

AMIN KARIMNIA¹, MAHSA MAHJUBI²

¹ Islamic Azad University, Fasa Branch, Iran

² Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Fars, Iran

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES AND QUALITY OF TRANSLATION: A PERSONALITY-BASED PERSPECTIVE

The current study was targeted at investigating the relationship between translation students' personality types and the quality of their English-to-Persian translations with respect to different text types. To this aim, 35 undergraduate senior students of translation were randomly sampled. To obtain some demographic information about the participants, the researchers used a background questionnaire. The participants were given three different text types for the translation task. An advertisement, a scientific text and a narrative text were chosen to serve Reiss' text typology (1971) including operative, informative and expressive texts, respectively. The students were also provided with retrospective questionnaires to shed light on their performance in the act of translating. Subsequently, once the participants' personality types were determined via the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) anchored in Jung's psychological theory, their dominant mental functions involving intuition, sensation, feeling and thinking were identified. To analyze the data, the One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedure and post-hoc analysis were employed. The results of the study indicated that the only dichotomy showing a significant difference was that of intuition versus sensation. Simply put, the intuitors outperformed their sensor counterparts in the translation of the expressive text. Taking into account the findings of the current study, the researchers suggest some pedagogical guidelines too.

Key words: translation, teaching, text types, personality, Jungian psychology, MBTI

Introduction

Taking into account the interdisciplinary nature of Translation Studies, Munday (2004) mentions two fields of study, *psychology* and *cognitive sciences*, as playing an important role in the study of translation. Wilss' (1998) definition of translation also confirms this. He defines translation as a *psycholinguistic* formulation process through which the translator reproduces a source language message in a target

language. To put it briefly, the process of translating involves psycholinguistic factors. The psycholinguistic analysis of translation by several scholars also supports the interdependency of translation and psychology (Hai, 2009; Hatzidaki, 2007; Lorscher, 1996; Maier, 2009; Malakoff & Hakuta, 1999; Zasyekin, 2009). The link between Translation Studies and the field of psychology has become more significant in recent years.

Personality, an issue explored by psychology, manifests itself in almost every area of life. When we talk about someone's personality, we mean what makes that person different from other people. This aspect of personality is called *individual differences* (Boeree, 2006).

Translation Studies has focused on determining the differences between translators in the translation process (Iida, 2008). From a general perspective, the translation process varies due to the individual differences of the translators (Coba, 2007). In other words, each translator has his or her own individual traits that uniquely affect his or her behavior in the act of translating. When translators translate the same source text from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL), their produced translations differ from one another.

There is general consensus among translation researchers, educators and practitioners that the decision-making process also plays a salient role in translators' performance and the quality of their translation (Darwish, 1999). Doubtlessly, the decision-making process is, in turn, influenced by the behavior, attitude, psychological disposition (Schmidt, 2005), cognitive, emotional (Hansen, 2005) and individual characteristics (Coba, 2007; Hubscher-Davidson, 2007; Wilss, 1998) of translators.

In addition, the participation of human beings as translators being involved, the person variable in this process is inevitable (Daisy, 2009). All translators are individuals in their own right whose behavior patterns are not identical (Hubscher-Davidson, 2007). That is why it is legitimate to say that *translators' personalities* and attitudes have an impact on their work. In fact, their personality guides the process of translation. In other words, translators' personalities play a salient role in translating. It is the translators' individual traits which are responsible for different behavior of translators and hence their success or failure in the translation process.

To put it simply, certain personalities are more at ease when translating specific texts. Therefore, to understand fully what translators do in the task of translation, it is necessary to study their personalities (Barboni as cited in Hubscher-Davidson, 2009).

Personality

There is still no clear and satisfactory definition for the elusive term 'personality'. Although it is not easy to define personality, this term has been defined in different ways. Kline (as cited in Hubscher-Davidson, 2007) defined personality as an individual's trait determining all behavior. In other words, personality refers to the complex of all the behavioral, temperamental, emotional and mental activities that characterizes a certain individual.

Jungian Psychology

The concept of type emerged due to the work of Swiss psychologist Carl Jung and two American women, Briggs and Myers. Jung as a psychologist states that an individual's behavior seems unpredictable. However, it can be anticipated through realizing one's underlying mental functions and attitudes (Tiger & Barron-Tiger as cited in Wilz, 2000). Jung's theory of personality focuses on how people gather information about the world (perception), how they conclude about what they have perceived (judgment) and what their sources of energy are (attitude or orientation). He categorized individual differences in terms of functions and attitudes (Wicklein & Rojewski, 1995).

Jung's psychological General Attitude Types

Jung divided the sources of energy into two basic types: introversion (I) and extraversion (E) (Chapman, 2010). These two orientations are called attitudes. Both attitudes, extraversion and introversion, are present in every person but in different degrees (Chapman, 2010).

Jung's Psychological Functional Types

In addition to these two opposite orientations of energy, Jung also developed a framework of four functional types. Jung's four mental functions include: Thinking (T) versus feeling (F) as well as sensation (S) versus intuition (N) (Chapman, 2010). All people have these four psychological functions (Bickard, Blunter et al., 2008).

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

Myers and Briggs developed Jung's theories into a usable methodology and system for understanding and assessing people's personality. They added another dichotomy, namely judging (J) and perceiving (P) to Jung's three-dimensional psychological types and proposed a personality inventory called MBTI (Chapman, 2010). This instrument includes four dichotomous dimensions which classify individuals either as extraverted or introverted, sensing or intuitive, thinking or feeling and judging or perceiving (Boyle, 1995).

The primary feature of the MBTI is that each person's personality fits into one of sixteen types, namely ISTJ, ISFJ, INFJ, INTJ, ISTP, ISFP, INFP, INTP, ESTP, ESFP, ENFP, ENTP, ESTJ, ESFJ, ENFJ, and ENTJ. Every individual's personality is described in terms of a four-letter code (Boyle 1995).

