# The Effect of Text Type in Inverse/Second Language Translation: an Empirical Study of Literary Vs. Scientific Texts

**Asist. Lect: Nada Dheyaa Lazim** University of Basrah / College of Arts E-mail: <u>nada.deyaa@uobasrah.edu.iq</u>

#### **Abstract:**

This experimental process-oriented study investigates the effect of the text type, specifically scientific and literary ones, on the quality of inverse/ second language (L2) translation. It attempts to look into the effect imposed by the text specialization on the participants 'levels of competence in translating into their non-native language. To investigate this problem, the study adapts the Translator Competence Model) PACTE, 2018), and a triangulation of methods (two tools; a translation task and a questionnaire). That is, the study has selected 23 studenttranslators 'who are native speakers of Arabic, at the Department of Translation to translate two Arabic texts; scientific and literary (appendix A), decided by the study expert, into English (L2). They are, also, required to respond to a questionnaire (Appendix B) designed in accordance with the study model. The collected draft translations are evaluated qualitatively and quantitatively (by the study evaluator) according to the parameters of assessment suggested by the same model of measurement, as it accounts for quality assessment too (PACTE 6 .(2018Besides, the responses to the questionnaire (Appendix B) are analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The findings prove the applicability of PACTE's model (2018 (in inverse/L2 translation and indicate that there is an effect of the text type on the quality of the TT, yet it is not that significant. Although a bit higher in the literary text than in the scientific one, approximately, similar mistakes, in number and category, are committed and nearly similar TTs are presented by each student-translator. Further, student-translators have not admitted much variance in the level of difficulty encountered during translating either text type, yet they are stalled by their linguistic competence in the TL. The results are of pedagogical use; they are meant to shape the designing of the curriculums adopted in student-translators' training courses and guide lecturers' methods of teaching L2 translation.

**Key words**: text-type, effect, inverse translation 'translation quality, translator competence, translator- training

# تأثير نوع النص في الترجمة الى اللغة الاجنبية: دراسة تجريبية في ترجمة النصوص الثين نوع النصوص العلمية

المدرس المساعد: ندى ضياء لازم

جامعة البصرة / كلية الآداب

E-mail: nada.deyaa@uobasrah.edu.iq

### الملخص:

تبحث هذه الدراسة التجريبية -المتعلقة بعملية الترجمة- تأثير نوع النص ، و بالتحديد النص العلمي والادبي، على جودة الترجمة الى اللغة الاجنبية. و تحاول الدراسة التحقق من تأثير التخصص النصى على كفاءة المترجمين المتدربين في الترجمة الى اللغة الاجنبية. و تتبنى الدراسة جزئياً نموذج كفاءة المترجم (مجموعة باكت، 2018) للبحث في هذه المشكلة؛ و بالتناغم مع هذا النموذج تستعين الدراسة بأداتين للبحث و هما اختبار ترجمة و استبيان. و عليه تم اختيار 23 مشاركاً من طلبة قسم الترجمة-المرحلة الاولى- و هم متحدثو اللغة الاصليين، ليترجمو النصين العلمي و الادبي (الملحق أ) الى اللغة الاجنبية، و بعدها يجيبو على استبيان الدراسة (الملحق ب). تم اختيار النصان من خبير متخصص، اما الاستبيان (الملحق ب) فقد صُمم حسب النموذج المتبع للقياس. تمت عملية تقييم الترجمات بوساطة خبير ترجمة حسب نموذج القياس (مجموعة باكت، 2018) الشامل للتقييم ايضاً، اما نتائج الاستبيان فقد تم تحليلها، كماً و نوعاً. اثبتت النتائج فاعلية نموذج باكت (2018) في الترجمة الى اللغة الاجنبية، و بيَّنت ان هناك تأثير لنوع النص على جودة الترجمات المقترحة الا انه ليس بالتأثير الكبير. فعلى الرغم من كون الاخطاء المستقصاة اكثر في النص الادبي منه في العلمي، الا ان الفرق بينمها محدود جدا. حيث ان كلا نوعي النصين، قيد الدراسة، متقاربين من حيث عدد الاخطاء و اصنافها. كذلك لم يُقر المترجمون المتدربون بصعوبة بالغة في عملية ترجمة اي نوع (من النصين) دون الاخر. بل ان كفاءتهم في الترجمة جاءت مقيدة بمدى معرفتهم اللغوية في اللغة الاجنبية. و اخيراً، يُؤمل لهذه النتائج ان تساعد في إغناء مناهج تدريب المترجمين و الاسهام في تطوير طرق تدريس الترجمة الي اللغة الاجنبية.

الكلمات المقتاحية: نوع النص، التأثير ، الترجمة العكسية، جودة الترجمة، كفاءة المترجمين، تدريب المترجمين.

#### 1- Preliminaries

#### 1.1 Introduction

This study investigates the significance (if any) of the text-type on the quality of the translated text into L2. Hence, it tries to look into the variance (if any) in the student-translators' levels of competence in translating each text type. Consequently, it is a process-oriented research that examines the translation process through the analysis of its product and the retrospective questionnaire (Sladanha & O'brein, 2013, p. 21). It adapts the PACTE's competence model (2003-2018) which identifies the translator's competence as being composed of two kinds of knowledge; declarative and procedural. As the declarative knowledge is confined to all the translation theories that translators have learnt through training years; the study limits itself to the procedural knowledge of the model. Hence (it is a partial adaptation of the model that explores the subcompetences of the procedural knowledge 'bilingual, instrumental, and strategic sub-competence. These areas of research are dealt with thoroughly in the methodology section.

### 1.2 Motivation of the Study

PACTE (2003, p. 7 (emphasizes the role of the text type (Reiss, 1989, p. 105) as being significant in deciding the quality level of a text translated into L2 (inverse translation .(In fact, the scholars see that the aesthetic effort exerted in the translation process of the literary text is often a demand, while it is rather limited in the scientific one. That is, the expressive function (detected in literary texts) is very challenging, and translators need to be qualified enough to reflect it in the TT. The scientific text, on the other hand, needs a much less effort; hence, it is translated more accurately than the literary one. Such an assumption has motivated the researcher to investigate this issue .

### 1.3 Problem of the study

The study looks into the effect imposed by the text type on the quality of translating literary versus scientific texts into L2. Thus, it attempts to shed the light on the role that the text type might play in inverse translation. Further, it examines the student-translators' sensitivity to such difference in translating these two texts into L2. Hence, the text-type-based inverse direction in translation is manifested in the study.

### 1.4 Hypotheses of the Study

The study hypothesizes the following:

- 1- Student-translators are likely to encounter significantly more problems in the literary translation than in the scientific one.
- 2- Student-translators attribute remarkable quality-variance in translating each text type .

#### 2 .Literature Review

This section lists a brief account of the literature that has tackled directionality in translation. It, logically, starts with an illustration of the traditional views about the direction of translation. Then, it elaborates on the new trends in this field based on the findings of the related recent studies. It, further 'sheds the light on the difficulties encountered in L2 translation and the difficulties related specifically to text-type translation. The theoretical background listed in this section stands in solidarity with the testing of the study hypotheses.

### 2.1 Traditional Notions Related to Directionality

According to Whayatt, directionality means translating either into one's first language (L1) or his second language (L2) (2018 p. 79). As comprehending the source text (ST) is mostly afforded via content words, while composing the target text (TT) is done by virtue of both the syntactic and semantic competence of the target language, the translator carries out one of the processes (comprehension or composition) into or out of his mother tongue. A similar definition is stated by Pavlovic (2007, p. 79) that directionality means to translate into or out of a translator's native language or language "of habitual use". Again, this notion means to comprehend a text in your second language and compose it in your first one, or it is the other way around. In either direction, the two processes of comprehension and production necessarily occur. Yet, and according to the traditional view of directionality that has long lasted; the best one occurs into the first direction.

The traditional notion about directionality is in favor of direct translation (or L1 translation). The highly-sited translation scholar, Newmark, (1988, p. 3) tends to side with the direct translation as it is the only "viable option" left for any non-native translator through which he can produce a natural, accurate, and effective

translation. Such a negative attitude of Newmark is taken further with his claim that translating into L2 can greatly produce a "hilarious" translation (1988 'p. 3). Proponents of Newmark (Kosciuczuk, 2016, p. 4), indicate that while" receiving the text in a native language" might result in a higher comprehension of it, it does not, necessarily, guarantee a well interpretation of the original message of the text. In fact, the limitation of L2 composition can hinder not only the quality of the TT but also the deliverance of the intended message. Moreover, the native translator is most likely in command of his/her language and is able to use proper terminologies, idiomatic expressions, and linguistic structures. Hence, it is the only direction that would result in a high-quality rendition.

Similarly, Marmaridou (1996, p. 60) confirms that professional translators are usually necessitated, by their agencies 'clients or both, to translate into their native language. In fact, didactic or experimental purposes are the only reasons why they would translate into L2. In other words, the only motive for such translators to engage in inverse translation (or L2 translation) is that they try to incorporate their L2 translation to serve a pedagogical purpose through practicing L2 grammar and vocabularies 'or they are conducting a research on the subject. This is the case with many professional institutions of translation) e.g. ATIA 2004, ITA 2006, CEATL 2006); such agencies urge their employee translators, in their code of ethics, to work into their native language rather than their second one. Such insistence is based on their embracing of the traditional view about directionality and their urgent need to fulfill the clients' expectations (cited in Pavlovic, 2007, p. 82). Hence 'it seems that such preference of L2 direction is motivated by a number of poor-translated texts into L2.

Harris (1989, P. 116) assures the assumption that a translator is not able to provide a qualitative translation when working into his foreign language. The reason, according to this scholar (is the awkwardness of the final product; the translator's comprehension of the second language will always surpass his composition of L2 resulting in so many discrepancies that cannot be overlooked. Further, Harris asserts that a very limited number of translators are actually able to work competently in and out of their two languages. This is why the scholar rejects the views that tolerate translating into one's L2 as such translation bears many mistakes that distort the whole message of the ST. Baker (1992, pp. 64-65), too, has advocated that a translator should work into the language that he perfectly is command of – his own. The theorist states that the translator's

competence in using and manipulating the metaphorical expressions and idioms is greatly obvious in his native language in comparison to his foreign one. Consequently, a translator cannot produce an L2 translation that is equally qualitative to the native one .A very similar statement is made by Pokorn (2005, p. 71) as she suggests that there are a very limited number of perfect translators in both languages – native and foreign language. The scholars attribute their rejection of L2 translation to the absence of native-like instinctive proficiency in the foreign language.

The afore-mentioned scholars have not only given their viewpoints regarding translating into one's foreign language, but also have supported their claims with reasonable proofs. The lack of instinctive sensitivity to the foreign language norms leads to assumption that there will never be a competent translator who is capable enough to produce an appropriate text in L2. Anyhow, new more areas of research into both directions have proven the possibility of producing high-quality L2 texts through mastering linguistic and cultural elements in the inquestion language as in the following section .

