Collective Thinking in Translation: Teamwork in Translating Literary Texts

Asst. Lect. Nada Dheyaa Lazim
Department of Translation / College of Arts / University of Basrah

Abstract

This is a process-oriented research that examines -through experiment- the feasibility of collective thinking in enhancing the quality of translation. It investigates the effect of collective thinking, within a translation group, on the quality of the translated literary text into the first language (L1). The benefits and drawbacks of such groups are, also, examined herein. To test its hypotheses, the study partially adopts Kiraly's model, The Emergence of Translator Competence (2013). In line with the practical application of the study model, 25 student-translators are recruited to translate, individually and collectively, an English text (Phillips, 2001, P. 41, appendix A) into their native language; Arabic. As it is adopted from a TOEFL course book, the text is chosen -by the study jury- based on its potential recurrence in classrooms. The study, also, adopts a questionnaire (Appendix B) which is designed in accordance with the study model to elicit the student-translators' perspectives about such groups.

التفكير الجمعي في عملية الترجمة: توظيف العمل الجماعي في ترجمة النصوص الادبية

المدرس المساعد ندى ضياء لازم

قسم الترجمة / كلية الآداب / جامعة البصرة

المستخلص

تستهدف هذه الدراسة التجريبية المعنية بعملية الترجمة التحقق من فاعلية التفكير الجمعي في زيادة جودة الترجمة. حيث تفحص تأثير التفكير الجمعي، ضمن مجموعات الترجمة، على جودة النص الادبي المترجم للغة الام، كما تنظر في ايجابيات و سلبيات مثل هذه المجموعات. و تتبنى الدراسة، جزئياً، نموذج كيرالي ، تطور كفاءة المترجم، (٢٠١٣) لاختبار فرضياتها. فتُطوّع ٢٥ طالب ترجمة ليترجمو، فردياً و من ثم جماعياً، نصاً انكليزياً (فيليبس، ٢٠٠٤، ص. ٤١، الملحق أ)، الى اللغة العربية، مختاراً من خبير متخصص من كتاب "توفل" بناءً على احتمالية وروده في مناهج تدريب المترجمين. كما تتبنى الدراسة استبياناً (الملحق ب) صُمم في ضوء النموذج المتبع اعلاه للكشف عن انطباعات المترجمين المتدربين عن المجاميع الترجمية من خلال اجاباتهم. بعد ان يتم ترجمة النص فردياً من المشاركين، تعاد ترجمته مرة اخرى جماعياً بعد تشكيل خمسة مجاميع تتكون من خمسة اعضاء لكل مجموعة.

Introduction:-

The study examines the utility of collective thinking within translation groups on the quality of translation. It investigates the excellence of literary translation via team work in contrast to individual work. It tries, also, to identify the advantages and disadvantages of these groups for possible future implementation in translator-training courses. Therefore, it is a process-oriented research that examines the translation process as it progresses all the way to the final product (Saladanha & O'Brien, 2013, p. 109). To examine these assumptions, the study partially adapts Kiraly's model, *The Emergence of Translator's Competence (2013)*, to elicit the questioned data. That is, since the original model deals with the evolving of the translator's competence through collaborative group/team work, and the study main concern is the group-work part of the model; it is partially employed. Hence, the areas being investigated are: *problem solving; individual, pair, and team work; conflict resolution; competence building; and confidence building*. Such areas are supposed to shed the light on the enhancement of the translator's competence within cooperative environment. Consequently, they will be discussed and investigated thoroughly in the methodology section.

1.2 Motivation

It is advocated by Kiraly (2013, p. 207) that the negotiation and interaction among group members give a "third dimension" (sense) to a "two-dimensional" word. That is, collective thinking can enhance the quality of the translated text (TT) through the interaction of a collection of minds to analyze the given text. These shared minds, according to Kiraly, help to evoke new areas of thinking and cultivate student-translator's intelligence, therefore, competence. Yet, such studies on this collaboration of minds in translation are often "blurred", "unrecognized", and "poorly documented" (Fois, 2016). Thence, as important as it is, the study is highly motivated to look into this feasible, yet, ignored area.

1.3 Problem of the Study

The study examines the effect of collective thinking, within translation groups, on literary translation. It investigates the feasibility of the collaborative negotiation of thoughts among group members, in contrast to individual thinking of each member, in the quality of the literary translation. Herein, the reflection of these shared thoughts on the suitability and aesthetics of

the final collective TT is the main focus. It, also, looks into the advantages and disadvantages of these groups.

1.4 Hypotheses

The study hypothesizes the following:

1- Each translation group produces higher quality translation than those produced individually by its members.

2- Student-translators react positively to being in groups because of the free space of negotiation and the higher quality of translation.

3- Disadvantages of translation groups are found, yet they are of less impact on the appropriateness of the translated literary text.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Collective Thinking

Thinking is the processing of various and complex types of information. It is the mental sorting and working of these pieces of information for a purposeful and intentional end, which is about making sense of the surrounding (Celikoz et al, 2019, p. 31). Collective thinking, in fact, refers to the interdependent cognitive processes present in several individuals' minds in various forms. These cognitive processes (or perspectives) are of mutual influence (Shteynberg, 2018, p. 93). That is, the information received from one mind is being deeply "conceptualized, renormalized, and represented" in a more complicated and evolved manner in another mind. Hence, the produced thoughts during a human exchange are not pure; rather, they are the result of conjoint inspiration by each other. Yet, the question is about whether this exchangeable influence has a forward or a backward advance?

The Social Brain Hypothesis (SBH) tackled by Dunbar (2009) has investigated the above issue. It has found that the "individual mental capacities" collaborate with each other progressively to fit in the society. Building on such a hypothesis, Mercer (2016, p. 3) assures that the humans have the capacity of developing their brains and consequently their reasoning of the world through collective thinking. He, evidently, refers to the intrinsic tendency of the human brain to socialize with other surrounding minds and consequently produce new thoughts that help them better understand and survive our society (see also: Grist, 2009, p. 44). Plausibly, each human brain resorts to interactions, negotiations, compromises, and alternative choices to tolerate the

different perspectives of different brains and cope with new advances in everyday life. It is a mechanism of survival.

From a linguistic point of view, the urge to interact with other people has underlined the emergence of language (Livenson, 2006, p. 40). For fulfilling everyday needs, humans learn how to acquire and use language through daily interaction and cooperation with each other. Motivated by the necessity to accomplish their tasks and deliver emotions, humans must interact with each other in a given environment (see also: the Cooperative Principle, Paul Grice, 1975). In their book, *Team-based Learning: A transformative use of small groups in college teaching*, Michaelsen et al (2004) depict such linguistic interaction in a classroom setting where students speak and support their claims with arguments so as to convince each other. In order to do that, they engage in a growing exchange of linguistic knowledge so their thoughts are stated clearly, and the thoughts of their peers are affected accordingly.

As Witherspoon et al (2016, p. 31) are mainly interested in the new methods of teaching; they consider collaborative classroom discussion as an effective tool for learning. The scholar has concluded that through engaging in conversation, students can redefine terms, accumulate more innovative ideas, and hit new areas of knowledge. To the same effect, Saba (2021, p. 719) refers to such teaching method as helpful in enhancing the students' awareness of a certain topic. The knowledge being shared directly among students can open up new potentials and lead to new creative ideas emerging through this constant exchanging and mingling of thoughts. Consequently, such conglomeration of various minds leads to the development of the brain's mechanism in processing information. This development is, in fact, a natural result of collective thinking.

Hence, human knowledge is not only the repertoire of what is being acquired directly throughout lifetime, but it is also what is being gained, enhanced, and, sometimes, empowered immediately through the interaction with the social surroundings. The human brain has the capacity to alter its working mechanism based on the feedback received from the surrounding environment. Based on that, having a number -or a group- of students discussing an issue is very probable to take it further, explore new areas of understanding, and add new dimensions. As individuals have their own dissimilar ways of processing thoughts (thinking), they are very likely

to share a different idea from the one that is being instantly delivered to them. These differing ideas can lead to a whole new and more innovative conception for each party. The new conception is likely to be shared again, receives more amendments, and gets enhanced one more time. These constant refinement and enrichment of thoughts open up new areas of understanding and leads to new perspectives. At this point, it is reasonable to talk about teamwork in translation where collective thinking is the main focus.

2.2 Teamwork in Translation (Translation Groups)

According to Salas et al (2005, p. 562) team work is a term that refers to two or more individuals who are assigned a task to be carried out though interaction and collaboration. An approximate definition of team work is given by Harris and Sherblom (2018, p. 4); they see a group to be consisted of, at least, three to less than twenty members, who depend and influence one another, have a shared goal, take on a particular role, have a sense of belonging to their teams, and interact actively with each other. In other words, the members of such group affect each other's opinions about a certain topic being discussed, and many of their opinions are trustfully compromised, so an agreed-upon one is reached and dominated. Based on the scholars, since a group member trusts his fellow members' perception, s/he is likely to abandon his/her own standpoint for the sake of his peers'. This mechanism of working within the team is hoped to evolve the discussion and fulfill its desired goal.

In translation, students are expected to have a good performance when working in groups, because such experience will make them able to mingle with other students and have a good chance of exploring the way they think (Setiani, 2020, p. 14) In fact, group work allows students to improve their comprehension as they are afforded with a mixture of thoughts that is likely to enhance their own. The conglomeration of minds in translation helps improve translation quality through conflict and compromise involved in group discussion to arrive at a viable TT which is "the effect of synergy" assured by Klimkowski (2006, p. 96). The thought is assured by Elmassah et al (2020, p. 1458), who insist that if students recognize how to act within groups they will make the outmost of it in learning. In other words, team work is a rich environment to learn giving that students acknowledge how to participate actively within.

Whereas the afore-mentioned scholars talk about the conceptual aspect of translation groups, where students' thinking is enhanced through the exchange of thoughts, Kelly (2014, p. 200) highlights both of the conceptual and social aspects. That is, the scholar considers that such groups do not only allow their members to improve their mental skills, through sharing, but also make them socialize more with each other. In other words, the interpersonal expertise exchanged help them become more competent in translation, whereas, the social experience makes them grow friendlier. The fact that they cooperate with each other and share their conceptual repertoire makes them grow closer. In the same vain, Wallace (2014, pp. 40-41) discusses the social aspect of translation groups; he considers that students thinking together in groups are more likely to be "positive and friendlier towards each other", unlike those who experience individual thinking. The "more fun and relaxed" atmosphere of working with fellow peers away from tutor's judgment has proved to be fruitful in translation (Pavlovic, 2019, p. 292). The students feel more freedom to share whatever they think with optimistic potential of receiving feedback from their colleagues to enhance their perception not a criticism from their tutors.

In line with the above-mentioned scholars, Pavlovic (2007, p. 46) highlights the significance of group work in translation as a natural way of learning. As the scholar sees the collaborative work to involve two or more people working together on the same text to be translated, their work necessarily involves many shared discussions conducted and problems solved. It is this cooperation in translation, according to Pavlovic, that naturally results in "more authentic data" (Pavlovic, 2007, p. 46). Within such collaborative environment, the pieces of information are processed more than once and via various mentalities; thus, data are fairly filtered and ready to be delivered. In fact, the natural type of learning through translation teams is highlighted, afterwards, Hatami (2015, p. 2167) states that students can learn from each other's mistakes. The response each member receives from his group help to enhance his negotiating and judgmental ability to reach the most acceptable translation decision. Effectively, the opposing views raised are not always taken for granted; they might be received with rejection and justification. For the refusal to be tolerated, the opposing party elaborates to convince his colleagues of the viability of his translational alternative(s).

Not very far away from the point of view above, Pym (2011, p. 6), throughout his paper, regards team work as the best way of "training a translator" because of the "meaningful interaction with peers". It is through this interaction that students can explore new areas of knowledge, on their own, that are absent in the individual work environment. Appreciating that thought, Wallace (2014, p. 40) approves the applicability of team-based learning method (TBL) for all students, including translator-students, and observes a "significant intellectual growth" besides a "profound friendship" among students through this type of learning. That is, this method is very promising in developing the mechanism of thinking among group members. In addition, it consolidates the social ties and consequently facilitates the receiving and accepting of opposing viewpoints of others. As effective as it is, translation groups, thus, purports for a solid learning among undergraduate students. Such mingled thoughts are very likely to be enhanced which would allow them to be successful in their careers afterwards (see also: Harris and Sherblom, 2018).

