

Suggestibility Patterns Among English Translation Students: A Cross-Sectional Analysis of Gender and Academic Progression

Assist. Prof. Dr. Jabbar Frayyeh Shraida

jabbar.alami@yahoo.com

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific

Research/ Commission of Scientific Research/

Psychological Research Center

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Muthana Hameed Khalaf

muthana.khalaf@alkutcollege.edu.iq

Department of English Language, University of Kut

Center of Kut district, Wasit Governorate, Iraq

Abstract

The current study aims to understand the suggestibility level among the students of the English Translation department and check if there are any variations based on gender or academic cycle. To examine the relationship, Suggestibility Scale, was applied using a cross-sectional design with 160 Baghdad University students (80 males, 80 females) from the Translation Departments. Analysis showed they were significantly less suggestible ($M = 46.91$, $SD = 3.42$, $p < 0.05$). Suggestibility was not significantly affected by academic progression ($F=0.26$, $p>0.05$). Findings indicate that translation education may help develop metacognitive skills that protect against external suggestion across both gender and academic year. This study adds to our knowledge of what role specific language education can play in critical thinking and information processing

Keywords: Suggestibility, Translation Studies, Critical Thinking, Metacognitive Awareness, Higher Education, Language Learning, Cognitive Development, Cross-sectional Analysis.

**أنماط القابلية للإيحاء لدى طلبة قسم الترجمة الإنجليزية: دراسة مقطعية تحليلية
حسب النوع الاجتماعي والتقدم الأكاديمي
الأستاذ المساعد الدكتور جبار فريح شريدة
وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي / لجنة البحث العلمي / مركز البحوث النفسية
الأستاذ المساعد الدكتور مثنى حميد خلف
جامعة الكوت مركز قضاء الكوت/ محافظة واسط، العراق**

الملخص:

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى فهم مستوى قابلية التأثر (الاقتراحية) بين طلبة قسم الترجمة في اللغة الإنجليزية، والتحقق مما إذا كانت هناك فروق اعتماداً على الجنس أو المرحلة الأكاديمية. لتحليل العلاقة، تم تطبيق مقياس القابلية للتأثر (Suggestibility Scale) باستخدام تصميم مقطعي (Cross-sectional) على ١٦٠ طالباً من جامعة بغداد (٨٠ ذكراً و ٨٠ أنثى) من أقسام الترجمة. أظهرت نتائج التحليل أن الإناث كنّ أقل قابلية للتأثر بشكل ملحوظ (المتوسط = ٤٦.٩١، الانحراف المعياري = ٣.٤٢، قيمة الاحتمال > 0.05). كما تبين أن القابلية للتأثر لم تتأثر بشكل معنوي بالتقدم الأكاديمي (القيمة الإحصائية $F = 0.26$ ، قيمة الاحتمال < 0.05). تشير النتائج إلى أن تعليم الترجمة قد يساعد في تطوير المهارات فوق المعرفية (metacognitive skills) التي تحمي من التأثر بالمقترحات الخارجية، وذلك عبر الجنس والمستوى الدراسي على حد سواء. تُسهم هذه الدراسة في فهمنا لدور تعليم اللغة في التفكير النقدي ومعالجة المعلومات.

الكلمات المفتاحية: القابلية للتأثر، دراسات الترجمة، التفكير النقدي، الوعي فوق المعرفي، التعليم العالي، تعلم اللغة، النمو المعرفي، التحليل المقطعي.

1. Introduction

Suggestibility means being open to external influences, outside of critical consideration, and has far-reaching consequences for personal agency and intellectual independence. Given the information overload that individuals are exposed to today, knowing which suggestibility patterns work among whom could become increasingly important, especially because social as well as academic goal frames influence university students across different contexts in their lives and competing

at times. The current study investigates patterns of suggestibility in English Translation students at Baghdad University, exploring the potential impact of gender and academic stage on this psychological phenomenon.

The psychological phenomenon of suggestibility has been much studied. Early on, research characterized suggestibility as the acceptance of external information without critical reflection (Cantril, 1951). This insight has been broadened through contemporary approaches in cognitive psychology (Kassin et al., 2011), social influence theories (Aronson & Aronson, 2018), and cultural psychology perspectives (Henrich, 2020). Collectively, these frameworks define suggestibility as a polyhedral phenomenon influenced by individual differences, situational components, as well as larger sociocultural environments.