### 2.2 New Trends: Recognition of Inverse/ Second Language Translation

The underestimation of inverse (L2 (translation has weakened at the end of the twentieth century. Scholars have developed interests in translating into languages other than their own. The new trend of research in this field has been fruitful for it has given L2 direction the proper recognition (Pavlovic, 2013, p. 149). One of these scholars investigating the in-hand issue is Whayatt (2018, p. 89) who sees that Newmark's statement is, actually, unrealistic. Whayatt argues that only translators who read the text in their native language can well understand its message and thus are able to render that message correctly. Such translators who are fluent in their second language will not face a problem composing a well written text in the TL that carries the intended message of the SL. In brief, the quality of the TT does not relate to the direction of translation; it is rather attached to the translator's competence (the linguistic and the cultural one) in both languages. Another supporting claim of inverse translation and opponent of Newmark's is that of Mracek (2018, p. 203); the latter rejects Newmark's assertion of frequent ironic inverse translations. On the contrary, he insists that there are many examples of ill-structured L1 translations produced by translators which cause similar hilarity to TT receptors. Herein, Newmark's

downgrading of inverse translation is attacked based on the findings of applicable researches

In a more comprehensive view of the two directions of translation, Campbell (1998, p (4 .states that inverse translation (or L2 translation) is an activity that bears similar recurrence and mistakes to the direct one. That is, in direct) L1) translation, the problems is in comprehending the ST, while in inverse) L2) one the problem is in composing the TT. That is, Campbell does not adopt a well written, flaw-free TT in either direction; the theorist rather advocates that there is a restraining factor in each, which affects the quality of the TT .Similar notion of regularity is mentioned in a study conducted by Pavlovic (2007) p. 79) among professional Croatian translators. The areas researched are: translation problems in terms of number and type, problem-solving (references used, participants' negotiations, and the quality of the translated text. The findings show that similar problems and decision-making are traced in both directions. Because of the similar practices and procedures conducted in translating into and out of a translator's mother tongue, the level of difficulties encountered is, somewhat equal.

Similar romantic approach to the issue of inverse translation is negotiated. Ferreira (2014, p. 114), for example, does not challenge the translator's command of his second language; the scholar rather attributes difficulty in each direction. Ferreira, in fact, attributes approximate difficulties to each of L1 and L2 translations as having their own nature and limitations. Without downgrading the status of L1 translators, Shuttleworth and Cwoie (1997, p. 90) have approached the subject differently. The two scholars see that the wide spread of English as an international language in the twentieth century has revived inverse/L2 translation. Translators have paid more attention to this direction of translation in order to "cope with" the recursive need of translating into the new global language (see also; Gorton '2012 'p. 80-81). Mraceck (2019, p. 23), too, greatly emphasizes the role of L2 translators in translating texts with international audience (for communities with limitedly defused languages). In fact, he thinks that such translators can be better than the native ones, in some contexts, for they are very likely to translate in a simple plain language that reaches as many target receptors as possible. Hence, it feels free to say that the banishment of L2 translation is rejected in more recent studies, as it occurs as many times as the direct one and contains approximately similar mistakes.

#### 2.3 Difficulties Relevant to Inverse/ Second Language Translation

Scholars in the translation field have tried to specify the difficulties faced in L2 translation. Dollerup (2000, p. 63), for example, relates difficulties in inverse translation to the fact that L2 translators are, simply, not native ones; hence, they will never master the second language in terms of linguistics, stylistics, and culture. No matter how translators are fluent in their second language, there will always be "white spots" and "uncharted domains" regarding linguistic and cultural use. The two terms ("white spots "and "uncharted domains") are clarified by Mracek (2019, p. 204); they refer to the collocational and idiomatic mistakes that are frequently committed by L2 translators. As these two issues relate mainly to the target culture which the L2 translator is not fully aware of, satirical translations are very likely to be produced. For Chriss (2016, p. 13), the case is similar. With respect to his own findings, he has concluded that L1 is superior to L2 in terms of assessing appropriate style of writing and, hence, making more rational decisions regarding TL composition. Based on that, in inverse translation there will, always, be the problem of proper word selection and sensible production.

In a more recent study, Pavlovic (2013, p. 154 (has concluded that neither direction is free from mistakes. In fact, and as much as the study is concerned, problems related to translating into inverse translation are, mainly, syntactic, whereas, those related to direct translation are mostly morphological. Hence, while a second language translator faces the problem of text composition due to the absence of instinctive capacity of L2, a native translator working into his own language has a high potential of producing morphological ill- formed transcription. Pavlovic's conclusion resembles that of Campbell's (1998, p. 163) regarding the fact that translational problems are found in either direction. As stated above, both SL and TL are demanding in translation. Bearing in mind the linguistic and cultural restrictions of both languages, translators have to activate their problem-solving procedures in either language with regard to understanding a segment of the SL and trying to transfer it into the TL. However, the quality of L2 translation is somewhat lower than that of direct one due to the recurrent ill-formed sentences.

Further, the detection of syntactic mistakes is also carried out by Whyatt (2019, p. 95) regarding inverse translation. It has been found that the grammatical mistakes are higher in L2 translated texts, yet spelling,

sense/nonsense, and punctuation mistakes are found in L1 translated ones too. The aforementioned scholar has, additionally, concluded that text type has a great impact on inverse translation; the study participants have been hindered by the appropriate word choice that best resembles the intended meaning and function of the TT (2019, p. 95). Again, the status of the translated text is greatly affected by the ill-formed composition and word selection. Talking about the style of writing, Fonseca (2015, p. 112) sees that one of the problems concerning translating into L2 is the low quality of writing. The scholar sees that it is the result of the frequent grammatical mistakes in the translated text due to the incompetence that the non-native translator has of his second language. Hence, the grammatical structuring and lexical choices affect the appropriate composting of the TT, which result in a mal-formed translation.

Exploring new area, Jakobsen (2003, pp. 77-78 (has investigated the time spent in either direction. The findings of his study has proved, once again, that inverse translation is highly demanding than the direct one; that is, the time needed to process a text in inverse translation is more than that of the direct one. He sees that the time lag is because students had to process TL equivalences and segmentation more in L2 translation. Hence the considers proper vocabularies and text dissection as the two time-consuming factors in inverse translation (see also :Buchweitz & Alves's, 2006 .(Not very far of such a view, Baachaoui (2014, p. 147 (insists that a non-native translator lacks control over the L2 syntax and semantic repertoire; hence, he will end up composing unnatural text and consume more time than in L1 translation. The long time spent in the translation process tobviously, relates to the fact that the TL composition does not come naturally . Consequently, translators take time in the repeated negotiation of sentence construction until they made their final compositional decision.

Not denying the existence of serious problems in direct translation, many researchers admit that problems pertinent to inverse translation are higher than those of the direct one. They, mainly 'relate these problems to the lack of control over the TL syntax, terminology 'and culture. Such lack is likely to result in linguistically abnormal and culturally awkward translations. Still, the scholars insist that the text type plays a pivotal role in deciding the quality of the translated text into the foreign language. The less aesthetics of a text are the more flexible in translation it gets, and the other way around is correct too. The

following section discusses this issue, which is the core of the study, in some details

### 2.4 Text-type-oriented Directionality

Many scholars have attributed the difficulties encountered in L2 translation to the type of the text being translated. Snell-hornby (2000, p. 38), for example, argues that the statement of the better native tongue of translation can be well applied onto literary texts, yet it cannot be reflected on scientific or technical texts. For the former is highly style-bound and needs a native speaker to go through its aesthetes; the latter, however, has a more direct composition that a translator with a good command of L2 can translate properly. Licko's statement (2014 p. 74) confirms Snell-hornby's; he also sees literary translation as one that should be retained to L2 translators, for they are the only ones who can preserve the aesthetic values of the literary text. In fact, he considers the competent translators to be the ones that are acquainted with the challenges of literary translation and, thus, they cleverly tend to avoid it. The successful non-literary translators are restricted to other types of texts where style of writing and idioms do not constitute the bulk of the text. Accordingly, the two scholars above attach the appropriateness of inverse translation to the type of the language with which a text is written.

Following the same line, Levy (2011, p. 48 (sees that the more aesthetic values in the text, the more challenging in translation it becomes. The scholar confines such complexity to literary textures, and hence, they are very hard to be dealt with in translation. In fact, such expressive values require the translator to delve deeply into the cultural aspects of the text to absorb the intertextual relations of words, and consequently, be able to render the intended meaning properly. In fact, the scholar touches upon the un-recursive structures that the literary texts are bound with. Therein, a translator needs to be flexible and creative enough to be able to deal with such complex inter-related structures in order to decompose their hidden meaning. Then, and only then, he will transfer the vague intention of the SL text into a remarkably obvious composition in the TL text. Appreciating the previous claims, the PACTE group (2003, p. 7) highly stresses the specialization of the text (literary, scientific, legal, technical) as affecting the translator's competence in inverse translation. The limitations imposed by the text type manipulate the translator's own command of the text and the kinds of procedures he adopts. So far, it seems that it is not only the

translator's competence that decides the quality of the translation but the text type too.

In her book 'In other Words 'Baker (1992 'p. 64-65) specifies the problems encountered in literary translation to the idioms employed in such texts. She highly evaluates the native tongue naturalness in choosing the proper corresponding idioms. She even considers the non-native translator as mainly incompetent in this respect and can barely attain approximate sensitivity that native translators might have with regard to judging the use and manipulation of an idiom. St. John (2003, p. 2) is in line with Baker; he regards the translation of collocational and idiomatic expressions as very challenging for non-native translator. The translator cannot, in any case, have the "feel" of a native one. Adapting these assumptions, Licko (2014, p. 74 (has relegated the text-type as a decisive factor in teaching the direction of translation. He presumes that operative and/or formative texts are not problematic in translating into L2; hence, they are amenable to train translators. Expressive texts, on the other hand, are harder to be dealt with and very questionable in L2 translation training. He assures that the type of structures that carry the expressive function needed to illicit the aesthetic response from the TL receptor is very demanding and urges the translator to exert a remarkable effort to find equivalent counterparts.

For Hatim (2001, p. 166), scientific texts are evaluated according to "accuracy" than "stylistic felicity", where the correctness of the information is the outmost requirement of a TT. In reading an informative text, the reader is simply after the information itself, which can be transferred with a fairly less effort. The "stylistic felicity" seems to be the reason why the Spanish market does not favor literary translation, and it is more in favor of the scientific and technical texts (Vigier-Moreno, 2019 'p. 93). The fluency needed for an appropriate literary TT cannot be achieved by non-native translator, unless it is proofread by a native speaker, which is not at hand all the time. Again, the argument of the text type regarding inverse translation still holds. The abundance of research on the topic relegates literary texts as unwilling to proper L2 translation in comparison to the technical ones. The richness of specialized linguistic peculiarities is found more in the former than in the latter. However, the bulk of the current study is dedicated to the investigation of that specific issue; the impact (if any (of the text-type on the quality of L2 translation. The

following section tackles the methodology with which the problem is approached.

