



**ISLAMIC AZAD UNIVERSITY
CENTRAL TEHRAN BRANCH
GRADUATE SCHOOL
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER
OF ARTS IN TRANSLATION STUDIES**

**On the Difference Between Field Dependent and
Field Independent Cognitive Styles Regarding
Translation of a Literary Text**

Advisor:

Dr. Masoud Seid Motahhari

Reader:

Dr. Mona Khabiri

By:

Mehrnoush Norouzi

December 2012

In The Name of God

To my family

Acknowledgement

It would not have been possible to write this master`s thesis without the help and support of the kind people around me, to only some of whom it is possible to give particular mention here.

First and foremost , I offer my sincerest gratitude to Dr.Motahhari, my patient advisor, not only for his support and the knowledge he offered me throughout this study, but also for the inspirational instruction , he provided in his classes as my professor

I am indebted to Dr. Khabiri, my honorable reader who patiently reviewed the present study and recommended invaluable comments and revisions.

I am thankful to dr.Akef for dedicating his time to referee this thesis.

I would like to gratefully thank my professors in Central Tehran Branch of Islamic Azad University for devoting any related knowledge to this study and for their support and assistance to collect required data throughout the research. This work is presumably a fruit of their long-term effort to train translation students in graduate and undergraduate courses.

My sincere appreciation goes to Dr. Ricardo Munoz Martin for sharing with me his knowledge about studies related to cognitive styles in the realm of translation studies.

I am also grateful to all 297 participants, the raters for dedicating their precious time to this study and all the instructors who allowed me to use the valuable time of their classes in Central and North Branches of Islamic Azad University.

Last, but not least I would like to deeply thank my family for their unconditional love, support, and great patience throughout my study.

Abstract

Studies in translation encompass various fields like cognitive translation studies. This study was an attempt to investigate whether there was any difference between field dependent and independent cognitive styles of BA translation students regarding their translation quality of a literary text from English to Persian. To gain the purpose of the study, the researcher followed a comparative study procedure. Piloted TOEFL test was administered to 297 participants and from among them, 204 who were homogeneous in terms of English language proficiency took GEFT test. Sixty four field dependent (FD) and sixty four field independent (FI) participants translated a same literary text by Virginia Woolf. Three raters scored the participants' translations. The obtained data from scoring GEFT and translations of the participants went through data analysis. The *t*-test result indicated FI translation students outperformed FD students in literary translation.

Table of Contents

Epigraph	i
Dedication	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	x
List of Figures.....	xiii
Abbreviations	xiii
Chapter One: Background and Purpose	14
1.1. Introduction	15
1.2. Statement of the Problem	18
1.3. Statement of the Research Question.....	21
1.4. Statement of the Research Hypothesis	22
1.5. Definition of Key Terms.....	22
1.5.1. Cognitive style	22
1.5.2. Field Independent	22
1.5.3. Field Dependent.....	23
1.5.4. Translation Quality Assessment	23
1.6. Significance of the Study.....	24
1.7. Limitations and Delimitations of the Study	28
Chapter Two: Review of the Related Literature	30
2.1. Introduction	31
2.2. Translation	33
2.3. Literary Translation.....	37

2.4. Approaches to Literary Translation.....	38
2.4.1.Cultural and Social Approaches to Literary Translation.....	39
2.4.1.1. Literary Work as a Cultural Artifact Theories	42
2.4.1.2. Literary Translation Study as a Descriptive Study	45
2.5. Translation Competence	48
2.5.1. Translation Competence as Summation of Knowledge	49
2.5.2. Translation Competence as Expert Knowledge.....	56
2.6. Cognitive Science	57
2.7. Translation as a Cognitive Activity	59
2.7.1. Models of Analysis of the Translation Process.....	60
2.7.1.1. The Interpretative Theory of Translation	60
2.7.1.2. Bell’s Linguistic and Psycholinguistic Model	62
2.7.1.3. Wilss and Translation as a Decision-making Type of Behaviour.....	63
2.7.1.4. Gutt and Relevance-Theoretic Approach to Translation	65
2.7.1.5. Gile’s Effort Model	67
2.7.2. PETRA and the Cognitive Aspects of Professional Translating Process.....	69
2.7.3. Empirical-experimental Research on Translation Processes and TC as a Cognitive Activity	72
2.7.3.1. Development and Combination.....	73
2.8. Cognitive Styles.....	75
2.8.1. Field Dependent and Independent Cognitive Styles	76
2.9. Translator as a Learner	80
2.9.1. Translator’s Intelligence	81
2.9.2. Translator’s Memory and Learning Styles.....	82
2.10. Context and Translation	85
2.10.1. Linguistic and Dynamic Contexts.....	86

