

In

His Most Glorious

Name



Allameh Tabataba'i University

Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages

Department of Translation Studies

SELF-REVISION AND THIRD PARTY REVISION IN TRANSLATION

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Translation Studies

Advisor: Dr. Gholam Reza Tajvidi

Reader: Dr. Hussein Mollanazar

by

Mohammad Reza Rezaeian Delouei

Winter, 2011

Allameh Tabataba'i University
Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages
Department of Translation Studies

SELF-REVISION AND THIRD PARTY REVISION IN TRANSLATION

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Translation Studies

Evaluated and Approved by the Thesis Committee:

Advisor: Dr. Gholam Reza Tajvidi

Reader: Dr. Hussein Mollanazar

Examiner: Dr. Kambiz Mahmoodzadeh

by

Mohammad Reza Rezaeian Delouei

Winter, 2011

فرم گردآوری اطلاعات پایان نامه‌ها

کتابخانه مرکزی دانشگاه علامه طباطبائی

عنوان: خودبازبینی و دگربازبینی در ترجمه
نویسنده/محقق: محمدرضا رضائیان دلویی
مترجم: -----
استاد راهنما: دکتر غلامرضا تجویدی استاد مشاور: دکتر حسین ملانظر استاد داور: دکتر کامبیز محمودزاده
کتابنامه: دارد واژه‌نامه: -----
نوع پایان نامه: <input type="checkbox"/> بنیادی <input type="checkbox"/> توسعه‌ای <input type="checkbox"/> کاربردی
مقطع تحصیلی: کارشناسی ارشد سال تحصیلی: ۱۳۸۹-۹۰
محل تحصیل: تهران نام دانشگاه: علامه طباطبائی دانشکده: ادبیات فارسی و زبان‌های خارجی
تعداد صفحات: i-xiv+167+I-XXI گروه آموزشی: مترجمی زبان انگلیسی
کلیدواژه‌ها به زبان فارسی: بازبینی، خودبازبینی، دگربازبینی
کلیدواژه‌ها به زبان انگلیسی: Revision, Self-Revision, Third Party Revision

چکیده

الف. موضوع و طرح مسئله (اهمیت موضوع و هدف):

اهمیت این پژوهش در آن بود که به گفته بسیاری از صاحب‌نظران حوزهٔ بازبینی ترجمه، ادبیات موجود در این زمینه به لحاظ نظری و عملی چندان قوی نیست و بخش‌های موجود نیز برداشت مناسبی از این مرحلهٔ فرایند ترجمه ندارند. با وجود این، پژوهش‌های انجام‌یافته از یک سو بر دگر‌بازبینی بیشتر از خودبازبینی تأکید دارند و از دیگر سو تنها به لحاظ نظری به این موضوع می‌پردازند که بازبین چه نوع تغییراتی باید انجام دهد و به چه مسائلی باید توجه کند. از آن گذشته، می‌توان ادعا نمود که ماهیت بازبینی ترجمه با ماهیت ویرایش نگارش‌های دست اول متفاوت است، اگرچه در زمینهٔ ترجمه نیز باید ماهیت و فرایند بازبینی را با تکیه بر جفت زبان‌های خاص و حتی سویگی ترجمه بررسی نمود. پیکره‌هایی که در اثر مقابلهٔ ترجمه‌های بازبینی‌شده با ترجمه‌های بازبینی‌شده و متون مبدأ حاصل شوند توجه مدرسان ترجمه و ترجمه‌آموزان را به مشکلات و راه‌حل‌های احتمالی حین فرایند ترجمه جلب خواهند نمود. به‌علاوه، ملاحظات نظری نشان می‌دهد که بازبین ترجمه نباید پسندهای شخصی خود را بر بازبینی اعمال کند و ضروری است تنها در صورت وجود مشکل در متن ترجمه‌ای به اصلاح دست زند. اما آیا این ملاحظات در عمل نیز کاربرد می‌یابند؟

ب. مبانی نظری شامل مرور مختصری از منابع، چارچوب نظری و پرسش‌ها و فرضیه‌ها:

این پژوهش در پی یافتن پاسخی به چهار پرسش زیر بود:

۱. خودبازبینی ترجمه اغلب موجب ایجاد چه نوع تغییراتی در نسخهٔ اولیه و پیش‌نویس ترجمه می‌شود؟
۲. دگر‌بازبینی ترجمه اغلب موجب ایجاد چه نوع تغییراتی در نسخهٔ اولیه و پیش‌نویس ترجمه می‌شود؟
۳. واکنش مترجمان به دگر‌بازبینی ترجمه‌هایشان چگونه است؟
۴. برداشت مترجمان از بازبینی ترجمه (شامل اهمیت، بسامد، ویژگی‌ها، شاخص‌ها و محدودیت‌های آن) چگونه است؟

پ. روش تحقیق شامل تعریف مفاهیم، روش تحقیق، جامعهٔ مورد تحقیق، نمونه‌گیری و روش‌های نمونه‌گیری، ابزار اندازه‌گیری، نحوهٔ اجرای آن، شیوهٔ گردآوری و تجزیه و تحلیل داده‌ها:

در این پژوهش کیفی فرآورده و فرایندمحور، دو گروه شامل ۴۰ دانشجوی نیم‌سال ششم و هفتم کارشناسی مترجمی زبان انگلیسی شرکت نمودند. برای گردآوری داده‌های پژوهش، دو ابزار شامل آزمون ترجمه و پرسش‌نامه تهیه و سپس داده‌های مورد نیاز در ۴ مرحله گردآوری شد. از آنجا که پژوهش فاقد چارچوب نظری بود، پژوهشگر ۳ نوع نظام طبقه‌بندی برای تحلیل نتایج ایجاد نمود که عبارت بودند از «فنون بازبینی»، «بازنمود متنی بازبینی»، و «پیامد بازبینی».

ت. یافته‌های تحقیق:

بر طبق نتایج، تغییرات ایجادشده در اثر دگر‌بازبینی تقریباً ۳ برابر خودبازبینی بود. خودبازبینی بیشتر موجب ارتقاء متن مقصد به لحاظ قواعد سجاوندی و املائی زبان فارسی و دگر‌بازبینی موجب ارتقاء آن به لحاظ معنایی شده بود. در هر دو نوع بازبینی، تغییراتی که منجر به ارتقاء نحوی شده بود با تغییراتی که منجر به تنزل نحوی شده بود یکسان بود. در مجموع، تنها ۲۰ درصد تغییرات در هر دو نوع بازبینی موجب ارتقاء کیفیت شد که نشان‌دهندهٔ حجم زیاد تغییرات غیرضروری بود. مترجمان با ۳۷/۳۹٪ تغییرات دگر‌بازبینی‌ها موافق، با ۳۴/۳۴٪ مخالف و دربارهٔ ۲۸/۲۵٪ نیز بی‌نظر بودند. در تحلیل پرسش‌نامه‌ها، ۵۵٪ پاسخ‌دهندگان بیان کردند که همیشه یا اغلب، خودبازبینی را به کار می‌برند.

برای تمامی آنها موقعیت‌هایی که از دیگران بخواهند ترجمه‌هایشان را بازبینی کنند تا این که دیگران از آنها بخواهند این کار را انجام دهند بیشتر اتفاق افتاده بود. پاسخ‌دهندگان بر اهمیت خودبازبینی بیشتر از دگربازبینی اتفاق نظر داشتند. بیشتر آنها ترجمه‌هایشان را دو بار بازبینی می‌کردند و اغلب اعلام نمودند که فاصله زمانی بین ترجمه اولیه و بازبینی آن منوط به عوامل متعددی است. مهم‌ترین شاخص‌های بازبینی نیز دقت، روانی، غلط‌های دستوری، و علایم سجاوندی بود.

ث. نتیجه‌گیری و پیشنهادات:

پژوهش حاضر را می‌توان با استفاده از شرکت‌کنندگان و متون دیگر و نیز در محیط‌های غیرآموزشی با استفاده از پیکره‌های طبیعی انجام داد. تغییر سویگی ترجمه (فارسی-انگلیسی) و تأثیر این دو نوع بازبینی بر کیفیت نهایی ترجمه (به لحاظ کمی) نیز درخور پژوهش است. می‌توان بر پژوهش‌های نظری به لحاظ اصطلاح‌شناسی مفاهیم مرتبط و نیز پژوهش‌های فکرگویی توجه بیشتر نمود. تأثیر توانش ترجمه‌ای و ویژگی‌های شخصیتی را بر بازبینی می‌توان مورد کاوش قرار داد. شایسته است جایگاه فعلی بازبینی و آموزش آن در محیط‌های دانشگاهی و غیردانشگاهی نیز محور پژوهش‌های آینده قرار گیرد.