The division of labour is another aspect tackled with regard to translation groups to reach as acceptable result as possible. While Kilmkoski (2006, p. 101) considers translation groups to consist of a leader and member(s), Gouadec (2007, pp. 21-25) has recommended that translation groups should carry diversified roles. The scholar sees that in order for the translational task to be carried out smoothly, each group should have a translator, reviewer, terminologist, and project manager. The assumption is that when students recognize the amount and type of participation they are required to, they will process information more professionally and contribute successfully. Similar division is carried by Olvera-lobo et al (2009, pp. 166-167); they insist that the team work must be highly organized. Each group member should have a significant role (documentalist, terminologist, translator, reviser, and typesetter or project manager) then the translation work is done efficiently regarding comprehension and production. For the roles to be played equally, in each translational task, the team members should assume a different role so that each student would have the chance to play all of the roles throughout their training courses.

Kiraly's suggestion (2000, p. 36) seems to partially differ from the division of labour presented above. He regards collaborative work as a unified accomplishment of a translation task so that meaning is constructed collectively and knowledge is shared equally. The roles are not that specified; the members exchange roles within the one task and the quality of the text to be

translated is the center of attention. He, further, sees no harm in unified working environment when no task is fixed to one student over the other, but all the tasks are shared equally. The shared reasoning of ideas on the part of members is exchangeable along the discussion process; and the suggested translations for the different portions of text are negotiable to reach their goal which is a consensually appropriate TT. Anyhow, despite the numerous advantages traced in translation groups, there are a fair number of disadvantages that are worth of some appreciation.

2.3 Drawbacks of Teamwork in Translation (Translation Groups)

Translation groups have some disadvantages that can weaken the translation quality. Brown (2001, p. 178) draws the attention to the fact that there are some students who, simply, prefer the solo work; they are not productive in teams for the limited participation they would offer. Besides, students tend to use their native language, as they are more comfortable with, more recurrently within the group which would slow down fluency in the second language (L2). To this effect, having students carrying out the discussion is very likely to enforce students' errors in class. In fact, it is very difficult for a tutor to observe all groups to correct these errors and control some trouble-maker students. Kiraly et al, tackles the issue with regard to the variance in competences. Hence, such variety among group members might lead to different speed in processing the given texts. Hence, there is a high risk of some weaker students depending totally on the more intelligent ones, whereas, the opposite happens rarely. Furthermore, some students do not prefer to work with peers; they tend to work alone for more concentration (the same point raised earlier by Brown). This is why, team work might be a very bad experience for them (2003, pp. 51-54).

As to Anderson (2004), the first defect is the variance of profiles towards carrying out the translational work. The dominance of one or some members over others is likely to lead to neglecting the opinions of other students and urges uncomfortable feelings within the group. The division of labour is another defect, listed by Anderson. It is not that easy to assign and handle the roles equally as there are students who prefer one role over the other. This necessarily suggests that if a student carries out a task that s/he does not desire, the benefit of his/her work is remarkably restricted. Time consumption is another factual drawback; the insistence of all group members to engage in meaningless discussions might result in taking more time than it is supposed to (see also: Pavlovic 2019, p. 292). In addition, some

unmotivated students might hide behind the motivated ones; some members are likely to assume a passive role and rely totally on their colleagues' effort (the same point mentioned by Kiraly et al, 2003). Finally, Anderson considers the possibility of students seeing the negative sides of their counterparts as they are getting closer on the social level. Hence, instead of being socially solid, students may be distant from each other.

For Roskosa and Rupniece (2016, p. 250), translation groups can be very problematic. One of these is the "problem of concentration"; students among the group are more likely to lose concentration due to the amount of information discussed at the same time and from various perspectives. Therein, the lack of concentration can highly affect the quality of the TT. Hence, it can be seen as a failure to the task of translation groups since students are unable of straight thinking. The unequal involvement might be another problem; since not all students are likely to participate equally in the discussion of translation problems and solutions. Necessarily, some students will not be able to evolve their information processing because of the dominated students. In fact, time consumption and the competitive moods of some students are also concluded by Pavlovic (2019, p. 292). Hence, not all students can get similar recognition or be able to finish the translation task in time. This can make group work very stressful, disappointing and unproductive for many students.

Thus, having many students means having many mentalities that are likely to clash with each other. Dominating opinions stand in the way of others who might have some better ones which would urge some grudge and hate among colleagues. Not all of the thoughts being shared are correct; hence, wrong thoughts might be taken for granted within the group. Also, some students might totally depend on their peers during the translation task, which means that not all students can cultivate thinking equally and efficiently. Finally, other students might feel more comfortable working alone as they can think more quietly away from the group noise. Hence, along with the many benefits that the translational groups reflect on the whole process of translation (comprehending, negotiating, and composing the final draft of a TT), their negative side cannot be overlooked. In the following sections, the study looks forward to test the feasible reflection (if any) of collective thinking in these groups on the quality of the final literary TT.

Also, it examines whether (or not) the disadvantages being discussed above slow down the process and negatively affect the appropriateness of the TT.

3. Methodology

This section illustrates the procedures and models adapted by the study. Hence, it presents Kiraly's adapted model of measurement, *The Emergence of Translator Competence (2013)*. Since the model tackles the translator's competence through group-work experiment, it is partially employed to test the feasibility of these groups, where various thoughts are shared and mingled, in the quality of the translational product. The study tools are a text (Appendix A) to be translated into L1 individually and collectively, and a questionnaire (Appendix B) to be responded to so that their stances of the teamwork in translation are stated clearly. The study also lists a brief account of the adapted assessment model (Waddington, 2001), to assess the participant's draft translations. As the words on a paper are meaningful by virtue of the totality of combined minds (Kiraly, 2013, p. 207), the study examines individual draft translations of the study participants in contrast to the collective drafts of the groups.

3.1 Model of Measurement

The model of measurement is Kiraly's *Emergence of Translator's Competence (2013)*. It presents a detailed account of the translator's competence through a team work. The current study is mainly concerned with the teamwork part of the model, hence; the model is employed partially to examine the quality of the group translation in contrast to the individual ones produced by the student-translators by virtue of collective thinking. It, additionally, looks into the awareness and reaction of the students to the team work and the applicability of the model regarding this point. Hence, the aspects that are investigated within this study are:

- **Problem solving**; the translational problems faced during the process and the shared discussions for supposedly more proper solutions,
- **The individual and team work**; the division of labour within the team partners to collectively comprehend the ST and compose the TT,
- **Conflict resolution**; handling different translation suggestions,
- **Competence building**; the individual progress of each member based on the collaboration with his fellow members,

- **Confidence building**; members' growing more confident in themselves and their fellow peers as well.

3.2 Model of Assessment

The model of assessment adapted in this study is that of Waddington's (2001) for its detailed evaluation of a given text. The scholar suggests four methods of evaluation (A, B, C, D) to account for the different text types, levels of difficulty, and direction of translation as well (Waddington, 2003, p. 419-421). As the study accounts for thorough error analysis of each translation into L1; it sees that method A best evaluates the chosen text.

Method A; it calculates the number of errors (lexical and grammatical) in terms of affecting the appropriateness of meaning. It considers the distinction between serious errors (-2) and minor errors (-1). Further, it accounts for good solution of a translation problem (+1) and exceptionally good one (+2). The categories of errors are: Inappropriate renderings affecting the understanding of the source text (ST), inappropriate renderings affecting the expression in the target text, and inadequate renderings affecting the transmission of function of the ST. Therein, it subtracts the total of errors out of the total of a fixed number of positive points of the text (both decided by the study evaluator). Then, it divides the resulting number by the positive points configured as x.x to reach a final mark out of ten. For example, if the total number of errors (gained by a student) is -40 and the fixed positive points are 75, the final mark is calculated as: 75-40= 35/7.5= 4.6 (fails to pass; the lowest pass mark is 5).

3.3 Participants

The study participants are 25 fourth-level students, at the Department of Translation/ University of Basra. They have acquired translation procedures and problem-solving skills during the past three years of training in light of Translation Studies (TS). Their verbal consent is obtained before taking part in the test. Anonymously and randomly selected, they are labeled with numbers. Their names, genders, and age are excluded as irrelevant to the study. At the beginning of the experiment, the participants are briefed about the purpose and requirements of the test. Considering the study problem, they are divided into five groups; each of which contains five members (see: Olvera-lobo, 2009, p. 166).

3.4 The Experiment

Each of the translation sheets is numerated after the students (1-25). The participants are handed the selected text (Phillips, 2001, p. 41, Appendix: A) to translate it individually into their

L1, then they are asked to form five groups; each of which includes five members. Each group is asked to translate the text collectively one more time (into L1 also). This would allow them to, presumably, think collectively and discuss translation problems and alternative choices. Having finished the collective translation, the students are required to respond to a questionnaire (Appendix B) designed according to the model of the measurement (Kiraly, 2013), to collect their opinions about the team work they have been engaged in and the usefulness, if any, that each has received. Further, for pedagogical purposes, the time allotted to the experiment equals that of a real lecture to simulate a real learning/training setting.

3.5 The Study Data

Hence, the data used in the study is derived from the participants' draft translations, their responses to questionnaire (Appendix B) questions, and the jury assessment of the draft translation according to the model of assessment (Waddington, 2001). The findings obtained are employed to test the research hypotheses regarding the feasibility of collective thinking within translation groups in improving the quality of translation, and the students' own opinions about the usefulness of these groups. The data used are both qualitative (derived from the draft translations and the open-ended questions of the questionnaire) and quantitative (derived from the assessment of draft translations and the questionnaire close-ended questions). Thus, a mixed analysis (quantitative and qualitative) is adopted (Saldanha & O'Brian, 2013, p. 22).

3.6 The Questionnaire

The questionnaire (Appendix B), which is set according to the adapted model of the study, Kiraly (2013), comprises nine questions to elicit the participants own perspective about the experience s/he has gone through. Likret Scale of Agreement is adopted to reflect the degree of their consent to the questions. It is considered as an essential tool for the study because it correlates the participant's mental repertoire about the translation process and his/her application of this repertoire in a real translation situation. In addition, it reveals his/her opinion about the translation groups/teams and how s/he has reacted to his/her group peers. Anyhow, the responses will be analyzed within the group members; that is, the response of each member of a given group is contrasted to the rest of the responses of the other members of the same group

for objectivity reasons. To this effect, their responses are exclusively limited to the experiences they have had with the selected members of their own groups.

3.7 Method of Analysis

The level of analysis adopted in the study regards the phrase and clause (Saladanha & O'Brien, 2013, p. 120). The units of analysis are problem-solving and alternative translation choices (Saladanha & Obrien, 2013, p. 127). Based on that, the study examines the translation problems (reflected in the individual draft translations) encountered in a phrase or a sentence, and the solutions to these problems, if any, (reflected in the collective drafts). Also, it looks for the weaker translations (derived from the individual drafts of a given group) and compares them with their counterparts (derived from the collective one of the same group). Then, the number of problems solved and correct/better alternatives made in the individual drafts of a given group — as a one set- are counted then compared to the collective one of the same group —as another set. A decision as to whether translation groups improves the quality of translation or not is made based on the lowest number of problems and highest number of correct/better alternatives obtained from either set.

4.   **Data Analysis**

The aim of the study is to investigate whether the quality of translations obtained from translation groups (team translation) is higher, equal, or lower than those obtained from individual translations (the individual members of these groups). Hence, a detection of translation problems is based on the different translation choices proposed for one portion of a text (Pavlovic, 2013, p. 156). This, also, includes the omission of certain elements in the TT (Sladanha & O'Brian, 2013, p. 120). According to the model of assessment (Waddington, 2001), the variables detected are: lexical choices, structure, and the style of writing. The more problems found in a certain TT, the less qualified it is judged. The correctness of the lexical choices is contrasted against Al-Mawrid Dictionary (2015), as well as the expert evaluation of the selected text. The syntactic errors are judged against the established syntax of the Arabic language. The style of writing is decided (by the study evaluator) according to the number of wrong or weak translation choices made. Further, both the total number of positive points (which is fixed as 95), as well as the total number of errors for each participant are counted by the study evaluator.

The final mark which is out of ten (to resemble the system of the model of assessment and the marking system adopted for assignments at the Department of Translation) is calculated according to the following formula: positive points- No. of errors= result/9.5= final mark.

4.1 The Current Study

Since, the study seeks to illustrate the difference, if any, in the quality of translation between the individual translations in contrast to the collective one; it contrastively analyzes the individual translations of each of the five group members to their own collective one. Due to space limitation, a detailed analysis will be applied onto the translation of the first group (A) individually and collectively, so the method of analysis would be manifested clearly. The same analysis will be applied onto the rest of the groups (individually and collectively), yet the results will be displayed in tables and summarized in general percentages. Still, some examples extracted of these groups (B, C, D, E) are listed for argumentative purposes. The evaluator has fixed a total number of positive points as 95. Then, the evaluation process has been carried out as it is mentioned earlier.

