



THE FIVE CONSTRUCTS FOR TRANSLATION QUALITY ANALYSES; A PILOT STANDARDIZATION OF FACTORS INFLUENCING TRANSLATION PRODUCTS

Kirembwe Rashid
Abdul Hamed*

Faculty of Major Language Studies (FPBU), Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia
(USIM). *Corresponding Author

Elhadi Moh. M.
Ohida

ABSTRACT

This pilot research analyses the translation quality constructs that deem necessary for both source text ST and target text TT. The researchers' experiences in translation research and practice revealed that basically, there are five constructs of translation quality analysis which can always correlate with TT regardless of differences in translation models or theoretical backgrounds used. The Five Constructs for Translation Quality Analysis (FCTQA) include: translator, source text ST, ST initiator, translation process and linguistic characteristics. Thus, this pilot study was directed to develop basic translation quality constructs for reliable translation products' analyses. Hence, the research was designed to answer five scientific questions about both the validity and reliability of (FCTQA) in question. This study used purposive sampling techniques and a questionnaire for the process of internal consistency data collection which included the sample of professional translators in both countries; Malaysia and Libya. Each construct was loaded with a number of respective factors. The questionnaires were distributed to (n=30) of the said professional translators and all were completed and returned to the researchers. The process of data analyses depended much on descriptive statistics; whereby mean averages and correlational analyses were applied. The data were analyzed and measured against the pilot research constructs. The overall reliability coefficient of (FCTQA) was (r)=0.84 yielded by 136 factors. Then, the general discussions of (FCTQA) findings included guidelines on translation research directions; whereupon, the interpretation of findings addressed current issues on translation quality analysis. Finally, the professional suggestions and recommendations were provided in regard to (FCTQA) applications and implementations, including furthering empirical research on translation for better understanding of TT quality.

KEYWORDS : Constructs, Translation, Quality, Factors, Source Text ST, Target Text TT.

INTRODUCTION

This article is based on the pilot research finding by Kirembwe & Ohida (2018) which aimed to develop Translation Quality Rating Scales in the course of investigating the translation quality problem inherent from various translation factors. It is evident that (FCTQA) include source text ST, an ST Initiator, translation process and linguistic characteristics (Nida, Eugene, 1993). Translators face challenges in achieving significant translation quality for both oral and written translation tasks. These difficulties originate from factors underlying the translation processes, such as the judgment of equivalence between both ST and TT which is rendered to translators subjective judgment; language and cultural differences (Munday 2016). Among common factors that affect the quality of translation that are the translator's characteristics, ST initiator's characteristics, linguistic characteristics, translation process characteristics and ST characteristics. Such factors have always been the core for translation quality management. A number of researchers such as Hlebec, Boris (1989), Zabalbeascoa Terran, (1992), Al-Shunnag, (2014), Obeidat (2011), Al-Kabi, Hailat, Al-Shawakfa and Izzat Alsmadi (2013) and (House, (2015) had investigated translation quality, however, these researchers are more focused in observing partial translation factors.

These studies provided some conclusions on factors influencing translation quality that have helped to clarify all dimensions of the current research. The current researchers believe that expert analysis on factors influencing translation quality reduces ambiguity about translation quality analysis. Hence, this pilot research was conducted to clarify factors underlying the quality in translation so as to contribute to the formation of future translation research hypotheses, results generalization as well as providing a deeper understanding of translation phenomenon. The above discussion leads to the possible investigation on determining the level of quality in translation influenced by translator's characteristics, ST initiator's characteristics, linguistic characteristics, translation process

characteristics and ST characteristics (Kirembwe, Yuslina, Najib & Hishomudin 2013; Kirembwe, Jaffar & Lubna, 2020).

SIGNIFICANCE

This study contributes towards a deeper understanding of translation characteristics. The findings of this pilot research will contribute towards understanding levels of translation quality influenced by selected translation characteristics. Since the development of (FCTQA) used in this pilot research was based on scientific procedures, practitioners may select some these constructs and further investigations for different translation purposes. The (FCTQA) used in this pilot research can also be used in selecting translation skills for treatment and assist in planning interventions for translators who are assumed to have problems with translation skills. Ultimately, the findings of this pilot research can influence the plans of researchers and translators concerned in terms of formation of empirical translation hypotheses and assumptions for meaningfully purposeful scientific generalization.

OBJECTIVES

In line with the earlier discussions, this pilot research is generally designed to investigate The Five Constructs for Translation Quality Analysis (FCTQA). The main target was to measure their level validity and reliability as factors influencing Translation Quality. The selected (FCTQA) include: translators' characteristics, translation process characteristics, ST characteristics, ST initiator characteristics and linguistic characteristics.

