

Leiden University

The Influence of the Information Structure on the Quality of a Translation

Marjolein van der Plas

S1292234

MA Thesis

MA Linguistics: Translation in Theory and Practice

mr. drs. A.A. Foster

J.J.E. Spies MA

1 July 2016

Abstract

Traditionally, grammar is important in translation. However, translation quality assessment often does not pay much attention to the correct use of grammar and information structure. This research aims to investigate whether Hannay and Mackenzie's five principles for effective writing in English can be used to provide a guideline for the assessment of grammatical constructions. The study contained a literature review and a questionnaire, which focused on quality assessment of Dutch to English translations in which the five principles are applied. Although the number of respondents is slightly small, there are interesting findings. Especially principle 1 and principle 5 are recognized and those translations are assessed as grammatically correct. The study also found that native speakers of English are more strict in their assessment than non-native speakers of English, who are more tolerant towards minor errors.

Table of content

List of Tables.....	4
Introduction	5
Chapter 1: Methodology.....	8
Chapter 2: Literature Review	13
Chapter 3: Results	24
Information on the respondents	24
Experience.....	24
Native Language	25
Areas	25
General questions: Beliefs about translation and the translation process.....	26
Texts and translations	31
Chapter 4: Discussion.....	42
General findings	42
Findings related to research questions.....	47
Conclusion.....	51
Works Cited.....	54
Appendix 1: Questionnaire.....	56
Appendix 2: Results	66
Table 1	66
Table 2	68
Table 3	69

List of Tables

<i>Table 1</i>	24
<i>Table 2</i>	26
<i>Table 3</i>	27
<i>Table 4</i>	27
<i>Table 5</i>	27
<i>Table 6</i>	28
<i>Table 7</i>	28
<i>Table 8</i>	29
<i>Table 9</i>	29
<i>Table 10</i>	29
<i>Table 11</i>	30
<i>Table 12</i>	30
<i>Table 13</i>	30
<i>Table 14</i>	31
<i>Table 15</i>	32
<i>Table 16</i>	32
<i>Table 17</i>	33
<i>Table 18</i>	33
<i>Table 19</i>	34
<i>Table 20</i>	34
<i>Table 21</i>	35
<i>Table 22</i>	35
<i>Table 23</i>	36
<i>Table 24</i>	36
<i>Table 25</i>	37
<i>Table 26</i>	37
<i>Table 27</i>	38
<i>Table 28</i>	38
<i>Table 29</i>	39
<i>Table 30</i>	39
<i>Table 31</i>	40
<i>Table 32</i>	40
<i>Table 33</i>	41
<i>Table 34</i>	41
<i>Table 35</i>	44
<i>Table 36</i>	44
<i>Table 37</i>	45
<i>Table 38</i>	46
<i>Table 39</i>	47
<i>Table 40</i>	49

Introduction

Translation quality assessment often is scheduled at the end of the translation process and considers the various lexical, grammatical and cultural choices that have been made. Since source and target language use different grammar and employ different information structures, translators need to be aware of differences in grammar and information structure and be able to use the right constructions in order to convey the message of the source language in the target language. Grammar traditionally is an important aspect of this quality assessment as many quality assessment models focus on linguistic aspects of a translation (Van den Broeck 1984,1985; Nord 1991; House 2015). However, this attention for linguistic aspects of a translation has recently shifted to a more influential role for subjective and intuitive assessment. These intuitive methods of translation quality assessment are found, as House states, among the “‘neo-hermeneutic approach’ (cf.eg., Paepcke 1986; Stolze 1992; Kupsch- Losereit 1994)” (2).

A considerable amount of literature has been published on translation quality assessment. One of the leading models is developed by Juliane House. Besides this, there is literature on constructing effective English texts (eg. Turley 2000; Lindsay 2010; Johnson 2011). This includes a system of 5 principles for sentence construction: the accessibility principle, the principle of end focus, the thematic patterning principle, the principle of end weight, and the initial subject principle (Hannay and Mackenzie, 111). These principles have been developed by Hannay and Mackenzie who provide the Dutch target audience with instructions on writing in English. Besides this, a number of researchers have written on the adaptation of grammatical pattern to the standards of the target language.

Although the correct use of grammar and information structure is a fundamental property of a translation of good quality, quality assessment often pays less attention to it. The focus is often on lexical problems which may be caused by the fact that these are easier to assess for lexical matters can be checked by means of the bilingual and monolingual dictionary. However, this is not the case for grammatical constructions. In contrast to lexical choices, there is much less information about the assessment of grammatical choices.