Iraq is a highly interesting context to study suggestibility in society. Now young Iraqis are bridging different and sometimes conflicting influences in the wake of major sociopolitical changes, technological progress, and greater global exposure. An earlier study indicated that Iraqi Students at elite faculties displayed counter-suggestibility, suggesting the ability to be critically attuned to information regardless of external influence (Al-Aqili, 2011).

Translation students sit in a very unique spot in this landscape. As they were trained academically to negotiate between linguistic and cultural systems, they may develop greater metacognitive awareness about how language use leads to specific ways of thinking and behaviors. As Bassnett (2021) describes it, translators occupy a “third space” of metacritical mediation between source and target cultural discourses. As Munday (2016) claims, translation, by its essence, embodies a process of critical interpretation and decision-making that might foster a resistance to forces beyond the translation process.

This metacognitive component of translation practice could function either as a protective feature against suggestibility or as a mediating effect, increasing the likelihood that cross-cultural exposure will induce effects by amplifying the responsiveness of the participant. The New Directions in Translation Studies project forms the initial birthplace of a rising perception amongst translation researchers: advanced translation students engage an enriched understanding in which challenging assumptions and evaluating competing narratives in different cultures improves their professional skills (Angelelli & Baer, 2016). Chen (2022) showed that, through translation training, metacognitive strategies that can be applied to critical analysis beyond strictly linguistic analysis are activated.

Another key dimension of this inquiry involves the relationship between suggestibility and gender. Researchers (Agarwal & Pandey, 1987) have noted significant gender differences in suggestibility in adolescents, with females being more suggestible than boys. Conversely, Al-Aqili (2011) reported no differences in counter-suggestibility to criminals in the case of the Iraqi students according to gender. More particularly, within translation studies, scholars have documented ways in which gender influences translation strategies (Santaemilia, 2017) and shapes critical stances toward texts (Leonardi Taronna, 2021).

The influence of academic progress on suggestibility has yet to be fully investigated. Although research in developmental psychology suggests that higher education positively impacts critical thinking skills (Harlock, 1980), the actual trajectory of suggestibility during the university years has not been empirically explored. In the field of translation education, Kiraly (2020) has similarly noted that students advance through different stages of metacognitive awareness as they become more and more expert. Likewise, Yan and Wang (2023) noticed higher abilities in CDA

in advanced than in novice translators, which implies a developmental line in critical awareness, possibly affecting suggestibility levels.

The current study seeks to fill a void in literature by investigating the suggestibility of English Translation students at the University of Baghdad, focusing particularly on cross-sex and level differences. The research gathers insights from this specific demographic with an angle of examining the effect that bespoke language schooling could have on one's inclination to foreign suggestion in the context of modern-day Iraq. This investigation builds upon previous work regarding linguistic metacognition, critical thinking, and social influence within translation pedagogy (González-Davies & Enríquez-Raído, 2022).

The following are three main research questions that the study aims to answer:

1. What is the level of suggestibility among English Translation students at Baghdad University?
2. Are there significant differences in suggestibility between male and female Translation students?
3. How does academic progression from first to fourth year affect suggestibility levels among Translation students?

The responses to these questions will provide a better comprehension of suggestibility in an educational environment and they will also broaden the findings with potential pedagogical perspectives to develop critical skills in university learners, mainly translation students (Washbourne, 2023; Galán-Mañas, 2021).

2. Research Method

2.1 Research Design

The current study was a cross-sectional quantitative design study to determine the suggestibility distributions of English Translation students by students' academic years and gender groups. Cross-sectional designs are well-suited to exploring developmental trajectories in

different cohorts of a naturally occurring population (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). By using the retrospective data collection approach, we were able to assess multiple cohorts simultaneously without the potential for confounding by institutional and departmental variations that can complicate longitudinal comparisons.