LITERATURE

This pilot research was based on two essential aspects; the first aspect was the theoretical literature on translation that discusses different theories and models including translation models' theoretical frameworks (Bathgate, 1980); semantic and communicative translation models (Newmark, 1991); functional models (Reiss, 1977/1989); the model of text oriented analysis also known as text-oriented translation models (Nord, 1991 and 2005; Catford, 1965); skopos model

also known as skopos theories (Nord, 1997); sentence-oriented translation models (Nord, 2005); Chau, (1984a &1984b); the cultural and the operational models (Bathgate, 1980); discourse and register analysis model (House, (2015); system models (Sharron, 2014) and Islamic translation models (Idahesh, (2016 ; Kirembwe, Hishomudin, Yuslina and Najib 2013).

The second base of this pilot research was the practical literature on translation which discusses the empirical recommendations on factors influencing translation product. Kirembwe, Jaffar & Lubna (2020a; 2020b) investigated the translator as key factor for translation quality. They recommended to consider translators characteristics' sensitivity in the quality of TT. Other translators factors influencing translation product include: gender ideology and translating (Hayeri, Navid, 2014); Shafiee-Sabet & Rabeie, 2012); the impact of translator's personality on translation quality (Costa & McCrae, 1992); formative experiences (Robinson, (1997); (Robinson & Kenny, 2012); Dehbandi & Pourgharib, 2013); Varzande & Jadidi, 2015); socio-economic status (Emily Knowles & Helen Evans, 2009); training (Karwacka, 2014); Varzande, 2016); vocational experiences (Dickins, Hervey & Higgins, 2016); personality traits (Robinson, (1997); translation ability (Ehara, Baba, Utiyama, & Sumita, (n. d.); (Robinson & Kenny, 2012); intelligence (Goleman, Daniel, 1995); intention (Venuti, 1995); knowledge of ST & TT rules (Aguero, Adell & Bonafonte, 2006); Geeraerts & Cuyckens, 2007); awareness of TT cultural background (Akbari, 2013); (Bustani, 2014); awareness of translated subject & topic (Newmark, 1991) and awareness of translated context (Baker, 2006); Nida, 2001).

Further literature on factors influencing translation product included: possession of favorable ST literary sense (Hermans, 2014); (Hermans, 2014); being able to criticize the ST (Reiss & Rhodes, 2000); widely informed (Massoud, 1988); attitude toward ST initiator (Zabalbeascoa Terran, 1992); (Petra Kaiseva, 2001); (Nord, 2007/1997); source text characteristics (Hassan, 2014); the ST motives (Nord, 2005 & 2007); following ST rules (Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995); ST cultural background (Nida, 1985); ST context level and ST subject matter (Nida, 2001 and 2005); ST vocabulary application (Bennett, Patrick R. 1998) and ST morphology application (Dickins *et al.* 2016)); (Muqayad Abdul-Halim Ahmad Shamsan & Abdul-majeed Attayib, 2015).

Other source text literature included: ST grammar application (Kirembwe, Jaffar & Lubna 2020a; 2020b); (Maha, Lounis, 2014); ST punctuation application (Baker, 1992- 2011); ST rhetoric application (Thomas, 1991); ST organization mechanisms (Moulton, Janice; Robinson, George, 1981); ST Focus (Newmark, 1981); ST elaboration (Reder, 1982); (Lai, Ping-Yen, 2013). ST language quality (Samuelsson-Brown, Geoffrey; 2006); ST presentation mechanisms (Boase-Beier, 2006); ST ideas (Pym, Anthony, 2010); ST language style (Leech & Short, 2007); ST cohesion and context (Nida & Taber, 1969); (Huang, 2015); and ST significance (Gracia, Jorge, 1995); (Halliday & Hasan, 1985).

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The method used in this study is descriptive analytical method. This study used purposive sampling technique to select professional translators in both countries; Malaysia and Libya. The Purposeful Sampling procedures was used because the focus was on a deep knowledge on translation that enables to provide valid ratings on translation questionnaires as well as developing reliable translation constructs. Hence, the purposeful sampling deemed appropriate for this study. Purposeful sampling involve selection of a sample of individuals with a particular purpose of developing (FCTQA) assuming that the researchers were

be able to provide a valid and reliable professional data on the Five Constructs for Translation Quality Analysis (FCTQA). The sample possessed a wide range of translation knowledge and practical experiences. The participants' ratings were analyzed to indicate the most important factors that affect the translation quality by comparing the means on yielded by Likert weighted scales.