All in all, the MBTI is based on four basic aspects of human personality (Wilz, 2000). These dimensions are as follows:

Extraversion (E)-----	Introversion (I)
Sensing (S)-----	Intuitive (N)
Thinking (T)-----	Feeling (F)
Judging (J)-----	Perceiving (P)

Extraverts versus Introverts

The extravert – introvert dimension determines how people gain their energy (Harrington and Loffredo, 2009). A wide spectrum of extraverts' relationships relates to social communication (Harrington & Loffredo, 2009). They are described as expressive, sociable, outgoing, talkative and initiators of conversations. On the other hand, introverts find the source of their energy in the inner world of ideas and concepts. They prefer to be reserved and limit their social activities to small numbers of relationships.

Sensors versus Intuitors

The sensing – intuition category refers to individuals' information gathering (Harrington & Loffredo, 2009). Sensing types have a preference for gathering information through their five senses. They pay attention to what is real, concrete and practical. They dislike new problems unless their prior experience helps them solve the problem. By comparison, intuitors prefer to take in information through their intuition or hunches. These individuals like solving problems and they have innovative thoughts. They rely on their inspiration and imagination (Wankat & Oreovicz, 1993).

Thinkers versus Feelers

The thinking – feeling dichotomy is responsible for the decision-making process. Thinkers tend to be analytical and objective when making decisions while feelers base their decisions on interpersonal factors (Harrington & Loffredo, 2009). The former can be described as logical, critical, cool-headed and organized, whereas the latter as empathetic, appreciative and agreeable.

Judgers versus Perceivers

The judging – perceiving dimension describes how people live. Judgers tend to live in a planned and decisive way. By contrast, perceivers enjoy living in a flexible and spontaneous way (Felder et al., 2000). A judging individual tries to finish his or her task in advance, before the specified deadline. Meanwhile, a perceiving person pays less attention to the deadline (Ahmed & Capretz, 2010).

Hierarchy of Functions

Each personality type has a hierarchy of functions. This hierarchy ranks the functions, sensing, intuition, feeling and thinking, from the strongest to the weakest. In this regard, Jung classified functions into four groups: dominant, auxiliary, tertiary and inferior (Butt, 2009).

The Dominant Function

Everyone has a favorite function which is developed to a greater degree in comparison to the other three. This function having the most significant role in

guiding individuals is called the dominant function (Lawrence & Martin, 2001). One of the four letters presenting individuals' personality type is viewed as the dominant factor. To put it briefly, the primary or dominant function is the function which individuals prefer to use (Fudjack & Dinkelaker, 1995).

Keirse as cited in Marrapodi (2004) presents the classification of personality types with regard to the dominant mental functions proposed by Myers as follows:

Dominant Intuitive Types: INFJ, INTJ, ENFP, ENTP

Dominant Sensing Types: ISFJ, ISTJ, ESFP, ESTP

Dominant Thinking Types: ISTP, INTP, ESTJ, ENTJ

Dominant Feeling Types: ISFP, INFP, ESFJ, ENFJ

The Auxiliary Function

The second function is specified as the auxiliary function. It is called auxiliary since it is the second function in the order of preference (Fudjack & Dinkelaker, 1995). The dominant function is balanced by this function which is also called the supporting function (Chapman, 2010).

The Tertiary Function

The opposite function to the auxiliary is called the tertiary function. It usually develops in adulthood. Besides, it is not as important as the dominant and the auxiliary functions in conscious mental activities (Hirsh & Kise as cited in Wilz, 2000).

The Inferior Function

Wilz (2000) argued that Tiger and Barron-Tiger consider the inferior function as the opposite of the dominant one. The dominant function is the most powerful preference in one's personality type, so the opposite of this preference should be the weakest. Like the tertiary function, this function does not attract its owner's attention (Fudjack & Dinkelake, 1995).

Personality and Translation Studies

Among a number of scholars from the field of Translation Studies, as Hubscher-Davidson (2009) declared, it is Reiss (1971) who is considered to be the forerunner in the analysis of translators' personalities. In order to understand and measure translators' personality traits, she adopted the concept of characterology whose aim is to distinguish various types of human characters. On the basis of Spranger's typology presenting the six forms of personality as the theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, aggressive and religious, Reiss (1971) asserted that the theoretical type would be good in translating technical and philosophical texts. On the other hand, such a person would feel frustrated in translating creative and literary works like poetry because his or her theoretical character prevents him or her from producing artistic works. She considered the aggressive type to be a person

who is not capable of being a translator. In contrast, she described the aesthetic type as the best translator.

Another piece of research was conducted by Kussmaul (as cited in Hubscher-Davidson, 2007), in which he employed the method of think aloud protocols (TAP) to show that studying translators' behaviors in this way reveals the impact of different personalities on the translated works. He came to the conclusion that those translators who lacked creativity in their personality produced less creative works. Above all, his research backed up the link between personality and the translating process.

Bearing the issue of personality in mind, Savory (as cited in El-Haddad, 1999) declared that there is a relationship between the quality of translation, personality types of translators and authors and even those of the readers. He believed that translators will come up with the most satisfying translations provided that their personalities are in tune with those of the authors and target recipients.

By the same token, Fraser (1996) examined the effect of confidence on translation. She declared that the personality profile of translators could be helpful in exploring their behavior. It is overambitious to conclude about the translated works of translators without considering their personality outline which should be attached to their protocols.

On the whole, current research on personality and Translation Studies is rather limited compared with other trends and concerns in this field (Daisy, 2009). Furthermore, the existing literature on this issue does not provide us with consistent and fruitful results. That is why the main concern of the present study is to investigate the relationship between translation students' personalities and the quality of their English-to-Persian translations in terms of different text types.

Methodology

Materials

The researchers of the present study opted to conduct this research with respect to Reiss' (1971) text typology involving operative, informative and expressive texts. Therefore, an advertisement, a scientific text and a narrative text were chosen to serve the aforementioned text types respectively. Three short paragraphs, each of which has a different function, i.e. either appellative, informative or expressive, were extracted from the following books:

1. The advertisement was selected from *Reader's Digest*, the world's most widely read magazine, written by Wallance and Wallace (1994).
2. The book *English for Computer Science* by P. Charles Brown and Norma D. Mullen (2005) provided the researchers with the scientific text.
3. *The Alchemist* by Paulo Coelho (2002) was chosen as the narrative book.

The extracted paragraphs were translated from English into Persian by the participants.