صحت اطلاعات مندرج در این فرم را بر اساس محتوای پایان‌نامه و ضوابط مندرج در فرم گواهی می‌نماییم.

نام استاد راهنما: دکتر غلامرضا تجویدی

سمت علمی: دانشیار

دانشکده: ادبیات فارسی و زبان‌های خارجی

رئیس کتابخانه:

To

My Dad

In Honor of his Wisdom and Self-Sacrifice

My Mom

In Honor of her Affection and Innocence

My Brother

In Honor of his Support and Love

For the Restful Nights of

My Grandma, my Grandpa, and my Grandma's Sister

(The Last Two I've Never Seen)

And in the Hope of

Long, happy Life of my Grandparents

Acknowledgements

All gratitude is due to God by whose grace His servants can learn and contribute to knowledge dissemination.

First, I would like to thank Dr. Tajvidi and confess that without his help I could *never* accomplish the research. I remember his invaluable and constructive guidance and comments through all stages of the work. I have learned teaching and research methodology, critical thinking, and open-mindedness, to name but a few, from every moment of enjoying his presence.

I am extremely grateful to Dr. Mollanazar who has devoted all his material and non-material life to an indefatigable campaign for raising the status of Translation Studies. Apart from being an expert in the research topic, I have learned a lot while serving as his student and he has supported and motivated me a lot in a way that words cannot express my indebtedness to him.

I would also like to thank Dr. Mahmoodzadeh as he was the first one who encouraged and motivated me the day I entered the university and he was the first one who helped me develop the research and consider its significance. Through his self-sacrifice, professional commitment, and altruistic, kind behavior I have learned how to face and overcome obstacles and be a true teacher.

Last but not least, I wish to express my deepest and most sincere gratitude to all professors who helped me during my course of studies in Allameh Tabataba'i University and also all other teachers of my life. I must also appreciate the cooperation of all participants who were very concerned about the research and enthusiastically devoted their time to it. I should also extend my thanks to all friends of mine who helped me develop and accomplish the research. I hope to return the favor someday.

I admit that all mistakes and flaws of this work are entirely of my own doing and take the blame for all errors left uncorrected.

Abstract

The main purposes of the research were to (a) illuminate changes made in the process of self-revising and third party revising translations, (b) ascertain translators' reaction to their translations' third party revisions, and (c) identify translators' conception of revision. To that end, a translation test and a questionnaire were developed and two groups of students participated in the research. The participants of the first group took English-Persian translation test and revised it after one week. The participants of the second group revised the initial translations of the first group. In the next stage, the first group commented on all third party revision changes. All 40 participants filled in the questionnaire as well. To analyze and describe the changes, three taxonomies were developed by the researcher: "revision techniques", "revision textual realization", and "revision outcome". The results indicated that third party revisers introduced almost three times as many changes as self-revisers did. Self-revision resulted in more promotional changes in terms of orthography and third party revision in terms of semantics. In both revision modes, the frequency of syntactic demotion and promotion was equal. Besides, nearly 20% of all changes in both revision modes resulted in quality promotion. Out of the total number of third party revision changes, translators agreed with 37.39%, were undecided on 28.25%, and disagreed with 34.34%. Analyzing the questionnaires revealed that self-revision was a habit for 55% of respondents; all respondents had experienced more situations of asking others to revise their own translations than being asked to do so. Translators agreed upon the effectiveness of self-revision more than third party revision. Most translators revised their translations twice and most of them mentioned that their drawer-time is dependent upon external factors. In terms of revision parameters, generally speaking, accuracy, fluency, grammatical errors, and punctuation were among the most important priorities.

Keywords: Revision, Self-Revision, Third Party Revision

Table of Contents

Title	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	xiii-xiv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
Overview	2
1.1. Background of the Problem	2-4
1.2. Statement of the Problem	4
1.3. Significance of the study	5-6
1.4. Purpose of the Study	7
1.5. Research Questions	7-8
1.6. Type of Research	8
1.7. Operational Definition of “Revision”	8-9
1.8. Scope and Limitations of the Study	9
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	
Overview	11
2.1. Introduction	12-14
2.2. Theoretical Considerations	
2.2.1. Revision: The Problem of Conceptual, Terminological, and Definitional Confusion	14-16
2.2.2. Revising vs. Editing	16-19
2.2.3. Self-Revision vs. Third Party Revision	19-22
2.2.4. The Three P’s of Revision: Purposes, Parameters, and Procedures	22-28
2.2.5. Problems with Revision	