### 3. Methodology

This section deals with the procedures and methods adopted to test the study hypotheses. It adapts PACTE's comprehensive model of measurement and assessment (2003-2018). Hence, the adapted model for this study accounts for both data elicitation and evaluation. The model tackles the translator's competence as the knowledge he has about the translation process, which are declarative and procedural. Since, the study is a process oriented one, it accounts for the procedural knowledge that the student-translator employs in a practical translational situation. Besides, the study adopts two tools to approach the problem; two texts (Appendix A) to be translated into L2, and a questionnaire (Appendix B) to be responded to, so that the student-translators' perspectives regarding text-typology in translation is manifested. The model, as it accounts for translation quality assessment, assigns the indicator "Acceptability" to evaluate the translation quality as accepted (A), semi-accepted (SA), and not-accepted (NA). The evaluation process is about contrasting the two translations produced by the individual participant to each other to examine thoroughly the difference (if any) in the translation quality of the scientific vs. literary texts.

#### 3.1 The Model of the Study

The Translation Competence model (PACTE, 2003-2018) is the adapted model of the study. The model deals with the competence that a translator should have to translate properly into his first (direct translation) or second language )inverse translation). It divides the Knowledge that a translator should possess into declarative and procedural knowledge (under each category, there are a number of sub-competences). The first one relates to the translator's repertoire of information about the translation process in general that he has learnt throughout translator training courses. The second refers to the applicability of this knowledge in actual translational situation. Since, the main focus of the study is investigating the difference (if any) in the translation quality that the text type might impose when translating into L2 4the study focuses on the procedural knowledge that deals with the processing of each of the text types in-question. That is, the study looks into the following sub-competences:

- **1- The bilingual sub-competence** 'terminological, syntactic, textual, pragmatic 'and socio-linguistic knowledge in the two languages.
- **2- Instrumental sub-competence** 'dictionaries, encyclopedias, grammars, style of writing books, parallel corpora, and websites .

**3- Strategic sub-competence** 'adopting proper methods of translation, contrasting the final TT to the purpose of translation, and pinpointing translation problems to find adequate solutions.

Interestingly, the model is competent enough to incorporate the assessment of the data it collects. That is, the PACTE group (2011, p. 11-12) has found that "Acceptability" is the indicator of translation quality in terms of conveying the meaning, function 'and proper linguistic choices. The model of assessment that this group has created is compatible with their model of measurement and predicts the translation problems (or the rich points as they call it) that are to be analyzed. Herein, the scale of acceptability ranks according to:

- **a.** Acceptable (A '(all relevant connotations are activated by the translational choice regarding meaning, function, and proper use. It is given the value of (1) mark.
- **b. Semi-acceptable (SA '(some** relevant connotations are activated by the translational choice regarding meaning, function, and proper use. It is given the value of (0.5) mark.
- **c. Not-acceptable** (**NA** '(no relevant/incoherent connotations are activated by the translational choice regarding meaning, function, and proper use. It is given the value of (0) mark.

The problems, or rich points, as referred to by this group, that are very likely to result in the TT assessed are of five types 'Linguistic problems, textual problems, extra-linguistic problems antentionality problems, and functionality problems. It is suggested by the model that it is not necessary that all of these problems would be detected in a TT. This matter depends on each text being dealt with, as the translation process is unique to each translational situation. Hence, the study has examined all the above-mentioned problems except for extra-linguistic one due to the few data collected in the two texts that are not sufficient enough for the comparative analysis (between the two) required for this study.

#### 3.2 Population

This study is exclusively dedicated to the first-level students who have received one year of training to translate into and out of their mother tongue. The goal is to reveal, at early levels of training 'the problems occurring in L2

translation and find proper solutions to overcome them in the succeeding years. So, the student-translators would be able to receive proper pedagogical addressing as far as text-type related inverse translation is concerned. Hence, 25 of these student-translators have been recruited to participate in the study at the Department of Translation/university of Basra/ College of Arts. Two of them have withdrawn the experiment after it has started. Anyhow, all the remaining participants have verbally agreed to take part in the study, and then they are instructed about the task requirements. They have nearly similar level of translation competence. They have all subjected to a whole year of training courses with the average of three hours per week, including the types of texts assumed by Reiss (1989, p. 105) in light of translation studies. Arabic is the mother tongue of all the participants and English is their second language. Their names, age and gender are irrelevant to the study; henceforth, they are labeled with numbers for ease of analysis.

### 3.3 The experiment

The L2 texts (English ones; Appendix A) are selected for the experiment by the consulted jury of the study; as they are comparable in terms of readability, length, genre, and word frequency. The two types of texts are being chosen to closely examine the requirements and limitations of translating each for proper addressing in translator-training courses and didactic reinforcement. The participants were instructed about the task requirement at the beginning of the experiment. Also they were allowed to have access to dictionaries. The test is of three tasks the participants have translated the literary text first, then they have translated the scientific one. Finally, they have filled out the study questionnaire to employ their conception about the problems and procedures of translating each text type into L2 in examining the existence of quality difference of their actual translational products. The time of the experiment was an hour and a half to simulate that of an academic lecture at the same department.

### 3.4 The Questionnaire

According to PACTE group (2003, p. 13), questionnaire is one of the tools that help to have an idea about the translator's cognitive processes. Thus, the study adopts a questionnaire tailored in accordance with the adapted model )PACTE, 2018) of the study. It involves seven questions meant to reveal as much as possible the students' own reaction to the text-typology in L2 translation. The first three questions are about the difficulty of the TL grammar, lexis, and the

cohesive devices used to compose the texture of each text, respectively. The fourth question is about the number of problems faced in translating each text. The succeeding two questions (5 and 6) regard the translation instruments/aids and the procedures adopted in the translation of each text. The final question deals with the student-translator's overall estimation of the level of difficulty regarding the translation of each text .

#### 3.5 Data Collection

The data are collected through a triangulation of methods, which (as it involves the collection of various data regarding the same topic through various tools) is thought to be the best way to have a trustworthy test (Ahlves, 2003). (In this study, three types of data were collected 'written draft translations of two texts, quality assessment of these translations by the study evaluator, and the questionnaire responses. After the experiment is over, the draft translations are collected and prepared for assessment, by the expert, via the holistic model of study (PACTE, 2018) which allows for both eliciting and assessing the data. The questionnaire sheets are gathered and analyzed too.

#### 3.6 Method of Analysis

Giving the rich points/translation problems traced in the collected data, the study employs the qualitative and quantitative analysis at the level of phrase and clause .Problem-solving and alternative translation choices are the units of analysis (Saladanha & O'Brien, 2013, pp. 120-127 .(Therefore, the study employs a contrastive analysis for each pair of translation (scientific and literary) produced by each student-translator to see whether or not there is a variance in his/her translation competence. The number of errors and/or weaker translations of a text is counted and contrasted to those of the other one (text) for each participant in isolation of other participants. Later, a decision is made as to whether the variance is significant or not. Then, an overall estimation of the number of pairs that are) or not) significantly different is made. Regarding the questionnaire responses, they are employed to explore the student-translators' reaction to translating each text type, and to support the findings of the draft translations analysis. The final decisions answer the study assumptions to text-type related inverse/second language translation .

### 4. Data Analysis

The core of the study is about analyzing the quality of participants' draft translations of each text type to examine the difference in quality (if any) in each text type during the task. Due to the variety of the data collected; quantitative and qualitative, a mix of analysis is carried out regarding the data extracted from both tools (translation task and questionnaire) (Saldanha & O'Brian, 2013, p. 22 .(That is, a contrastive analysis of the draft translations is done qualitatively to track errors, and quantitatively to examine the marks gained for each draft. The questionnaire responses, on the other hand, are analyzed quantitatively in percentages to reveal the general opinions regarding text typology in L2 translation, and qualitatively to reveal the trainee-translators standpoint of L2 translation in relation to scientific and literary types .

A remark on the detection of translation problem should be stated to guide the reader through the entire analysis. A translation problem (or a Rich Point) is signaled when different decision-making procedures and translation solutions are suggested regarding a specific segment of a text .Omission of important portions of the text that is likely to affect the transference of meaning is counted too (PACTE, 2008, p. 9). The lexical choices are run through Al-Mawrid dictionary (2010) to account for the lexis of the literary text, while A Learner's Scientific and Technical Dictionary of Current English (2008) is employed to account for the lexis of the scientific text. The syntactic errors are contrasted against that of the Standard English. Finally 'the style of writing is judged according to the study evaluator. Hence, the types of problems examined herein are: linguistic; lexis and syntax, textual 'cohesion and coherent devices, intentionality; comprehension problems, and functionality problems (PACTE, 2017, p. 16.(

#### 4.1 The Current Study

The current study compares the quality of the translations of the two texts, for each participant, in-question into the L2. The comparison is for shedding the light on the impact (if any) that the type of the text imposes on the quality of the L2 translational product. The evaluation of the student-translators' draft translations has been carried out by an external evaluator for objectivity purposes. The evaluator has located the linguistic errors in the drafts 'decided the reflection of ST functions, highlighted the specialized terminologies of each text type, and given the final marks. It should be mentioned that each process of translation has its own problems and translational procedures to overcome them based on the type of the text and the translator's competence in the immediate

translational situation. Therefore 'the type and number of problems presented and discussed here are restricted to the current study .

In fact, the extra-linguistic problems are irrelevant to the current study; that is, the cultural differences associated with the literary text do not have enough similar counterparts in the scientific ones. Further, the subject domain knowledge needed for the scientific text is of a very narrow importance for the given literary one .Hence, the equal contrastive analysis, on extralinguistic basis, of the translations of the two texts in question that is essential to test the hypothesis of the study fails. Finally, it should be mentioned that two of the student-translators have withdrawn the experiment (P & 15P (20 and another two (P 2P (18 have translated only the literary text. They consider the scientific text as much harder to be translated. Anyhow, the first two are rolled out while the latters are counted in. As they omit the translation of the whole scientific text for its supposed difficulty their omission is considered, by the evaluator, as a translation mistake. Hereafter the quality of their literary translation is examined to have a look at the difference (if any) in translation performance. For space limitation, the translation problems (rich points) detected in the draft translations are classified and analyzed in tables.

#### **4.2 Rich Points (Translation Problems)**

The analysis is carried regarding the rich points obtained from the draft translations of the participants. They are called "rich" because of the insights they bring about to the kind of obstacles that translators face and the probable solutions offered. However, the rich points are unique to each translational situation 'so, not all of the translation problems should occur at once and in the same range. Hence, and as mentioned earlier, the extralinguistic problems are irrelevant to the current study.