Participants

To examine the effect of the translation students' personality type on the quality of their English-to-Persian translations, a total of 35 (10 male and 25 female) students of translation were randomly chosen for this study. The participants were undergraduate students majoring in English translation at Fasa Islamic Azad University, Iran. They were senior students whose age ranged from 22 to 39 years old.

Instruments

In order to achieve the purpose of the current research, some instruments were adopted for data collection. They are as follows:

Firstly, the researchers used a background questionnaire to gain some demographic information about the participants. It contained 11 questions ranging from personal to educational ones like age, gender, years of translating experience and so on (see Appendix A).

In addition, a retrospective questionnaire about the translated texts was also developed. This questionnaire aimed to shed light on a number of aspects of the students' performance, including translation difficulties, their opinions on enjoyment of the translation and the like. To this aim, the researchers used the questionnaire designed by Orozco and Albir (2002). The questionnaire was modified to a great extent to make it suitable for the purpose of the present study. The researchers decided to use the aforementioned questionnaires to be aware of other factors that might influence the process of translation in general and the quality of translation in particular.

Above all, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), a personality test extrapolated from Jung's type theory, was applied to determine the personality type of each participant. The MBTI contained 72 yes/no questions that attempted to identify preferences for extraversion or introversion, intuition or sensing, feeling or thinking and perceiving or judging. This personality test was downloaded from the website www.humanmetrics.com.

Data Analysis Procedures

This investigation examined the effect of translation students' personality types on the quality of their translations from English into Persian with regard to different text types. In the first step, after a short warm-up presented by the researchers, the background questionnaire was administered to the students (see Appendix A). This questionnaire aimed to provide the researchers with some necessary demographic information about the participants, such as their age, gender, years of translating experience and so forth. In order to motivate the students to answer the questions more accurately, the instructor promised to add 1 point as a bonus to their final exams.

In the second step, the researchers distributed three different English source texts among the participants for the task of English-to-Persian translation (see

Appendix B). The texts differed from one another in terms of function, including expressive, informative and appellative. The participants were also provided with a glossary in which some difficult words of the source texts were translated into Persian. They were asked to choose the best equivalent with respect to the function of the texts. Subsequently, they were given two pieces of paper, one for the draft and the other for the fair copy. The allocated time for translating the paragraphs was 75 minutes. The time had been determined through a pilot study carried out by the researchers at the beginning of the study.

Having finished the task of translating, the students were administered the retrospective questionnaire through which they shed light on some aspects of their performance, including translation difficulties, their opinions on enjoyment of the translation and the like (see Appendix C). The researchers distributed the questionnaire very quickly after the translation task so that the participants answered the questions when they were fresh. To save time, the participants were given the option to answer the questions using either Persian or English.

In the next step, the participants were asked to fill in the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), a yes/no question personality test, retrieved from the website www.humanmetrics.com. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, the researchers had attached a list of English-to-Persian translated words existing in the personality test to the MBTI inventory. However, due to the lack of time, the researchers had to translate the questions one by one orally and the students answered them simultaneously.

The result was tallied electronically. Thus, the researchers got the hosting website to analyze the responses of each individual's personality test. In order to be sure about the result of the students' personality types, the researchers did this step twice. A total number of 10 different personality types were represented on the basis of the website analysis. They included INFJ, INTJ, ENFP, ESTP, ISTJ, ENFJ, ESFJ, ISFP, ENTJ, and ESTJ. Once the participants' personality types were identified through the site, their dominant mental functions were determined. To do so, the researchers used the first taxonomy of dominant mental function proposed by Myers-Briggs educator Danielle Poirier (see Appendix E). To confirm the result, the researchers also used the personality hierarchy chart used by Wilz (2000) in his study. This chart illustrates the personality hierarchy of the 16 different personality types (see Appendix F). Overall, on the basis of the determined personality types, four groups were specified, namely intuitors, sensors, feelers and thinkers, to see the effect of their personality types on the quality of their translations.

The target texts produced by the students were the key elements to understand the correlation between personality traits and the quality of translation. Hence, all of the translated texts were sent for assessment. In order to avoid any bias that could affect the outcome of the study and to come up with a more accurate result in the process of translation quality assessment (TQA), three instructors of translation were selected. They were asked to evaluate the translations and score them. Before the translation papers were given to the instructors, a marking sheet (Hubscher-

Davidson, 2009) was attached to each translation paper (see Appendix G). The marking sheet was modified slightly by the researchers to make it suitable for the purpose of assessing the three text types. It contained criteria such as vocabulary, grammar, coherence and so forth based on which the evaluators evaluated each translation. They were asked to consider only those criteria that could be applied to the texts for the process of assessment. The sheet also showed the evaluators how to give scores to the students' work. The researchers employed the UK higher education percentage system where a mark below 40% is a fail, 50-59% and 60-69% are considered lower second-class and upper second-class marks respectively, and 70% and above represents first-class work. Moreover, some space was left at the bottom of the marking sheets for the evaluators' comments on the translations.

Multivariate methods were applied in this study. In the first step, the frequency of the students' personality types was presented. To see whether significant differences existed between the students' translation quality with respect to their personality types, the researchers employed the one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedure. This procedure was repeated three times due to the existence of three text types.

"As multiple comparisons increase the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis and committing type I error, the Bonferroni adjustment was used" (Yamini & Rahimi 2007, p. 99). Therefore, the researchers divided the level of significance by the number of comparisons. Thus, a new level of significance was found that is $0.05/3 = 0.017$. Subsequently, post-hoc analysis including the Tukey test was run to find the differences, if any, among the students in terms of text types.

Results

Researchers in second or foreign language research can employ various methods to collect data. Triangulation helps researchers explore the issues from all feasible perspectives (Mackey & Gass, 2005). The present study utilized multiple methods including the use of background and retrospective questionnaires to elicit necessary data. On the basis of the students' responses, the following points were extracted.

1. All the participants started the task of translating upon their arrival at the university.
2. The participants neither work in any translation centers nor translate any special books.
3. A good number of the students believe that they can produce a better translation in group rather than in isolation.
4. The majority of them ($P = 71.42\%$) are interested in translating literary texts; however, they have mainly translated non-literary texts in comparison to other genres.
5. Quite a few of the students are not satisfied with their major although they had loved it before their admission to university.