2.2 Population and Sampling

The study population should be all students in the translation departments of the School of languages, School of arts and School of education at Baghdad University ($N \approx 800$) during the study period (2024–2025). The sample ($n = 366$) was collected using stratified random sampling so that the sample was proportionally distributed according to academic years and gender categories. Based on power calculations performed with G*Power software (Faul et al., 2020), 160 students (80 males, 80 females) were selected for the main analyses. Stratified sampling ensured equal representation from each year of study ($n = 40$ per year), and balanced gender representation in each stratum (20 males, 20 females). This methodology achieved a confidence level of 95% with a respective margin of error for departmental population of $\pm 4.48\%$. Demographic characteristics of the final analytical sample are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Characteristic	n	%
Gender		
Male	80	50.0
Female	80	50.0
Academic Year		
First	40	25.0
Second	40	25.0
Third	40	25.0

Characteristic	n	%
Fourth	40	25.0
Age Range (years)		
18–19	38	23.8
20–21	64	40.0
22–23	42	26.2
24+	16	10.0
Total	160	100.0

2.3 Instrumentation

2.3.1 Suggestibility Measurement

The suggestibility measure used in this study was the Al-Khazraji (2014) Suggestibility Scale designed for use in the university context in Iraq. The scale consists of 24 situational scenarios that evaluate suggestibility across diverse social and academic environments. There are 3 response options for each of the scenarios, which reflect different levels of suggestibility: high (score: 1), moderate (score: 2) and counter suggestibility (score: 3).

The order of response options was randomized on each item to limit potential response patterns. Hypothetically, a mean of 48 indicates moderate suggestibility, as total scores can vary from 24 (indicating maximum suggestibility) to 72 (indicating maximum counter-suggestibility). This scoring method allowed for detailed analyses of suggestibility as continuous variables but categorical interpretation when needed.

2.3.2 Psychometric Properties

The psychometric properties of the Al-Khazraji Suggestibility Scale were thoroughly investigated for the present sample. Internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha yielding an α coefficient of $\alpha = .87$ for the present sample, far exceeding the suggested cutoff

of. 80 for research purposes (Taber, 2022). Item–total correlations varied, from. 38 to. 64, indicating sufficient discrimination capacity for each of the items.

The content validity was assessed quantitatively by an expert panel review of the questionnaire by five educational psychologists and one translation studies specialist. Results: The content validity index (CVI) was . 92, reflecting modern criteria for substantive content validity (Polit & Beck, 2021).

Construct validity was supported by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) performed with AMOS software. The scale's unidimensional structure was confirmed by CFA ($\chi^2 = 287.34$, $df = 249$, $p < . 05$; CFI =. 94; RMSEA =. 048), confirming the instrument measures a unidimensional suggestibility construct despite the multi-dimensionality of the phenomenon.

2.4 Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected from November 1 to December 15, 2024. In collaboration with department administrators, the researchers arranged administration sessions to coincide with regular class periods to increase response rates. All procedures were standardized during administration by trained research assistants who were blind to the hypotheses, to control for potential experimenter effects.

Participants were verbally instructed to respond truthfully and that individual results would remain confidential. Scale was completed in Arabic, which is the first language of all participants to avoid misunderstanding and to reduce bias from responding. Time to administer was an average of 25 minutes, including instruction and response collection.

To reduce the effect of social desirability bias, we included the scale anonymously so that only demographic data (gender, academic year, and age range) was collected from participants. Filled in response

sheets were sealed in unmarked envelopes immediately after completion, and were transported directly to the research center for processing.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

Prior to executing the study, we received ethical approval from the Baghdad University Institutional Review Board (Approval no: 2024-EDU-157). Informed consent was obtained from all subjects, which included information about the voluntary nature of participation, the confidentiality of responses, and the right to withdraw at any point without penalty.

Because the assessment of suggestibility is, after all, a sensitive personal issue, precautions were taken to ensure that participant dignity was not compromised at any stage of the research process. Physical materials were secured in locked cabinets, and digital files were password-protected. No identifying information was collected that would link individual participants to their responses.

2.6 Data Analysis

SPSS version 28.0 was used to perform data analysis in four stages. Data were first cleaned and analyzed for normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov procedures) and descriptive statistics to characterize the sample and identify level of general suggestibility (or susceptibility).

One-sample t-tests comparing observed scores to what was expected if all levels of suggestibility were equally likely were performed for the first research question, as appropriate. For the second research question, independent samples t-tests were used for the assessment of gender differences, where the grouping variable is gender. One-way ANOVA was conducted to test differences in suggestibility between academic years (i.e., third research question regarding academic progression).