Although grammar is such an important factor, few studies have investigated its role and assessment in translation. Since there is a lack of information on the assessment of grammatical constructions in translations, this research sets out to investigate whether the literature on writing effective texts can be used to provide a guideline for the assessment of grammatical constructions.

This thesis sets out to investigate how translators assess the quality of translations in which the five principles of Hannay and Mackenzie are applied. This aims to provide insight in the usefulness of Hannay and Mackenzie's five principles for the assessment of Dutch to English translation. As stated earlier, translators may benefit from the application of the five principles for they can aid in the construction of effective target text oriented translations. Therefore the claim is that translators will assess the translations in which the five principles are applied more positively than translations in which this is not the case. This implies that translators are likely to be able to recognize these principles in Dutch to English translations. From this assumption follows the claim that especially native speakers of English will recognize the application of these principles in translated texts even if they cannot meta linguistically describe their observation. This is related to the fact that Hannay and Mackenzie take the native speaker as their starting point in the definition of an effective text (14).

The thesis is designed according to a deductive approach to research and therefore includes a literature review and a form of data collection. Data for this study have been collected using a questionnaire.

The findings of this study will make a contribution to the creation of a perspective on translation in which all aspects of a language are considered. The study aims to provide new insights into the relation between sentence structure and translation quality assessment. Unfortunately, it is beyond the scope of this study to examine all aspects related to sentence structure and translation quality assessment.

The overall structure of the thesis takes the form of five chapters. The first chapter is concerned with the methodology used for this study. This chapter is followed by a literature review, which provides a theoretical background for the thesis and the data collection. The review focuses on the five principles for effective writing in English. In addition to this, it focuses on translation quality assessment and reviews the model developed by House. Lastly, other researchers who wrote on grammatical adaptation in translation are represented in this literature review. After the theoretical information on grammar and sentence structure, the thesis moves towards the findings of the data collection. These are described in the third chapter which focuses on the results of the questionnaire. The presentation of the results is structured according to the three parts of the questionnaire, namely the information on the respondents, beliefs on translation and the translation process, and the translations. This chapter also employs tables to provide a clear overview of the outcome of the data collection. fourth chapter of the thesis discusses the findings. The discussion will first focus on the general findings and then on the findings related to the research question and claims. These

practical findings are connected with the theoretical background in the concluding chapter. This presents the answer to the research question and claims as well as recommendations for further research. In addition to these chapters, the thesis contains several appendices. These contain information on the questionnaire and tables with the results of the questionnaire. The first appendix provides the questionnaire and the other appendices provide tables with the results of the questionnaire.

My personal interest for this topic prompted this research. This interest was sparked by an observation I made in the translation process. I noticed how subtle differences in sentence structure provided me with several possible translations out of which only one could be selected for the final version of the assignment. This led me to think about grounds on which I as a translator could take a decision that would lead to the best target text oriented translation. It is very interesting to see the different observations and reactions from the respondents on the two possible translations.

Chapter 1: Methodology

Although different translation quality assessment models have been developed, the quality of a translation remains difficult to assess. This empirical research then aims to discover whether sentence construction has an influence on the quality of a translation. The questionnaire aims to test whether the application of Hannay and Mackenzie's five principles in translation results in texts which are considered to be of better quality.

There are two main philosophies used in research, these are: the qualitative and quantitative philosophies. In addition to these main philosophies, a researcher can also use a mixed method in which qualitative and quantitative research are combined. Such mixed method aims to combine the strengths of the qualitative and the quantitative philosophy, which can be done in the research as well as in the data analysis (Dörnyei, 45). For this research, the quantitative philosophy is selected. In quantitative research, "a hypothesis is deduced from the theory and is tested" (Bryman, 141). This may not always be strictly applicable, however, the theory always provides matters which should be taken into concern in the research. This contrasts with qualitative research in which the general research question is leading (Bryman, 370). Theory also has a different place in qualitative research with many qualitative researchers "emphasizing a preference for treating theory as something that emerges out of the collection and analysis of data" (Bryman, 373). Since this research takes theory as a starting point, the quantitative philosophy was considered most suitable and from this flows: the research starting with an overview of theory; a literature review; followed by a form of data collection.