4.2 Errors

The taxonomy of errors between English and Arabic is diversified and unique to each text being studied. That is, the translation errors detected in one text is very likely to differ from that of another due to text specifications. However, the current study adopts Solaiman's (2021) categorization of errors as it is compatible with the type of errors detected herein. Hence, the analysis of the draft translations of group A is carried regarding the lexical and grammatical errors as follows:

4.2.I Lexical Errors

4.2.I.1 Mistranslations

Mistranslation refers to the meanings that are wrongly transferred into the TL. The items (carrying the meaning) are contrasted against Al-Mawrid Dictionary (2015) to decide their correctness. If the item given in the draft translation does not match that of the dictionary, then the study evaluator has the final decision regarding its appropriateness. Anyhow, if the item fails to meet the proper meaning proposed by either one (the Dictionary or evaluator), then it is judged as incorrect. The following examples illustrate the mistranslated items done individually versus collectively. The analysis starts with contrasting the individual draft translations of members of group A to the collective translation of the same group as follows:

a. The proper nouns traced in the passage are transliterated by the evaluator; their appropriateness is decided accordingly. Hence, the noun *Carrie* is wrongly transliterated into "كايرا" by P³. Yet, it is correctly transliterated into "كاري" in the collective translation; the same correct transliteration is detected by the other four members of the group. Also, the proper noun *Fitzgerald* is wrongly transliterated into "فيتكرالد, فيركيليد, فازغرالد, فينزركالد" by the participants: 5, 3, 2, 4 respectively. Yet, it is correctly transliterated into "فيتزجيرالد" by P⁶ of the same group. Interestingly, this correct transliteration is detected in their collective one. Further, the proper noun *Dreiser* is mistakenly transliterated into "ديسار" by P⁴, "دريزر" by P⁶, "ديزاز" by P³, and "دريسر" by P⁵. The only correct transliteration is given by P² (درايزر), which is also reflected in their collective translation. Furthermore, the proper noun *Midwest* is wrongly translated into "الوسط الغربي" by P⁴, and "الشرق الاوسط" by P⁵. The correct transliteration -because it is a proper noun- is given by P⁶ as "ميدويست" and reflected in the collective translation of the group. Moreover, the proper noun *Indiana* in the phrase "Indiana University" is mistakenly rendered into "الهندية" by P³ and P⁶, and "اندينا" by P⁵. The drafts of P² and P⁴ have transliterated the noun into "انديانا", which is also the one reflected in their team translation. Once again, the team has chosen the most acceptable ones of all.

b. The term *style* in "introduced a powerful style of writing" was mistakenly rendered into "نمط". Consulting the dictionary, the proper meaning for this word, within this context, is "اسلوب" to best collocate the word "الكتابة". Three of the participants (3, 4, and 5) of the A group have wrongly rendered it into "نمط". Two of them (P² and P⁶) have rendered it correctly. Still, "نمط" is present in their collective translation.

c. The term *account* in the clause "Dreiser created a fictional account" is omitted by P² and mistakenly rendered into "مجد, صورة, عالم, حساب" by the participants: 4, 6, 5, and 3 respectively. The meaning given in the dictionary and is decided by the evaluator as best fits the context is "قيمة، اهمية". However, it is rather acceptably translated into "اسلوب" in their collective translations. Hence, the omission and mistaken translations are, somewhat, overcome in the collective translation.

d. The phrase *laid bare* is wrongly translated into "اطلق عنان" by P[6] and correctly rendered into "اظهرت, تكشف, كشفت, اوضح" by the participants: 5, 3, 2, 5 respectively. The collective translation, however, has wrongly translated it into "اطلق العنان".

e. The term *harsh* in the phrase "harsh life" is mistakenly rendered into "الهشة" by P[4] and "الواقعي" by P[5]. It is correctly rendered by P[6] and P[3], into "القاسية" and "القاسي", which is the dictionary meaning. The collective negotiation of the group seems to result in the most acceptable rendition which is "القاسية".

f. The term *architect* is mistakenly rendered into "مهندس" by P[3]. This translation is found in the dictionary among many others, yet it does not fit the context herein. The same term is correctly translated into "مصمم" by the rest of the participants and it is also reflected in the group translation.

g. The term *genre* is mistakenly rendered into "جيل" and "اسلوب" by P[4] and P[6] respectively. The same word is omitted by P[2] and P[5]. The dictionary rendition of this term is "صنف، نوع" The second choice is made by P[3], which is detected in the collective one of the same group too.

h. The term *fortune* in the clause "whose fortunes had in the recent past taken a dramatic turn for the worse" is mistakenly rendered into "نهايتها" by P[5], and into unreadable word by P[6], "اقدار" by P[4], and P[3], and finally "حظوظ" by P[2]. The dictionary has the words "حظ، قدر، نصيب، ثروة", yet the evaluator has suggested that "ثروة" is the most applicable choice regarding the given context. Still, the collective translation had the word "اقدارها" as a translation, which is not that acceptable since the context is in favor of "ثرواتها". All in all, it is still a somewhat better translation than "نهايتها".

i. The phrase *taken a dramatic turn for the worse* has the meaning of "got worse", according to the evaluator. It is mistakenly rendered into " مأخوذ من تحول دراماتيكي اخذت منحنى درامي تحول الى " by P[2], " اخذت الدراما تتحول نحو الاسوء" by P[6], "للأسوء الاسوء" by P[4], and "يأخذ الدور المأساوي" by P[5]. The last participant (3) in this group has shortened the whole clause into "السيئة". This phrase has been rendered collectively into "اخذت منحنى دراماتيكي سيء". The collective translation affected by the collection of the wrong thoughts of its members is judged as inappropriate.

j. The phrase *factory business* in "build up a successful factory business" is improperly translated into "عمل" by P[4]. The other participants (6, 5, 2, and 3) have rendered it into "مصنع اعمال " ,"مصنع تجاري ناجح" ,"عمل ناجح" ,"مصنعاً للاعمال ناجحاً" "ناجح" respectively. The collective translation has come up with a more acceptable rendition which is "مصنعاً ناجحاً للاعمال", which resembles that of the dictionary. The team translation resembles that of P[6], yet it has a better word order. It seems that such rendition is the result of a successful team negotiation.

k. The phrase *only to lose it to a fire* in the clause "his father has built up a successful factory business only to lose to a fire" is mistakenly rendered into " مختص بأعمال" by P[4], and omitted by P[2] and P[3]. "فقط من اجل خسارته امام النار" by P[5], "اخماد الحرائق" It is only P[6] who has given a correct translation, decided by the evaluator, which was also reflected in the collective one as "فقده نتيجة لحريق". Again, the team has chosen the most acceptable translation of all.

l. The phrase *abruptly thrust into poverty* in the clause "the family was rather abruptly thrust into poverty" means "the family has suddenly become poor". Such meaning is not found in the dictionary because it depends on the literary context; hence, it is decided by the evaluator. Anyhow, it is awkwardly rendered into " كانت و بشكل مفاجىء " by P[6]. It is, also, mistakenly rendered into "على حين غرة اصبحو فقراء" تعرضت العائلة الى خسارة ممتلكاتها" by P[5]. The translation is unacceptably reduced into "كانت العائلة مفتقرة فجأة" by P[2]. Anyhow, P[3] and P[4] have given correct translations "و فجأة اصبحت عائلة ثيودور في حالة عوز" and " اصبحت العائلة فجأة ضحية" والذي)العوز". Very interestingly, the collective translation bears a correct translation (والذي دفع عائلته الى حين غرة الى العوز) that is very similar to that proposed by P[3] and P[4] of the same group. Despite the fact that the correct phrase is "على حين غرة" and not "الى حين غرة", the overall meaning of the collective translation is better than that of the individual ones of the members.

m. The term *earning* in "after earning some money" is rendered into " يكسب، يجني، يستحق". The evaluator has decided that the translation "يجمع" is also acceptable. Considering the draft translations of this group, it is mistakenly rendered into " نفذ بعض المال" ,"ايداعه بعض المال" , and "اقتراض بعض الاموال" by P[2], P[6], and P[4]

respectively. The last two participants (3 and 5) have given correct translations as "بعد ان جمع بعض المال" and "بعد ان كسب بعض الاموال" respectively. A similar translation is correctly given as "بعد ان جمع بعض الاموال" in the collective translation.

n. Consulting both the dictionary and the evaluator, the phrase "yearning for the glory and excitement it offered" is translated into "كان يتلهف او يتوق الى المجد او السمو و" . Yet, it is mistakenly translated into "الحماس الذي كان متوفراً في تلك المدينة كان متلهفاً" , and "كان يتوق الى مجد وسمو الذي حققه" , "للعروض المبهجة التي عرضت عليه" by P[6], P[2], and P[4] respectively. The same phrase is "المجد و السعادة التي عرضت عليه" omitted by P[3], P[5], and the collective translation too.

o. The phrase *the beggar, the alcoholics, and the working poor is* rendered into "المتسولون- مدمني الكحول، و العمال الفقراء" by P[6], "الكبارو المؤرخين و العمال الفقراء" by P[2], and it is omitted by P[5]. "المتسولين و مدمنين الكحول و العمال الفقراء" by P[4], Anyhow, it is more properly rendered into "المتسولون, و مدمنين الكحول, و العمال الفقراء" by P[3] according to the dictionary. The last rendition (of P[3], which is the most accepted of all) is reflected in the collective translation.

p. The term *as* is mistranslated into "كما" in "كما حاولت العائلة بيأس.." by P[2], "بعد" in "بعد حاولت عائلته ان تؤسس..." by P[3], "حيث" by P[4] and P[6], and finally "بينما" by P[5]. The collective translation has resorted to the same translation found in the dictionary, which is "حيث" proposed by the above-mentioned participant.

q. The term *side* in the phrase "the seamier side of life" is mistranslated into "الطرف" by P[4]. The rest of the participants in this group have translated it into "الجانب". However, the dictionary meaning of this term is "الجانب", and it is detected in the collective translation.

4.2.I.2 Addition

The added translations are judged as unacceptable if they are not only absent of the ST but also distort the meaning of the TT. The following are examples detected in the draft translations:

a. The clause "يصعب فهمه" in "اسلوب كتابة قوي يصعب فهمه" is wrongly added by the P[6]; it has no equivalent in the ST. The style of writing is described by using the word "قوي" as a good style of writing; the addition of "يصعب فهمه" changes the meaning drastically. That is, the style of writing is so bad that it cannot be understood, which

does not reflect the intention of the ST. Yet, it is correctly absent from the collective translation of the group to which this participant belongs.

b. The propositional phrase "في الارجاء" is wrongly added by P[2], with no equivalent in the ST. The original text expresses that Dreiser has roamed from place to place in the Midwest; the city is clearly stated. Thus, the rendition should clearly reflect the sense of traveling within this city without adding extra vague words. However, it is not found in the group translation.

c. The phrase "بشكل نهائي" is added to the translation by P[4] in his/her translation of "حاولت العائلة بيأس النهوض بنفسها بشكل نهائي". There is no lexical equivalence for such phrase, besides it changes the meaning of the ST. The family has tried to work hard again to regain their money; there is no mention of anything that is final to correspond to the addition of the participant. Anyhow, such addition is not found in the collective translation.

d. The clause "ان تضع طريقا " in "كما حاولت العائلة بيأس ان تؤسس أو تضع طريقاً لنفسها مالياً" is wrongly added to the translation by P[2] with no equivalence in the TT. According to the context, the intended meaning is that the family is trying to start another successful work to regain its financial status. That is why the above addition is unneeded and the meaning would be manifested clearly without it. Again, the addition is not detected in the collective translation.

e. The term "المؤذي" is added to the translation of P[5], and it has no equivalence in the ST. The participant has added this term to emphasize the meaning in the phrase "الجانب الدنيء و المؤذي للحياة". It is judged as unacceptable because the low side of life discussed in the novel is expressed in the term "seamier: دنيء"; the term "مؤذي" has another different meaning that is not mentioned by the author. Still, it is successfully missing in the collective translation.

f. The phrase "افضل مؤلف امريكي" is added to the translation with no SL equivalence. It is attributed to the lack of understanding of the context "the American author best known for the novel". Anyhow, the addition changes the meaning from: the novel that he is best known for into the best American author ever. The collective

translation has no such addition; the word "best" is rendered into "جيداً" and it is employed correctly, consulting the evaluator, in the context as "عُرف جيداً براويته..".