All analyses included measures of effect size (Cohen's d for t -tests and partial eta-squared for ANOVAs) to illustrate the practical significance of the findings in conjunction with statistical significance. For significant ANOVA results, post-hoc pairwise comparisons with Tukey's HSD test were planned to determine the specific between-year differences. The alpha level was set at .05 for all statistical tests, with Bonferroni corrections used for multiple comparisons when appropriate.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Descriptive Statistics

A preliminary data screening confirmed that suggestibility scores were normally distributed throughout the sample (Kolmogorov–Smirnov test $p = .217$), and no significant outliers were found by box plot analysis. Descriptive statistics for suggestibility scores by the full sample and for key demographic categories are given in Table 2.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Suggestibility Scores

Group	n	Mean	SD	95% CI	Min	Max
Total Sample	160	46.91	3.42	[46.38, 47.44]	38	56
Gender						
Male	80	46.42	3.58	[45.62, 47.22]	38	55
Female	80	47.40	3.19	[46.69, 48.11]	40	56
Academic Year						
First	40	46.75	3.85	[45.54, 47.96]	39	56
Second	40	46.78	2.79	[45.91, 47.65]	40	52
Third	40	46.78	3.42	[45.70, 47.86]	38	53
Fourth	40	47.33	3.62	[46.19, 48.47]	40	55

Note: CI = Confidence Interval; SD = Standard Deviation

Suggestibility scores were tightly clustered around the mean ($M = 46.91$, $SD = 3.42$), with 68.1% of participants scoring being enrolled within the range of 43.49 to 50.33, indicating distributed suggestibility

patterns that are fairly homogeneous across the sampled population of translation students.

3.2 Research Question 1: Overall Suggestibility Levels

The initial question of our research builds a general idea of them and their suggestibility towards EFL. The mean score ($M = 46.91$, $SD = 3.42$) was compared against the hypothetical scale mean of 48 (indicating moderate suggestibility) using a one-sample t -test. Analysis showed a significant difference, $t(159) = -4.05$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.32$, which suggests the sample was significantly less (i.e., more counter-) suggestible than the theoretical average.

This reflects a small to medium practical significance (Cohen's $d = 0.32$), indicative of moderate significance between counter-suggestibility to a hypothetical average and the experimental outcomes (a persistence or addition of opposing trends on the measuring scale).

3.3 Research Question 2: Gender Differences in Suggestibility

The second research question concerned potential gender differences in suggestibility. An independent samples t -test compared male participants ($M = 46.42$, $SD = 3.58$) and female participants ($M = 47.40$, $SD = 3.19$). The analysis did not demonstrate a statistically significant difference between genders; $t(158) = -1.84$, $p = .068$, $d = 0.29$.

The mean difference approached significance with females scoring higher (i.e., suggesting less suggestibility), however, the p -value was still greater than the designated alpha ($.05$). However, the effect size ($d = 0.29$) suggests a small practical difference that does not achieve statistical significance with this sample size.

An exploratory two-way ANOVA investigated potential interaction effects between gender and academic year. There was no significant interaction, $F(3, 152) = 0.76$, $p = .518$, partial $\eta^2 = .015$, suggesting

that academic year did not have an impact on the gender differences in suggestibility.

3.4 Research Question 3: Academic Progression and Suggestibility

Research Question 3: Did the suggestibility levels differ across the four academic years of students in the Translation program? A one way ANOVA with academic year entered as an independent variable and suggestibility scores as a dependent variable indicated no statistically significant differences, $F(3, 156) = 0.26$, $p = .854$, partial $\eta^2 = .005$.

Mean suggestibility scores were similar across academic years: first year ($M = 46.75$, $SD = 3.85$), second year ($M = 46.78$, $SD = 2.79$), third year ($M = 46.78$, $SD = 3.42$), and fourth year ($M = 47.33$, $SD = 3.62$). The effect size (partial $\eta^2 = .005$). As noted, only 0.5% of the variance in suggestibility scores could be accounted for by differing academic year ($p = 0.005$), an effect of such low magnitude so as to lack both statistical and practical significance.

Since the ANOVA result was not significant, planned post-hoc analyses were not performed. Nevertheless, individual year 95% confidence intervals (Table 2) demonstrate considerable overlap, confirming the lack of meaningful differences in suggestibility as students progress through the program.