2.11. Translation Quality Assessment.....	89
2.11.1. Reiss’s TQA Approach.....	91
2.11.2. Baker TQA Categorization	93
2.11.2.1. Anecdotal and Subjective Approaches.....	94
2.11.2.2. Response-oriented Approaches.....	95
2.11.2.3. Text-based Approaches	95
2.11.3. Translation Quality Assessment Models	96
2.11.3.1. House’s Model of TQA	97
2.11.4. Rubric in Translation Assessment.....	100
2.11.4.1. Frahzad’s Rubric	102
2.11.4.2. Sainz’s Rubric	105
2.11.4.3. Bastin’s Rubric	107
2.11.4.4. Beeby’s Rubric	109
2.11.4.5. Goff-Kfouris Rubric.....	110
2.11.4.6. Waddington’s Rubric	111
2.12. Conclusion	116
Chapter Three: Method.....	119
3.1. Introduction	120
3.2. Design of the Study.....	120
3.3. Participants	120
3.4. Instrumentation	122
3.4.1. Language Proficiency Test.....	122
3.4.2. Cognitive Styles Recognition Test	123
3.4.3. Text to Translate	124
3.4.4. Rating Rubric	126
3.5. Procedure	127
3.6. Statistical Analysis.....	129
Chapter Four: Results and Discussions	131

4.1. Introduction	132
4.2. Pilot Test of the General English Proficiency	132
4.2.1. Reliability of the General English Proficiency Test Piloting	134
4.3. Homogenization in terms of General English Proficiency	134
4.4. GEFT Administration	136
4.5. Translation Quality Assessment.....	138
4.5.1. Raters Training Session.....	138
4.5.2. Translation Scores	139
4.5.3. Inter-Reliability between Raters for Assessment of the Participants' Translations.....	140
4.6. Testing Hypothesis.....	142
4.6.1. Normality of Translation Scores Distribution	142
4.6.2. Independent –Samples Test Results for Translations of FD and FI Group.....	143
4.7. Discussion	145
 Chapter Five: Conclusion, Implications, and Suggestions for Further Research	 148
5.1. Introduction	149
5.2. Summary	149
5.3. Conclusion	150
5.4. Implications.....	151
5.5. Suggestions for Further Research.....	153
 References	 155
 Appendixes	 174

Appendix A: Readability Statistics of Assessment text.....	174
Appendix B: Assessment Text.....	176
Appendix C: Glossary.....	179
Appendix D: TOEFL test.....	181
Appendix E: GEFT test.....	199

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Characteristics of FI and FD Learners.....	79
Table 2.2: Sainz’s Rubric: Correction Chart.....	105
Table 2.3: Goff-Kfourı’s Rubric.....	111
Table 2.4: Serious and Minor Errors in Methods A.....	113
Table 2.5: Typology of Errors in Method B.....	114
Table 2.6: Scale for Holistic Method C.....	115
Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics of TOEFL Piloting.....	133
Table 4.2: Reliability Statistics of TOEFL Piloting	134
Table 4.3: Reliability Statistics of TOEFL.....	135
Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics of the General English Proficiency Test Administration	135
Table 4.5: The Primitive Numerical Data Obtained from GEFT.....	137
Table 4.6: Specifications of FD and FI Translation Students	137
Table 4.7: Inter- Reliability between Raters for Pilot Assessment in Training Session	138
Table 4.8: Pearson`s Correlation Coefficient between Raters for Samples Assessment in Training Session	139
Table 4.9: Descriptive Statistics of Translation Scores.....	139
Table 4.10: Inter-Reliability between Raters for Assessment of the participants’ Translations.....	140
Table 4.11: Pearson`s Correlation Coefficient between Raters for Assessment of the Participants’ Translation.....	141
Table 4.12: Descriptive Statistics of Skewness and the Result of Calculating the Normality of Translation Scores Distribution.....	142
Table 4.13: Descriptive Statistics of Groups	143

Table 4.14: Independent Samples Test Result for Translation Scores.....144

List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Scheme for Analyzing and Comparing Original and Translation Texts.....	99
Figure 4.1: Histogram of the Scores Obtained from TOEFL Piloting	133
Figure 4.2: Histogram of the Scores Obtained from the TOEFL Administration for Homogenization.....	136
Figure 4.3: Histogram of the Scores Obtained from Translation Assessment.....	140
Figure 4.4: Box plots of Translation Scores of FI and FD groups	145

Abbreviations

SL	Source Language
TL	Target Language
ST	Source Text
TT	Target Text
TC	Translation Competence
FI	Field Independent
FD	Field Dependent
GEFT	Group Embedded Figures Test
PATCE	Process of Acquisition of Translation Competence and Evaluation
PETRA	Pericia y Entorno de la Traducción (Expertise and Environment in Translation)
WM	Working Memory

Chapter One

Background and Purpose

1.1. Introduction

“For most people, the main goal of learning a foreign language is to be able to communicate. It is through communication that people send and receive messages effectively, and negotiate meaning” (Rubin & Thompson, 1994, p. 30). Translation is considered as “an act of communication” (Hatim & Mason, 1997, p.1).