4.2.I.3 Omission

Omission refers to the deletion of the meaningful portions of the text. Such deletion affects the informative value of the proposition. It also, distorts the textuality, as the strings of thoughts are cut short, so the contextual meaning is compromised. The following are examples of the omissions made to the text by the participants' drafts in contrast to their collective translation:

a. The term *best* in "best known for the novel Sister Carrie…" is missed in the rendition of Participants: 3, 4, and 6. Still, it is translated acceptably, evaluator's judgment, in the collective translation as "عُرف جيداً بروايته الاخت كاري". It seems that the lack of understanding of the meaning which the term "best" reflects here is the cause of omission.

b. The term *profound* in the phrase "a profound influence" is omitted in the rendition of P[6]. The omission badly affects the meaning in the sense that the adjective "profound" describes why such style has influenced the succeeding writers. That is, since it is a profound style of writing it has a big influence on them. Yet, the meaning traced in the dictionary is correctly reflected in the collective translation as "ذات تأثير عميق".

c. The term *account* in the clause "Dreiser created a fictional account that had laid bare the harsh reality of…" is omitted in the draft translation of P[2]. Again, *account* is the agent that had disclosed the harsh reality of the city; hence, the omission of such word is definitely wrong, and it negatively affects the meaning and the texture of the whole sentence. Still, the term is rendered in their collective translation into "اسلوب", which is not traced in the dictionary, yet approved by the evaluator.

d. The term *harsh* in the clause "the harsh life" is omitted in the translation of P[2]. Since, the term "harsh" is an adjective that reflects the wild side of life; then it has an important portion of meaning that affects the understanding of the whole text. Still, the term is rendered correctly, contrasting the dictionary, "القاسية" in the collective translation to which this participant belongs.

e. The clause "and in which Dreiser established himself as the architect of a new genre" is omitted by P[2]. In addition, P[5] has omitted "of a new genre" of the same clause. The meaning in the original text suggests that Dreiser is the one who has established a new

genre of writing; omitting it means omitting this important portion of the text. The reader will not be able to know that Dreiser has contributed to literature as the founder of a new genre. Comparatively, this meaning is weakly, judged by the evaluator, reflected in the group translation as "و الذي عرَف نفسه كمصِمم لصِنف جديد." In other words, the meaning is about Dreiser adding a new genre to literature not defining himself as a designer of a new type (genre is different from type according to the dictionary). Still, it has, at least, tried to render it into the target language (TL).

f. The prepositional phrase "in the recent past" and the verbal one "has taken a dramatic turn" have been omitted by P³. Such omission is not acceptable because the first has the meaning of the time of an important event (the family losing its money in the past) and the second has the meaning of the family's financial status getting worse. Their renditions are still manifested in the collective translation as " في الماضي القريب اخذت منحنى دراماتيكي سيء. Although, the adverb of time "في الماضي القريب" precedes the clause "اخذت منحنى دراماتيكي سيْ", the translation is seen as better than all of the individual ones given by the group members. The meaning, contrasted against both the dictionary and the evaluator judgment, is still conveyed despite the wrong word order.

g. The phrase *only to lose it to a fire* has been omitted by P² and P³. Yet, their rendition is successfully, traced in the dictionary, found in the collective translation as " و الذي فقده نتيجة لحريق". The meaning carried by the omitted phrase is essential because it shows why the family's fortune has been lost (because they have lost their factory in the fire). Hence, omitting this piece of information cuts short the general meaning of the text.

h. The term *Midwest* is omitted in the translation of P² and P³. Again, the evaluator transliteration is properly found in the collective translation as "ميدويست". Since, it is a proper noun and it refers to the place within which Dreiser has gone from place to place; then it should be transliterated into L2.

i. The phrase *desperately to establish itself financially* in the clause "the family tried desperately to establish itself financially" is omitted by P⁵. Yet, it is translated correctly, based on the dictionary, in the collective translation as " قامت عائلته بمحاولات يائسة لتأسيس نفسها مالياً". The omission of this phrase is not tolerated because the rendition loses the segment of the text that suggests the family's attempts, with despondence, at

regaining their financial status again. It is a portion of a text that cannot be overlooked or denied in the TT.

j.   The term *financially* in the verbal phrase "reestablish itself financially" is omitted by P[4]. Still, the dictionary meaning "مالياً" is found in the collective translation. It is unacceptable deletion because the meaning reflected in the TT is vague; it is not obvious what kind of reestablishment that the family has been trying to do. The TL rendition needs the term "financially" to uncover the kind of foundation that the family is attempting.

k.   The phrase *yearning for glory and excitement* is omitted in the rendition of P[3] and P[5]. Unacceptably, it is not detected in the collective translation too. It seems that the collective negotiation has failed to render this portion of the text this time. Anyhow, it is very sensitive phrase; it shows the reason why Dreiser has returned to Chicago. So, deleting such segment of the text means covering the reason why an event had happened which is judged, by the evaluator, as unacceptable.

l.   The phrase "that befell the less fortunate in the city, the beggars, the alcoholics, and the working poor" is omitted in the translation of P[5]. However, the correct meaning dictionary exists in the collective translation as " المتسولون و مدمنين الكحول و العمال و الفقراء". The clause depicts the kind of people that Dreiser has been recording their life events and the ones whom he has tackled in his novel. The omission is not tolerated because a translation cannot lose that much of a sensitive segment of a text.

m.   The nominal phrase *less fortunate* is omitted in the rendition of P[4]. Again, the deletion of this phrase is not acceptable because the unlucky people mentioned by the original text are the ones that Dreiser has been recording their lives, as a reporter, and also they are the ones that he has been inspired by to write his novel, *Sister Carrie*. Consequently, omitting this segment of the text leads to obscure the contextual meaning. Nonetheless, this phrase is found in the collective translation as "الاحداث الاقل حظاً ", yet it is not that acceptable according to the study evaluator.

4.2.II Grammatical Errors

The Arabic structure has a somewhat flexible word ordering in contrast to the English one. It is smooth enough to incorporate some changes in the grammatical positions of the words. That is, the Arabic sentence normally starts with the verb, yet it may start with the subject if there is a

need to be emphasized. Further, subject ordinarily precedes the predicate; nevertheless, it can follow the predicate in some cases where the latter has more informative value over the former. These interchangeable positions are tolerated as far as this study is concerned. Yet, the study seeks out the bold deviation from the accepted Arabic structure. What follows are examples of the grammatical mistakes detected and analyzed.

4.2.II.1 Wrong Word Order

Therein, a number of grammatical errors are detected in the draft renditions of the members of group A and contrasted to their collective one as follows:

a. P[4] has committed a grammatical mistake in placing the verb "صنع" after the phrase "كانت (الاخت كاري) التي صنع.." putting, incorrectly, the noun of "كانت" in brackets. Further, he has put the subject "ثيودور ديسار" in brackets in "صنع لها (ثيودور ديسار)". Both the misplacements of elements and the bracketing of subjects are judged as wrong. However, the collective translation for this clause (صنع لروايته الاخت كاري اسلوب خيالي..) is judged as more acceptable. It starts with the verb, and the context does refer to the hidden subject "هو" and does not imply any emphasis on the subject, which corresponds to the established Arabic structure.

b. A grammatical mistake, according to the evaluator, is committed by P[2]; he has placed the verb "كشفت" after the subject "رواية الاخت كاري" in " رواية الاخت كيري الذي كشفت عن...". Such a mistake is not tolerated since the normal word order would still conveys the meaning properly. Nevertheless, this unaccepted word order is successfully absent in the collective translation; an alternative rendition is chosen for the in-question clause. It is judged as more acceptable and reads as: " صنع لروايته الاخت كاري اسلوباً خيالي و الذي اطلق العنان للحقيقة القاسية..".

c. A wrong word order is detected by P[6]; he has placed the subject before the verb in a number of Arabic clauses; "حيث ديزر عرض نفسه", "دريزر ولد عام ١٨٧١", and " عائلته على حين غرة اصبحو فقراء". It is found that there is no need to misplace these elements. Anyhow, the collective translation has the following comparative word order regarding the same above-mentioned segments of the text: " و الذي عرَف نفسه كمصمم لصنف جديد", "ولد درايزر في عام ١٨٧١", and finally "و الذي دفع عائلته الى حين غرة الى العوز". All of

the collective renditions are judged to be better than all of the individual ones regarding the word order (placing the verb before the subject).

d. The adjective "ناجحاً" is placed away from the noun it describes "مصنعاً" in the phrase " مصنعاً للاعمال ناجحاً" by P[6], which is not that desirable word order in Arabic. The collective translation has rendered it into "مصنعاً ناجحاً للاعمال", which is more acceptable because the Arabic adjective is better to be placed directly next to the noun it describes, so the description is not vague or confused.

e. The subject "رواية" is placed before the verb "صنعت" in " كانت رواية الاخت كايرا للكاتب ثيرو " صنعت حساب خيالي.." by P[3]. It is very unacceptable because not only the position of the verb after the subject is wrong, but also the addition of "كانت" is irrelevant within this sentence. The collective translation, on the other hand, has a better word ordering; "صنع لرواتيه الاخت كاري اسلوب .."

f. An awkward order of the phrase "بعد حاولت عائلته ان تؤسس نفسها.." is given by P[3]. The semi-verb proposition "أن" is incorrectly placed after "عائلته". It should be placed after the adverb "بعد" and before the verb "حاولت". No such mistake is found in the other translations of group A. In fact, the collective translation of this group successfully reads: "قامت عائلته بمحاولات يائسة لتأسيس نفسها.."

g. The phrase "عائلته كانت على حين غرة اصبحو فقراء" is wrongly ordered by P[6]. The verb "اصبح" should be placed at the beginning of the clause and attached with the feminine pronoun "ت" to collocate with the feminine word "عائلته". Also, the plural noun "فقراء" should be singularized and feminized into "فقيرة", and it should be placed after "عائلته". A more acceptable rendition is given in the collective translation as " و الذي دفع عائلته الى حين غرة الى العوز". Still, the mistake detected herein is the preposition " الى " in "الى حين غرة"; it should have been "على".

4.2.II.2 Wrong Agent

An agent is the noun, pronoun, or noun phrase that refers to the doer of an action in the sentence. Here are examples of misinterpretation of the agent in the individual drafts in comparison to the collective one.

a. The agent in the clause "introduced a powerful style" is Theodore Dreiser. It is misunderstood by P[3] for Sister Carrie. Hence, s/he proposes "قدمت نمط كتابي قوي" as a

translation for the above clause. The wrong agent here has changed the meaning of the text. The same mistake in not manifested in the other renditions of this group. Also, the collective translation is better; the team rendition is: "و انتج نمط قوي للكتابة". The translation, herein, correctly refers to Dreiser as the agent.

b. The agent in the clause "a powerful style of writing that had a profound influence on…" is *style*. The translation offered by P[5] is "و التي تمتلك تأثير عميق على.." refers to "رواية الاخت" "كاري" in his own draft as the agent. Herein, the participant has committed a mistake regarding the agent. The same agent "اسلوب" is also misunderstood by P[3] as "الكتابة" in his translation "التي لها تأثير عميق على..". That is why he has written "التي" to collocate with "الكتابة" as a feminine noun. A similar misunderstanding is detected in P[4] whose translation has the same wrong agent "الكتابة" as: "التي تحتوي على تأثير عميق للكتاب". The collective translation is more successful; the translation offered is "ذا تأثير عميق على..". The term "ذا" is attributed to "اسلوب" which is the correct agent (style).

c. P[6] has misunderstood the subject "fictional account" for "Theodore Dreiser" in "Theodore Dreiser had created a fictional account that had laid bare the harsh reality..". So, he has rendered it as "كانت رواية الاخت كاري التي كتبها ثيودور ديزر بصورة خيالية و اطلق عنان الحقيقة القاسية.."; that is, he conceives Theodore as the one who had laid bare the harsh reality not his creative style of writing within this context. Although, the meaning is not that confused, the textuality is compromised. The passage is about Dreiser's style of writing and how it has influenced the succeeding writings, and so it should be rendered. The rest of renditions do not bear similar mistake as far as this agent is concerned. Contrastively, the collective translation which this participant is part of has rendered it more acceptably as "صنع لرواتيه الاخت كاري اسلوب خيالي الذي اطلق العنان للحقيقة القاسية...". Hence, the agent "اسلوب" is correct here.

d. A wrong agent is detected in the rendition given by P[2]; he has mistakenly attributed the verb "had taken" to the word "dramatic" instead of "fortunes" in his rendition "ذات حظوظ في الماضي اخذت الدراما تتحول..". The collective translation is more acceptable; it is "اقدارها". So, the word "كانت اقدارها في الماضي القريب اخذت منحى دراماتيكي.." reads as: the correct agent that collocates with the verb "اخذت", although it has been judged as not that accurate lexical equivalent. The rendition "ثرواتها" is seen as more appropriate.