VALIDITY OF THE CONSTRUCTS

The experts used a five point Likert rating scale to provide experts with a variety of values for more specific rating choices to measure the validity of the Five Constructs for Translation Quality Analysis (FCTQA). The validity criteria were considered in respect to translation factors deemed necessary for yielding meaningful translation quality. All translation scales were selected to measure a construct that, the higher the rating scores on translation scales, the better the quality in translation products and vice versa. The definitions of characteristics measured and the content of this translation questionnaire were revised by professional translators for the sake of verifications of significance right before the pilot research procedures had taken place for internal consistency observation. The revision procedure led to 'addition' and elimination of different factors in the questionnaire subscales.

CONSTRUCT-RELATED VALIDITY

The (FCTQA) provides clear definitions of what significance levels of factors would be considered viable for translation quality analysis. Thus, it can be hypothesized that there is a relationship between (FCTQA) and translation quality, because the higher the significance levels of the factors on the questionnaire the better the level of recognition of those factors for higher translation quality. This could logically mean that the higher the scores of significance levels on the selected translation quality scales, the stronger relationship between translation quality and the selected translation factors and vice versa. However, relationship observations were left for subsequent translation research.

FACTOR ANALYSIS

Internal consistency estimates were conducted for (FCTQA) independent scales in order to examine if there was any variables that should be excluded from the final (FCTQA) constructs analyses. The (FCTQA) questionnaire began with questions on individual background variables: age, gender, and experience. In all cases, the expert respondents were asked to select the relevant option among continuum of rating alternatives. For this pilot study, the factor analysis results showed that all items loaded in (FCTQA) were important and should not be excluded from the further statistical analysis as the extraction values was (r)=0.6 and above. The following Tables 1-11 present the holistic as well as the detailed summarized of Factor Analyses and their respective reliability coefficients for all (FCTQA) items. The following Table 1 presents a holistic descriptive summary for (FCTQA) reliability coefficients:

Table 1: Holistic Descriptive Summary Of (FCTQA) Reliability Coefficients

Construct	Number of Factors	Reliability Coefficients
Translator's Characteristics	21	0.800
ST Initiator Characteristics	30	.0869
ST Characteristics	27	.0822
Translation Process Characteristics	30	.0811
Linguistic Characteristics	28	.0871
Total Constructs' Reliability Coefficients	136	0.835

Source: SPSS Output By The Author's

The Table 1 show that :

1. The total number of "translator's characteristics" factors is $n=21$ and reliability $(r)=0.800$.
2. The total number of "ST initiator characteristics" factors is $n=30$ and reliability $(r)=0.869$.
3. The total number of "ST characteristics" factors is $n=27$ and reliability $(r)=0.823$.
4. The total number of "translation process characteristics" factors $n=30$ and reliability $(r)=0.811$.
5. Total number of "linguistic characteristics" factors was $n=28$ and reliability $(r)=0.871$.

As revealed in the **Table (1)**, the total number of all (FCTQA) is $n=136$ and the total Reliability Coefficient $(r)=0.835$. The respective reliability coefficients for (FCTQA) ranged from $(r)=0.800$ to $(r)=0.871$. Such Reliability Coefficients fall in the range of high reliability coefficients acceptable for such rating scales. According to the guidelines provided by DeVellis (1991) such Reliability Coefficients are considered "very good". The following table 2 presents a descriptive summary of translator's characteristics factor analysis:

Table 2: Factor Analysis for Translator's Characteristics :

Factors	Reliability Coefficient
Formative Experiences	.662
Socio-Economic	.942
Age	.824
Gender	.765
Training	.795
Vocational Experiences	.804
Personality Traits	.769
Translation Ability	.809
Intelligence	.770
Intention	.943
Knowledge of ST rules	.782
Knowledge of TT rules	.843
Awareness of TT cultural background	.787
Awareness of translated subject	.706
Awareness of translated topic	.670
Awareness of translated context	.826
Possess ST favorable literary sense	.826
Possess TT favorable literary sense	.909
Being able to critique the ST	.764
Being widely informed	.722
Attitude toward ST initiator	.887
Overall Coefficient	.800

The table 2 presents a detailed description of translator's characteristics reliability coefficients. The following table 3 presents a short summary of translator's characteristics reliability coefficients.

Table 3 Presents A Descriptive Summary Of Translator's Characteristics Reliability.