Table 1. Type distribution of the respondents

Group	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>
Intuitors	9	25.7
Sensors	7	20.0
Thinkers	11	31.4
Feelers	8	22.9
Total	35	100

Some useful information was also obtained via the retrospective questionnaire, as follows:

1. The participants were not at ease in translating the appellative function text.
2. The majority of them preferred to translate the narrative text.
3. Quite a few of them enjoyed translating the informative text.
4. A number of respondents said that decoding was easy. However, the difficult step for them in the process of translating was encoding. In other words, they had no problems with comprehending the texts, but changing ST into TT was an arduous task for them.
5. They paid attention mainly to the linguistic aspect of the texts rather than their contextual dimensions.

The first objective of this study was to determine the effect of translation students’ personality types on the quality of their translations. Therefore, the students’ dominant mental functions were specified. As shown in Table 1, four dominant traits were determined, including *intuitive*, *sensing*, *feeling* and *thinking* types. Within the group of respondents, intuitors and thinkers outnumbered their sensor and feeler counterparts respectively. Moreover, thinkers were over-represented while sensors were under-represented in this research. Table 1 illustrates the frequency and percentage of each type within the group.

Table 2. Analysis of variance for the operative text

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>p</i>
Corrected model	170.51	3	56.83	1.77	0.172
Intercept	121574.34	1	121574.34	3.79	0.000
Group	170.51	3	56.83	1.77	0.172
Error	992.58	31	32.01		
Total	126025.67	35			
Corrected total	1163.09	34			

Note: Due to the existence of non-significance differences, the post-hoc test was omitted

Table 3. Analysis of variance for the informative text

Source	SS	<i>df</i>	MS	<i>f</i>	<i>p</i>
Corrected model	99.85	3	33.28	1.70	0.187
Intercept	142088.90	1	142088.90	7.27	0.000
Group	99.85	3	33.28	1.70	0.187
Error	605.74	31	19.54		
Total	146982.04	35			
Corrected total	705.59	34			

Note: Due to the existence of non-significant differences, the post-hoc test was omitted

To see whether significant differences existed between the students' translation quality with regard to their personality types, the researchers applied the one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedure. Subsequently, post-hoc analysis including the Tukey test was used to find the differences, if any, among the students in terms of text types. As shown in Table 2 and Table 3, there are no significant differences between the sensors over the intuitors and the feelers over the thinkers with respect to their translations of the operative and informative texts.

Unlike Table 3 which shows no significant relationship, Table 4 highlights a significant difference. The results as portrayed in Table 4 reveal a significant difference between the intuitors and the sensors regarding the expressive text. The mean difference of the intuitors and their sensing counterparts is 8.12 and -8.12 respectively. Simply put, participants with an intuitive preference outperformed their counterparts in the translation of the literary genre. The correlation existed at the 0.017 significance value between the intuitive-sensing personality dimension and the quality of translation.

Overall, the findings of the present study did not reveal any significant relationship to distinguish the thinkers from the feelers. The only dichotomy manifesting

Table 4. Analysis of variance for the expressive text

Source	SS	<i>df</i>	MS	<i>f</i>	<i>p</i>
Corrected model	272.81	3	90.93	3.91	0.018
Intercept	148003.15	1	148003.15	6.36	0.000
Group	272.81	3	90.93	3.91	0.018
Error	720.48	31	23.24		
Total	154099.46	35			
Corrected total	993.29	34			

Table 5. Post-hoc test for the expressive text

Group	Group	Mean difference	SE	<i>p</i>
Intuitior	Sensor	8.12*	2.42	0.011
	Thinker	4.65	2.16	0.160
	Feeler	4.91	2.34	0.175
Sensor	Intuitior	-8.12*	2.42	0.011
	Thinker	-3.46	2.33	0.458
	Feeler	-3.20	2.49	0.580
Thinker	Intuitior	-4.65	2.16	0.160
	Sensor	3.46	2.33	0.458
	Feeler	0.26	2.24	0.999
Feeler	Intuitior	-4.91	2.34	0.175
	Sensor	3.20	2.49	0.580
	Thinker	-0.26	2.24	0.999

Note: * = $p < 0.017$, 98.3% confidence interval

a significant difference was that of the intuitors versus the sensors. In a nutshell, the results highlighted the impact of personality preferences on the quality of work and the null hypothesis of the study was rejected in favor of intuitive over sensing dimension. The intuitive-sensing subscale is considered to be the most salient category in studies employing the MBTI. Its importance has been reported by some researchers (Cohallan, 2000; Marefat, 2009; Hubscher-Davidson, 2009; Wankat & Oreovicz, 1993) as well.

Discussion

Considering different personality types, Schroeder (as cited in Marrapodi, 2004) stated that sensors show more difficulty with basic academic skills like writing. To put it another way, they cannot write well. This is possibly the reason why the sensing students in this research exhibited poorer performance than the intuitive students in the task of translating.

Uncertainty and anxiety lead to low-quality translation and therefore poor results. It has been proved that negative attitudes like passiveness and fear of failure toward a task weaken translators' performance and prevent them from doing their best (Laukkenen as cited in Hubscher-Davidson, 2007).

In accordance with Schroeder (as cited in Marrapodi, 2004) and bearing different personality types in mind, sensing translators often lack confidence in their

abilities. In addition, lack of self-confidence leads to the suppression of translators' creativity. Consequently, in such a context, poor translation will be produced. As it was seen, the sensing students in this research showed weak performance in the translation task due to a lack of creativity and perhaps the presence of uncertainty about their abilities.

Translators approach a text from different standpoints due to their individual differences. Therefore, their reading comprehension differs from one another. To put it simply, understanding of a text, as a subjective phenomenon, always remains very personal. Translators interpret a text in their own way and they interact with the task of translation in a specific individual manner.

Regarding translators' personality types in the process of reading, some scholars claim that intuitors outperform sensors in reading (Marrapodi, 2004; Oxford and Ehrman as cited in Chui, 2007). Unlike sensors, intuitive students like reading. Intuitive people who like abstract ideas are more attracted to language as a symbolic system than sensors, who are after concrete materials (Moody as cited in Chui, 2007).