4.2.II.3 Wrong Gender

Arabic has a masculine-feminine distinction that is absent in English. Yet, the gender variation can be inferred in the English ST via the context. Therefore, the analysis process traces the reflection of this variation in the TT as well as the gender parallelism within Arabic elements.

a. The term "نهايتها" in P[5]'s translation is feminine, yet s/he has associated it with a masculine form of the verb "يأخذ" in "و التي كانت نهايتها في الماضي القريب يأخذ الدور". Such a mistake is not detected in the collective translation; the same clause is rendered into "و التي كانت اقدارها في الماضي القريب اخذت منحنى...". The feminine agent "اقدارها" collocates with the feminine form of the verb "اخذت".

b. The term "ذات" is a feminine form of a word that is wrongly used by P[2] to attribute to a masculine noun and associate with a masculine verb in "اسلوب كتابي قوي و يعتبر ذات تأثير على..". The collective translation, similarly, has a rather acceptable translation as "اتبع نمط قوي للكتابة ذات تأثير عميق...". Although, the team translation has also used the term "ذات", it has attributed it to the feminine word "الكتابة" and not "اسلوب" -which is the correct agent here. Hence, the gender association in the collective translation is better which refers to a fair sensitivity of gender variations between English and Arabic within the group.

c. The masculine term "الذي" is wrongly attributed to the feminine word "رواية" by P[2] in "رواية الاخت كاري الذي كشفت عن واقع...". Interestingly however, the collective translation also has the masculine term "الذي", and it is correctly attributed to a masculine word "اسلوب" in "صنع لروايته الاخت كاري اسلوب خيالي و الذي اطلق العنان...". Again, gender variation is appropriately reflected in the team translation.

4.2.II.4 Wrong Number

The number system in Arabic is richer than English in the sense that is distinguishes between singular, dual, and plural. English is satisfied with singular-plural variation. The following examples trace the reflection of number variation in the Arabic draft translations.

a. The term *writers* in "on the writers that followed him" is wrongly translated into a singular form "الكاتب" by P[5] and P[2]. It is translated into "الكُتاب" in the collective translation with the addition of Al-Dhamah (ُ) to differentiate it form "كِتاب" that

means *book* in English. This rendition shows successful team negotiation and appreciation of the plural form of the Arabic word.

b. The term "الذي" is mistakenly attributed to "الكُتاب" in "على الكُتاب الذي.." by P[3]. It should be "الذين" to collocate with the plural noun "الكُتاب". This mistake is absent in the collective one; instead, it is successfully translated into "على الكُتاب الذين اتبعوه..".

c. The term "اتبعه" is mistakenly attributed to "الكُتاب" in P[3] in comparison to the successful collective translation as "على الكُتاب الذين اتبعوه.." mentioned above.

4.2.II.5 Prepositions

Prepositions are the part of speech that glues the portions of a sentence together. In Arabic, they have certain places that best show their meaning. Here are some examples of the wrong, lack, or overuse of prepositions in the draft translations of the study participants in contrast to their collective one.

a. Wrong use of the preposition "لـ" in "و قد كان المسؤول لتقديم الاحداث التي تحدث.." by P[5] and, also, "لـ" in "و قد كان مسؤولاً للتسجيل احداث وقعت في المدينة" by P[2]. The collective translation has mentioned "و قد كان مسؤولاً عن ايصال الاحداث للأقل حظاً.." which is detected in the individual translation of P[6] and judged, by the evaluator, as a better translation than the ones offered by the previous participants of the same group. For, the preposition "عن" is the one that collocates correctly with the word "مسؤول".

b. The wrong use of the preposition "لـِ" in "عُرِف لرواية (الاخت كاري)" instead of "عُرِف بِـ" by P[4] and P[5]. The same preposition is, also, used by P[3] in "معروف لرواية الاخت كايرا". P[6], on the other hand, has rendered the preposition correctly as "معروف بروايته" which is reflected successfully in the collective translation.

c. The wrong addition of the preposition "كـ" in "كان كشاهد للطرف البشع" by P[4]. No use of this preposition, within this context, is traced in the collective translation.

4.2.II.6 Wrong Punctuation

As punctuation marks have major roles in adding meaning to the sentence, any absence or lack of these marks would affect its appropriateness. The following examples illustrate the mistakes committed by student-translators of group A in comparison to their collective draft.

a. The participants 5 and 6 have no punctuation marks in their renditions except for dots placed at the end of the last four sentences.

b. P[3] has used the comma in the last four sentences.

c. Anyhow, all of the sentences in their collective translation end with full stops, which indicate a somewhat better punctuation.

Following Method A in the model of assessment which deals with the error analysis, the number of lexical and grammatical errors is counted and subtracted from the total number of positive points; 95. The result is divided by 9.5, so the final mark for each draft of group A is gained. The same process is applied onto the collective translation. The following table shows the final mark of translation quality gained by each participant in contrast to the collective translation:

Table (4-1): Evaluating Translation Errors for Group A

	Lexical Errors					
Errors	P٣	P٢	P٤	P٥	P٦	Collective translation
Mistranslation	١١	١٩	١٥	٢٥	٢٤	٦
Addition	٣	---	---	٤	٢	---
Omission	١٦	٥	١	١٧	---	٤
Grammatical Errors						
Wrong Word Order	٤	٢	٤	٤	٤	٢
Wrong Agent	١	٢	٣	١	٢	---
Wrong Gender	٢	---	---	١	---	---
Wrong Number	١	٢	---	١	---	---
Wrong Preposition	١	١	٢	٢	١	٢
Wrong punctuation	١٣	١٣	١٦	٢٠	١٩	١١
Number of errors	-٦٦	-٤٤	-٤٦	-٧٥	-٥٣	-٢٥
Final Score out of ١٠	٣٠٠	٥.٣	٥.٦	٢.١	٤.٤	٧.٣

As mentioned earlier, for space limitation, the study will display the results of the analysis of the last four groups in tables. The analysis of the translation quality has employed the same methods discussed above.

4.3 Analysis of the Results of Group B

The results obtained from the analysis of the individual draft translations in comparison to the collective one is being displayed in the below table:

Table (4-2): Evaluating Translation Errors of Group B

	Lexical Errors					
Errors	P٨	P٩	P١٠	P١١	P٢٠	Collective translation
Mistranslation	٧	٩	٤	٤	١٣	٤
Addition	٥	٤	١	---	٨	---
Omission	٢	١	---	١	---	١
Grammatical Errors						
Wrong Word Order	٢	٢	١	٣	٩	٢
Wrong Agent	١	٣	---	٢	١	٠
Wrong Gender	---	١	---	---	---	٢
Wrong Number	٢	٢	٤	٤	٥	٢
Wrong Preposition	٢	١	١	---	---	---
Wrong punctuation	١٥	٧	٤	١٦	١٢	١١
Number of errors	-٣٦	-٣٠	-١٥	-٣٠	-٤٨	-٢٢
Final Score out of ١٠	٦.٢	٦.٨	٨.٤	٦.٨	٤.٩	٧.٦

4.4 Discussion of Group B Results

Most of the errors detected within the members of this group are interestingly absent in the collective translation. For the sake of argument, and judging by the dictionary, here are some examples. The clause "introduced a powerful style of writing" is collectively translated into " و الذي قدم اسلوباً قوياً في الكتابة" which is considered as a better rendition than those of other members of this group. It is the same rendition introduced by P[8], in comparison to " عُرِف بقوة " given by "قدم اسلوباً كتابياً قوياً", "قدم اسلوب كتابي", "كتبت بأسمى اسلوب كتابي", "الاسلوب في الكتابة" the participants: 9, 10, 11, and 20 respectively. Also, the clause "his father has built up a successful factory business only to lose it to a fire" is collectively translated into " كان والده قد شيد معملاً انتهى به المطاف مشتعلاً بالنيران" which is seen, by the evaluator, as a good style of literary writing that transfers the function of the original text.

However, the renditions "والده الذي خسر معمله يحترق باللهب ", " و الذي خسره على اثر حريق اضرم بنى والده مصنع تجاري لكن سرعان ما تعرض لحريق الذي ", " انشأ والده مصنع تجاري ناجح للغاية فيه بنى والده مصنع اعمال ناجح ", "شيد والده مصنع اعمال ناجح فقط لخسارته بحريق", "سبب لخسارته فقط ليخسره تماماً " are given by P[8], P[9], P[10], P[11], and P[20] respectively. Such translations are judged, by the evaluator, as weaker than the collective one mentioned above. Interestingly, the collective translation has a successful alternative that is not detected in any of the members. It is thought to be the result of the collective negotiation of the group members of different translational alternatives. Furthermore, the term "Midwest" is a proper noun that has been successfully transliterated into the TL in the collective translation as "ميدويست". It is a proper transliteration that it detected in the renditions of P[10] and P[11] of this group. Two of the participants; 8 and 20, have mistakenly translated it into "الشرق الاوسط" and "الغرب الاوسط" respectively. As for the last participant in this group, who is P[9], he has wrongly omitted the term.

Regarding the grammatical mistakes, the wrong word order traced in the translation of "Dreiser is born in 1871 into a large family whose fortunes had in the recent past taken a dramatic turn for the worst." is lesser in the collective translation than in the individual ones presented by P[11] and P[20]. That is, P[11] has rendered it into " في عائلة كبيرة التي كانت حظوظها في الماضي و التي كانت مصيرها يشكل انتقالة " while P[20] has given " القريب اخذت منعطفاً دراماتيكياً نحو الاسوء درامية بشكل اسوء في الماضي". More acceptable translations are given byP[8], P[9], and P[10]; they have

rendered the clause into: " ولد درايزر سنة ١٨٧١ وسط عائلة ضخمة قد ساءت بها الاقدار الى نهايات ولد ثيودور في عام ١٨٧١ وسط عائلة كبيرة و التي شاءت الاقدار ان تأخذ حياتهم منحنى ", "دراماتيكية سيئة ولد درايزر في عام ١٨٧١ في عائلة كبيرة التي تعرضت لمأسي درامية و ازدادت سوءاً " and, "درامي الى الاسوء ولد درايزر في عام ١٨٧١ وسط عائلة " respectively. The collective translation " خلال الفترة الماضية. كبيرة قد ساءت بها الاقدار الى نهايات شنيعة " is evaluated as much better than the individual ones. Therefore, the collective effort exerted by the participants of this group has turned out to be fruitful. Their group rendition, mentioned above, bears some distinguishable words collected from the renditions of some participants. That is, the rendition is not seen in any of the individual translations, yet it is composed of pits and pieces of all of them. The first part of it " ولد ثيودور (درايزر) عام (سنة) ١٨٧١ وسط عائلة كبيرة (ضخمة) " is seen in almost all of the draft translations. Still, it is the second part of the sentence that is considered as problematic because the participants have suggested different solutions (Pavlovic, 2013: 156). Although, the two terms "ساءت" and "شنيعة" are unacceptably grouped in one sentence, the argument still holds regarding the better word ordering according to the evaluator. That is, gluing the two parts of the sentence; Theodore's birth and his family's misfortune fate, using the Arabic terms " قد ساءت" is remarkably better.

In addition, the word order traced in the translation of "The family was rather abruptly thrust into poverty" is better in the collective translation than in some individual ones. That is, P[11] and كانت العائلة تواجه " and "كانت العائلة مندفعة نحو الفقر بصورة مفاجئة" :P[20] have rendered it into الفقر بصورة مفاجئة للممتلكات " respectively. The renditions proposed by the rest of the participants; 8, 9, and 10 are more acceptable, judging by the evaluator, and they obviously bear traces in the collective one. The renditions are "انحدرت العائلة بشكل مفاجئ الى الفقر الشديد", "انقلبت احوال عائلة ثيودور بصورة مفاجئة الى فقراً و عوز" and, "اصبحت العائلة على حين غرة في فقر" respectively. The collective translation chosen by this group for the mentioned clause is " انحدرت العائلة بغتةً الى فقرٍ شديد". The incorrect word order given by P[11] and the unacceptable one given by P[20] is absent in the team translation; instead, the collective one bears traces of the correct word order of the other mentioned three participants. That is, it is judged that the verb is better proceeds the subject and be emphasized to show the turn of fate that the family has witnessed.