#### 4.2.1 Linguistic Problems

The type of problems being detected in this section relates to the lexical and syntactic problems traced in the draft translations of the two text types. As complex and large in number, the errors traced will be displayed in tables for each text type. In fact, space limitation of this small-scale study has urged the summarization of data in tables. The first one relates to T1:

Table (4-1 ): The Linguistic Problems in T1

The Lexical Errors						
Participant	Mistranslations	Awkwardness	Omission	Addition		
1	0	8	2	2		
2	6	20	17	0		
3	2	5	0	1		
4	3	0	1	1		
5	1	3	2	1		
6	0	2	2	0		
7	6	9	2	0		
8	7	5	4	0		
9	11	15	6	0		
10	23	28	0	1		
11	3	1	2	0		
12	4	4	2	0		
13	5	12	8	3		
14	7	12	3	1		
16	10	12	2	2		
17	2	4	5	0		
18	4	24	2	0		
19	1	4	8	0		
21	1	0	3	0		
22	1	1	4	0		
23	3	5	126	0		
24	1	20	7	0		
25	5	3	6	1		

The Grammatical Errors							
Participant	Word order	Agent	Tense	Definite- ness	Presuppo- sition	Punctua- tion	
1	1	1	0	0	1	5	
2	25	2	7	5	13	1	
3	4	1	5	3	5	8	
4	0	1	0	0	0	2	
5	1	0	0	0	0	6	
6	1	0	0	0	0	0	
7	6	5	3	1	7	20	
8	4	3	2	3	4	10	
9	20	1	9	5	5	20	
10	25	3	3	1	13	20	
11	2	0	3	1	3	4	
12	2	0	0	0	1	12	
13	11	3	6	3	4	14	
14	8	7	1	0	8	13	
16	12	3	4	0	9	11	
17	4	0	2	3	5	6	
18	20	0	15	0	15	7	
19	1	0	1	0	2	12	
21	0	0	3	0	6	8	
22	0	1	1	1	6	9	
23	5	2	4	2	0	3	
24	19	7	7	8	13	13	
25	1	2	4	0	4	7	

As is the case in the first text, the below table (4-2) displays the linguistic problems encountered by the participants in the draft translation of T2:

Table :(2-4) The Linguistic Problems in T2

The Lexical Errors							
Participant	Mistranslations	Awkwardness	Omission	Addition			
1	2	3	0	0			
2							
3	4	4	0	2			
4	1	2	1	0			
5	1	3	1	2			
6		1	0	0			
7	6	3	4	0			
8	1	8	4	0			
9	7	16	3	1			
10	4	14	3	0			
11	5	2	1	0			
12	2	2	1	0			
13	6	8	1	0			
14	2	5	0	0			
16	4	3	75	1			
17	7	3	0	0			
18							
19	2	1	1	0			
21	2	0	0	0			
22	1	1	4	0			
23	10	9	0	0			
24	11	10	0	0			
25	4	2	1	0			

	The Grammatical Errors						
Pa rtic ipa nt	Word order	Agent	Tense	Definiteness	Presupposition	Punctuati on	
1	1	0	1	0	0	3	
2							
3	3	0	1	0	4	5	
4	0	0	0	0	2	3	
5	0	0	0	0	0	7	
6	3	3	0	0	5	1	
7	8	1	0	0	7	15	
8	1	0	2	1	4	9	
9	16	2	3	8	11	13	
10	10	3	2	0	6	12	
11	3	0	5	1	2	6	
12	2	1	2	4	2	8	
13	15	1	3	3	3	10	
14	2	6	0	0	3	9	
16	5	2	3	4	23	30	
17	5	0	3	5	4	4	

The Effect of Text Type in Inverse/Second Language Translation: an Empirical Study of Literary Vs. Scientific Texts

18						
19	0	2.	2	3	2	6
21	0	0	1	2	2	6
22	1	0	1	2	6	6
23	5	3	6	6	12	11
24	10	2	0	12	3	12
25	3	1	2	1	3	3

As the study main aim is a comparative analysis of the difference of the translation quality of the two texts in question, the table (4-3) below serves that purpose. It displays the total number of the lexical and grammatical errors committed by the tested subjects in the translation of the literary text in comparison to their counterparts in the scientific one as follows:

Table :(3-4) The Difference in the Linguistic Problems between T1 & T2

Participant	Total No. of	Total No. of Errors in	Acceptability indicator	Acceptability
1	Errors in T1	T2	in T1	indicator in T2
1	20	10	A	A
2	96		NA	NA
3	34	23	A	SA
4	8	9	A	A
5	14	7	A	A
6	5	13	A	A
7	59	49	SA	SA
8	42	21	SA	A
9	92	80	NA	NA
10	117	54	NA	SA
11	19	25	A	A
12	23	24	A	SA
13	69	50	SA	NA
14	60	27	A	A
16	65	150	A	NA
17	31	31	A	SA
18	87		NA	NA
19	29	20	A	SA
21	21	13	A	A
22	24	21	A	A
23	150	62	NA	NA
24	95	60	NA	NA
25	33	20	A	A

#### 4.2.2 Discussion of the Results of the Linguistic Problems

As this section deals with the grammatical and lexical errors encountered during the process of translation, the findings show that the number of errors traced in the draft translations of the literary text is of an approximate similarity to that of the scientific one. According to the study evaluator, although the number of errors obtained in the literary text is a bit higher than that obtained in

the scientific ones, the difference is not that significant. That is, the average number of errors in the literary text is 47 in comparison to that of scientific text which is 37.4. Although somewhat higher in the literary text than in the scientific one, these numbers indicate that the type of the text being tackled is of a slight effect on the student translator's competence as far as the linguistic problems are concerned. Looking at the table (4.3 '(the indicator "Acceptability" is consistent between the two texts except for P '<sup>10</sup>P '<sup>13</sup> and P '<sup>16</sup> whose translations have been affected by the text type. They have shown acceptability variance based on the text type they have dealt with; non-accepted literary translation for P '<sup>10</sup> and non-accepted scientific translations for P <sup>13</sup> and P .<sup>16</sup>

For the sake of argument, some examples of the draft translations are to be analyzed in what follows of this section to shed some light on the way within which evaluation process has been carried out. P 7has presented an approximate number of incorrect and awkward translations in both texts. In the literary text, the Arabic sentence "كما كان يسيء اليه بالتوبيخ و الصراخ كلما اتيحت له الفرصة لذلك" is wrongly translated into "also he was insult him by scold and yelling at him every chance for that." Judging by the evaluator, the errors detected are: the misuse of the tense in "he was insult", the unparalleled structures "scold and yelling" as well as the awkward translation "every chance for that". The same ill-formed structures are detected here and there in the rest of the translation, yet there is not enough space to mention them .

The scientific text 'on the other hand, has borne similar incorrect and awkward structures for the same participant; 7. The Arabic sentence و توثر على " و تؤثر على " و تؤثر على wrongly translated into English as "and it effect on how human recognize other people". The verb "تؤثر" is wrongly translated into "effect "instead of "affects". The preposition "on" is wrongly added to the sentence .The word "human" should be replaced with "person" and the verb "recognize "should be attached with third personal S. Another Arabic example "recognize "should be attached with third personal S. Another Arabic example "is translated into English as "also ruffle repetition ceremony for the infected." Again, the previous translation is incorrect. The word "اضطراب" which is "disorder" in the dictionary, is wrongly translated into "ruffle", the translation of the verb "يَضَمَن" is missed, the word "ceremony" is wrongly added for there is no counterpart for it, and finally 'the word "المصاب" is improperly translated into "infected". The dictionary meaning for "طيف" is wrongly within this context, is "patient". Further, the word "فيف" is wrongly

mistranslated into "shade"; the correct suggested, and specialized, translation, given by the evaluator is "spectrum". Such translation carries the scientific meaning of the word. Hence, the translation fails to render the meaning appropriately.

Also 'P 10 has showed wrong word choice in both texts; this indicates a poor knowledge of word specialty in both of the two types. For example, the Arabic words "نجار " يحسن، إناء " يسيء " العجوز " لا ينبس ببنت شفة " ضيق وقع وجهه وابل من العجوز " لا ينبس ببنت شفة ضيق وقع وجهه الحفيد الأخر عنيف عندما الشتائم المؤذية و الجارحة دون ان يكون له حيلة في الدفاع عن نفسه الحفيد الأخر عنيف عندما " dadition as "najara, improve, vase, was misleading, clarity, does not stand with a flange, narrowing, occurred, the face of his face, with a powder from the impetus, without being a trick in defending himself, the granddaughter of the grandchief, the last, weakenless, come up with the older, voy your food 'quickly, train, enlarge from his mistakes" respectively. It is noticed that these TT equivalences are not only mistaken, consulting the dictionary, but also some of them are misspelled. Further, the word "النجار" has been transliterated into "najara" more than once throughout the translation.

Comparatively, the scientific text has also reflected many words that have been mistranslated or wrongly chosen (do not fit the type of the text). For example, the Arabic words "حالة، يتعامل، محيط، تمييز الشخص للاخرين، تكرار السلوكيات للمصاب، اعراض متباينة الشدة، اضطراب طيف التوحد، السنة الاولى، يمر بغترة ارتداد، عندما تظهر wrongly translated into English as "state, deal, ocean, how to distinguish the person to others 'repetition behaviors to injured, different symptoms, the unity disorder 'initial year, pass from the rebound, when the appear as until symptoms". Consulting the dictionary, all the lexical choices are incorrect except for the two terms" state, deal" which are judged, by the evaluator, as irrelevant to the type of the text. They should be replaced with "condition, interact" to preserve the medical context. Normally, such wrong choice of words has weakened the translation.

#### 4.2.3 Textual Problems

The type of problems being traced in this section relates to the cohesive and coherent devices added to the text to make smooth transitions through the sentences and make up the required solid textuality. In addition, the logical flow of sentences is counted too as a concord cohesive device. It is taken into account

that the textual devices needed for the literary text (T1) are higher and richer than those needed for the scientific one (T2) because of the abundance of information being presented in an aesthetic way. Anyhow, as it is not possible to have countable problems regarding cohesiveness and coherence, the study evaluator has resorted to quality assessment of the overall textuality of the two texts focusing on the parameters in Table (4-4). The researcher has assigned general numerical values according to the study model for ease of analysis:

Table (4-4) Textual Acceptability in T1 & T2

	Table (4	4-4) Textual Accept	ability in T1 & T2	
		T1		
Participant	Cohesion	Coherence	Logical Flow of Sentences	Total Score
1	SA	A	A	1
2	NA	SA	SA	0.5
3	SA	A	A	1
4	A	A	A	1
5	A	A	A	1
6	A	A	A	1
7	NA	SA	SA	0.5
8	SA	SA	NA	0.5
9	NA	NA	NA	0
10	NA	NA	NA	0
11	A	A	A	1
12	SA	A	A	1
13	SA	SA	SA	0.5
14	SA	A	A	1
16	SA	SA	SA	0.5
17	A	A	A	1
18	NA	NA	NA	0
19	A	A	A	1
21	A	A	A	1
22	A	A	A	1
23	NA	NA	NA	0
24	NA	NA	NA	0
25	SA	A	A	1
		T2		
Participa nt	Cohesion	Coherence	Logical Flow of Sentences	Total Score
1	A	A	A	1
2	NA	NA	NA	0
3	SA	A	SA	0.5
4	A	A	A	1
5	A	A	A	1
6	A	A	A	1
7	NA	SA	SA	0.5
8	A	A	SA	1
9	NA	NA	NA	0
10	SA	SA	SA	0.5

The Effect of Text Type in Inverse/Second Language Translation: an Empirical Study of Literary Vs. Scientific Texts

11	A	A	A	1
12	SA	SA	SA	0.5
13	NA	NA	NA	0
14	A	A	A	1
16	SA	NA	NA	0
17	NA	SA	SA	0.5
18	NA	NA	NA	0
19	A	SA	SA	0.5
21	A	A	A	1
22	A	A	A	1
23	NA	NA	NA	0
24	NA	NA	NA	0
25	A	A	A	1

#### 4.2.4Discussion of the Results of Textual Problems

Table (4.4) above reveals, once again, that there is no significant difference in the textual performance in the two texts. Both the use of the cohesive devices and the reliance on the logical flow of sentences is somewhat similar in the two texts. In other words, the average of "Acceptability" indicator retrieved from the study evaluator is 0.6 in the literary text in contrast to 0.5 in the scientific one. This fact refers to similar competence in using the textual devices in both texts. The participants have resorted to a fair amount of the cohesive devices (and, furthermore, also, so, but, because, since, on another side, as, and, therefore, moving into his family, and, looking at his son, on the other hand, once, both, as well, so that, likewise, whereas, as well as, which (to link the information gained from the texts. Besides, there has been a reliance on the logical flow of sentences (on the student-translators' parts) to present the content. Again, some examples will be presented so the evaluation process is made clear.