2.2.5.1. Revisers' Regained Consciousness and the ST ...	28-29
2.2.5.2. Degree of Revision	29-31
2.2.5.3. Time, Money, and Quality	31-32
2.2.5.4. Multi-Faceted Relations between Revisers and Translators	32-37
2.2.6. Training Revisers and Editors	37-43
2.3. Practice-Based Studies	44-50
Summary	50
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	
Overview	52
3.1. Participants	
3.1.1. The First Group	52
3.1.2. The Second Group	53
3.2. Instruments	
3.2.1. The Translation Test	54-55
3.2.2. The Questionnaire	55-61
3.3. Data Collection Procedure	61-70
3.4. Data Analysis	71-75
3.5. Revision Techniques	76-78
3.6. Revision Textual Realization	79-87
3.7. Revision Outcome	88-95
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS, DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	
Overview	97
4.1. Self-revision	97-102
4.2. Third Party Revision	102-107

4.3. Self-revision versus Third Party Revision	107-111
4.4. Translators' Reaction to Third Party Revised Translations	112-117
4.5. Translators' Comments on their Third Party Revised Translations	117-119
4.6. Subsidiary Observations	120-125
4.7. The Questionnaire	125-144
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS	
Overview	146
5.1. Conclusions	146-153
5.2. Implications	153-157
5.3. Suggestions for Further Research	157-160
REFERENCES	162-167
APPENDICES	
Appendix I: Translation Test	II-III
Appendix II: Sample Questionnaire	IV-VII
Appendix III: Sample of Students' Comments on Third Party Revised Translations	VIII-XIV
Appendix IV: Translation Test (Manipulated vs. non-manipulated version)	XV-XVI
Appendix V: Sample of Tabulated Data	XVII-XXI

List of Tables and Figures

Title	Page
Table 4.1. Self-revision Techniques	98
Table 4.2. Self-revision Textual Realization	98-99
Table 4.3.1. Self-revision Outcome (1)	100
Table 4.3.2. Self-revision Outcome (2)	100
Table 4.3.3. Self-revision Outcome (3)	101
Table 4.4. Third Party Revision Techniques	103
Table 4.5. Third Party Revision Textual Realization	103-104
Table 4.6.1. Third Party Revision Outcome (1)	105
Table 4.6.2. Third Party Revision Outcome (2)	105
Table 4.6.3. Third Party Revision Outcome (3)	106
Table 4.7. Number of Changes: Self-revision versus Third Party Revision	107-108
Table 4.8. Translators' Reaction: Revision Techniques	113
Table 4.9. Translators' Reaction: Revision Textual Realization ...	114
Table 4.10. Translators' Reaction: Revision Outcome	115-116
Table 4.11. Instances of Conciseness in both Revision Modes	122-125
Figure 3.1. The Process of Revising	95
Figure 4.1. Frequency of Self-revision	126
Figure 4.2. Frequency of Third Party Revision (Respondents as Third Party Revisers)	128
Figure 4.3. Frequency of Third Party Revision (Respondents as Translators)	129
Figure 4.4. The Importance of Self-revision	131

Figure 4.5. The Importance of Third Party Revision	132
Figure 4.6. Number of Revisions	134
Figure 4.7. Length of Drawer-time	136
Figure 4.8. Revision Parameters (Number of Mentions)	138
Figure 4.9.1. Revision Parameters (The First Priority)	140
Figure 4.9.2. Revision Parameters (The Second Priority)	140
Figure 4.9.3. Revision Parameters (The Third Priority)	141
Figure 4.9.4. Revision Parameters (The Fourth Priority)	141
Figure 4.9.5. Revision Parameters (The Fifth Priority)	142

CHAPTER

1

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1

Introduction

Overview

This chapter provides a brief introduction to background, significance, purpose, and limitations of the study. To that end, background and significance of the study are discussed first. Then, research purpose and research questions are discussed. Elaborating on type of research and its scope and limitations concludes the chapter.

1.1. Background of the Problem

Revisability is a crucial distinguishing feature of writing in contrast with speech (Mossop, 1992). Revising is thus one of the most important skills to be learned not only by translators but also by everyone who is concerned about quality in writing; however, due to some further considerations (see Sainz, 1994; Hine, 2003; and Mossop, 2007 b), it is above all important in translating in a way that every text needs revision, be it translated by a novice translator or a professional one (Somers, 2001; Colina, 2003; and Hervey, Loughbridge, & Higgins, 2006).