4.5 Analysis of the Results of Group C

The results obtained from the analysis of the individual draft translations in comparison to the collective one is being displayed in the below table:

Table (4-3): Evaluating Translation Errors of Group C

Errors	P١	P١٢	P١٤	P١٨	P٢٣	Collective translation
Lexical Errors						
Mistranslation	٩	٦	٣٩	١٨	٤	٥
Addition	—	١٨	٢	٤	٢	٢
Omission	١٢	٤٢	٢	٢٨	٢	٤
Grammatical Errors						
Wrong Word Order	٥	٤	٨	٤	—	١
Wrong Agent	٢	١	٢	٢	١	—
Wrong Gender	—	—	١٠	—	—	١
Wrong Number	٢	—	٢	١	٥	—
Wrong Preposition	٤	١	٨	٤	—	—
Wrong punctuation	١٦	٢٠	١٦	١٨	١٤	١٢
Number of errors	-٥١	-٩٢	-٨١	-٧٩	-٢٨	-٢٦
Final Score out of ١٠	٤.٦	-١	١.٨	١.٦	٧.٠	٧.٢

4.6 Discussion of Results of Group C

Arguably, the results of this group are remarkably unique. The totality of the individual translations (except for P[23]) is inadequate; the drafts have failed to render 60% of the meaning properly. Still, their collective translation has succeeded to bring about the overall meaning of the text with less lexical and grammatical mistakes. The influence of the rendition of P[23] is obvious as many of the word choices and syntactic structures are reflected in the collective draft translation. For example, the collective translation has correctly started with the verb "قدم" which is the translation of "introduced"; this successful rendition, according to the dictionary, is only traced in P[23] translation. The same verb is absent in P[1] and P[12]'s renditions, and it is mistakenly placed after the subject "Theodore Dreiser" in P[14] and P[18]'s. It seems that the team has negotiated the verb place traced in P[23] as the correct one that should be reflected in their collective translation.

More interestingly, the group has, in some examples, chosen terms that are not chosen by any of its members in their individual drafts. For example, the term "بليغاً" in the phrase "اسلوباً بليغاً" is only traced in the collective translation; the evaluator has decided that it is a correct choice of word that shows the significance of the style of writing. The group members; 1, 12, 14, 18, and 23 have given "النمط القوي" , "انماط قوي" , "نمطاً قويا" , "نمطاً قوياً", and "اسلوباً قوياً" respectively. The term "قوياً", according to the evaluator, does not collocate with the term "اسلوباً". Again, it is thought that the manifestation of this term in the collective translation is the result of the

collective discussion of the group members for a more acceptable translation than what they have already chosen in their drafts. Further, the major omissions done by P[12] and P[18]; also, the many additions done by P[18] is, successfully, not reflected in the group translation.

　　　　The syntactic structure of the sentences in the group translation is almost adequate. The verb is placed before the subject which is the more acceptable kind of Arabic ordering of a sentence. Furthermore, the functional words selected for gluing the parts of the sentence is more appropriate than those presented in the drafts (mainly by the Participants: 1, 12, 14, and 18). For example, the rendition of "Theodore Dreiser, the American author first known for the novel, Sister Carrie (1912), introduced a powerful style of writing" is translated into " ثيودور درايزر، المؤلف الامريكي الافضل معرفة بالرواية، الاخت كاري (١٩١٢) ادخلت النمط القوي للكتابة ، " ثيودور درايزر، " ، " افضل الروائيين الاميركيين، رواية..... (١٩١٢) و التي تقدم انماط قوية من الكتابة المؤلف " ، " ثيودور دريزر، المؤلف الافريقي للرواية " ، " الاميركي الاكثرة شهرة لرواية..... ١٩١٢ قدم نمط قوي للكتابة دريسر المؤلف ، و الذي " and , " الاكثر شهر (سستر كاري ١٩١٢) قدم نمطاً قوياً للكتابة قدم المؤلف الامريكي ثيودور درايزر by P[1], P[12], P[14], P[18], and P[23] ، " اشتهر براويته، الاخت كاري (١٩١٢)، اسلوباً قوياً في الكتابة respectively. The collective translation has a correct syntactic structure and resembles that which is given by P[23].

Number, which is another problematic portion of the text, is transferred successfully in the collective translation. The phrase "on the writers that followed him" is translated into " الكاتب الذي تبعه " by P[1] and P[14]. This is obviously a wrong number transference that does not correspond to the original. Further, it is rendered into " الكاتب الذي تلاه " by P[23], which is the same mistake, again, in number. Notwithstanding, the collective translation gives " الكُتاب الذين اتبعوه " as a successful rendition of the phrase, which is the same rendition detected in the translation of P[12] and P[18]. That is, the plural of the SL is rendered into plural in the TL. It is worth mentioning that while the two draft translations suggested by P[12] and P[18] are considered as weak ones, by the evaluator, the team has chosen their number translations in the collective translation. This is evidence that the translation group chooses the best translation of a portion of a text even from the overall weaker ones.

4.7 Analysis of the Results of Group D

The results obtained from the analysis of the individual draft translations in comparison to the collective one is being displayed in the below table:

Table (4-4): Results of Group D

Errors	Lexical Errors P١٣	P١٦	P١٩	P٢١	P٢٢	Collective translation
Mistranslation	١٠	٤	١٦	١٢	١٤	٤
Addition	٢	―	٢	٢	―	١
Omission	―	٥١	١	٢	١	٢
Grammatical Errors						
Wrong Word Order	٢	٦	٥	٢	٢	٢
Wrong Agent	٢	١	٢	٢	١	٢
Wrong Gender	١	―	٢	―	―	―
Wrong Number	٤	٤	٢	١	٢	١
Wrong Preposition	٢	١	١	٢	٢	١
Wrong punctuation	٩	٢٠	١٢	٨	١١	١٥
Number of errors	-٣٢	-٨٨	-٤٥	-٣٨	-٣٨	-٣١
Final Score out of ١٠	٦.٢	.١	٥.٢	٦	٦	٦.٧

4.8 Discussion of the Results of Group D

Once again, the collective translation has a higher level of quality; it has less lexical mistakes in comparison to the individual drafts of its members. For example, the lost meaningful bits "and in which Dreiser established himself as the architect of a new genre." in the P[16]'s rendition is reflected in the collective translation as "جعل من نفسه منشأ لنوع جديد من الرواية". Although, the rendition does not reflect the intended meaning properly; as "منشأ" is a weak choice of word consulting both of the dictionary and evaluator. It, still, has attempted to render it. A very close rendition is detected in P[22]; s/he has given "جعل درايزر من نفسه المنشأ لنوع جديد من الرواية". This rendition is judged, by the evaluator, as better than those given by the other participants. That is, P[13], P[16], P[19], and P[21] have translated the above-mentioned clause into: "و قام (دريزر) بخلق نفسه كمهندس لنوع جديد", and "حيث نصب دريزر نفسه كمصصم الجيل الجديد", and "حيث نشر دريزر نفسه بأنه المخطط لمشروع ضخم للجيل الجديد" respectively. Hence, the team has chosen the best rendition of all members for their collective translation.

In addition, the phrase "only to lose it to a fire" is collectively, and correctly, rendered into: "ليخسره لاحقاً في حريق". The term "يخسر" is a correct rendition traced in the dictionary. The same clause is being omitted by P[16] and awkwardly translated by P[13] into "حيث اخسرته النيران هذا العمل". As for the participants: 19, 21, and 22, they have rendered the phrase more correctly into "ليخسره في حريق", "وخسره بسبب الحريق", and "خُسر في حريق" respectively. It is worth mentioning that the addition of the term "لاحقاً" in the collective translation suits the context for it represents the correct sequence of events; that is, the factory is built then it is *lost* in a fire. The same argument applies for the addition of "صدرت" in the collective translation to collocate with "عام"

in "صدرت عام ١٩١٢", which is a very acceptable collocation in Arabic. Approved by the evaluator, the team negotiation has resulted in good additions that have enriched the Arabic context in this respect.

With regard to the grammatical mistakes, although the collective translation bears many of these mistakes, the totality of them is less than those of the individual drafts. This can be attributed to the level of competence regarding the members themselves. The negotiations and compromises being made by them are the outcome of their own levels of proficiency which is rather moderate, judging by the quality of their drafts. Anyhow, the collective translation has succeeded regarding the word ordering than some individual translations made by the group participants. For example, the clause "introduced a powerful style of writing that has a profound influence on…", in the collective translation, is acceptably translated into " قدم نمطاً قوياً في الكتابة ". Comparatively, the same clause is translated into " قدم اسلوب قوي في الكتابة ...تاركاً اثراً عميق على". "قدمت ", "قدم نمط قوي من الكتابة و الذي له تأثير بعيد المدى على...", "و كان ذا طابع عميق حيث اثر على... قدمت " ذو تأثير سحيق على..." "قدم نمط كتابة قوي و, "نمطاً قوياً من الكتابة الذي له تأثير سحيق على... "اسلوباً قوياً من الكتابة يترك اثراً عميقاً على..." by P: 13, 16, 19, 21 and 22 respectively. The collective rendition is judged as more cohesive than the individual drafts.

Furthermore, the rendition of the clause "whose fortunes had in the recent past taken a dramatic turn for the worse" is collectively translated into: "حيث انقلبت احوالها الى الاسوء في الماضي القريب". Herein, this word ordering is very interesting considering the renditions given by all the members of this group. Therein, the ordering given regarding this clause is: " حيث كانت اقدار هذه كانت حظوظها في الاونة الاخيرة تأخذ منحى, "العائلة يتخذ منحاً دراماتيكي نحو الاسوء في الماضي القريب اقدارها حالت الى ", "كان لها نفوذ في الماضي و الذي اخذ منحى درامياً قلبها الى الاسوء", "درامي الى الاسوء الاسوء" by P: 13, 19, 21, and 22. The same clause is omitted by P[16]. Obviously, the collective arrangement of words is more successful since it has ended up with plausibly accepted Arabic wording. Once more, the group translation has surpassed the individual ones of its members.

4.9 Analysis of the Results of Group E

The results obtained from the analysis of the individual draft translations in comparison to the collective one is being displayed in the below table:

Table (4-5): Results of Group D

Errors	PV	P١٤	P١٧	P٢١	P٢٥	Collective translation
Lexical Errors						
Mistranslation	١٢	١٢	١٦	١٠	١	—
Addition	١	٢	٣	٦	—	١
Omission	٦	١٢	٥	١	٢	—
Grammatical Errors						
Wrong Word Order	٧	٥	٤	١	٢	—
Wrong Agent	٢	١	٤	٢	١	١
Wrong Gender	١	٢	١	١	—	١
Wrong Number	—	—	٣	—	٢	٢
Wrong Preposition	١	١	٤	١	٣	—
Wrong punctuation	١٤	١٦	١٦	٣	٢	٢
Number of errors	-٤٥	-٥١	-٥٦	-٢٥	-١٣	-٧
Final Score out of ١٠	٥.٢	٤.٦	٤.١	٧.٢	٨.٦	٩.٢

4.10 Discussion of the Results of Group E

The results of this group show a dramatic interference of P^{25} in the collective translation. Almost, all of the positive points detected in the draft translation proposed by this participant are reflected in the collective one. Consequently, the collective translation is as successful as the draft No. 25. Anyhow, a number of examples are chosen for the sake of argument. The phrase "whose fortunes had in the recent past taken a dramatic turn for the worse" is rendered collectively into " ذات ثروة و التي انعطفت انعطافاً درامياً نحو الاسوء في الماضي القريب". Such a translation is considered correct, according to the dictionary and the evalustor, given the lexical choices and grammatical ordering of words. Comparatively, the translational suggestions offered by the participants: 7, 15, 17, 24, and 25 are " كانت لديها ثروة في الماضي مأخوذ الذي "، "اخذت حظوظه في السنين الماضية منحى درامي اتجاه نحو الاسوء"، "من تحول دراماتيكي للاسوء في اسرة كبيرة فقدت ارثها في حادثة مأساوية مما "، "حظته في الماضي عندما انعطف عمله الدرامي الى الاسوء "ذات ثروة و التي اتخذت منعطفاً دراماتيكياً نحو الاسوء في الماضي القريب"، and "قادهم الى وضع مادي سيء" respectively. Obviously, the collective translation bears almost the same word choice to that of P^{25} except for the two words "انعطافاً" and "درامياً".