“Translation is a multidisciplinary process, and that a multidisciplinary viewpoint is necessary for the understanding of the translation process” (Wilson, 2009, p.3). Toury (1982) believes translation, as a cognitive science, has to reach beyond linguistics, and calls it "interdisciplinary". Translation process and product are investigated through Cognitive Translation Studies (Hurtado Albir & Alves, 2009).

On the other hand, in her work on allusions in literary translation, Leppihalme (1997, pp.8-20) describes various views regarding translator's role, one of which is translator's capability of making choices and decisions in translation. The degree to which choices can and need to be made by the translator depends on various factors. Lopez Folgado (2012) explains that literary comprehension in translation involves not only cognitive activities, but also the aesthetic experience. Successful production in translation also does not rise from equivalence finding of

individual words or sentences, but is gained by means of a mentally formulated image gestalt, which is an integrated entity of both linguistic organization and visualized scene (Jiang, 2008).

An individual goes through a certain organization and range of cognitive resources to translate a text. These multiple translation-relevant Cognitive resources are referred to Translation Competence (TC) (shreve, 2006).

In translation studies, the characteristics of a good translator have been typically addressed based on the concept of (TC). Originally, Competence stands for the quality of acquiring a skill, knowledge, or qualification. In that sense, it is a synonym for aptitude. However, competence has acquired a new meaning in translation studies as “the knowledge a speaker / listener has of his language” that is a mental faculty or underlying knowledge. As such, Competence is thought of as a psychological attribute of an individual (Rothe-Neves, 2007).

In addition, according to Process of Acquisition of Translation Competence and Evaluation (PACTE) research group in 2000, translation/ translator competence, which is the underlying system of knowledge needed to translate, includes five interrelated and hierarchical sub-competencies: 1. Bilingual sub-competence; 2. Extra-linguistic sub-

competence; 3. Knowledge about translation; 4. Instrumental sub-competence; 5. strategic competence (PACTE, 2011; Farrahi Aval, 2009).

In fact, the TC Model proposed by PACTE research team (2003) is made up of 5 sub-competencies and psycho-physiological components that overlap each other as they operate (Montalt Resserecci, Ezpeleta Piorno & Garcia Izquierdo ,2008).The psychophysical components include different types of cognitive and attitudinal components and psychomotor mechanisms (PACTE, 2011). Furthermore, Robinson (2003, p.49) puts forward that “translation is an intelligent activity involving complex processes of conscious and unconscious learning.” He mentions that, “translation is an intelligent activity, requiring creative problem-solving in novel, textual, social, and cultural conditions” (p.51). “A translator should know that translation is a learning activity and it involves the use of the main direct (memory, cognitive and compensation) and indirect (metacognitive, affective and social) language-learning strategies” proposed by Oxford (1990, p.14).

“ The way we learn things in genral and the way we attack a problem seem to hing on a rather amophous link between personality and cognition;this link referred to as cognive style”(Brown, 2000 ,p.113). He defines FI style as human ability to perieve a particular, relevent item or

factor in a “field” of distracting items. In psychological terms, that “field” may be perceptual, or it may be more abstract and refer to a set of thoughts, ideas, or feelings from which the task is to perceive specific relevant subsets. In contrast, field dependence is the tendency to be “dependent” on the total field so that the parts embedded within the field are not easily perceived, although the total field is perceived more clearly as a unified whole. A field-independent style enables the person to distinguish parts from a whole, to concentrate on something, to analyze separate variables without the contamination of neighboring variables.

Translation is a transfer process which aims at the transformation of a written SL text into an equivalent TL text, and which requires the syntactic, the semantic and the pragmatic understanding and analytical processing of the SL text (Wilss, 1982). “A good translator must be aware of the importance of cognitive information processing of texts so that they can be accurately understood, processed and transformed by their cognitive system” (Gurdial -Singh, 2005).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Vandepitte’s (2008) wide map of translation studies distinguishes four main types of methods employed: deductive translation studies, experimental approaches, speculative ones and inductive translation

studies with its qualitative, quantitative and hermeneutic approaches. In addition, various fields of translation study also apply methods typically related to their field: linguistic, neurolinguistic, cognitive, psycholinguistic, behavioral, communicative / functional, semiotic, sociological approaches in interpreting, etc. Halverson (2010) more specifically proposes that to answer questions about translational phenomena, cognitive translation scholars use numerous ways within translation studies` sister disciplines of bilingualism, psychology, cognitive science, etc. Vandepitte (2008) adds in TC research, translators are seen as individuals going through the translation process and taking many decisions. Hurtado Albir (2001) highlights the process of translation as a complex process, which requires processes of problem-solving, decision-making and the use of strategies.

Decisions are taken consciously or unconsciously, they may involve translation strategies. How to improve students' TC is a very frequent subject in translation studies specifically in teaching translation that forms a fruitful field of study. The area includes issues such as translation curriculum design, program implementation, translation assessment or evaluation, translator training institutions and the place of technology in translation training. (Williams & Chesterman, 2002)