Hence, the translation offered by P ¹for the Arabic sentence "لم يكن النجار" "The carpenter was not treating his father well at all, he was serving him food in a filthy glass plate." No use is detected of a conjunctive adverb to link the two propositions together, as the tested thought that the sequence of sentences alone is sufficient to transfer the meaning fairly. Such logical flow of sentences is reasonably accepted, by the evaluator, for it renders the meaning in a proper construction of sentences. Yet, this participant has felt the urge to use some textual connectors in the succeeding sentences. In fact, the Arabic sentence "ولم يكن ذلك الطعام بالكافي الذي العجوز المسكين. كذلك كان يسيء اليه بالتوبيخ و الصراخ كلما اتيحت له الفرصة لذلك،" "And that food was not enough to fill in the hunger of

the old man. Furthermore the was, also, abusing him by yelling and scolding him every time he had the chance to do so,...". It is seen by the evaluator that this variety in the textual linking is accepted, since it transfers the original meaning clearly and smoothly.

The same participant) P '¹however, has minimized the use of the textual connectors in the scientific text, relying, mainly, on the logical flow of sentences. It has been attributed to the fact that a scientific text does not require the aesthetic conjunctive adverbs needed for an aesthetic text. Thus, the Arabic sentence معالم والمنطر المعالم المع

P '4as another example, has made an effort in the textual devices added to the literary text to glue the parts of sentences, the neighboring sentences, and the text as a whole properly. It has been found, by the evaluator, that such use is accepted for it has made the smooth transitions needed. For example, the translation offered by the P '4for the Arabic sentence الم يكن النجار يُحسن معاملة والد is "the carpenter did not treat his father well at all, as he was offering him food on a filthy plate ."Herein, the use of "as" is correct and suits the context as well. Concerning the scientific text, the participant has translated the Arabic sentence "كما يتضمن الإضطراب تكر ار السلوكيات "كما يتضمن الإضطراب تكر ار السلوكيات اضطراب طيف التوحد" الى مجموعة كبيرة من الإعراض للمصاب يشير مصطلح "الطيف" في عبارة "اضطراب طيف التوحد في مرحلة الطغولة المبكرة." "فانعم وحدة الله المبكرة." "Autism Spectrum" often refers to dissimilar symptoms. Autism usually start to develop in an early age.." The scientific text sentences are, also, connected successfully without and conjunctive adverbs .

The sample examples manifested above prove that the textual devices used by the student-translators are approximate in both of the texts chosen for the study. Also, their performances have gained similar "Acceptability" numerical

values. This indicates that the translators' performances are not that affected by the text type regarding the textual part of the texts. It is only for the translations offered by P <sup>13</sup> and P <sup>16</sup> that a variance in the indicator "Acceptability" has occurred. They have showed various performances regarding the textual devices used. That is, the two participants have failed to successfully link the proposition of the scientific text. Anyhow, the argument of similar translation performance in either text type regarding textual problems still holds.

### 4.2.5 Intentionality Problems

The intention of the text, according to the Translator Competence model (PACTE, 2018) adapted in the study, means the comprehension of the text presuppositions, implicatures, intertextuality, and speech acts (among many others that are not related to the current study). This section tries to examine 'in contrast, the comprehension of the two selected texts. The evaluator has 'also, assigned the indicator "Acceptability" to the comprehension parameters for each participant instead of listing the number of errors in comprehension for ease of analysis as follows:

Table (4-5): The Intentionality Problems in T1 & T2

			T1		
Participant	Presupposition	Implicatures	Intertextuality	Speech acts	Total Score
1	A	A	A	A	1
2	NA	NA	NA	SA	0
3	A	SA	SA	SA	0.5
4	A	A	A	A	1
5	A	A	A	A	1
6	A	A	A	A	1
7	A	SA	SA	A	0.5
8	A	SA	SA	SA	0.5
9	A	A	A	A	1
10	SA	SA	SA	SA	0.5
11	A	A	A	A	1
12	A	A	A	A	1
13	A	A	A	A	1
14	NA	SA	SA	SA	0.5
16	A	A	A	A	1
17	A	A	A	A	1
18	SA	NA	SA	SA	0.5
19	A	A	A	A	1
21	A	A	A	A	1
22	A	A	A	A	1
23	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
24	A	A	A	A	1

The Effect of Text Type in Inverse/Second Language Translation: an Empirical Study of Literary Vs. Scientific Texts

25	Ι Δ	Ι Δ	Δ.	Λ	1
23	A	A	A	A	1
	I =		T2		
Participant	Presupposition	Implicatures	Intertextuality	Speech acts	Total Score
1	A	A	A	A	1
2	NA	NA	NA	SA	0
3	A	SA	SA	SA	0.5
4	A	A	A	A	1
5	A	A	A	A	1
6	A	A	A	A	1
7	A	SA	SA	A	0.5
8	A	SA	SA	SA	0.5
9	A	SA	SA	A	0.5
10	SA	SA	SA	SA	0.5
11	SA	A	A	A	1
12	A	A	A	A	1
13	SA	SA	SA	A	0.5
14	A	A	A	A	1
16	SA	NA	NA	NA	0
17	A	A	A	A	1
18	NA	NA	NA	NA	0
19	SA	A	A	A	1
21	A	A	A	A	1
22	A	A	A	A	1
23	A	A	A	A	1
24	A	A	A	A	1
25	A	A	A	A	1

#### 4.2.6 Discussion of the Results of the Intentionality Problems

The results show that the level of the comprehension for all the participants— except for P <sup>2</sup>P <sup>16</sup>P <sup>18</sup>and P <sup>23</sup>is nearly similarly. Table (4-5) displays the general results of the comprehension parameters, for each participant, and the acceptability indicator as evaluated by the expert. The average of acceptability indicator for the literary text is 0.8 in comparison to 0.7 of the scientific text. It is totally understandable that the majority of the participants have, almost fully, comprehended the two texts. Since, the original texts are in Arabic which is their mother tongue; it is likely that most of the students do not have major problems with comprehension. It is even for P <sup>9</sup>who has gained the lowest score of all, s/he has understood the full propositions of the literary and scientific text. It is obvious that his/her weak performance in the second/target language is the reason behind such a score. It is worth mentioning that P <sup>16</sup>have not translated all of the scientific text, while P <sup>23</sup>has not translated the literary one fully too. The reason behind not translating could be that they

have found it difficult to be rendered into English. In other words, it is not necessary that they have not comprehended the text. Hence, the study argument could hold here two.

Examples taken from P <sup>9</sup>can be used to support the argument above and the evaluation assigned to his/her two translations. The original texts are written in the native language of the participant that is why they are comprehendible. This comprehension is reflected in the translation even if it bears major TL grammatical mistakes .Hence, the evaluator has evaluated the comprehension part of the translation performance of this participant as acceptable. The following example supports this claim; the original segment من المسكين المسكين الطعام في الطعام في المسكين الطعام بالكافي الذي يسد جوع العجوز المسكين. "فقد كان يقدم له الطعام في المسكين الطعام بالكافي الذي يسد جوع العجوز المسكين." The TL sentence and this food wasn't enough to give his father felling ful". The TL sentence bears many grammatical mistakes, yet it shows an understanding of the original proposition of the SL sentence. It carries the main content words "give, food, plate, uncleaned, not enough food, give feeling full". That is why it has been decided that the meaning is intact in the previous sentence even though the grammatical mistakes are many.

In comparison, the scientific translation of the same participant has "اضطراب طيف reflected similar mistakes. He has translated the Arabic sentence" التوحد عبارة عن حالة ترتبط بنمو الدماغ و تؤثر على كيفية تمييز الشخص للاخرين و التعامل معهم على is translated into English as: "Ruffle Spectrum Autism it status" المستوى الاجتماعي relevant with growing bran and affect about how recognize the patient to the other and deal with them on social level". It is obvious that the translation has no correct English structure. P <sup>9</sup> seems to have used the dictionary to successfully "طيف التوحد، ترتبط، نمو الدماغ، الاخرين، التعامل، render the meaning of the words Still, s/he has misused it to translate the rest of the in-question المستوى الاجتماعي". sentence. Although, s/he has incorrectly composed the sentence in the TL, which indicates an obvious TL incompetence, the participant has still delivered the meaning correctly. In fact, another translation mistake is committed by this participant regarding his/her translation of the title ."مرض التوحد". S/he has wrongly added 'decided by the evaluator, the morphologically ill word "sick" as "Autism Sick" !"Autism" alone should have served as a proper translation. Again, the name of the sickness is transferred (poorly) into the TL.

Another translation taken from P <sup>24</sup> for the same Arabic literary segment is "so he do may food in glass plate [uncleaned] And he don't that food [unsufficient [that old man his hungry." Although, the TL sentence is totally illstructured the original proposition can be inferred from the content words used by the participant. Again, the English words "food, plate, uncleaned, food unsufficient, old man, his hungry" reflect the student-translator's understanding, according to the dictionary, of the text despite that this meaning is carried in very ill-structured sentences. Looking at the scientific translation offered by this is "مما يتسبب في حدوث مشكلات في التفاعل و التواصل " participant for the Arabic segment "Because it was happen problem and interaction with periphery ."Once again, the ill-structuring of the translation does not affect the transference of meaning. Hence, the comprehension of the two texts has been reflected in the translation of the two texts regardless of the TL grammatical mistakes. Regarding the study main concern, the type of the text has not raised any problem; the participant who understands the literary text is able to understand the scientific one. Further, the TL composition problems have been there in the two TL texts, yet the reflection of their proposition has stayed intact.