Further, the clause "but left school and returned to Chicago, yearning for the glamour and excitement that it offered" is collectively translated into " لكنه سرعان ما غادر المدرسة عائدا الى شيكاغو تلهفاً الى رونقها و الحماس الذي يدب فيها" in comparison to the draft translations; " لكنه غادر المدرسة و عاد الى شيكاغو، يتوق الى "، "لكنه ترك المدرسة و عاد لشيكاغو كان يتوق الى التطور و السعادة "، "لكنه سرعان ما ترك الدراسة و عاد الى شيكاغوا. متلهفاً للحماس الموجود هناك"، "البهجة الرفاهية and "لكن غادر المدرسة عائداً الى شيكاغو متلهفاً الى رونقها و الحماس الذي يدب فيها" finally by the

participants: 15, 17, 24, and 25 respectively (P[7] has not translated this phrase). Once again, the rendition of P[25] is similarly reflected in the collective one. The difference between the collective translation and P[25]'s draft is only in the word "تلهّفاً" that has been changed into "متلهّفاً" in the collective one. Still, the evaluator has seen that P[25] rendition is better than all of the rest, and it is best reflected collectively.

The ill-word ordering in rendering the clause "he was witness to the seamier side of life and was responsible for recording events that befell the less fortunate in the city,…" is reflected as: "كان شاهد على الجانب البشع من حياته" , "في طريق كريه و الخطأ يقع في مدينة الاكبر" (the rest is deleted)"، "المتسول، الاحداث تسجيل عن مسؤولاً كان الحياة من السيء للجانب شاهداً كان" by the participants: 7, 15, 17 respectively. According to the dictionary, P[24] has given a better and more acceptable translation than the previous participants; his rendition is " البشع الجانب على شهد الاقل حظاً للفئة الجارية الاحداث وثق و للحياة". Yet, his rendition does not appear in the collective translation; instead, it is P[25] whose rendition is adopted there. His/her rendition is " الجانب شهد المدينة في حظاً الاقل للفئة تجري التي الاحداث تدوين عن مسؤولاً اضحى و الحياة من البشع" in comparison to the collective translation which reads " مسؤولاً اضحى و البشع الجانب شهد حظاً الاقل الفئة مع تجري التي الاحداث تدوين عن" . It is judged, by the evaluator, that " الاحداث وثق" is a better rendition than " الاحداث تدوين عن مسؤولاً اضحى". Yet, the domination of P[24]'s " الجارية" translation is obvious. This might be attributed to the growing trust of the group members in that participant, as s/he has made many appealing translational choices.

Besides, the word order in the phrase "the family was rather abruptly thrust into poverty" is collectively rendered into "فجأة فقيرة عائلته اصبحت حيث". Comparatively, the rest of renditions are "العائلة جرت غرة حين على و" , "الفقر نحو مفاجئة بصورة عائلته دفع تم", "فقيرة اصبحت فجأة عائلته", and "العائلة دفع مما" , "الفقر الى اتجهت و احوالهم تدهورت عائلته فجأة لكن", "شيء ادنى ودون الهاوية الى" by the participants: 7, 15, 17, 24, and 25 respectively. It is noticed that all of "فجأة فقيرة لتصبح" the draft renditions have wrong word ordering even the one offered by P[24]. That is, his rendition lacks the " ، " in Arabic to separate the adverb "غرة حين على" from the rest of the sentence for the ordering of words to be correct. Anyhow, the correct word ordering is detected in P[25] rendition and reflected in the collective translation. This time the team has chosen the most appropriate rendition they reached.

4.11 Analysis and Discussion of the Results of the Questionnaire

In accordance with the way the quality of translations is evaluated, the results of the questionnaire (Appendix B) are dealt with among the members of each group. That is, the participants' answers of the same group are contrasted to each other. This is meant to show the perspective of a given group members of the collaborative work in contrast to their collective performance. Then general percentages are displayed of the overall participants' answers to gain insights about the reaction of student-translators to teamwork in translation. The results of the questionnaire are as follows:

- The first question deals with the feasibility of collective discussing of translation problems for more adequate solutions, which is the first aspect, being questioned, of the adapted model. Two of group A members have agreed to the question; the other three have partially agreed. All of the members of group B have agreed to the same question. Four members of group C have agreed to the same question; the last member has partially agreed. Four members of group D have agreed while one has partially agreed. This participant has attributed the success of discussion to the level of competence that the members have. Four members of group E have agreed to the question with only one member disagreeing. S/he suggests that every member has his own opinion; hence, according to this participant, conflicting ideas have their negative impact on the quality of translation. Hence, 76% of all questioned participants have agreed to the feasibility of translation groups in solving problems. Comparatively, 20% of them have partially agreed; P[22] has seen that such groups are helpful if the participants are qualified enough. 4% of participants (P[24]) have disagreed stating that the conflicting ideas are found in such groups. It is seen that the majority of students are in favor of the collective work in solving translation problems.

- The second question has dealt with the usefulness of discussing alternative translation choices within the same group. All members of group A members have agreed; three members of group B have agreed and the last two have partially agreed. Regarding group C, four of the participants have agreed; the last one has partially agreed. Regarding group D, four members have agreed; P[22] has stated that it enhances the

translator's imagination of the text. Only one member (P^{16}) has partially agreed. Four members of group E have partially agreed; the last one has agreed stating that translation groups are very useful. All in all, 64% of participants have agreed to the usefulness of collective discussing of alternative translation choices. 46% of them have partially agreed. Hence, teamwork has proved to be fruitful in discussion various translation alternatives.

- The third question concerns the division of labour within the groups to ease the task. Three of group A have agreed; two of them have partially agreed. Three of the members of group B have agreed; one has partially agreed, and the last have disagreed. Four members of group C agreed, while only one has partially agreed. Two members of Group D have agreed, one has partially agreed on the condition that the labour is divided equally, and the last one has disagreed. Three of the last group, Group E, have agreed to the question, while two of them have partially agreed. Anyhow, 64% of the participants have agreed, 28% have partially agreed, and 8% of them have disagreed. Considering this question, the majority of student-translators think that group work should be divided explicitly to the translation task is carried smoothly.

- The fourth question asks about the level of participation that each member had. The responses received are interesting; one member (P^4) has responded that his role was superiorized. Another member (P^6) states that his role was equalized. The other three members (P^2, P^3, and P^5) consider their roles to be marginalized. Four members of group B think that their functions are equalized; the last member thinks that his role is superiorized. In fact, he has commented that he is the one who thinks and writes. Four members of Group C have been equalized in their participation, while one of them thinks that his role is superiorized. Regarding Group D, three of the members think that their roles are equalized; two of them think that their roles are superiorized. One of the last two thinks that his role is superiorized because he is the one who has written the draft. Three members of Group D think that their roles are superiorized while two of them think that they are equalized. Generally, 56% of the participants think that their roles are equalized, 32% think that their roles are superiorized, the last 12% of them think that their roles are marginalized. This question is productive for it shows the

student-translators' constructive estimation to their level of participation in groups. Consequently, it can be said that they have reacted positively to be enrolled in teamwork.

- The fifth question is a bout managing the conflicting translation decisions within groups; two of the members (2, 6) have agreed, while the rest (3, 4, 5) have partially agreed. All members of group B agreed to this question. Three of the group members have agreed to the question, while two of them have partially agreed. For P[18], the handling of conflict within translation groups depends on the team itself. Four members of Group D have agreed, while one of them has partially agreed. Three members of Group E agree, one partially agrees, the last one disagrees. 68% of all participants agree, 28% disagree, and the last 4% disagree. The majority of participants have seen that the group work environment is hospitable to conflicting ideas. Opposing points of view are fairly controllable, so the marginalization within groups is very limited.

- The sixth question asks about the usefulness of translation groups in enhancing the understanding of a text. Two members (5, 2) of group A agreed to the question while three of them (3, 4, and 6) have partially agreed. All members of Group B have agreed. Three participants of Group C agree while two of them have partially agreed. Three members of Group D agree while two of them partially agree. Four members of Group E agree; in fact, P[25] comments: "sure", to this question to assure his stance. Only one of this group partially disagrees. General statistics show that 68% of the participants agree, and 32% of them partially agree. The student-translators admit that their understanding of the text is enhanced due to the shared thoughts and perspectives.

- The seventh question deals with the feasibility of translation groups in enhancing the quality of the TT. Again, two members (5, 2) of group A agreed to the question while three of them (3, 4, and 6) have partially agreed. All members of group B and C have agreed. Three members of Group D have agreed to the question, while two of them have partially agreed. Three of Group E have agreed; one has partially agreed, and the last one has disagreed. In general, 76% of the participants agree, 20% partially agree, and 4% disagree. The high percentage gained refers to the fact that student- translators have witnessed improvement in the appropriateness of the TT due to the rich translation suggestions shared of the members.

- The eighth question is about building confidence in colleagues; it investigates the possibility of discovering new potentials in colleagues through team negotiation. P^6 has agreed, P^3 and P^4 have partially agreed, and the last two (5, and 2) have disagreed. All members of group B have agreed. Three members of Group C agree while two of them partially agree. Three of the members of Group D have agreed. Whereas, two of them have partially agreed. For Group E, four members of them agree, while one partially agrees. A total response to this question states that 68% agree, 16% partially agree, and 16% disagree. The result indicates that majority of student-translators have grown more confident of their peers due to the social and academic closer exchange offered by the group work.

- The last question has examined the usefulness of translation groups in building self-confidence. One participant has agreed; the other four ones have partially agreed. Four members of group B have agreed, while one has partially agreed. All members of Group C agree. Three members of Group D have agreed, while two of them have partially agreed. Two members of Group E agree, two partially agree, and the last disagrees. The total average of answer is: 64% agreement, 32% partial agreement, and 4% disagreement. This answer indicates that teamwork can be beneficiary in building up student-translators' confidence in their performance. This is very likely to make them more optimistic regarding translation tasks.

4.12 Correlating Questionnaire Responses to the Collective Translations

The questions are designed to have insights about the student-translators' perception of the usefulness of team work in the translation process. The majority of answers gained are in favour of the team work. Comparatively, all of the collective translations have proven to be better than the individual ones. That is, their positive stances towards teamwork in translation are reflected successfully in their collective translational performance. In fact, they agree that team discussion of translation problems can help in exploring new solutions because of the different perspectives from which the problem is approached. The participants, also, see translation groups as fruitful in considering various translation suggestions for one portion of a text. Looking back at the translations proposed, their collective drafts have not only reflected the most successful translation suggestions that are proposed by one or more of the group members, but also have exemplified some weak solutions that have not been manifested in any

of the individual draft translation. That is, the members have resorted to what they have thought is the most applicable translation choice.

Furthermore, the division of labour does exist within groups despite some answers that have negated this issue, yet it is neither assigned equally nor explicitly. Field observation of the researcher during the test has shown that the work is not divided equally among the members of the group. The roles have been blurred to the participants; many of them consider themselves as superiorized because they are the ones who have written the drafts. Some of the participants, whose translation choices have been fairly chosen in the collective translation, see themselves as equalized with their colleagues. It seems that the participants have their roles obscured and mixed with each other within the same group. Besides, although most answers have agreed that the conflicted decisions are manageable within each group, there are some answers that partially agreed. Since, they have partial agreement; then, they have witnessed some undesirable arguments. The existence of such argument is very likely to happen, yet it has not been reflected badly on the final collective product.

Regarding the collective understanding of the text, the majority of participants have agreed; the five collective translations prove that too. The vague sentences produced, and sometimes omitted, by some participants are almost absent in the collective drafts. It suggests that the exchange of ideas within the team has resulted in a better understanding of the text. This necessarily results in enhancing the quality of the TT given the fact that the translation is in the native language. That is, the participants are not likely to have problems composing a text in their native language since they have good command of it. Hence, the understanding alone is very likely to result in good quality text. Further, it has been detected that even if the group rely heavily on a selected member's comprehension of the text (P^{23}, in group C), it, still, chooses some more accepted inferences of some other members (P^{12} and P^{18}, of the same group) that are, generally, considered weaker. The group seeks the inferences in every draft of its members, so it can reach the most, supposedly, successful translation. This is why it is proven that the team answer, regarding collective comprehension, to the question is manifested in the team translation.

Finally, translation groups have attested to be a good tool for building self-confidence. Most members of the groups have felt that their opinions are heard, tolerated, and discussed.