In the process of reading comprehension, sensors and intuitors apply their own specific method. On the one hand, sensing students are possibly not capable of reading individually. They need help with reading. They read word by word, which is why they may lose the overall contextual meaning within the reading. To put it in another way, sensing students employ a bottom-up process for the process of reading comprehension. The problem with this type of reading is that it does not take into account the context and the reader's background knowledge in reading comprehension (Al-Samandi, 2007). Using the bottom-up approach leading to low-quality translations hinders translators from searching for successful solutions in the task of translation.

Intuitive translators have an advantage over sensing ones in reading comprehension, in which one of the phases is guessing the meanings of words. Intuitive translators are more successful because they are at ease with guessing, predicting and other compensation strategies (Sharp, 2004). The findings of the present study prove the abovementioned points.

From the viewpoint of cognitive psychology, transferring texts from one language into another is a task requiring gathering, processing and storing of information. Such a task also encompasses advanced problem-solving needing a high degree of creativity, flexibility and the ability to make decisions which, in turn, link to successful translation (Schmidt, 2005). Translators and translators' associations claim that translations are tantamount to creation, although neither are all translations produced creatively nor are all translators creative. Creativity and translation are interrelated especially in the translation of literary texts. By the same token, Cuellar (2008) and Knittlova (2005) affirm that literary translation is a creative activity.

Literary translation is a very social, culturally bound process in which translators have a key role. It is in this context that translators' creativity and their imagination

manifest themselves. Translators' creativity is highlighted in decoding and encoding the message of the ST. Creativity in translation is of two kinds. On the one hand, it is equal to coming up with novel strategies for coping with lexical and syntactic problems because of having innovative ideas and enjoying solving problems. On the other hand, translation itself is a creative process in which translators are forced to use their creativity to encode the ST message (Niska, 1998).

Furthermore, it is pointed out that translating literary texts demands imagination and intuition. The imaginative, intellectual and intuitive writing of the translator must not be lost in the process of translating (Bush, 1998). On the contrary, taking a practical approach does not lead to a successful translation of literary texts. Therefore, sensors' tendency to take a practical approach to tasks does not guarantee their success in literary translations. It is not easy for them to use their imagination – a prerequisite for the process of translating literary texts. Above all, translation is considered an activity that involves problem solving. However, sensors dislike problems unless their prior experience helps them solve the problem (Ahmed & Capretz, 2010). That is why they are not capable of translating literary texts as well as intuitors.

Hubscher-Davidson (2007) believes that certain personality characteristics make translators apply successful behavioral patterns during the translation process. It is essential for a good translator to have special skills and personality traits. Also, possessing a creative mind is a requirement in the task of translation for competent translators. Imaginative visualization is considered for using excellent words and phrases. [visualization is useful for finding the best words and phrases [?]]

Bearing the aforesaid issue in mind, the researchers of the current study believe that the sensors' failure in translation could originate from the lack of creativity and imagination in their personality as well as using the bottom-up approach in reading comprehension. That is why they cannot translate as well as the intuitors.

Implications

Taking into account the findings of the current study, the researchers suggest the following pedagogical guidelines:

Firstly, the impact of personality on the quality of translation should not be ignored. That is why translation students should be given opportunities for self-awareness and better understanding of their own personality by being offered psychological courses at university. They will then be able to recognize their own strengths and weaknesses, leading to their success and helping them develop their potential abilities. Hence, the attention of curriculum designers of translation courses is necessary here.

Secondly, students should also take a test of personality upon their arrival at university so that their individual peculiarities can be revealed and the translation educational system can meet the needs of students through providing them with ap-

appropriate training in both theory and practice with regard to their personality types. It is believed that personality inventories should not be neglected in academia since individual differences in personality and higher learning programs are interrelated.

What is more, translation educators should not ignore the important role of their students' personality types in the act of translation. They should not expect all students to translate all text types equally well. Some are more capable of translating texts of certain functions. Bearing the students' personalities in mind, different approaches should be offered in translator training.

It is also recommended that the translation educational system develops a comprehensive curriculum for the benefit of all students with respect to their personality types. It is essential to restructure the curriculum in order to support all students and increase their output.

It is hoped that the findings of the present study will open new horizons for translation trainees and translation trainers, leading to a better insight into the role of individual differences in the act of translating. What is more, individuals must be treated as a priceless asset in the educational system. Last but not least, as Kolesina and Nikolae (2008) assert, ensuring individuals' personal sovereignty and cultivating their choice-making abilities should be of crucial importance in education. This tendency will help students' talents to flourish.

References

- Ahmed, F. & Capretz, L.F. (2010). Why do we need personality diversity in software engineering. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 32 (2), 1-11.
- Al-Samandi, H.A. (2009). *The relationship between Saudi EFL college level students' use of reading strategies and their EFL reading comprehension*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Ohio, U.S.A. Retrieved 26.11.2012 from <http://www.ETD.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi/alsamandiha>
- Bickhard, M., Blunter, R., & Hochnadel, E. (2010). Two qubits for C.G. Jung's theory of personality. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 11, 243-259.
- Boeree, G. (2006). *Personality theories*. Retrieved 19.04.2012 from http://www.social-psychology.de/do/pt_intro.pdf
- Boyle, G.J. (1995). *Myers-Briggs type indicator (MBTI): Some psychometric limitations*. Retrieved 20.04.2012 from http://www.ePublications.bond.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1026&context=hss_pubs
- Brown, P.C. & Mullen, N.D. (2002). *English for computer science*. Tehran: Azarang.
- Bush, P. (1998). Literary translation: Practices. In N. Baker & K. Malmkjaer (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 127-130). London: Routledge.
- Butt, J. (2009). Functional analysis. Retrieved 9.04.2012 from <http://www.typeLogic.com/fa.html>
- Chapman, A. (2010). Personality theories, types and tests. Retrieved 7.04.2012 from <http://www.businessballs.com/personalitystylesmodels.htm>