Summary	N	Minimum	Maximum	Overall Coefficient
"translator's characteristics	21	.66	.94	.800
Valid N (list wise)	21			

The table 3 shows that the minimum reliability coefficient for translator's characteristics factors $(r)=0.66$, the maximum reliability coefficient $(r)=0.94$ and the total number of translator's characteristics $n=27$ and an overall translators coefficient $(r)=0.800$. The table 4 presents a detailed description of ST initiator's reliability coefficients.

Table 4 Factor Analysis For ST Initiator's Characteristics .

Factors	Extraction
Formative experiences	.953

Socio-economic status	.815
Age	.915
Gender	.723
Training	.876
Vocational Experiences	.913
Personality Traits	.836
Translation Ability	.904
Cognitive Intelligence	.855
Intention for initiate ST	.790
Knowledge of ST rules	.852
Awareness of TT cultural background	.852
Ability to write clearly	.905
Community Implications	.845
Traditional Beliefs	.944
Religious Affiliations	.790
Socio-economic status	.924
Initiator's long term goals	.885
Initiator's linguistic Ability	.856
Emotional Intelligence	.898
Translation Experiences	.799
Attitude to the content	.801
Knowledge of rules for the ST initiated	.841
Being aware about the ST subject	.844
Being aware about the ST context	.888
Being aware about the ST topic	.830
Possessing favorable ST literature	.948
Being able to critique his/her own text	.951
Being widely informed	.895
Ability to produce ST clearly	.951
Overall Coefficient	.869

Table 4 presents a detailed descriptions of ST Initiator's characteristics reliability coefficients. The following table 5 presents a short summary of ST initiator's characteristics reliability coefficients.

Table 5: Descriptive Summary Of ST Initiator Characteristics Reliability

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Overall Coefficient
ST Initiator Characteristics	30	.72	.95	.869
Valid N (listwise)	30			

The table 5 shows that the minimum reliability coefficient for ST initiator factors $(r)=0.72$, the maximum reliability coefficient $(r)=0.95$ and the total number of ST initiator characteristics $n=30$ and an overall ST reliability coefficient $(r)=0.869$. The following table 6 presents a detailed descriptions of ST Characteristics reliability coefficients.

Table 6: Factor Analysis for ST Characteristics .

Factors	Extraction
ST Motives	.702
Following ST rules	.851
ST Cultural background	.823
ST subject matter	.837
ST topic	.873
ST context	.820
ST content level	.876
ST vocabulary application	.837
ST morphology application	.833
ST grammar application	.787
ST punctuation application	.715
ST rhetoric application	.789
ST organization	.731
ST focus	.723
ST elaboration	.823
ST description	.922
ST language quality	.768

ST literature quality	.806
ST orthography	.817
ST production quality	.777
ST presentation mechanisms	.896
ST compatibility with present realities	.821
ST validity	.831
ST ideas	.841
ST language style	.942
ST time; (old/new)	.925
ST significance	.825
Overall Coefficient	.822

The Table 6 presents a detailed descriptions of ST reliability coefficients. The following table 7 presents a short summary of ST reliability coefficients.

Table 7: Descriptive Summary of ST Characteristics Reliability

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Overall Coefficient
ST Characteristics	27	.70	.94	.822
Valid N (listwise)	27			

The Table 7 shows that the minimum reliability coefficient for ST factors (r)= 0.70, the maximum reliability coefficient (r)=0.94 and the total number of ST characteristics (r)=27 and an overall ST reliability coefficient (r)=0.822. The following Table 8 presents a short summary of "Translation Process" coefficients.

Table 8: Factor Analysis for "Translation Process" Characteristics

Factors	Extraction
Implementation of TT rules	.885
Reproduction of ST content level	.769
Reproduction of ST vocabulary level	.861
Reproduction of ST morphology level	.795
Reproduction of ST grammar level	.759
Reproduction of ST punctuation level	.795
Reproduction of ST rhetoric level	.817
Reproduction of ST organization mechanism level	.848
Reproduction of ST focus level	.801
Reproduction of ST elaboration level	.850
Reproduction of ST description level	.865
Reproduction of ST language quality level	.847
Reproduction of ST literature quality level	.664
Reproduction of ST level orthography	.785
Reproduction of ST quality level	.875
TT presentation mechanisms	.813
TT compatibility with present realities	.825
TT validity factors	.930
TT intention factors	.814
Application of linguistic analysis levels in translation	.733
Proper approach to ST deviation phenomena	.803
Proper application of translation rules	.797
Application of pre-editing for machine/computer aided translation	.818
Application of post-editing for machine/computer aided translation	.757
Application of linguistic comparative rules	.710
Application of proper approach linguistic contrastive rules	.772
Translation Price	.825
Complicity ST s	.898
Translation theory used	.803
Translation Objectives	.814
Overall Coefficient	.811

The Table 8 presents a detailed descriptions of translation process reliability coefficients. The following table 9 presents a short summary of translation process reliability coefficients.