They have witnessed the reflection of their understanding or their word choices on the collective drafts. Such reflection has made them grow more confident in the way they process the text and the different choices they make. Moreover, through the engagement with their colleagues, they have been able to witness their colleagues' translational performance. That is, the groups have allowed the peers to interact with each other both on the academic and the social levels. Such interaction would uncover some of the potentials that have been covered during class and, hence, would result in more trust in the colleagues' translation choices in general. It is seen that the most applicable translational choices proposed by the group members are reflected in the collective draft which resulted in a better quality translation. As a result, despite the minor inconveniences in teamwork, what the answers have positively suggested is well reflected in all of the collective draft translations.

5.   Conclusions

Teamwork in translation (translation groups) is evidently effective in enhancing the quality of translation. As far as this study is concerned, peers have proven to be very cooperative with each other to comprehend the ST and produced the TT more properly. The collective translation is the result of a progressive cooperation of minds to reach out the most, allegedly, applicable TT. The safe environment of learning (away from teacher's judgment) evolves their self-esteem as real translators not students being tested. Not worrying about committing mistakes in front of teachers and getting low marks, students are more liberate to engage in a broad-minded verbal exchange that enhances their thinking mechanisms. This more evolved thinking during the translation task has resulted in a fruitful engagement in the process and lead to a higher quality in the product.

The many advantages of translation groups have triggered positive reaction, on the part of student-translators, towards such groups. By virtue of this protected environment, students are introduced into a new work dimension. They have witnessed different perspectives to translation that are to be taken into account for the succeeding translational tasks. Experiencing different and more liberate approaches to translation problems has made the student-translators acquainted with the fact that they should think out of the box more often. Besides, they can consider more different alternatives, than those at their disposal, for a portion of text giving that they have previously engaged in a task that has revealed many other translation

suggestions than their own. Hence, the rich thoughts being exchanged open up new translation potentials that are not tackled previously by the student-translators. Therefore, s/he is encouraged to both analyze the ST and compose the TT more innovatively.

Rare occurrence of peer collision and marginalization are traced within groups. Nevertheless, they do not impede the success of translation groups in producing better-quality translations than the individual ones. Very few students have their views overlooked, roles marginalized, and self-esteem lowered by their colleagues of the same group. Still, the collective translations of all groups have witnessed remarkable improvements. A tolerance of opposing visions and compromise of own ones are resorted to for the sake of the final proper TT. This, necessarily, suggests that a collaborative mechanism of working with fellow peers has very limited disadvantages, and it is sufficient enough for a good-quality translation. All in all, teamwork has encouraged student-translators to exchange ideas cooperatively, so their thinking is enhanced markedly.

6. Recommendations

As effective as it is in the quality of translation, teamwork (or translation groups) need to be addressed more often in the translator-training courses. The feasibility of the collaborative exchange of knowledge among fellow peers need to be highlighted by the tutor to encourage students to engage more efficiently in the group work. That is, acquainting the students with the enhancement that such a cooperative work does to their thinking mechanism is very likely to make them more hospitable for other opposing opinions. However, as the team work might unfold some drawbacks, the tutor's supervision is highly recommended. The translation trainer is to draw the attention to some of undesired conduct within the group and provide proper amendments.

References

Anderson, R. (2004). The development of Teenagers' Social Skills. Riga: RaKa.

Ba'albaki, M. (2015). Al-Mawrid Al-Qareb Dictionary: English-Arabic. 26th ed. Beirut: Dar El-Ilim LilMalayin

Brown, D. (2001). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. New York: Longman.

Çeliköz, N., Erişen, Y., & Şahin, M. (2019). Cognitive Learning Theories with Emphasis on Latent Learning, Gestalt and Information Processing Theories. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World,* 9 (3), 18-33.

Dunbar, R. (2009). The Social Brain Hypothesis and Its Implication for Social Evolution. *Annuals for Human Biology*, 5 (36), 178–189.

Elmassah, S., Bacheer, S. M., & James, R. (2020). What Shapes Students' Perceptions of Group Work: Personality or Past Experience?. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(9), 1457-1473.

Fois, E. (2016). *Collective Translation as Training to the Profession* (?). https://revues.univ-tlse2.fr:443/lamaindethot/index.php?id=649.

Grice, P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation". In Cole, P., Morgan, J. (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts*. (pp. 41—58). New York: Academic Press.

Grist, M. (2009). Changing the Subject: How New Ways of Thinking about Human Behavior might Change Politics, Policy and Practice. London: Royal Society of Arts.

http://www.thersa.org/data/assets/pdffile/0020/250625/Nov28th2009

Gouadec, D. (2007). Translation as a Profession. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Harris, T., Sherblom, J. (2018). Small Group and Team Communication. US: Waveland Press.

Hatami, A. (2015). The Effect of Collaborative Learning and Self-Assessment on Self-Regulation. *Educational Research and Reviewers*, 10 (15), 2164—2167. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1095285.pdf

Kelly, D. (2014). A Handbook for Translator Trainers. A Guide to Reflective Practice. London: Routledge

Kiraly, D. (2000). A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education: Empowerment from Theory to Practice. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing

Kiraly, D. et al. (2003). "Summary of Discussion on Collaboration, Teamwork and Group Work." Pym, Anthony et al. (Eds). *Innovation and e-Learning in Translation Training. Reports on Online Symposia*. (pp. 51-57). Tarragona: Universitat Rovira i Virgili.

Kiraly, D. (2013). Towards a View of the Translator Competence as an Emergent Phenomena: Thinking Outside the Box(es) in Translator Education. In D. Kiraly, S. Hansen-Schirra, & K. Maksymski (Eds.), *New prospects and perspectives for educating language mediator* (pp. 197—224). Narr Francke Attempto.

Klimkowski, K. (2006). Team Work as a Method in Translation. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 7 (1), 93—103.

Levinson, S. C. (2006). On the Human "Interaction Engine." In N. J. Enfield, & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition and interaction*, (pp. 39—69). Oxford, UK: Berg

Mercer, N. (2016). Education and the Social Brain: Linking Language, Thinking, Teaching and Learning. *Éducation et didactique*, 10 (2), 1-22. https://journals.openedition.org/educationdidactique/2523

Michaelsen, L. K., Knight, A. B., & Fink, L. D. (2004). Team-based Learning: A transformative use of small groups in college teaching. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Olvera-Lobo, M.D., Robinson, B., Senso, J., Martin, R. (2009). Teleworking and Collaborative Work Environments in Translation Training. *Babel*, 55 (2), 165—180.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263106712_Teleworking_and_collaborative_work_environments_in_translation_training

Pavlovic, N. (2007). Directionality in Translation and Interpreting Practice: Report on a Questionnaire Survey in Croatia. In A. Pym, A. Perekrestenko (Eds.), *Translation research projects*. (pp. 79-95). Tarragona: Universitat Rovira i Virgili.

Pavlovic, T. (2013). The Role of Collaborative Translation Protocols (CTPs) in Translation Studies. *Jezikoslovlje*, 14 (2), 549-563.

Pavlovic, T. (2019). Collaborative Work in Translation Education: a Case of Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Cultus*, 12, 280-297. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339124080_Collaborative_work_in_translation_education_A_case_of_Bosnia_and_Herzegovina?enrichId=rgreq-c977621b42918cb5378e404ec6e2999d-XXX&enrichSource=Y292ZXJQYWdlOzMzOTEyNDA4MDtBUzo4NTYyNDU0NTYwODA4OTZAMTU4MTE1NjIzMzU0Nw==&el=1_x_2&_esc=publicationCoverPdf

Phillips, D. (2004) Longman Preparation Course for the TOEFL Test. New York, Pearson Education Inc.

Pym, A. (2009). Translator Training. In Malkjear, K., Windle, K. *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies.* (pp. 1-9). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roskosa, A., Rupniece, D.(2016). Advantages and Drawbacks of Using Group Work in Translator Training. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, (231), 244 – 250. http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

Saba, F. (2021). Strategies to Improve Classroom Discussion. International Journal of Advance Research: Ideas and Innovations in Technology, 7 (2), 715-720.

https://www.ijariit.com/?utm_source=pdf&utm_medium=edition&utm_campaign=OmAkSols&utm_term=V7I2-1503 [Accessed in: 2/9/2023]

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

Salas, E., Sims, D., Burke, C. (2005). Is There a "Big Five" in Teamwork. *US: Small Group Research*, 36 (5), 555-559.

Setiani, R. (2020). Enhancing Student's Translation Ability through Group Work. *Jurnal Elsa,* 18 (1), 13-22.

Shteynberg, G. (2018). A Collective Perspective: Shared Attention and the Mind. *Current Opinion in Psychology,* 23, 93-97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.12.007

Solaiman, M. (2021). Examining the Grammatical Problems and Difficulties Faced by the M.A. Arabic Students in India in English to Arabic Translation. *Translation Today*, 15 (2), 151-176. https://www.ntm.org.in/download/ttvol/volume15-2/Article%207.pdf

Waddington, C, (2001): Different Methods of Evaluating Student Translations: The Question of validity. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 46 (2), 311-325. http://www.erudit.org/documentation/eruditPolitiqueUtilisation.

Waddington, C. (2003). A Positive Approach to the Assessment of Translation Errors. *Gongreso International*, 409-426 https://www.aieti.eu/wp-content/uploads/AIETI_1_CW_Approach.pdf

Wallace, M. (2014). Team-based learning in introductory translation courses. In Y. Cui & Z. Wei (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching Methods in Language Translation and Interpretation*. (pp. 27-45). IGI Global Education.

Witherspoon, M., Sykes, G., & Bell, C. (2016). Leading a Classroom Discussion: Definition, Supportive Evidence, and Measurement of the ETS® National Observational Teaching Examination (NOTE) Assessment Series. *Research Memorandum*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 16 (9), 1-47. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED570574.pdf

Appendices

A.   The text

Dear participant ...,

Please translate the following passage into Arabic.

Theodore Dreiser

Theodore Dreiser, the American author best known for the novel, *Sister Carrie* (1912), introduced a powerful style of writing that had a profound influence on the writer that followed him, from Steinbeck to Fitzgerald and Hemingway. It was *Sister Carrie* that Theodore Dreiser created a fictional account that laid bare the harsh reality of life in the big city and in which Dreiser established himself as the architect of a new genre.

Dreiser was born in 1871 into a large family whose fortunes had in the recent past taken a dramatic turn for the worse. Before, Theodore's birth his father had built up a successful factory business only to lose to a fire. The family was rather abruptly thrust into poverty, and Theodore spent his youth moving from place to place in the Midwest as the family tried desperately to reestablish itself financially. He left home at the age of sixteen. After earning some money, he spent a year at Indiana University but left school and returned to Chicago, yearning for the glamour and excitement that it offered. At the age of twenty two, he begun work as a reporter for a small newspaper in Chicago, the *Daily Globe*, and later worked on newspapers in Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Saint Louis, and New York City. In his work as a reporter, he was witness to the seamier side of life and was responsible for recording events that befell the less fortunate in the city, the beggars, the alcoholics, and the working poor.

B.   Questionnaire

Dear participant ..,

Kindly, respond to the questions below by ticking the boxes with the preferable choice and elaborate when needed.

1-   You consider solving translation problems to be successful if it is discussed within a group.

Scale of agreement	Tick	Comment
Partially agree		
Agree		
Disagree		

2-   You regard discussing alternative translation choices with other colleagues as fruitful for it might result in a more proper translation.

Scale of agreement	Tick	Comment
Partially agree		
Agree		
Disagree		

3- You think that there was a division of labor in your translation group to ease off the task.

Scale of agreement	Tick	Comment
Partially agree		
Agree		
Disagree		

4- You consider that your function in the translation group, you were member of, is…

Scale of agreement	Tick	Comment
Superiorized		
Equalized		
Marginalized		

5- You think that conflicting translation decisions are manageable and resolvable in a group.

Scale of agreement	Tick	Comment
Partially agree		
Agree		
Disagree		

6- You think that translation groups help in enhancing the translator's understanding of a text to be translated.

Scale of agreement	Tick	Comment
Partially agree		
Agree		
Disagree		

7- You think that translation groups help in enhancing the quality of the translated text.

Scale of agreement	Tick	Comment
Partially agree		
Agree		
Disagree		

8- You think that you have discovered new promising translation potentials of your colleagues because you had the chance to interact and share ideas better in a translation group.

Scale of agreement	Tick	Comment
Partially agree		
Agree		
Disagree		

9- You think that you have grown more confident of yourself for the collaborative discussions you have been engaged in with colleagues and the translation choices you have made.

Scale of agreement	Tick	Comment
Partially agree		
Agree		
Disagree		