Several approaches can be taken in the data collection, but first the distinction between inductive and deductive research has to be considered. The inductive approach implies that the collected data generates the theory (Bryman, 11). In contrast, the deductive approach implies that the researcher constructs a hypothesis based on the theory and subjects it to "empirical scrutiny" (Bryman, 9). This approach corresponds with the quantitative philosophy and "is usually associated with it" (Bryman, 10). This research uses the deductive approach and the guiding principles for this research are provided by the theory of Hannay and Mackenzie. Although this research uses the deductive approach, one should note that there is no "clear-cut distinction" (Bryman, 12). The research may be mainly deductive but can still include an inductive element at the end as the results of the data collection may confirm or deny the theory (Bryman, 12). Secondly, the researcher can choose to use primary or

secondary data. Secondary data has already been collected by others and such secondary analysis implies that the data is analysed “for purposes that in all likelihood were not envisaged by those responsible for the data collection” while primary data on the other hand, is collected by the researcher themselves (Bryman, 296). The collection of primary data is preferred for several reasons: in the first place, it is difficult to find credible sources with results related to this specific research question. Besides this, a search shows that not much research has been conducted in this area. A further consideration is whether the data that could be found would be suitable for further analysis, since this analysis is conducted with different aims than the aims of the researchers who collected the data. This is important since the form of data collection is highly influenced by the research question or hypothesis.

The combination of the quantitative philosophy, the deductive approach and the choice to collect primary data lead to the selection of a survey as the most suitable strategy. I have selected a survey since this allowed for a greater number of participants.

A single method has been adopted. However, one may consider a slight use of mixed method since the survey contains some open ended questions which provide qualitative detail (Wray and Bloomer, 155). This choice has been made in order to gain a better insight into the considerations of the respondents in their judgment on quality. Individual considerations differ greatly and therefore it is not possible to provide a multiple choice list that includes all options. Another advantage of these open questions is that they can provide new issues that can lead to new perspectives on the hypothesis (Dörnyei, 107).

Respondents were selected on the following criteria: all respondents had to be professional translators, including literary and legal translators; they had to have sufficient knowledge of the English language and Dutch language, in order to understand the source and target texts. These respondents were approached via email by the supervisor of this thesis and another thesis supervisor and received a link to the online questionnaire.

The time scale for this research is cross-sectional and takes place within the set period of time for MA thesis as determined by the board of examiners. Within this time frame the literature review proceeds the questionnaire which is open for two weeks.

Several data collecting techniques can suit this research. Quantitative data collection often takes place through a test or survey (Dörnyei, 95). “Survey data” can be collected in two ways, either through structured interviews or through questionnaires. Dörnyei states that “although survey data can be collected by means of structured interviews (...) the main data collection method in survey is the use of questionnaires” (101). The questionnaire has been chosen for several reasons, the main one being that via a questionnaire “a huge amount of

information” can be gathered in a relatively short period of time (Dörnyei, 113). In addition to this, a questionnaire is “versatile” which implies that it can easily be adapted to a specific topic and a specific group of respondents (Dörnyei, 113). Since the hypothesis tests an unconscious preference, it is important that respondents are in no possible way influenced in their responses. This is more difficult to achieve in interviews since the student conducting the research is present. In addition to this, a questionnaire is more likely to provide a great number of respondents and another advantage is that a questionnaire “work[s] with any number of subjects” (Wray and Bloomer, 154). This is important since it is difficult to predict the response rate. There are also advantages in relation to the outcome, as a well-constructed questionnaire results in data which can be processed “relatively straightforward” (Dörnyei, 115). This is especially the case for closed questions with Wray and Bloomer stating that “the identical format means you can easily find corresponding answers across your cohort of informants” (159).

However, the form of a questionnaire also has limitations and disadvantages. One disadvantage of a questionnaire is that the researcher cannot ask further questions in order to gather relevant material (Wray and Bloomer, 159). This may be a problem for the open questions, where respondents might not fill in any more information than the number of the translation they prefer. This would mean that the open questions will provide superficial information. Another of these limitations is the fact that “respondents cannot always tell you what they actually do, only what they *believe* they do- self-reporting is not necessarily very accurate because we often don’t know ourselves very well” (Wray and Bloomer, 155). These limitations may affect the open questions where respondents are asked to explain their preference for a specific translation. Although this is a difficult limitation, the questionnaire tries to overcome it by asking a closed question on the readability of the translation which is asked immediately after the open question and ensures that at least some correlation between the answers can be found.