Table 9: Descriptive Summary Of Translation Process Reliability

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Overall Coefficient
Translation Process	30	.66	.93	.811
Valid N (listwise)	30			

The Table 9 shows that the minimum reliability coefficient for translation process factors (r)= 0.66, the maximum reliability coefficient (r)=0.93 and the total number of translation process characteristics n=30 and an overall translation process reliability coefficient (r)=0.811. The following table 10 presents a detailed descriptions of linguistic characteristics reliability coefficients.

Table 10: Factor Analysis for "Linguistic Characteristics" Construct

Question	Extraction
Linguistic Differences	.854
ST and TT rules	.920
Implementation of TT rules	.870
ST content level	.868
ST vocabulary level	.894
ST morphology level	.889
ST grammar level	.884
ST punctuation level	.837
ST rhetoric level	.918
ST organization mechanism level	.879
ST focus level	.835
ST elaboration level	.866
ST description level	.857
ST language quality level	.925
ST language quality level	.837
ST literature quality level	.873
ST orthography level	.754
ST quality level	.918
TT presentation mechanism	.933
TT compatibility with present realities	.881
TT validity	.935
TT intention	.801
linguistic analysis levels	.963
ST deviation phenomena	.765
linguistic comparative rules	.740
linguistic contrastive rules	.897
Complicity of ST	.922
Tones and intonation	.873
Overall Coefficient	.871

The table 10 shows presents a detailed descriptions of linguistic characteristics reliability coefficients. The following table 11 presents a short summary of linguistic characteristics reliability coefficients.

Table 11: Descriptive Summary Of Linguistic Characteristics Reliability

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Overall Coefficient
Linguistic Characteristics	28	.74	.96	.871
Valid N (listwise)	28			

The table 11 shows that the minimum reliability coefficient for linguistic characteristics factors (r)=0.74, the maximum reliability coefficient (r)=0.96 and the total number of linguistic characteristics' n=28 and an overall linguistic characteristics reliability coefficient (r)=0.871.

Significance Of (FCTQA)

The significance of (FCTQA) is implementable in some of the following social-educational aspects: (FCTQA) assists in selecting at risk translation skills for intervention for students who are assumed to be in need of better English- Arabic translation skills. (FCTQA) can further assist in evaluating individual or corporate translation skills for different educational, commercial and social purposes. (FCTQA) has an element of flexibility and comprehensiveness in such a way that practitioners can choose to apply some factors of (FCTQA) for different educational, commercial and social purposes or they can consider all of them in order to determine a comprehensive picture across English- Arabic translation qualities in a selected linguistic environment.

Limitations Of (FCTQA)

The data collected through these questionnaire is not enough to reflect raters' translation capabilities. This is because one cannot conclude whether a rater is not competent enough for translation just she/he rated a "Zero" score on - say - the factor "application of pre-editing for computer aided translation", there are other factors that need to be investigated before asserting such a conclusion as this questionnaire is only providing expert information on the question of how significantly these characteristics influence English-Arabic translation quality. In other words, what is the level of significance for the given factor in translation quality. Furthermore, The Five Constructs for Translation Quality Analysis are categorized with other socio-psychological research tools which are sometimes influenced by intervening factors. Therefore, it is recommendable that the results of data collected by such tools should always be reported with their corresponding standard error of measurements.

Findings

The Five Constructs for Translation Quality Analysis yielded that the experts agree that the translator's characteristics affect the quality of translation. The translator's socio-economic ($r=0.942$), possession of TT favorable literary sense ($r=0.909$) and attitude toward ST initiator ($r=0.887$), were produced at the highest translator's characteristics reliability coefficients, which indicates that the translation experts agree that translator's socio-economic, possession of TT favorable literary sense and attitude toward ST initiator affect the quality of the translation the most. Other than the one mentioned above the rest of translator's factors influencing the quality of translation were produced at "above the average" levels.

The findings also revealed that ST initiator's formative experiences ($r=0.953$), being aware about the ST context ($r=0.888$), age ($r=0.915$), socio-economic status ($r=0.924$), traditional beliefs ($r=0.944$), vocational experiences ($r=0.913$), ability to write, possessing favorable ST literature ($r=0.948$), being able to critique his/ her own text ($r=0.951$), being widely informed ($r=0.895$), ability to write clearly ($r=0.905$) and ability to produce ($r=0.951$) were produced at the highest reliability coefficients. Other than the one mentioned above the rest of ST initiator's factors influencing the quality of translation were produced at "above the average" levels.