#### **4.2.7 Functionality Problems**

The focus, in this section, relates to the reflection of the SL text function in the TL translation. The original model states that the function is stated in the translation brief, as it might be altered in the TT following the requirement of each translation situation. Based on that, and during the task, the participants have been asked to preserve the same function of the two texts in their draft translations. Hence, the evaluation process detects this specific matter in the table (4-6) as follows:

**Table (4-6): The Function Acceptability** 

Dortiginant		T1	T2		
Participant	Acceptability	Numerical value	Acceptability	Numerical value	
1	A	1	A	1	
2	NA	0	SA	0.5	
3	A	1	A	1	
4	A	1	A	1	
5	A	1	A	1	
6	A	1	A	1	
7	SA	0.5	SA	0.5	
8	SA	0.5	SA	0.5	
9	SA	0.5	SA	0.5	
10	NA	0	NA	0	
11	A	1	A	1	

The Effect of Text Type in Inverse/Second Language Translation: an Empirical Study of Literary Vs. Scientific Texts

12	A	1	A	1
13	SA	0.5	A	1
14	SA	0.5	A	1
16	NA	0	NA	0
17	SA	SA	SA	0.5
18	NA	0	NA	0
19	A	1	SA	0.5
21	A	1	A	1
22	A	1	A	1
23	NA	0	NA	0
24	NA	0	NA	0
25	SA	0.5	A	1

### 4.2.8 Discussion of the Results of the Functionality Problems

This type of problems, according to the model of assessment, relates to the translation brief. It looks into the transference of the original function into the TL text as agreed upon before the process of translation takes part. The two poles that the function has been decided upon is the complexity of structures and the terminology used. That is, according to Reiss's text typology (1989, p. 105), which is adopted in this study, the direct structure that bears simple sentences is used in the scientific text along with the specified lexis of the scientific field. Whereas, the complex, compound, and complex compound structures along with the specified aesthetic lexis are used with literary ones. Herein, the evaluator has monitored these two poles to determine whether the original function has been reflected in the TL texts or not. The analysis proceeds as it is mentioned earlier in this study; a comparative analysis of the two translations of each participant is carried out to detect the reflection of function in each. Anyhow, the average of the indictor Acceptability is 0.5 in the literary text in comparison to 0.6 in the scientific one. Although it is higher in the scientific text than the literary one, the variance between the two is not that significant.

Table (4-6) above shows the acceptability indicator for function transference for each pair of TTs by each participant. P <sup>12</sup>as an example <sup>13</sup> is considered as successfully transferred the SL function into the TL literary text. The type of structures used is mainly compound and complex compound to convey the flow of information offered by the text. The evaluator has regarded it as a correct choice of structures that best reflects the expressive function of the TT .Argumentatively, the Arabic sentence "في احد الايام و اثناء تناول طعام الغداء، وقع إناء

الطعام من بين يدي العجوز و تحطم الى قطع صغيرة. فاستشاط الابن غضباً حتى احمر وجهه، و انهال تناطعه من بين يدي العجوز و تحطم الى قطع صغيرة. فاستشاط الابن غضباً حتى احمر وجهه، و انهال على الشنائم المؤذية و الجارحة" one day, and while they were having lunch, a plate fall, by mistake, from the old man's hands and smashed into small pieces. Because of that, the father was so angry that his face got red, and he insulted his father with tons of harmful bad words." Regarding the terminology used herein 'the Arabic word's "يُحكى، لا ينبس العضب و الضيق، مزقت كلمات الابن قلب... ضعيفاً لا يسعه الوقوف في وجه" translated into English as "once upon a time, without saying a word, was angry and felt down, those words broke.. man's heart, was with no avail to stop his.." It is seen that these terminologies carry the expressive function since they represent the TL meaning redundantly as they are meant to be in the SL.

In addition, the scientific translation for the same participant carry the informative function successfully too. P <sup>12</sup>has adopted the direct simple structures to render the meaning of the original text. For example, s/he has translated the Arabic sentence "يبدأ اضطراب طيف التوحد في مرحلة الطفولة المبكرة و يتسبب في حدوث مشكلات على مستوى الاداء الاجتماعي في المدرسة و العمل، على سبيل المثال. غالباً ما تظهر اعراض مشكلات على مستوى الاداء الاجتماعي في المدرسة و العمل، على سبيل المثال. غالباً ما تظهر اعراض المناة الاولى." and at very early time of the a child's life. It causes other problems on the social level, for example in school and at work. Mostly, autism shows up in the first year ".Further, the terminology used is meant to be as decisive as those of the original to convey the specified function. That is, the Arabic words "اضطراب at المعافية" التعامل مع اعراض، متباين، بالنمو بصورة طبيعية" التعامل مع اعراض، متباين، بالنمو بصورة طبيعية" grow up normally". Hence, the evaluation process has decided that the choice of terms is successful for it bore the scientific informative meaning of the original. The participant has succeeded in rendering the two functions into the TL.

Another example is discussed below to relate to the study assumptions. That is, P <sup>16</sup>has not succeeded in delivering the two functions of the original text because of his/her incompetence in translation regardless of the text type. For example, the Arabic sentence المحقيد لما كان يحدث امامه، لكنه هو الاخر كان ضعيفاً لا translated into English as "The grandson was sadding about that. but he also the other cannot stand up and stops his father." The translation has failed to convey the aesthetic function of the SL and, therefore, to make an equivalent effect on the TL receptor, the evaluator, for the inappropriate choice of words and the ill-formed structures used. Further, the terminologies

chosen by the evaluator that they are supposed to carry the aesthetic value of the text and should be preserved in the translation are not transferred successfully. The translations offered for the Arabic literary words "يُحكى، العجوز الطاعن في السن، العافي الذي يسد جوع... يسيء اليه بالتوبيخ و الصراخ، صامت لم يكن.. يحسن معاملة والده، لم يكن.. بالكافي الذي يسد جوع... يسيء اليه بالتوبيخ و الصراخ، صامت are incorrect; "once day, was be old, hadn't have a good handling, wasn't enough to closes hungry, was insulting him with scolding and screaming, was quiting, brokening" respectively.

Regarding the scientific text, the same participant has not succeeded too. The structures used to compose the TT are grammatically wrong, and the terminologies used are irrelevant .Hence, the TL text is out of register. For "اضطراب طيف التوحد عبارة عن حالة ترتبط بنمو الدماغ و تؤثر example, the Arabic sentence على كيفية تمييز الاشخاص للآخرين و التعامل معهم على المستوى الاجتماعي. مما يتسبب في حدوث is translated into English as "The shade – مشكلات في التفاعل و التواصل مع المحيط" autism ruffle means about a shape attached with the brain growth and influence at how to distinguish the person to the others and work with them at the social level 'when it causes to happen problems with interaction and exchange of the periphery." It must be mentioned that the rest of the text is not translated .It seems that the participant has found it either more difficult or s/he just had got bored. Either case, the study argument still holds; that is, s/he has rendered the first three sentences grammatically incorrect. In addition, the translation offered bears a lot of out-of-register terminologies that do not fit their context. They are "ruffle, shape, influence, work, causes to happen 'periphery" as translation of the . respectively "محيط، يتسبب في حدوث، التعامل مع، يؤثر ، عبارة، طيف" Arabic words

#### **4.3 General Evaluation**

At this point, with every set of translation problems detected in the draft translation being discussed, it is worth to mention the overall evaluation of the two texts for each participant by the study external evaluator. She has decided to mark them out of 10 to resemble the marking system adopted in the Department of Translation as in the table below:

Table (4-7): Evaluation of the Draft Translations of the Two Texts

Participant	Literary Text	Scientific Text
1	7	8
2	4	0
3	7	7
4	8	7
5	6	7
6	7	8
7	6	7
8	5	6
9	4	4
10	5	6
11	8	8
12	6	6
13	6	7
14	6	8
16	8	6
17	6	7
18	3	0
19	7	6
21	7	8
22	6	6
23	2	4
24	3	4
25	7	8

As is showed it the Table (4-7), the performance of the student-translators is fairly approximate in each text. The type of the text did not significantly affect the quality of the TTs. The participants' competence in the literary text resembles the one traced in the scientific one. This suggests that the student-translator' command in the TL language is what determine the translation quality not the text type. Having said that, the study does not negate the slight difference in the quality of the translation of the two text type; yet, it does not find it essential or crucial in deciding the appropriateness of translation. That is, judging by the average of marks gained which are 5.8 for the literary text in comparison to 6.3 for the scientific one; the literary text has proven to be slightly harder to translate than the scientific one. Further, the trainee translators have resorted to simplify the literary composition for their inability to cope with demanding aesthetic language of the original. The challenging literary terminologies and structures are transferred in a simpler fashion due to the lack in the aesthetic repertoire on the part of the student translators. The following section illustrates the results obtained from the study questionnaire for correlating them to the draft translations to test the study hypothesis once again for more solid results.

#### 4.4 Discussion of the Results of the Questionnaire

To support approaching the study problem 'the questionnaire is composed of seven questions to reveal the student-translators' conception of the differences (if any) in the quality of the translation of each text type. Therefore, the draft translations and responses are triangulated to check whether (or not) the participants assign translation difficulty to either text type. The questions ask about L2, regarding the two texts, since the study is about the effect (if any) of text typology in inverse translation. Hence, each question is dealt with in the following table for ease of analysis:

Q No.	Q Significance	Scientific Text	Choice Rate	Literary Text	Choice Rate
		Complex	%30	Complex	%45
.1	TL grammar	Neutral	%50	Neutral	%20
		Simple	%20	Simple	%35
		Difficult	%30	Difficult	%30
.2	TL Lexis	Neutral	%50	Neutral	%50
		easy	%20	easy	%20
		Rarely	%6	Rarely	%16
.3	Cohesive devices	Sometimes	%54	Sometimes	%30
		Often	%40	Often	%54
	Translational	Rarely	%16	Rarely	%29
.4		Sometimes	%54	Sometimes	%51
	problems	often	%30	often	%20
		High	%30	High	%36
.5	Translation Aids	Neutral	%45	Neutral	%50
		Low	%25	Low	%14
	Translation	Indirect	%20	Indirect	%10
.6		Direct	%36	Direct	%22
	procedures	Both	%44	Both	%68
	Translation	Difficult	%40	Difficult	%44
.7		Neutral	%45	Neutral	%36
	process	Easy	%15	Easy	%20

**Table (4-8): Averages of Questionnaire Responses** 

- The first question is related to the complexity of TL grammar regarding the two texts. The results obtained shows that 30% of student-translators have found that the scientific text has complex structures in comparison to 45% of them who assign complexity of structures to the literary one. Although, the literary text seems to be more complex to the student-translators, the difference is not that significant.
- The level of difficulty regarding the lexis of the two texts is equal; 30% of the student-translators think that the terminology of either text is difficult. In fact, 50% of them think that the lexis of each is neutral on the scale of

difficulty. The remaining think it is easy. Again, the level of lexical difficulty is similar.