Moreover, in the design of the questionnaire, the risk of bias also has to be taken into account with a risk of “social desirability bias” and of “sucker bias” considered (Wray and Bloomer, 155; Dörnyei, 54). In order to limit bias as much as possible, the questionnaire takes an indirect approach, which means that the questionnaire does not communicate all information considering the aim of the research (Wray and Bloomer, 155). According to Wiener and Crandall this retention is a form of deception and thus transgresses ethical principles (Bryman, 117,124). However, Bryman states that this deception is “widespread” (125) and he is of the opinion that it is “rarely feasible or desirable” to provide all information

on the topic of research (125). In this research, information is withheld at the start of the questionnaire but the retention of information does not result in risks for respondents and at the end of the questionnaire, further information is provided. It is ensured that respondents cannot return to earlier pages of the questionnaire after reading the further information on the research. Respondents can fill in their email address if they want more information regarding the research and the outcome of the research.

Besides the supply of information, anonymity and confidentiality are important factors in data collection. Dörnyei emphasizes that data collection via the Internet ensures a “high level of anonymity” (121). Anonymity is often preferred since respondents tend to be more candid in their opinions (Wray and Bloomer, 174). However, there is also a negative consequence for respondents may be “less responsible, and you may be left unsure about the validity of their answers (Wray and Bloomer, 174). The questionnaire is anonymous, no names are asked and questions where explicit personal information is provided are not obligatory, which means that respondents are only traceable if they choose to provide their email address. Before respondents can start the questionnaire, they have to agree with the letter of consent. This provides them with information about their “right to withdraw from the project at any stage without any obligation to explain their decision” (Wray and Bloomer, 173). Furthermore, it ensures respondents that the information they provide will solely be used for the purpose of this research.

When respondents supply their email address, their results will be made anonymous. The information provided by respondents is kept confidential and kept in a separate list which is not linked to their answers in order to maintain anonymity in results.

Overall, respondents are asked different types of questions, these include: questions on their experience as a translator; on their native language; on source and target languages; and some factual questions about their background. These questions are either closed questions or a specific open question. The specific open question concerns the number of years of experience. The background questions are followed by questions on the attitude of translators towards certain aspects of translation and the translation process. The questions on translation and the translation process take the form of statements, with some statements cross-referenced. At the end of this block of questions, respondents can choose to answer an open question. This questions asks respondents whether there are any issues they consider important for translation that have not been mentioned in the statements. This will help to get a clear view on matters respondents consider important in translation. The statements are followed by 10 texts, translations of these 10 texts apply the 5 principles of Hannay and

Mackenzie and each text has two translations: one is possible but not entirely correct and the other one is formulated according to one of the principles. The respondents are asked two questions on each text. The first question is an open question and asks respondents which translation they consider grammatically correct. This could be one of the two translations, or both, or neither of the translations. Besides this, respondents are asked to explain their answer. While the second question is a closed question and focuses on the readability of both texts. Before the questionnaire is spread, a pilot is run to check the questionnaire on any mistakes and errors.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Syntax, information, and quality of a text: the three are closely related and display the unique character of a language. An error in syntax may cause confusion about the message of the sentence. This confusion about information can lead the reader to consider the text to be of lesser quality. In translation, the quality of a text can be assessed through an assessment of syntactic and semantic features. The first overview focuses on the differences in information structure between the Dutch language and the English language. Hannay and Mackenzie conducted research in this field and have provided guidelines for Dutch authors of English texts. Their guidelines can be useful for Dutch to English translation as they give the translator a better understanding of differences in information structure that need to be considered in the translation process. This first overview will be followed by a second overview concerning translation and quality. Whereas the first overview focuses more on the translation process, the second one considers translation evaluation. The evaluation model reviewed in the chapter is developed by Juliane House. This is followed by theoretical views on the importance of the adaptation of the grammatical structure to the target language structure. The importance of using the correct grammatical pattern finds its basis in the unique grammatical patterns which determine the information that is to be found in a clause (Jakobson, 129). However, the unique character of grammatical patterns can cause problems during the translation process and may result in translation loss. The review concludes with a perspective on the similarities between Dutch and English in terms of grammatical constructions.

In their book *Effective Writing in English*, Hannay and Mackenzie provide guidelines for Dutch authors of English texts. The guidelines are based on research that was conducted on a collection of English essays written by Dutch students. Hannay and Mackenzie highlight the most common errors and use these to explain the differences between the English information structure and the Dutch information structure. The book focuses on the argued text. This type of text includes academic articles - the genre that is most relevant for their audience. The argued text contains a descriptive component and an argumentative component. The authors call this the “expository function” and the “argumentative function” of the argued text (Hannay and Mackenzie, 13). This limits the scope of the book but at the same time the choice for a specific type of text ensures that the suggestions are specific and to the point.