- Chui, Y.P. (2007). *Learning styles and language learning outcomes*. Unpublished master's dissertation. University of Hong Kong, China.
- Coba, N.C. (2007). *The latina value scales: Translation and cultural adaptation*. Doctoral dissertation. University of New Jersey, New Brunswick.
- Coelo, P. (2003). *The alchemist*. Tehran: Karavan.
- Collahan, S. (2000). Responding to the invisible student. *Assessing Writing*, 7, 57-77.
- Cuellar, S.B. (2008). *Towards an integrated translation approach: Proposal of a dynamic translation model (DTM)*. Unpublished doctoral's dissertation. Hamburg: Germany.
- Daisy, L. (2009). A comparative study of translated children's literature by Lu Xun Zhou Zueren: From the perspective of personality. *Journal of Macao Polytechnic Institute*, 3, 69-79.
- Darwish, A. (1999). *Towards a theory of constraints in translation*. Retrieved 9.11.2012 from http://www.translocutions.com/translation/constraints_o1.pdf
- El-Haddad, M. (1999). *An analytical study of some aspects of literary translation: Two Arabic translations of Hemingway's The Old Man and the Sea*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Glasgow: Scotland.
- Felder, R.M., Felder, G.N., & Dietz, F.J. (2002). The effects of personality type on Engineering student performance and attitudes. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 91, 3-17
- Fraser, J. (1996). Mapping the process of translation. *Meta*, 41, 84-96.
- Fudjack, J. & Dinkelaker, P. (1995). The five levels of the four Jungian functions. Retrieved 1.12.2012, from <http://www.tap3x.net/ENSEMBLE/mpage3c.html>
- Hai, T.M. (2009). *How psycholinguistic elements affect the translation of fairy tales for children of Vietnam*. Retrieved 30.04.2012, from <http://www.englishhoneycl.com/2009/12/graduation-paper-2008-how.html>
- Hansen, G. (2005). Experience and emotion on empirical translation research with think aloud and retrospection. *Meta*, 50, 511-521.
- Harrington, R. & Loffredo, D.A. (2009). MBTI personality type and other factors that relate to preference for online versus face-to-face instruction. *The Internet Higher Education*, 13, 9-95.
- Hatzidaki, A. (2007). The process of comprehension from a psycholinguistic approach: Implications for translation. *Meta*, 25, 13-21.
- Hubscher-Davidson, S.E. (2007). An empirical investigation into the effects of personality on the performance of French to English student translators. *The Interpreter and Translator trainer*, 2, 277-279.
- Hubscher-Davidson, S.E. (2009). Personal diversity and diverse personalities in translation: A study of individual differences. *Perspectives: Studies in Translationology*, 17, 175-192.
- Iida, A. (2008). Individual differences in the translation process: Differences in the act of translation between two groups of EFL Japanese students. *Translation Journal*, 12 (3). Retrieved 6.04.2012 from <http://translationjournal.net/journal/45edu.htm>

- Jaasskelainen, R. (1998). Think aloud protocols. In N. Baker & K. Malmkjaer (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 127-130). London: Routledge.
- Knittlova, D. (2000). On the degree of translators' creativity. Retrieved 30.04.2012 from http://www.publib.upol.cz/~obd/fulltext/Anglica-2/Anglica-2_01.pdf
- Kolesina, K.Y. & Nikolaev, S.G. (2008). Personality-oriented principles in teaching languages in today's Russia. *Translation Journal*, 12 (2). Retrieved April 19, 2012, from <http://translationjournal.net/journal/44russia.htm>
- Lorscher, W. (1996). A psycholinguistic analysis of translation processes. *Meta*, 41, 26-79.
- Mackey, A. & Gass, S.M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Maier, R.M. (2009). Structural interference from the source language: A psycholinguistic analysis of translation processes. *Meta*, 41, 26-32.
- Malakoff, M. & Haukuta, K. (1999). Translation skill and metalinguistic awareness awareness in bilinguals. In E. Bialystock (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 141-166). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marefat, F. (2006). Student writing, personality type of the student and the rater: Any interrelationship? *The Reading Matrix*, 6, 116-124.
- Marrapodi, J. (2004). *Myers-Briggs type indicator in education: Implications for adult literacy learners*. Retrieved 26.11.2012 from <http://www.applestar.org/capella/MBTIinEducation.doc>
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing translation studies. Theories and applications*. New York: Routledge.
- Niska, H. (1998). *Explorations in translational creativity: Strategies for interpreting neologisms*. Retrieved 1.12.2012 from <http://www.reocities.com/~talk/lic/kreeng2.htm>
- Orozco, J.M. & Albir, H.A. (2002). TQA measuring translation competence acquisition. *Meta*, 47, 375-402.
- Reiss, K. (1971). Type, kind and individuality of text: Decision making in translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies readers* (pp. 180-192). London: Routledge.
- Schimdt, M.A. (2005). *How do you do it anyway? A longitudinal study of 3 translator students translating from Russian into Swedish*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. ACTA Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Stockholm.
- Sharp, A. (2004). *Language learning and awareness of personality type in Chinese settings*. Retrieved 7.04.2012 from <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Article-1-June-as-2004-pdf>
- Venuti, L. (2008). *The translation studies reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Wallace, D. & Wallace, L.A. (1994). *Reader's digest*. USA: Coleman.
- Wankat, P.C. & Oreovicz, F.S. (1993). *Psychological type and learning*. Retrieved 30.09.2012 from <http://www.engineering.purdue.edu/ChE/AboutUs/Publications/TeachingEng/chapter13.pdf>

Wicklein, R.C. & Rojewski, J.W. (1995). The relationship between psychological type and professional orientation among technology education teachers. *Journal of Technology Education*, 7 (1), 57-74. Retrieved 13.05.2012 from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JTE/v7n1/pdf/wicklein.pdf>

Wilss, W. (1998). Decision making in translation. In N. Baker & K. Malmkjaer (Eds.), *Rutledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 57-60). London: Rutledge.

Wilz, B. (2000). *Relationship between personality type and grade point average of technical college students*. Unpublished master’s thesis. Stout: University of Wisconsin. Retrieved 27.07.2012 from <http://www2.uwstout.edu/content/lib/thesis/2000wilzb.pdf>

Yamini, M. & Rahimi, M. (2007). *A guide to Statistics and SPSS for research in TEFL, linguistics and related disciplines*. Shiraz: Kooshamehr.