- The third question has tackled the recurrence of the cohesive and coherent devices used in the two texts in contrast. 54% of student has thought that the cohesive devices are "sometimes" needed for the scientific texts. The same percentage of the student-translators (54%) thinks that such devices are "often" needed in the literary text. The comparison between *often* for the literary and *sometimes* for the scientific suggests that the literary text seems to be more demanding for student-translators, yet the demand is not higher.
- Regarding the translation problems which the fourth question is about, 54% of the students have "sometimes" encountered these problems in the scientific text. Comparatively, 51% of them have encountered the problems more "often" in the literary text. Hence, student-translators seems to have more problems with literary than with scientific, but the difference in percentages implies approximate number of problems encountered
- The translation aids are needed more in the literary text (50%) than the scientific one (45%). Although, many students have assured the difficulty of the lexis is equal to each other in the two texts; they seem to have encountered problems that need aids other than dictionaries to overcome them.
- Both direct and indirect procedures are needed for the two texts. Anyhow, 68% of them have used a mix of structures in the literary text in contrast to 44% of them who have used such mix in the scientific text .This suggests that the literary text is linguistically more demanding in translation than the scientific one, yet the literary demand is not much higher than the scientific one.
- Finally, the overall estimation of the translation process is approximate; 44% of the student-translators think that it is more difficult to translate the literary text in comparison to 40% who consider the scientific text to be more difficult. Again, the level of difficulty encountered is slightly higher in the literary than in the scientific.

The results obtained from the questionnaire shows approximate similarity in the student- translators 'estimation of the requirements and limitations of the

two texts in-question .They have given reasonably similar answers to the questions regarding the level of difficulty of the lexis and grammar for the two texts. Further, the student-translators have used approximate cohesive and coherent devices 'translational aids, and finally translation procedures in both texts. Moreover 'translation problems are encountered in each text which has made the overall translation process as almost equally difficult. Such results prove that the trainee translators do not find that a text type is easier by itself. On the contrary, they assign unique difficulty and translational problems to each individual text type. Hence, it is not only that the translation process is not hindered by the type of the text being tackled but also the quality of translation does not depend on such type.

### 4.5 Correlating the Questionnaire Responses to the Quality of the Translations

In accordance with the study model (The Translator's Competence; PACTE, 2018), this section aims at mapping the answers to the questionnaire to the evaluation of the draft translations. The results gained of this mapping are meant to aid the study hypotheses regarding the participants' conception of the quality variance (if any) imposed by the text type on the translation process for more solid findings. However, although some participants; P · ¹P · ⁴and P · ⁵have considered the scientific text to be a little harder to translate than the literary one ' their marks prove that they manifested similar competence in translating both texts. That is, the complex structures and terminologies used in the scientific text have required them to consult the dictionary more often than in the case of the literary text. Hence, the translational problems are encountered a little more recurrently and the overall translation process is easier with the literary text. Anyhow, these participants have gained 7:8, 8:7, 6:7 marks 'respectively, for each pair of the literary vs. scientific texts (according to the external evaluator); it seems that their competence is not affected that much by the text type.

Regarding grammar, P <sup>6</sup>finds them to be more complex in the literary text than the scientific one, for s/he had to use the indirect structures to render the literary meaning .According to him/her, scientific texts are more "sensitive to be changed" when using indirect structures. Additionally, s/he sees translation problems to occur more often in the scientific than in the literary. Yet, s/he evaluates the overall translation process to be "neutral" with each having its own

obstacles. His/her marks are 7:8 for the literary vs. scientific texts. Again 'although the participant is aware of the different requirements of each text type, s/he has proved that his/her own command of the TL has the final decision of translation quality.

The two participants (14 and 21 (have considered the grammar of the scientific text to be more complex than that of the literary one. Anyhow, for P '14 the lexis is more difficult and the recurrence of the translational problems is more "often" in the scientific text. P '21 on the other hand, has regarded the lexis as "neutral" and the translation problems as occurring "sometimes" in the two texts. In general, the two participants have relegated the translation process of the scientific text as more difficult than that of the literary one. Further 'P <sup>14</sup>has adopted indirect procedures and less cohesive devices to link the information of the scientific text. P '21 on the other hand 'has gone with direct and indirect procedures in the two texts and used more cohesive devices in the scientific text to overcome its difficulty. As similar as their translation competence in the translation of the two texts, P <sup>14</sup>has gained 6:8 marks for the literary vs. the scientific one, whereas, P <sup>21</sup>has gained 7:8 marks for the two texts in-question.

Although, P <sup>22</sup>regards the grammar of the literary text as more complex, the rest of his/her answers reveal that s/he has encountered relatively similar level of difficulty. S/he has considered the level of the difficulty of lexis of the two texts to be" neutral", and the translation problems encountered are similar which has urged for similar consultation of the translational instruments. Direct procedures have been used to render the meaning of the scientific text while indirect ones have been adopted for the literary one. The estimation of the overall difficulty of the translation of the two texts is "neutral". P <sup>25</sup>has considered the grammar of the scientific text to be a little more difficult than that of the literary one. Whereas, the lexis are equally "neutral", the need for the translational instruments as "high", the translation procedures as" both" direct and indirect, and the cohesive devices used for the literary text are somewhat more than those in the scientific one. Finally, the translation process is seen as "easy" for the two texts. The marks gained for the two participants are approximate; they have showed approximate level of competence in the two text types regardless of the somewhat differences they have encountered in translating the two texts. That is, P <sup>22</sup>has gained 6 for each text, while P <sup>25</sup>has gained 7:8 marks for the literary text vs .scientific text .

P 3has found that the grammar of the literary text is simpler than those of the scientific ones 'while the level of difficulty of lexis is even. Further, s/he considered the coherent devices needed for the scientific text as more than those needed for the literary one. The translational instruments consulted are higher and the translational procedures adopted are indirect in the scientific text in comparison to the literary text. All in all, this participant sees the translation process for the two texts as neutral. The marks gained are 6:7 for the literary text vs. scientific one. Comparatively, P <sup>7</sup>has found that the literary grammar and lexis are more difficult than those in the scientific text, also, s/he has needed to consult more translational instrument to overcome this difficulty. Yet s/he has considered the recurrence of the translation problems in the literary text as "sometimes", and concluded that both direct and indirect procedures are adopted for the two texts. At the end, s/he regarded the translation process for both texts as "easy". These responses to are contrasted to his performance in translation; the scientific text has gained 6:7 for the literary vs. scientific text. Hence, the difference in the translation performance is not that significant.

P • <sup>19</sup> on the other hand has stated that the difference in the requirements and limitations of the translation process of the two text types. S/he has considered the lexis and the translational instruments of the literary text as more demanding than those of the scientific one. Anyhow, s/he has seen that the grammar and the recurrence of translational problems are similar in either text type. The cohesive devices are more required in the scientific text than in the literary one, according to this participant. Additionally, the participant has also stated the difference in the translational procedures adopted; the literary text has needed both direct and indirect procedures in comparison to the scientific one which has been translated with only direct procedures. Finally the overall translation process is seen as difficult for both texts. Interestingly however, such repertoire about the translation of the two texts has led to a significant difference in the translation performance of the two participants .For P • <sup>19</sup>he has gained 6:7 marks for the literary vs. the scientific text .

P <sup>9</sup>has clearly stated that the translation process for the two texts is very difficult. As this participant has struggled with many of the specialized lexis, he, also 'considered the grammar as difficult. Further, the cohesive devices are often needed in the literary text more than the scientific one, yet, a mix of procedures is adopted in each, and the translation aids are consulted equally .The marks gained

for each of the two texts are 9. His/her marks prove that s/he is aware of what it takes to translate each text type; his/her competence in the TL has made him/her overcome the encountered difficulty successfully. P <sup>23</sup>has, also, regarded the translation process of the two texts as equally difficult. Yet, s/he has assigned more difficulty and challenge in the literary text than the scientific one. This challenge relates to the grammar, lexis, the coherent devices used, translation aids, and the translation procedures adopted .The marks gained, by this participant, are 4 for both texts. P <sup>24</sup>has, also, regarded the literary text to be more problematic in terms of grammar 'lexis, as wells as the translational aids and procedures. The marks gained, by this participant, are 3:4 for the literary vs. the scientific text. Although 'these participants attribute more difficulty to one type of a text over the other, they have gained fairly similar marks .Therefore, the level of difficulty encountered evidently relates to the translator's own command of the TL not the specialization of the text.

P <sup>13</sup>has showed sensitivity to the text type; that is, the grammar, lexis, cohesive devices, and finally the translation procedures are more demanding in the literary text than in the scientific one. Also, s/he has encountered more translational problems in the literary text than in the scientific one. Anyhow, s/he considers the translation process as equally difficult. This participant has gained 6:7 marks for the literary vs. the scientific text. P <sup>16</sup>has, also, showed a sensitive reaction towards each text type; s/he has stated the difficulty of the grammar of the literary text. Yet, this participant has chosen more coherent devices for the scientific text and has dealt with more translational problems in terms of specialized lexis. Further, the translation instruments are more used in the literary text than in the scientific one, and the two texts have required direct translational procedures. Finally, the overall translation process is estimated as more difficult in the literary text vs. the scientific one. The participant has received 8:6 marks for the literary vs. scientific text .Hence, even though s/he has seen that the scientific text is easier to be handled his performance is hindered by the linguistic mistakes which play an essential role in the quality of translation. Henceforth, the findings gained from the two tools stand in solidarity with each other.

#### 5. Conclusion

The study has concluded that there is no major quality difference in the translation of literary texts in comparison to scientific ones. Although higher in the literary text, fairly close number of mistakes are committed and approximate

efforts are exerted by the student-translators in the two texts because of the unique challenge that is faced in each translation process. Special lexis, syntax • cohesive devices, and translation procedures are attached to each text and need to be dealt with accordingly. The excellence of the translation performance is confined to the linguistic abilities; the student-translators' own command of the TL conventions. Regardless of the type, knowing how to compose a well-formed sentence with proper terminologies and structures that carry the meaning plays a pivotal role in the quality of the TT. If a student-translator is unable to produce a grammatically correct sentence, then it is not very important from which type of text he is translating. Such findings side by those of Pavlovic (2017); both text types bear similar complexity, need special skills to overcome the problems faced, and have their own restrictions in translation .Nevertheless, the study does not negate the necessity of the textual sensitivity. Being acquainted with the various types of the texts to be translated summons the requirements of the translation process, brings about the suggested proper method/s of translation, and enhances the quality of the TT. Still, it does not attribute it as conclusive as the linguistic competence in the quality of the TT.

#### 6. Recommendation

The study recommends that future studies can address the translation quality between another pair of text types. This can enrich the teaching methods of translation and provide student-translators with resourceful tools to deal with every type of text properly. In fact, the abundance of translation studies that addresses the requirements and limitations encountered in the translation of various text types can bring about new insights in teaching trainee-translators how to deal with the specification of each text alone. This would result, hopefully, in resourceful translators that handle various texts with appropriate problem-solving skills and translation solutions .

#### **References:**

Alves, Fabio, ed. (2003). (*Triangulating Translation*). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Aoudi, A. (2008). A learner's Scientific & Technical Dictionary of Current English. Lebanon: Al-Mouassassa Al-Haditha Lil-Kitab.

Baachaoui, M. (2014 .(Translation into L2: the Unachievable Perfection. Journal of Arab World English Journal. (3) 147-154 .