The book emphasizes on knowledge and application, which is visible in the guidelines supported by academic research. This enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the

reasons for these guidelines. Besides connections with their research, one can also see connections with linguistic theories. Hannay and Mackenzie assume a fixed word order and thus seem to follow Halliday and Hasan in the theme- rheme concept. On the other hand, one can also see some correspondence with the Prague School, in terms of the placing of important information and communicative dynamism. The guidelines are based on research conducted on a collection of English essays written by Dutch students. The findings of the research provide examples that are used to explain the reasons for the advice. For instance, the examples are used to indicate the erroneous character of sentences that are developed according to the Dutch information structure. In this way, the authors ensure that the problems are illustrated with examples to which the reader can relate. Each explanation concludes with a prescriptive part where the authors offer the reader practical advice. This support by examples is in line with the aim of the book, which is “to offer you not only practical advice on writing skills but also an understanding of the reasons behind that advice. Only in this way, we feel, will you achieve control over your writing” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 13). The aim of knowledge and application results in a handbook that is descriptive as well as prescriptive.

The practical character of the book is reflected in the language it uses. The reader is often addressed and the language is at times informal and easy to access and understand for students. Suggestions from the authors are usually explicitly given, for instance, by the words “we advise you....” or “our advice”. This enables the reader to distinguish the facts of the research from the opinions of the authors.

The book covers the entire process of text writing. It starts with an explanation of the differences between written text and spoken word. Here, the authors emphasize amongst others that “syntactic organization” in written texts can be said to replace the function of intonation in spoken word for the way in which a sentence is structured determines where the reader’s attention is drawn to (Hannay and Mackenzie, 39).

In addition to the explanation of the difference between the character of written texts and spoken word, the authors explain the differences between Dutch and English texts. For instance, Dutch texts are more tolerant than English texts when it comes to comma splices and incomplete sentences (Hannay and Mackenzie, 41). These explanations aid the readers in the process of becoming aware of the possible mistakes in writing in English.

One third of the book is dedicated to the construction of effective sentences. The starting point is that written texts in principle contain complex sentences. This is related to the genre of the argued text. Complex sentences aid the author, who aims to communicate their perspective via the text. Hannay and Mackenzie explain this by saying that the writer will

“rely heavily on complex sentences” in order to “get across quite complex and sophisticated pieces of argumentation in an orderly and effective manner” (90). These complex sentences can be made with different “syntactic devices” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 90). Since these syntactic devices are so central to the creation of an effective text, it is important that the writer knows these devices and is able to apply them: “As a Dutch writer of English, you need to have extensive command of all the mechanical devices commonly used in English for making complex sentences” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 91). This shows that the authors emphasize the importance of this knowledge and its application. The combination of these two leads to what the authors define as “the extensive command”. This emphasis of Hannay and Mackenzie is similar to that of Baker’s. Baker states that translators should be aware of and should learn to use thematic devices in both source and target language (Baker, 151). According to Baker, “awareness of aspects of information flow and potential ways of resolving tension between syntactic and communicative functions is important in translation” (Baker, 180). However, she does not entirely agree to a complete adaptation to the “word order principles of the target language” (Baker, 180). On this point, there is a clear contrast with Hannay and Mackenzie, for Baker seems to be in favour of staying close to the “thematic organization of the source text” (Baker, 180). This may serve as an explanation for the fact that Baker fails to present a strong emphasis on the awareness and application of the structures.

The authors claim that the use of the five principles leads to an effective text (i.e. a text that serves the aim of the writer). Each principle will be briefly explained in the following paragraphs. The first three principles focus on “the informational status of constituents” and the last two focus on “more formal properties of constituents” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 111-112). Through this difference in focus, the five principles can be said to encompass the content and form of a text. The principles that focus on the informational status are concerned with the content whereas the other principles are concerned with the form. Together, the five principles show how an effective text combines content and form. If this reasoning is followed, one will conclude that there has to be a greater emphasis on content than on form.

The first principle is the accessibility principle. This principle is explained as follows: the writer should “make lexical and syntactic choices to ensure that the initial constituent consists of accessible information” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 113). Accessible information is defined as existing knowledge. This knowledge can be found in the context of the sentence or “made accessible at the time of mention by means of an anchoring device” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 114). Thus, Hannay and Mackenzie define accessible information as information

that is present in the text. This is a rather narrow view in comparison with Chafe's notion of given information. Chafe states that "given (or old) information is that knowledge which the speaker assumes to be in the consciousness of the addressee at the time of the utterance" (30). He uses two criteria to determine whether or not an item is in the consciousness of the reader or hearer: the number of intervening sentences and a change of scene (Chafe, 32-33). A great number of intervening sentences and a change of scene can cause items to leave the consciousness of the reader. These items will then have to be introduced anew.