Even though Künzli (2007 a) states that revision is increasingly becoming more important as a concept as well as a practice, it has no “well-developed history of theorizing and study” (Haar & Horning, 2006: 3) and above all it has not been “well understood, either as a concept or as an activity”, perhaps partly due to being “a deceptively simple notion” (Martin, 2007: 57). Among the problems preoccupying translation scholars is that translators tend to be immersed in ST and therefore fail to consider the possibility of new alternatives for re-expressing what was previously said in TL or fail to focus on TT as the reader of an independent piece of writing (see Mossop, 1992; Hervey, Higgins, & Haywood, 1995; and Bazerman, 2006 among others).

Translators may neglect to put themselves in the shoes of TT consumer (as they are TT producer and maybe unable to undertake a dual function). This in part bears on the fact that in the first ST reading and consequently translating, meaning comes to the translator’s mind through ST and it is only in follow-up consideration of TT (after translating) that meaning tends to come to the translator’s mind first through TT (Mossop, 1982). Therefore, when processing moves from unconsciousness to consciousness in primary translating and follow-up revision respectively and thus decreases in speed (Campbell & Wakim, 2007), the translator is provided with a fresh mind to adopt a new vision, regain the lost consciousness, and

specifically focus on TT. On these lines, Colina (2003: 36) takes the view that part of the problems of initial drafts of translations may be associated with “limitations in processing capacity.”

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The available literature on revision is by and large lacking in studies which juxtapose revised and non-revised translations to note features of a non-revised translation which mostly change in revision process (see Mossop, 2007 a); the studies would rather focus on theorizing about the possible parameters the translators tend to take into account and/or correct when they revise without trying to see (except Shih, 2006) whether these parameters are actually important for them. Even Shih’s study does not tell us whether revisers¹ actually do what they believe they do. Another problem regarding theoretical and practice-based considerations in revision is that most of the studies focus on third party revision at the expense of self-revision (Mossop, 2007 a).

¹Both spellings—reviser and revisor—are correct. However, as far as the present research is concerned, “reviser” is uniformly used, unless quoting a writer verbatim.

1.3. Significance of the Study

It is widely argued that the volume of literature on revision is thin on the ground (Mossop, 2007 b) and even that part treats revision unfairly. That revision has no well-defined and well-developed history in terms of both theory and practice and is unknowingly treated as a simple notion is lamented by many scholars (see Chakhachiro, 2005; Bazerman, 2006; Haar & Horning, 2006; Künzli, 2007 b; Martin, 2007; and Shih, 2007). Still, Mossop (2007 a) argues that most of the studies on revision concern other-revision or the so-called third party revision. The present study, among other things, will clarify the nature of self-revision as compared with its counterpart, other-revision.

Furthermore, it is argued that translation revision procedures and considerations are totally different from original writing editing, not to mention specific SLs and TLs (see Sainz, 1994). Describing what self-revision and third party revision means to translators helps to shed light on language-specific translation procedures and repeatedly occurring problems. Besides, it is contended that the nature of translation revision (either self or third party) must be delineated in terms of specific SLs/TLs, by taking into account even translation directionality (Mossop, 1992 &

2007 a), although Hine (2003) implies that part of revision principles universal.

Raising the level of translators' consciousness as to the nature of revision helps to better understand L1 interference. Martin (2007) argues that the actual benefit of revision lies in being "a feedback tool that allows its results to be channeled back into the whole cycle of translation production in order to eliminate or reduce problems at source" (62). Consciousness-raising regarding problems which may happen during revision and the so-called corpus developed through juxtaposing STs together with revised and non-revised TTs will hopefully help revisers, translators, and teachers among others.

Finally, a review of the literature demonstrates that theorists conclude that a reviser must refrain from imposing his stylistic preferences on the translator by taking into account just problematic areas and what must be corrected, not what can be improved. Therefore, a reviser must not impose his own taste area and creativity on translation and translator (see Newmark, 1991; Hervey, Higgins, & Haywood, 1995; Chakhachiro, 2005; Künzli, 2007 a; and Martin, 2007 among others). Whether this is something which lends itself to theory more than practice or the other way round is cleared up through the present research.