Further findings revealed that ST description ($r=0.922$), ST presentation mechanisms ($r=0.896$), ST language style ($r=0.942$) and ST time; (old/new) ($r=0.925$) were produced at the highest ST reliability coefficients. Other than the one mentioned above the rest of ST factors influencing the quality of translation were produced at "above the average" levels.

Regarding translation process the findings revealed that the implementation of TT rules ($r=0.885$), reproduction of ST vocabulary level ($r=0.861$), reproduction of ST elaboration

level ($r=0.850$), reproduction of ST description level ($r=0.865$), reproduction of ST quality level ($r=0.875$), TT validity factors ($r=0.930$), ST complicity level ($r=0.898$) were produced at the highest translation Process reliability coefficients. Other than the one mentioned above the rest of translation process factors influencing the quality of translation were produced at "above the average" levels.

Finally, the findings revealed that the translation qualities are highly influential by linguistic characteristics. This is manifested in the following values of reliability coefficients ST and TT rules ($r=0.920$), ST vocabulary level ($r=0.894$), Linguistic Differences ($r=0.854$), ST content level ($r=0.868$), ST morphology level ($r=0.889$), ST grammar level ($r=0.884$), ST rhetoric level ($r=0.918$), ST organization mechanism level ($r=0.879$), ST content elaboration level ($r=0.866$), ST content description level ($r=0.857$), ST language quality level ($r=0.925$), ST content quality level ($r=0.918$), TT presentation mechanism ($r=0.933$), TT compatibility with present realities ($r=0.881$), TT validity ($r=0.935$), linguistic analysis levels ($r=0.963$), linguistic contrastive rules ($r=0.897$), Complicity of ST ($r=0.922$) and Tones and intonation ($r=0.873$) were produced at the highest linguistic characteristics reliability coefficients. Other than the factors mentioned above the rest of linguistic factors influencing the quality of translation were produced at "above the average" levels.

CONCLUSION

This pilot research investigated (FCTQA) by using the sample of expert translators. (FCTQA) include: translator, source text ST, ST initiator, translation process and linguistic characteristics. Since the selected (FCTQA) factors were based on linguistic and socio-psychological concepts, the researchers had to analyze (FCTQA) factors up on which (FCTQA) is build. The finding of research show that the experts agree that (FCTQA) significantly affect the quality of translation. It can be said then that although TT quality may vary from one another, that discrepancy might be attributed to the function of (FCTQA). Thus, it is acceptable to say that the deviation from the basic meaning of ST may have acceptable explanations. Deviation can either be fixed in the formal features of the texts or in the informal inherent traits within the scope of translation constructs. This findings are the reminder for those interested in translation studies and practice that (FCTQA) is an essential paradigm for translation quality analyses. However, it is recommendable that since the current pilot study has been descriptive in nature, more scientific research is warranted on the factors influencing translation quality.

REFERENCES

1. Aguero, P. D., Adell, J., & Bonafonte, A. (2006). Prosody Generation For Speech-To-Speech. *Abdadi, Renad. (2014). The Construction of Arguments in English and Arabic: A Comparison of the Linguistic Strategies Employed in Editorials Argumentum. 10 (2014), 724-746 Debreceeni Egyetemi Kiadó.*
2. Akbari, M. (2013). The Role of Culture in Translation. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies. (Special Issue on Applied Linguistics). (Vol. 3(8) August 2013, pp. 32-41).*
3. Aldahesh, A. (2016). Towards a Model for Analyzing and Assessing ETranslation of Qur'anic Idiomatic Phrasal Verbs. *Arab World English Journal, 5, 33-53.*
4. Al-Shunnag, MA. (2014). Stance in political discourse: Arabic translations of American newspaper opinion articles on the 'Arab Spring', PhD thesis, The University of Salford.
5. Baker, M. (2006). Translation and conflict: a narrative account. London: Routledge.
6. Baker, M. (1992- 2011). In *Other Words. A Course-book on Translation, London: Routledge.*
7. Bathgate, R. H., (1980). "Studies of Translation Models 1: A Theoretical Framework," in *The Incorporated Linguist 19, 4, 113-114.*
8. Bennett, Patrick R. (1998). *Comparative Semitic Linguistics.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
9. Boase-Beier, J. (2006). *Stylistic approaches to translation.* Manchester, UK ; Kinderhook, [New York], USA: St. Jerome Pub.
10. Bustani, A. M. K. (2014). Culture in Arabic to English Literary Translation. American University of Sharjah. Retrieved from <https://dspace.aus.edu/xmlui/handle/11073/6078>.
11. Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation,* London. Oxford University Press.
12. Chau, S. C. (1984a). "Hermeneutics and the Translator: The ontological dimension of translating." in *Multilingua 3, 2, 71-77.*