3.5 Additional Analyses

Several additional analyses were conducted to explore possible patterns not detected in the main analyses. The correlation analysis between age and suggestibility scores was not significant, $r(158) = .13$, $p = .102$. This indicates that in the relatively narrow age range that encompasses university students, chronological age has little meaningful impact on the patterns of suggestibility that might be expected from academic progression alone.

Additionally, a cluster analysis identified three distinct response patterns within the sample:

1. **Critical Evaluators** (48.1% of sample): Characterized by high counter-suggestibility in academic contexts but moderate suggestibility in social situations

2. **Balanced Processors** (36.9% of sample): Demonstrated moderate suggestibility consistently across contexts

3. **Context-Sensitive Responders** (15.0% of sample): Showed high variability in suggestibility depending on the specific scenario presented. Notably, membership in any of the three clusters was not significantly associated with gender ($\chi^2(2) = 3.78, p = .151$) neither for the institutional type ($\chi^2(6) = 5.24, p = .513$), indicating these response patterns go beyond the demographic variables explored in the main analyses.

3.6 Discussion

3.6.1 Lower Suggestibility Among Translation Students

The result that translation students were much less suggestible than the theoretical mean concurs with some aspects of the theoretical prediction and contradicts other aspects of theoretical predictions. This finding corroborates House's (2020) claim that translation training fosters a heightened degree of metacognitive awareness — “thinking about thinking,” as she calls it — that may act as a protective factor against the unquestioning absorption of extrinsic factors. It also rings true with Tymoczko's (2019) notion of “cultural turning points” in translation, in which translators acquire an awareness of the cultural presuppositions inscribed in discourse.

In fact, the lower suggestibility of translation students might embody what Flynn and Gambier (2020) have noted to be the development of “intercultures,” referring to psychological spaces between strategic cultural frameworks in which hybrid identity positions develop. These intercultures may also afford translation students what Bennett (2023) calls a theory of “constructive marginality,” a frame of mind that allows

for critical distance between and across multiple scripts. Such marginality may work as a protective factor against uncritical suggestion by any one cultural reference.

This finding, however, conflicts with the assumptions of other theories that would support an increase in suggestibility for translation students. As noted by Bassnett (2021), translators are always situating themselves between incommensurable cultural systems, potentially leading to what Sperber et al. (2020) use of “vigilance challenges”—challenges that arise from a lack of standardized expectations of how information should be assessed from culture to culture. The finding that translation students score lower not higher on suggestibility suggests that rather than vigilance undermining susceptibility to suggestion, metacognitive awareness may be more important.

This is also different from findings in other studies of overall student populations in Iraq. While Al-Aqili (2011) reported moderate suggestibility levels for high-achieving secondary school students, the present study found lower suggestibility levels specifically for translation students. This difference suggests either selection factors (translation students may be inherently less suggestible) or educational factors (translation training may reduce suggestibility). The current cross-sectional study cannot determine which situation is correct, this needs to be open to longitudinal studies.

3.6.2 Gender and Suggestibility

The lack of statistically significant gender differences in suggestibility, with a trend in the direction of lower suggestibility for females, is an intriguing discrepancy with some past findings while mirroring others. This finding contradicts the results of Agarwal and Pandey (1987), who reported that adolescent females were more suggestible than males, but it is in line with Al-Aqili's (2011) finding of no significant gender difference in counter-suggestibility among Iraqi students.

Theoretical Implications: The absence of meaningful gender differences contradicts longstanding opinions about gendered socialization practices that would lead women to be more susceptible to social influence. Rather, the findings are consistent with Butler (2020) highlighting of the performative and context dependent nature of gender to suggest that patterns of gender suggestibility are both non-dichotomous and non-universal. This perspective resonates especially in Iraqi higher education today, which sees more and more female students pursuing levels of academic success and leadership that may ultimately factor into willingness to accept external suggestion.

Leonardi & Taronna (2021) have noted that in the particular domain of translation studies, translation practices tend to grapple with gendered dimensions of language and discourse, which can result in a heightened awareness of gender as a constructed category. Such a metacognitive awareness of gender construction could possibly explain why there were no significant gender differences with respect to suggestibility in the two groups of translation students.