Baalabaki, R. (2010 .(Al-Mawrid: a Modern Arabic-English Dictionary. Lebanon: Dar El-Elim Lilmalayin.

Baker, Mona. (1992). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London: Routledge.

Buchweitz, A & . Alves, F. (2006). Cognitive Adaptation in Translation: An Interface between Language Direction, Time and Recursiveness in Target Text Production. *Letras de Hoje*.272–241 (2)41

Campbell, S. (1998. (Translation into the Second Language. London: Longman.

Chriss, R. (2006. (Translation as a Profession. Raleigh, NC: Lulu Press Inc.

Dollerup, C. (2000 .(English: Axes for a Target Language. In Grosman, M., Kadric, M., Kovacic, I .and Snell-Hornby, M. (eds (.*Translation into non-mother tongues: Professional Practice and Training*) .pp. 61-70 .(Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.

Ferreira, A. (2014 .(Analyzing Recursiveness Patterns and Retrospective Protocols of Professional Translators in L1 and L2 Translation Tasks .*Translation and Interpreting Studies* .Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. 9 (1), 109-127

Fonseca, N. (2015 (Directionality in Translation: Investigating Prototypical Patterns in Editing Procedures. Journal of *Translation & Interpreting* 122-111 (1) 7.

Gorton, A. (2012). "B "Language Interpreting: The interpreter's perspective 'FORUM' .88–61 (2) 10

Harris, B. (1989). Norms in interpretation . *Target 2* .119-115 (1) http://doi:10.1075/target.2.1.08har

Hatim, B. (2001). Teaching and Researching Translation. Essex: Pearson Education .

Jakobsen, A. L. (2003). (Effects of Think aloud on Translation Speed, Revision and Segmentation. In F. Alves (Ed. (.*Triangulating Translation: Perspectives in Process Oriented Research*) pp. 69–95). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kosciuczuk, T. (2016). L2 Translation :to Teach or to Discourage? Journal of Translator Education and Translator Studies, 1 (1), 4-22 .

Levy, J. (2011). The Art of Translation. Transl. Patrick Corness. Amsterdam: John Benjamins .

Liashuk, X. (2018. (Translation and Communicative Competence in Foreign Language Education. In Danek, J., M. Sirotová, A. Lobotková and V. Michvocíková (eds 5. (.th International Conference on Language, Literature and Culture in Education) pp. 59-78). Nümbrecht: Kirsch-Verlag.

Licko, R. (2014 .(*Translation into English as a Foreign Language. A Slovak Survey* . Banská Bystrica: Belianum.

Marmariduo, S. (1996). (Directionality on translation processes and practice. Target. 8 (1), 49-73.

Mracek, D. (2019). The Role(s) of Native Speakers in L2 Translation. Journal of Studiez Aplikovanie Lingvistiky. 7-25.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337026136\_The\_Roles\_of\_Native\_Speakers\_in\_L2\_Translation#fullTextFileContent

Mracek, D. (2018). Inverse Translation: The More Challenging Direction. Linguistica Pragensia, 28 (2 .221–202 (

Newmark, P. (1988 .(A Textbook of Translation .London: Prentice Hall.

PACTE. (2003). Building a Translation Competence Model. In Alves, F, (ed (. *Triangulation Translation :Perspective in Process Oriented Research*) 'pp. 43-66). Amsterdam. John Benjamin's.

PACTE. (2008). "First Results of a Translation Competence Experiment: Knowledge of Translation and Efficacy of the Translation Process." In *Translator and Interpreter Training*. *Issues, Methods and Debates*. J. Kearns (ed), 104-126. London: Continuum.

PACTE. (2011 .(Acceptability. In: Hurtado Albir, A. (ed (*Researching Translation Competence by PACTE Group*) .pp. 119-130). Amsterdam: John Benjamins .

PACTE. (2018). Results of PACTE Group's Experimental Research on Translation Competence Acquisition. The Acquisition of the Instrumental Sub-Competence Across Languages and Cultures 51-19 (1)19 (1)19 (1)19

https://akademiai.com/doi/abs/10.1556/084.2018.19.1.2

Pavlović, N .(2007) .Directionality in translation and interpreting practice :Report on a questionnaire survey in Croatia .Forum .99–79 ·(2) 5 <a href="https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292951332\_Directionality\_in\_Translation\_and\_Interpreting\_Practice\_Report\_on\_a\_questionnaire\_survey\_in\_Croatia">https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292951332\_Directionality\_in\_Translation\_and\_Interpreting\_Practice\_Report\_on\_a\_questionnaire\_survey\_in\_Croatia</a>

Pavlovic, T. (2013 .(Exploring Directionality in Translation Studies .*Journal of Original Scientific Article* 165-149 (2) 1

Pokorn, N. (2005 .(Challenging the Traditional Axioms. Translation into a Non-Mother Tongue .Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Reiss, K. (1989). Text Type, Translation Types and Translation Assessment. In Chesterman 'A. (ed (.*Readings in Translation Theory*).pp. 105-115). Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.

Saladanha 'G., O'Brien, S. (2013). Research Methodologies in Translation Studies . Manchester, St Jerome.

Shuttleworth, M., Cowie 'M. (1997). Dictionary of Translation Studies. London & New York: Routledge: Tylor & Francis Group.

Snell-Hornby, M. (2000' .(McLanguage': The identity of English as an issue in translation today. In M .Grosman, M. Kadric, I. Kovacic & M. Snell-Hornby (Eds (. *Translation into Non Mother Tongues: In Professional Practice and Training*) pp. 35–44 .(Tubingen: Stauffenburg

Vigier- Moreno, F. (2019). (Corpus-assisted Translation of Specialised Texts into the L2 from the Classroom to Professional Practice. Trans.kom, 12 (1), 90-106. http://www.trans-kom.eu/bd12nr01/trans-kom 12 01 07 Vigier L2.20190816.pdf

Whyatt, B. (2018). Old Habits Die Hard: Towards Understanding L2 Translation . Między Oryginałem a Przekładem .112–89 (41)24 (http://dx.doi.org/10.12797/MOaP.24.2018.41.05

Whayatt, B. (2019). In Search of Directionality Effects in the Translation Process and in the End Product .*Translation, Cognition & Behavior* .100–79 (1) 2 (https://doi.org/10.1075/tcb.00020.why

### **Appendices**

A. Dear participant .... translate the following text into L2

### النجار القاسي1-

يحكى أنّ نجّارًا كان يعيش مع زوجته وابنه الصغير و والده العجوز الطاعن في السنّ. لم يكُن النجار يحسنُ معاملة والده على الإطلاق، فقد كان يقدّم له الطعام في إناء زجاجي قذر، ولم يكن ذلك الطعام بالكافي الذي يسدّ جوع العجوز المسكين. كذلك كان يُسيءُ إليه بالتوبيخ والصراخ كلّما أتيحت له الفرصة لذلك، والعجوز صامت منكسر لا ينبس ببنت شفة. أمّا ابن النجار فقد كان طفلاً طببًا يحبّ جدّه كثيرًا ويحترمه و يشعر بالغضب والضيق من تصرّفات والده. في أحد الأيام و اثناء تناول طعام الغداء، وقع إناء الطعام من بين يدي العجوز دون قصد وتحطّم إلى قطع صغيرة. فاستشاط الابن غضبًا حتى احمر وجهه، وانهال على والده المسكين بوابل من الشتائم المؤذية الجارحة. مزقت كلمات الابن قلب والده العجوز دون أن يكون له حيلة في الدفاع عن نفسه. حزن الحفيد لما كان يحدثُ أمامه، لكنه هو الآخر كان ضعيفًا لا يسعُه الوقوف في وجه والده. في اليوم التالي، صنع الطفل إناءً خشبياً و قال لوالده: "عندما تكبر وتتقدّم في السن مثل جدّي، ستحتاج إلى إناء طعام خاصّ بك. فالأوعية الزجاجية تنكسر بسرعة، وقد أضطر حينها لنوبيخك بقسوة." عند هذه الكلمات، أجهش الأب بالبكاء؛ لقد أدرك خطأه أخيرًا. فقرّر التكفير عن أخطائه لومذ ذلك اليوم حرص على أن يُحسن لأبيه العجوز ويقوم على رعايته كما يجب.

### مرض التوحد2-

اضطراب طيف التوحد عبارة عن حالة ترتبط بنمو الدماغ وتؤثر على كيفية تمييز الشخص للآخرين والتعامل معهم على المستوى الاجتماعي، مما يتسبب في حدوث مشكلات في التفاعل والتواصل مع المحيط. كما يتضمن الاضطراب تكرار السلوكيات للمصاب. يُشير مصطلح "الطيف" في عبارة "اضطراب طيف التوحد" إلى مجموعة كبيرة من الأعراض متباينة الشدة. يبدأ اضطراب طيف التوحد في مرحلة الطفولة المبكرة ويتسبب في حدوث مشكلات على مستوى الأداء الاجتماعي في المدرسة والعمل، على سبيل المثال. غالبًا ما تظهر أعراض التوحد على الأطفال في غضون السنة الأولى. و بعضهم يبدأون فيها بالنمو بصورة طبيعية ثم يمرون بفترة من الارتداد بين الشهرين الثامن عشر والرابع والعشرين من العمر عندما تظهر عليهم أعراض التوحد.

#### B. Questionnaire

Dear participant...

Kindly, respond to the questions below regarding each text-type by ticking the boxes with the preferable choice and elaborate when needed.

#### 1- You consider the grammar of TL texts as ...

Scientific Text		Literary Text		Comment
Scale of rating	Tick	Scale of rating	Tick	Comment
Complex		Complex		
Neutral		Neutral		
Simple		Simple		

#### 2- You consider the lexis of TL texts as ...

Scientific Text		Literary Text		Comment
Scale of rating	Tick	Scale of rating	Tick	Comment
Difficult		Difficult		
Neutral		Neutral		
Easy		Easy		

### 3- You consider that the cohesive and coherent devices, added to the TL texts, are needed....

Scientific To	Scientific Text		ext	Comment
Scale of rating	Tick	Scale of rating	Tick	Comment
Rarely		Rarely		
Sometimes		Sometimes		
Often		Often		

### 4- The recurrence of the translational problems in each text is...

Scientific Text		Literary Text		Comment
Scale of rating	Tick	Scale of rating	Tick	Comment
Rarely		Rarely		
Sometimes		Sometimes		
Often		Often		

#### 5- The need to consult translational instruments in each text is...

Scientific Text Literary T		ext	Comment	
Scale of rating	Tick	Scale of rating	Tick	Comment
High		High		
Neutral		Neutral		
Low		Low		

### 6- The translation procedures you have adopted in each text are...

Scientific To	ext	Literary Text		Comment
Scale of rating	Tick	Scale of rating	Tick	Comment
Indirect		Indirect		
Direct		Direct		
Both		Both		

### 7- You evaluate the overall translation process in each text as ...

Scientific T	ext	Literary Text		Comment		
Scale of rating	Tick	Scale of rating	Tick	Comment		
Difficult		Difficult				
Neutral		Neutral				
Easy		Easy				

Thank you for your time!

Name of the researcher: Nada Dheyaa Lazim