Zasyekin, S. (2009). *Translation as a psycholinguistic phenomenon*. Retrieved 1.12.2012 from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/h7rl78q52326w813/full-text.pdf>

Appendix A

Name: Male Female Age:

Phone number:

E-mail address:

Please answer the following questions carefully. If you do not have enough space below each question, copy the number of the question on the back of the page and write the answer there.

1. What is your area of interest in the realm of translation?
 - a. Literary why?
 - b. Non-literary why?
2. Do you enjoy translating from English into Persian?
 - a. Yes why?
 - b. No why?
3. How long have you been translating texts?
4. Which text types have you translated more so far?
 - a. Literary
 - b. Non-literary

5. Which text types can you translate well?
 - a. Literary
 - b. Non-literary
6. Which text is difficult for you to translate?
 - a. Literary why?
 - b. Non-literary why?
7. Is the condition in which you translate a text important? (in the class, at home, in group, individually, and so forth)
 - a. Yes why?
 - b. No why?
8. Have you ever translated any books or articles?
 - a. Yes (please specify)
 - b. No
9. Have you ever had any translations published?
 - a. Yes (please specify)
 - b. No
10. Have you ever worked in any translation centers?
 - a. Yes (please specify)
 - b. No
11. Do you love your major in the realm of translation?
 - a. Yes why?
 - b. No why?

Appendix B

Name:

Please translate the following texts from English into Persian.

Text 1:

A Historic Breakthrough in Heel Pain Relief
Just Ask the Podiatrists Who Made It Possible

No matter what you do to overcome heel pain, it just seems to strike with every step you take. But Dr. Scholl's revolutionary new insole, Heel Guard, gives you clinically-proven heel pain relief. Developed by leading podiatrists, it provides the specialized support and cushioning you need to relieve your heel pain. And it also protects against future irritation and discomfort. So buy Dr. Scholl's Heel Guard. The advanced treatment that lets you walk away from heel pain.

Make life in your shoes more comfortable.

Text 2:

Railways use large computer systems to control ticket reservations and to give immediate information on the status of its trains. The computer system is connected by private telephone lines to terminals in major train stations and ticket reservations for customers are made through these. The passenger's name, type of accommodation, and train schedule is put into the computer's memory. On a typical day, a railway's computer system gets thousands of telephone calls about reservations, space on other railways, and requests for arrivals and departures. A big advantage of the railway computer ticket reservation system is its rapidity because a cancelled booking can be sold anywhere in the system just a few seconds later. Railway computer systems are not used for reservations alone. They are used for a variety of other jobs including train schedules, planning, freight and cargo loading, meal planning, personnel availability, accounting and stock control.

Text 3:

The boy's name was Santiago. Dusk was falling as the boy arrived with his herd at an abandoned church. The roof had fallen in long ago, and an enormous sycamore had grown on the spot where the sacristy had once stood. He decided to spend the night there. He saw to it that all the sheep entered through the ruined gate, and then laid some planks across it to prevent the flock from wandering away during the night. There were no wolves in the region, but once an animal had strayed during the night, and the boy had had to spend the entire next day searching for it. He swept the floor with his jacket and lay down, using the book he had just finished reading as a pillow. He told himself that he would have to start reading thicker books: they lasted longer, and made more comfortable pillows. It was still dark when he awoke, and, looking up, he could see the stars through the half-destroyed roof.

Good Luck

Appendix C

Name:

Please answer the following questions about the texts you have just translated. If you do not have enough space below each question, copy the number of the question on the back of the paper and write the answer there.

1. Which genre do the texts belong to? (for example, a business letter, news, speeches, etc.)

a. Text 1:

b. Text 2:

c. Text 3:

2. Which text type could you translate well? why?

.....

3. Which text type would you have chosen for translating if you had been asked to translate one?

a. Text 1, why?

b. Text 2, why?

c. Text 3, why?

4. What did you do to produce a good translation?

.....

5. Did you read the whole source text before you started to translate?

a. Yes why?

b. No why?

6. Did you read your translation before giving it in?

a. Yes how many times? why?

b. No why?

7. What steps did you use in the process of translating?

Firstly,

.....

8. Which step was easy and which one was difficult for you? why?

.....

9. Which step was the most important one? why?

.....

10. Which text did you enjoy the most for translating?

- a. Text 1 why?
- b. Text 2 why?
- c. Text 3 why?

11. Qualify the texts you translated on the following scale of difficulty. Circle the number you think is appropriate. ("0" is very easy and "10" is very difficult)

- a. Text 1 very easy 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 very difficult
- b. Text 2 very easy 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 very difficult
- c. Text 3 very easy 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 very difficult

If you think the texts are difficult, what do you think makes them difficult?

.....

12. Did you find any problems when you were translating the texts?

- a. No
- b. Yes If yes, please specify the fragments that caused the problems.

Could you solve the problems? What did you do to solve them?

.....
.....
.....

Appendix D

Last name:

First name:

Student number

Instructor:

Please answer the following questions carefully. Answering these questions accurately requires honest reflection on how you really think, feel and act. If you have any questions, raise your hand and we will try to help you.

