted in light of institutional orientations, language pairs, and student backgrounds.

AI-related courses should also cover tool use, output evaluation, and the judgment of limitations. Pym and Hao (2025) provide a reference for classroom activity and assessment design, and the EMT Competence Framework 2026, with its emphasis on machine translation and large language model literacy, workflow evaluation, and data and terminology management, can be used to check whether course content stops at tool operation. Ethical issues such as data protection, bias, transparency, and professional responsibility should also have an explicit place in syllabi.

Course content renewal also requires corresponding faculty development support. Institutions can organize collaborative lesson preparation, case development, and teaching assessment training around authentic course tasks, so that technology training serves concrete course objectives rather than remaining at the level of general software introductions. For thinly covered areas such as audiovisual translation, institutions should first assess their training orientation and student needs before deciding among a stand-alone course, a course module, or cross-institutional resource sharing.

Differentiated Curriculum Development According to Institutional Positioning

The grouping results show that quality-enhancement-stage institutions account for a large share of technology course volume, compulsory coverage, and F-AI courses, and that the two type groups also differ in mean technology courses and compulsory courses per institution. Categorized construction should proceed from training objectives and available resources rather than taking one group's practice as the standard for the other.

Science, technology, and industry-characteristic institutions can draw on their industry and disciplinary resources to examine whether substantive links have formed between technology courses and domain-translation courses. For example, a course project can require students to complete domain knowledge retrieval, terminology management, tool use, and translation quality assessment, so that translation, domain, and technology are realized in task design. Institutional disciplinary backgrounds can be turned into curricular features, but whether a feature has formed must be demonstrated by concrete course content and learning outcomes and cannot be inferred from institution type alone.

Comprehensive and normal universities with a strong foreign-language tradition can proceed from their existing foundations in language, translation, and literature and culture courses, examining which technology contents are suitable for embedding in existing courses, which need stand-alone provision, and which can be supplemented through cross-faculty or inter-institutional resource sharing.

Finally, occupational trends in the translation industry suggest that institutions should articulate the relationship between courses and target occupational tasks, rather than require different institutions to adopt identical course lists; at the provincial level, cross-institutional course cases, faculty training, and teaching resource sharing can be supported.

Building Evidence Chains for University–Enterprise Cooperation and Professional Practice

As the findings on university-enterprise co-construction show, the co-construction labels of the nine institutions listing 23 relevant courses or lectures demonstrate neither that the other institutions lack cooperation nor that the labeled courses involve the same depth of cooperation. The focus of quality assurance should shift from "whether co-construction labels appear" to "how cooperation is implemented and what learning outcomes it produces." Institutions can record in course archives the cooperating entities, the qualifications of industry personnel, the teaching tasks they assume, actual contact hours, the sources of project materials, modes of student participation, and assessment responsibilities, so that labels such as "university–enterprise cooperation", "jointly built and co-taught", and "industry–education integration" correspond to process documentation. Course evaluation should consider not only whether companies participate but whether their participation generates tasks suitable for teaching and feedback.

Professional practice likewise needs to go beyond single credit or word-count indicators. In addition to explicit quantitative practice requirements, institutions can record task types, text difficulty, technology tool use, supervisory feedback, revision processes, and final outputs, avoiding equating word counts with competence. Practice credits, placement duration, translation volume, and output assessment each have a role; they should not replace one another, and they should not ground simple evaluations of institutional practice quality.

Provincial- or institutional-level quality monitoring can sample courses and practice projects for

verification and feed the findings into the next round of program revision. Whether every institution should be required to operate co-constructed courses should be justified by necessity, resource conditions, and implementation quality; without these conditions, uniform course-count requirements may multiply formalistic labels without automatically improving training quality.

Monitoring Implementation at Newly Authorized Institutions

The ten institutions authorized in 2024 still require continuous verification of their programs in the training process. Course delivery, student enrollment, staffing, university–enterprise cooperation, and practice tasks can be checked against the program each semester or academic year, with particular attention to newly added AI courses, compulsory technology courses, and co-constructed courses. Problems reflected in student feedback, course assignments, practice outputs, and degree thesis work should also inform program revision.

Quality assurance at newly authorized institutions should not presuppose a single indicator such as the CATTI pass rate as a uniform exit standard for all institutions; professional qualification results can serve as one type of material but cannot replace a comprehensive assessment of course objective attainment, practice outputs, and degree thesis requirements. The key is to link program requirements, implementation records, learning outcomes, and feedback-based improvement, avoiding judgments of training status based on texts alone.

CONCLUSION

This study has organized the training programs of the 28 MTI institutions in Jiangsu Province into 778 course-level records and examined the overall curricular picture, the configuration of technology courses, structural deficiencies, and quality assurance pathways within a single framework, enabling comparison of curricular arrangements across authorization cohorts and institution types and providing a material basis for subsequent research on curriculum implementation.

By combining institutional-level analysis with course-level coding, the study examines not only the number of technology courses but also their categories, institutional coverage, course-group placement, and attributes, providing a reference for course-text research in other provinces.