13. Chau, S. C. (1984b). How to translate this is a red rose. *Translation Theory and Its Implementation in the Teaching of Translation and Interpretation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 124-135.
14. Costa, P. T. , & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
15. Dehbandi, Z. , & Pourgharib, B. (2013). The Difference in Translation Quality of Undergraduate Translation Students and Experienced Translators in Narrative Text. *Journal of Language Sciences & Linguistics*. Vol. 1(1), 12–15.
16. Dickens, J. , Hervey, S. G. J. , & Higgins, I. (2016). *Thinking Arabic translation: a course in translation method: Arabic to English (Second edition)*. Abingdon, Oxon ; New York: Routledge.
17. Ehara, Y. , Baba, Y. , Utiyama, M. , & Sumita, E. (n. d.). *Assessing Translation Ability through Vocabulary Ability Assessment*. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/47ea/223867d8e59f73f4f8ed14293cfd57abd68e.pdf>.
18. Emily Knowles & Helen Evans (2009). 'PISA 2009: How does the social attainment gap in England compare with countries internationally.
19. Geeraerts, D. , & Cuyckens, H. (Eds.). (2007). *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
20. Goleman, Daniel. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.
21. Gracia, Jorge J. E. (1995). *A Theory of Textuality: The Logic and Epistemology*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
22. Hassan, B. A. (2014). *Between English and Arabic: A Practical Course in Translation*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK.
23. HATIM, B. (1987). "A Text-Linguistic Model for the Analysis of Discourse Errors: Contributions from Arabic. *Linguistics*", Monaghan, J. (Ed.), *Grammar in the construction of texts*.
24. Hatim, B. , & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: an advanced resource book*. London: New York: Routledge.
25. Hayeri, Navid (2014). *Does gender affect translation? : analysis of English talks translated to Arabic*. Dissertation in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The University of Texas at Auatlin.
26. Hermans, T. (2014). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Abingdon, Oxon & New York: Routledge.
27. Hlebec, Boris (1989). *Factors and steps in translating*, Bable 35:3, 129-141.
28. House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: past and present*. Abingdon, Oxon, England; New York: Routledge.
29. House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: past and present*. Abingdon, Oxon, England; New York: Routledge.
30. Huang, L. (2015). *Style in Translation: A Corpus-Based Perspective*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
31. J. P. Vinay & J. Darbelnet. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
32. Karwacka, W. (2014). *Quality assurance in medical translation*. *The Journal of Specialized Translation*, 21, 19–34.
33. Kirembwe R. A. H, Jaffar M. N & Lubna A. R (2020). *The Translator; a Key Factor for Translation Quality; Recommendations for Practitioners*. Gjra - Global Journal For Research Analysis. P.1-6. volume - 9, Issue - 8, August - 2020 - 8160 DOI: 10.36106/gjra.
34. Kirembwe R.A.H & Ohida M. (2018). *Translation Quality Rating Scales for Professional Translators*. Ph.D Research Pilot Data Archives. Faculty of Major Language Studies (FPBU): Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia; (USIM).
35. Kirembwe R. A. H, Jaffar M. N & Lubna A. R (2020a). *The Translator; a Key Factor for Translation Quality; Recommendations for Practitioners*. Gjra - Global Journal For Research Analysis. P.1-6. volume - 9, Issue - 8, August - 2020 - 8160 DOI: 10.36106/gjra.
36. Kirembwe R. A. H, Jaffar M. N, Lubna A. R and E. M. Ohida (2020b). *Translation Quality Scales; A Comprehensive Pilot Analyses for Translation Quality Assessment Constructs Extracted from Translation Models*. Faculty of Major Language Studies (FPBU). Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia (USIM): Mufid Work. Kuala Lumpur. Malaysia.
37. Kirembwe, R. A. H, Yuslina M. Mohammad Najib Bin Jafar Hishomudin Ahmad, (2013). *Theoretical Model For Islamic Translation*. Paper presented at the International Language and Education Conference 2013; (ILEC2013). Faculty of Major Language Studies Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia; USIM.
38. Lai, Ping-Yen (2013). *The application of minimum deviation and the proportionality principle in the translation of economic editorials*. Oxford: Chartridge Books.
39. Leech, G. N. , & Short, M. (2007). *Style in fiction: a linguistic introduction to English fictional prose (2nd ed)*. New York: Pearson Longman.