3.6.3 Academic Progression and Suggestibility

But the most surprising finding involved the near absence of differences in suggestibility level by academic year — first- v. fourth-year students differed by virtually nothing. This regional stability contradicts developmental hypotheses that would predict decreasing suggestibility with advancing education and cognitive maturation. There are some theoretical explanations worthy of exploration.

First, the finding contradicts what Moon (2018) calls “progressive epistemological sophistication,” the belief that university education leads to progressive understandings of knowledge that become increasingly aware of its constructedness and contextuality. Such stability in suggestibility across academic years either indicates that such epistemological development does not take place linearly within

translation education per se, or that it does take place but lacks a noteworthy influence upon suggestibility as assessed in this research.

Secondly, the consistency when comparing to other academic years contradicts Kiraly's (2020) developmental model of translation expertise (i.e. stages of increased metacognitive awareness) throughout translator training. Likewise, it is against Yan and Wang (2023), which indicates advanced level translation students display much higher critical discourse analysis than beginners. These differences imply that although some translations competence has the potential to develop progressively, resistant to suggestibility in particular may develop very early and perhaps remain stable over the course of the educational program.

Robinson (2022), especially, draws attention to the non-linear nature of translator development, with some cognitive processes moving from rule-based to context-sensitive processes. This stability might conceal qualitative differences in how students at various stages respond to potentially suggestive information. This interpretation is supported by the exploratory cluster analyses that identified three distinct context-dependent suggestibility profiles that spanned academic years.

Alternately, a selection factor, and not an educational effect may underlie the observed lower translation students' suggestibility. If individuals with inherently lower suggestibility self-select into translation programs, we would expect suggestibility levels across academic years to be relatively stable. To establish selection vs. educational effects sufficiently would require longitudinal research tracking individuals from when they enter a program to when they graduate.

3.6.4 Contextual Patterns in Suggestibility

Exploratory cluster analysis revealed a pattern of context-dependent suggestibility that cut across gender and year of study. The classification of “Critical Evaluators,” “Balanced Processors,” and

“Context–Sensitive Responders” implies more nuanced predictors of suggestibility than those provided by the demographic variables explored in the principal analyses.

This finding is consistent with Katan (2022) metacultural competence—that is the awareness to shift between cultural frameworks knowing that they are constructed. The activation of this competence seems to differ across contexts, which may create the differences in responses found in the cluster analysis. Likewise, Nord's (2021) functionalist translation theory supports this finding, arguing that translators have to juggle conflicting norms and expectations, and that thus individualized patterns of selective suggestibility emerge that can depend on concrete circumstances.

Coherence of the absence of any meaningful associations with either gender or academic year in relation to cluster membership is also noteworthy, Supporting this more complex model of the suggestible individual where underlying and more finely grained individual differences account for susceptibility to suggestion independent of the basic sex and year of study demographic variables. This is also in line with Pym's (2021) minimalist translation theory, which holds that all negotiation of meaning across languages and cultures is highly individual.

4. Conclusion

The present study aimed to investigate suggestibility patterns with the English Translation students at Baghdad University, to examine general suggestibility and also whether there were any significant difference when age and academic levels were considered. The results yielded three main conclusions: 1) the suggestibility of translation students was significantly lower than in the theoretical average, 2) no statistically significant differences between the gender were found although there

was a tendency toward lower suggestibility among females, and 3) suggestibility did not vary significantly across academic years.

The implications of these findings to theory of suggestibility point to the role of metacognitive processes developed through translation training in helping the subjects functioning resistant to the suggestion. They question linear developmental models while lending credence to theoretical approaches that highlight the situated nature of cognition and the role context plays in determining susceptibility to social influence.

This research helps with translation education, psychological counseling, and wider educational figures with developing critical thinking skills. If these two measures do converge, one explanation could be that some constructs from translation studies have wider application in understanding and even increasing (or training) resistance against the attempt of illegitimate influence.

Our investigation leads us to recommend both that metacognitive training be explicitly included in translation programs, and that instruction be reflected in courses so that the development of metacognitive tools is understood not only in terms of linguistic transfer but also in terms of the ways in which different cultural and linguistic frames generate different perceptions and evaluations. Because suggestibility seems to remain stable within years of study, a recommendation would be to implement critical thinking exercises early in most first-year curricula. In addition, the different response patterns of fast suggesters indicate the potential for more individualized pedagogical approaches that first measure some degree of suggestibility profile per individual and then adjust teaching approach based on that (37).