The study is limited by the nature of its materials. Training programs present institutional curricular arrangements but cannot directly prove that courses have been delivered, that students have enrolled, or that competence goals have been attained. Course syllabi, enrollment numbers, classroom teaching, staffing inputs, and student outcomes were not included in the full-population statistics; the study therefore addresses only the curricular dimension of training quality and cannot replace an overall assessment of staffing, student intake, teaching processes, and degree outcomes. Nor does the absence of a course from the texts mean its complete absence from actual teaching. Coding relies mainly on titles and program statements and cannot fully reveal syllabus and classroom content; the single-

primary-category rule avoids double counting but compresses the information carried by composite courses; and the inter-coder verification sample does not cover all records, so the reliability results do not extend to all coding decisions. The stage and type comparisons are descriptive only; this study conducts no causal identification or interaction tests; and the research is confined to Jiangsu Province, so generalization to other provinces must take account of differences in institutional composition, industrial environment, and educational governance.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research can combine program texts with course syllabi, actual course delivery, student enrollment, classroom tasks, and teacher feedback to examine how technology competence goals enter teaching. Machine translation and post-editing, audiovisual translation, and AI courses warrant further analysis of prerequisite relations, content articulation, quality assessment, and ethics education. University–enterprise cooperation and professional practice also require evidence on industry contact hours, project sources, supervisory feedback, and output revision records to determine whether course labels are converted into learning opportunities for students.

Where sample conditions and coding conventions are commensurable, cross-provincial comparison can be conducted to analyze commonalities and contextual differences in curricular systems across provinces. Subject to material use and disclosure conditions, course-level data, the coding manual, and verification records can be organized to provide a replicable basis for follow-up research, with attention to mutual corroboration among programs, teaching, student enrollment, and learning outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the College Foreign Language Teaching Research Project (No. 2024053001) and by the 2023 “Reading and Teacher Development” Special Research Project of the Chinese Tao Xingzhi Research Association and Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press (No. 2023JS0051).

REFERENCES

Cao, L. (2012) A probe into curriculum design for Master of Translation and Interpreting (MTI) postgraduate education, Academic Degrees & Graduate Education, (04), 30-34.

Doherty, S. and Kenny, D. (2014) The design and evaluation of a statistical machine translation syllabus for translation students, The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 8(2), 295-315.

European Commission (2026) EMT competence framework 2026: European master’s in translation, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

Li, D., Liu, Q. and Yu, Y. (2013) A survey of computer-aided translation courses for Master of Translation and Interpreting in China, Journal of Language and Literature Studies, (02), 118-120.

Ma, Y. (2012) Investigation and reflection on the curriculum setting of Master of Translation and Interpreting, Journal of Chongqing University of Science and Technology (Social Sciences Edition), (07), 193-195.

Miao, J. and Wang, S. (2010) MTI education in light of a survey on employment trend in translation industry, Foreign Languages and Their Teaching, (03), 63-67.

Moorkens, J. (2018) What to expect from neural machine translation: a practical in-class translation evaluation exercise, The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 12(4), 375-387.

Mu, L. and Wang, W. (2011) MA and MTI in translation education: divergent goals, differentiated curricula, Chinese Translators Journal, (02), 29-32, 95.

Plaza-Lara, C. (2022) Competences of translation project managers from the academic perspective: analysis of EMT programmes, The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 16(2), 203-223.

Prieto Ramos, F. (2024) Revisiting translator competence in the age of artificial intelligence: the case of legal and institutional translation, The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 18(2), 148-173.

Pym, A. and Hao, Y. (2025) How to augment language skills: generative AI and machine translation in language learning and translator training, Routledge, London.

Ramírez-Polo, L. and Vargas-Sierra, C. (2023) Translation technology and ethical competence: an analysis and proposal for translators' training, Languages, 8(2), Article 93.

Rico, C. and González Pastor, D. (2022) The role of machine translation in translation education: a thematic analysis of translator educators' beliefs, Translation & Interpreting, 14(1), 177-197.

Rothwell, A. and Svoboda, T. (2019) Tracking translator training in tools and technologies: findings of the EMT survey 2017, The Journal of Specialised Translation, 32, 26-54.

Sánchez-Castany, R. (2022) Teaching translation technologies: an analysis of a corpus of syllabi for Translation and Interpreting undergraduate degrees in Spain, In The Human Translator in the 2020s, Routledge, London.

Translators Association of China (2026) 2026 Report on the Development of China's Translation Industry, Translators Association of China, Beijing.

Wang, H. (2013) A constructive technology curriculum for MTI education from the perspective of language service industry technologies, Chinese Translators Journal, (06), 23-28, 128.

Wang, H. (2014) Construction of MTI "translation project management" course, Chinese Translators Journal, (04), 54-58.

Wang, H., Li, D. and Li, L. (2018) Translation technology teaching in MTI programs in China: problems and suggestions, Technology Enhanced Foreign Language Education, (03), 76-82, 94.

Wang, H. and Liu, S. (2021) On the technological turn of translation in the era of artificial intelligence, Foreign Language Education, (05), 87-92.

Wang, H. and Liu, S. (2025) From MTPE to AIPE: evolution of translation modes in the GenAI era and its implications for translation education, Shandong Foreign Language Teaching, (03), 111-121.

Wang, H. and Xie, F. (2024) Research on innovation of translation education practice mode driven by large language model technology, Chinese Translators Journal, (02), 70-78.

Wang, Q. and Huang, Q. (2013) On the construction of curriculum for MTI in the universities of science and technology, Research in Higher Education of Engineering, (06), 158-162.

Wei, X. and Cao, X. (2021) A survey on the current development of MTI, Shanghai Journal of Translators, (04), 58-62.

Wen, J. and Mu, L. (2009) A study on the course offering of MTI, Foreign Language Education, (04), 92-95.

Yang, R. (2016) An analysis of some problems in school-enterprise cooperation teaching in master of translation and interpreting education, Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies, (05), 64-67.

Yu, J. and Wang, H. (2010) A master program in computer aided translation, Chinese Translators Journal, (03), 38-42, 96.

Zheng, Y. (2019) Reflection on MTI training at local universities, Heilongjiang Researches on Higher Education, (06), 115-118.