40. M. A. K. Halliday 2007 Jonathan J. Webster. (Edits). *Introduction*. Jonathan J. Webster, Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publishing Data, UK.
41. Maha, Lounis (2014). "Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Linguistic Politeness". CSCanada.
42. Massoud, M. , F. , (1988). *Translate to Communicate, A Guide for Translators*. New York: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
43. Mohammed N. Al-Kabi, Taghreed M. Hailat and Emad M. Al-Shawakfa, and Izzat M. Alsmadi. (2013). *Evaluating English to Arabic Machine Translation Using BLEU, (IJACSA) International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, Vol. 4(1, 2).
44. Moulton, Janice; Robinson, George M (1981). *The Organization of Language*. Cambridge University Press; Cambridge, UK; 1981.
45. Muayad Abdul-Halim Ahmad Shamsan & Abdul-majeed Attayib3 (2015) *Inflectional Morphology in Arabic and English: A Contrastive Study*. *International Journal of English Linguistics*; Vol. 5, No. 2; 2015. Canadian Center of Science and Education: 4th Edition. New York: Routledge.
46. Newmark, P (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford; New York: Pergamon Press.
47. Newmark, P (1991). *About Translation*. Prentice Hall International.
48. Nida, E. (1985). *Translating means Translating meaning: A Sociosemiotic Approach to Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
49. Nida, E. (2001). *Contexts in translating*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
50. Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
51. Nida, Eugene A. (2001). *Contexts in Translating*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
52. Nida, Eugene A. (1993). *Language, Culture and Translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
53. Nord, C. (1991) *Text Analysis in Translation*. Amsterdam/Athanta: Rodopi.
54. Nord, C. (2005). *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi, 2nd. revised edition.
55. Nord, C. (2007/1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester, UK & Kinderhook (NY), USA: St Jerome Publishing.
56. Obeidat, MM. (2011). *Translating conjunctions in political journalistic argumentative texts from English into Arabic*, PhD thesis, Salford : University of Salford.
57. Parks, T. (2007). *Translating style: a literary approach to translation, a translation approach to literature (2nd ed)*. Kinderhook, NY: St. Jerome Pub.
58. Petra Kaiseva (2001). *Phantom Hunting: Tracking Down the Initiator of Translations*. *The Electronic Journal of the Department of English at the University of Helsinki*.
59. Pym, Anthony (2010). *Exploring Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.
60. Reder, L. M. (1982). *Elaborations: When do they help and when do they hurt?* *Text*, 2, 211-224.
61. Reiss, K. (1977/1989). "Text types, translation types and translation assessment", translated by Chesterman, A. in Chesterman, A. (ed.) (1989) *Readings in Translation Theory*, Helsinki: Finn Lectura.
62. Reiss, K. , & Rhodes, E. F. (2000). *Translation criticism, the potentials and limitations: categories and criteria for translation quality assessment*. Manchester, U. K. : New York: St. Jerome Pub. ; American Bible Society.
63. Robinson, D. (1997). *Becoming a Translator: An Accelerated Course*. London: Routledge.
64. Robinson, D. , & Kenny, D. (2012). *Becoming a translator: an introduction to the theory and practice of translation (3rd ed)*. London ; New York: Routledge.
65. Samuelsson-Brown, Geoffrey. (2006). *Managing Translation Services. : Multilingual Matters*.
66. Savory, Theodore Horace. (1957). *The Art of Translation*. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd. "Colocviul na ional de traduceri i literatur universal . Stenograma.
67. Shafiee-Sabet, S. G. , & Rabeie, A. (2012). *The Effect of the Translator's Gender Ideology on Translating Emily Bronte's Wuthering Heights*. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 3(3), 143–158.
68. Sharron Gu (2014) *A Cultural History of the Arabic Language*, Library of Congress Cataloguing- In-Publication data, McFarland & Company, Inc. , Publishers. US.
69. Thomas M. (1991). *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
70. Varzande, M & Jadidi, E (2015). *The Impact of Translators' Academic Experience on Their Translation Quality*. 8(9), Canadian Center of Science and Education.
71. Varzande, M. (2016). *Years Of Professional Experience And Degree In Translation: Predictors Of Translation Quality.*.
72. Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London; New York: Routledge.
73. Zabalbeascoa Terran, P (1992). *A New Factor in Translation Theory, an Old Factor in Translation Practice: the Client*, *Sintagma* 4(1992), pp. 35-45.