- 1. You are almost never late for your appointments
 YES NO
- 2. You like to be engaged in an active and fast-paced job
 YES NO

3. You enjoy having a wide circle of acquaintances
 YES NO
4. You feel involved when watching TV soaps
 YES NO
5. You are usually the first to react to a sudden event: the telephone ringing or unexpected question
 YES NO
6. You are more interested in a general idea than in the details of its realization
 YES NO
7. You tend to be unbiased even if this might endanger your good relations with people
 YES NO
8. Strict observance of the established rules is likely to prevent a good outcome
 YES NO
9. It's difficult to get you excited
 YES NO
10. It is in your nature to assume responsibility
 YES NO
11. You often think about humankind and its destiny
 YES NO
12. You believe the best decision is one that can be easily changed
 YES NO
13. Objective criticism is always useful in any activity
 YES NO
14. You prefer to act immediately rather than speculate about various options
 YES NO
15. You trust reason rather than feelings
 YES NO
16. You are inclined to rely more on improvisation than on careful planning
 YES NO
17. You spend your leisure time actively socializing with a group of people, attending parties, shopping, etc.
 YES NO
18. You usually plan your actions in advance
 YES NO
19. Your actions are frequently influenced by emotions
 YES NO
20. You are a person somewhat reserved and distant in communication
 YES NO
21. You know how to put every minute of your time to good purpose
 YES NO
22. You readily help people while asking nothing in return
 YES NO

23. You often contemplate about the complexity of life
 YES NO
24. After prolonged socializing you feel you need to get away and be alone
 YES NO
25. You often do jobs in a hurry
 YES NO
26. You easily see the general principle behind specific occurrences
 YES NO
27. You frequently and easily express your feelings and emotions
 YES NO
28. You find it difficult to speak loudly
 YES NO
29. You get bored if you have to read theoretical books
 YES NO
30. You tend to sympathize with other people
 YES NO
31. You value justice higher than mercy
 YES NO
32. You rapidly get involved in social life at a new workplace
 YES NO
33. The more people with whom you speak, the better you feel
 YES NO
34. You tend to rely on your experience rather than on theoretical alternatives
 YES NO
35. You like to keep a check on how things are progressing
 YES NO
36. You easily empathize with the concerns of other people
 YES NO
37. Often you prefer to read a book than go to a party
 YES NO
38. You enjoy being at the center of events in which other people are directly involved
 YES NO
39. You are more inclined to experiment than to follow familiar approaches
 YES NO
40. You avoid being bound by obligations
 YES NO
41. You are strongly touched by the stories about people's troubles
 YES NO
42. Deadlines seem to you to be of relative, rather than absolute, importance
 YES NO
43. You prefer to isolate yourself from outside noises
 YES NO

44. It's essential for you to try things with your own hands
 YES NO
45. You think that almost everything can be analyzed
 YES NO
46. You do your best to complete a task on time
 YES NO
47. You take pleasure in putting things in order
 YES NO
48. You feel at ease in a crowd
 YES NO
49. You have good control over your desires and temptations
 YES NO
50. You easily understand new theoretical principles
 YES NO
51. The process of searching for solution is more important to you than the solution itself
 YES NO
52. You usually place yourself nearer to the side than in the center of the room
 YES NO
53. When solving a problem you would rather follow a familiar approach than seek a new one
 YES NO
54. You try to stand firmly by your principles
 YES NO
55. A thirst for adventure is close to your heart
 YES NO
56. You prefer meeting in small groups to interaction with lots of people
 YES NO
57. When considering a situation you pay more attention to the current situation and less to a possible sequence of events
 YES NO
58. You consider the scientific approach to be the best
 YES NO
59. You find it difficult to talk about your feelings
 YES NO
60. You often spend time thinking of how things could be improved
 YES NO
61. Your decisions are based more on the feelings of a moment than on the careful planning
 YES NO
62. You prefer to spend your leisure time alone or relaxing in a tranquil family atmosphere
 YES NO

- 63. You feel more comfortable sticking to conventional ways
 YES NO
- 64. You are easily affected by strong emotions
 YES NO
- 65. You are always looking for opportunities
 YES NO
- 66. Your desk, workbench etc. is usually neat and orderly
 YES NO
- 67. As a rule, current preoccupations worry you more than your future plans
 YES NO
- 68. You get pleasure from solitary walks
 YES NO
- 69. It is easy for you to communicate in social situations
 YES NO
- 70. You are consistent in your habits
 YES NO
- 71. You willingly involve yourself in matters which engage your sympathies
 YES NO
- 72. You easily perceive various ways in which events could develop
 YES NO

Appendix E

Danielle Poirier Taxonomy of Dominant Mental Function

The Four Primary Personality Types

Dominant Intuitive Types	INFJ, INTJ	ENFP, ENTP
Dominant Sensing Types	ISFJ, ISTP	ESFP, ESTP
Dominant Thinking Types	ISTP, INTP	ESTJ, ENTJ
Dominant Feeling Types	ISFP, INFP	ESFJ, ENFJ

Appendix F

Personality Hierarchy Chart (Hirsh & Kise as cited in Wilz, 2000)

<p>INTJ</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intuition 2. Thinking 3. Feeling 4. Sensation 	<p>INFJ</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intuition 2. Feeling 3. Thinking 4. Sensation 	<p>ISFJ</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sensation 2. Feeling 3. Thinking 4. Intuition 	<p>ISTJ</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sensation 2. Thinking 3. Feeling 4. Intuition
<p>INTP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thinking 2. Intuition 3. Sensation 4. Feeling 	<p>INFP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feeling 2. Intuition 3. Sensation 4. Thinking 	<p>ISFP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feeling 2. Sensation 3. Intuition 4. Thinking 	<p>ISTP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thinking 2. Sensation 3. Intuition 4. Feeling
<p>ENTP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intuition 2. Thinking 3. Feeling 4. Sensation 	<p>ENFP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intuition 2. Feeling 3. Thinking 4. Sensation 	<p>ESFP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sensation 2. Feeling 3. Thinking 4. Intuition 	<p>ESTP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sensation 2. Thinking 3. Feeling 4. Intuition
<p>ENTJ</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thinking 2. Intuition 3. Sensation 4. Feeling 	<p>ENFJ</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feeling 2. Intuition 3. Sensation 4. Thinking 	<p>ESFJ</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feeling 2. Sensation 3. Intuition 4. Thinking 	<p>ESTJ</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thinking 2. Sensation 3. Intuition 4. Feeling

Appendix G

Evaluators' assessment sheet

On a scale from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent), please rate how you felt this student handled the following aspects in their translation:

	1.2.3.4.5. (Text1)	1.2.3.4.5. (Text2)	1.2.3.4.5. (Text3)
Overall coherence of translation			
Stylistic features e.g. register			
Vocabulary			
Grammar			
Idioms			
Cultural features			
Imagery / expression			

What mark (out of 100) would you give the student for this translation?

Other comments:

Below 40% is a fail

50-59% is a lower second-class mark

60-69% is an upper second-class mark

and 70% and above constitutes first-class work