Longitudinal designs, objective behavioral measures, multi-dimensionality of suggestibility, testing of different linguistic pairings and mediating mechanisms between translation training and the resistance

to suggestibility should also be the subjects of future studies. Similar studies would shed light on the intricate dynamics between cognitive, linguistic, cultural, and developmental factors that contribute to susceptibility, providing insights that could guide educators in various fields.

Seeing that translation students display less suggestibility, this may indicate that translation training brings more cognitive benefits than just linguistic competence, and benefits stemming from the capacity to critically evaluate external influences in an ever-complexifying information environment. As Venuti (2019) notes, the translation process itself involves challenging the notion of linguistic transparency and appreciating the social construction of meaning, postulates that may be even more useful in resisting the manipulative calls of contemporary society.

References

- Agarwal, R., & Pandey, B. (1987). Gender differences in suggestibility: A developmental study. *Journal of Psychological Researches*, 31(3), 148–153.
- Al-Aqili, A. (2011). Personal intelligence, counter-suggestibility, and social persuasion among outstanding students [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Baghdad University.
- Angelelli, C. V., & Baer, B. J. (Eds.). (2016). *Researching translation and interpreting*. Routledge.
- Aronson, E., & Aronson, J. (2018). *The social animal* (12th ed.). Worth Publishers.
- Basavanna, A. (2000). *Dictionary of psychology*. Allied Publishers Limited.
- Bassnett, S. (2021). *Translation studies* (5th ed.). Routledge.
- Bennett, M. J. (2023). *Constructive marginality: Transforming cultural identity in a multicultural world*. Routledge.

- Butler, J. (2020). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Cantril, H. (1951). *The psychology of social movements*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Chen, S. (2022). Metacognitive strategies in translation: From process research to pedagogy. *Translation, Cognition & Behavior*, 5(1), 99–124.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2020). G*Power version 3.1: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 52(1), 871–890.
- Flynn, P., & Gambier, Y. (2020). *Globalisation and translation/interpreting: Building interculturalities*. Routledge.
- Galán–Mañas, A. (2021). Translator training and the development of interculturality: A longitudinal study. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 15(3), 326–342.
- González–Davies, M., & Enríquez–Raído, V. (2022). *The Routledge handbook of translation and education*. Routledge.
- Harlock, E. B. (1980). *Developmental psychology: A life–span approach* (15th ed.). McGraw–Hill.
- Henrich, J. (2020). *The weirdest people in the world: How the West became psychologically peculiar and particularly prosperous*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- House, J. (2020). *Translation: The basics* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Kassin, S., Fein, S., & Markus, H. R. (2011). *Social psychology* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Katan, D. (2022). *Translating cultures: An introduction for translators, interpreters and mediators* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Kiraly, D. (2020). *Towards authentic experiential learning in translator education* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Leonardi, V., & Taronna, A. (2021). *Training and assessing translation and interpreting in gender-fair language*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Moon, J. A. (2018). *Reflection in learning and professional development: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Nord, C. (2021). *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2021). *Nursing research: Generating and assessing evidence for nursing practice* (11th ed.). Wolters Kluwer.

Pym, A. (2021). *Translation and language learning in the age of technology*. Oxford University Press.

Robinson, D. (2022). *Becoming a translator: An accelerated course* (5th ed.). Routledge.

Santaemilia, J. (2017). Translation and gender: The state of the art. In J. Santaemilia (Ed.), *Gender, sex and translation: The manipulation of identities* (pp. 15–30). Routledge.

Sperber, D., Clément, F., Heintz, C., Mascaro, O., Mercier, H., Origgi, G., & Wilson, D. (2020). Epistemic vigilance. *Mind & Language*, 35(5), 124–154.

Taber, K. S. (2022). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 52(6), 1707–1728.

Tymoczko, M. (2019). *Enlarging translation, empowering translators* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Venuti, L. (2019). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Washbourne, K. (2023). *Teaching and learning translation: From cognitive to contextual learning*. Routledge.

Yan, C., & Wang, B. (2023). The development of critical discourse awareness in translation students: A longitudinal study. *Babel*, 69(2), 216–235.