Since the focus is only on the text itself, Hannay and Mackenzie do not refer to specialist knowledge that is prior to understanding any text of the field. From this perspective follows that the accessibility principle applies to the second dimension of Biber's seven dimensions, as explained by Baumgarten and Probst. This second dimension is situation-dependent versus explicit reference. Situation-dependent communication "refers to an external situation" but also applies to communication that "can only be interpreted with reference to the extralinguistic context" (Baumgarten, 68). Explicit reference on the contrary contains a direct definition of the objects that are part of the discourse, this is also called "endophoric reference" (Baumgarten, 68).

The accessibility principle ensures a good textual structure and a text that is "reader-friendly" (Hannay and Mackenzie, 114). The focus on the reader is also emphasized by Baker in her review of the information structure of a text (Baker, 156). Baker states that the information structure distinguishes between given and new information. Given information is regarded by the speaker as already known to the hearer (and therefore accessible) (Baker, 156). New information is the information that "the speaker wishes to convey to the hearer" (Baker, 156). Which segment of the clause can be said to be given or new is determined by "the linguistic or situational context" (Baker, 156). Hannay and Mackenzie refer to the linguistic context since the focus is on the information which was mentioned earlier in the text.

The second principle is the principle of end focus, which is explained as follows: "the principle of end focus can be seen to lend maximum support for the reader when interpreting the message, because he will always know where to expect the most important information" (Hannay and Mackenzie, 114). This provides consistency in the text and functions to provide clarity to the reader and aid the understanding and thus the communicative function of the text. This seems mainly to the benefit of the reader. But it has also a ground in the "effective system of information ordering" (Hannay and Mackenzie, 115). The basic assumption of this system is that "pieces of information which belong together should be placed close together"

(Hannay and Mackenzie, 116). The advantage of end focus is that it can be achieved in almost every sentence. There are only two exceptions to the rule: cleft constructions and constructions with verbs of existence or emergence. The principle of end focus flows from the given-before-new principle. The order of the segments is determined by the “given-before-new principle” which implies that the given before new is “the normal, unmarked order” (Baker, 156-7). This is explained by Greenbaum and Quirk as related to communicative dynamism. Communicative dynamism is defined by linguist Firbas: “Communicative dynamism refers to the variation in communicative value as between different parts of an utterance” (Greenbaum and Quirk, 394). The given information has a low information value, whereas new information has a high information value. “It is common to process the information in a message so as to achieve a linear presentation from low to high information value” (Greenbaum and Quirk, 395). Thus, this perspective explains end-focus. When one takes this perspective into account, it is logical that the new information will be placed at the end of the clause because of its high information value.

Thirdly, there is the thematic patterning principle. This principle is expressed in this advice: “When choosing your starting point for the construction of the clause, take into account the best thematic pattern for achieving your rhetorical aim” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 120). The pattern that is chosen is important for the flow of the text. The authors distinguish between the pattern of continuous progression and the pattern of linear progression (Hannay and Mackenzie, 116-118). These are different ways in which sentences and information can be connected to each other. Hannay and Mackenzie present the two different patterns and eventually conclude that the argued text will contain both patterns.

The fourth principle is the principle of end weight. This principle is defined in the following advice: “Place shorter constituents towards the beginning of the clause and the longest and most complex constituents in final position” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 124). This principle helps the writer to avoid frontal overload and is related to the end focus principle. In frontal overload, the sentence initial constituent is too weighty. This can be seen in the following sentence:

1. “How it was possible for the companies to by-pass the strict export controls was mainly looked at” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 126).

When readers encounters a sentence like this, they are likely to be confused about the focus of the sentence. In addition to this, the syntactic pattern of the English language does not allow the writer to construct sentences in which long constituents can appear in sentence initial position in a complex sentence.

The fifth principle is the initial subject principle. This principle is defined as follows: the writer has to “seek idiomatic formulations which allow the subject to appear in clause-initial position” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 124). In combination with end weight, the writer will have to choose a subject that is a short constituent. When this is also combined with end-focus, it leads to the conclusion that the subject is likely to exist of known information. In this way, the principle builds on the accessibility principle and explains how the writer can convey the known information in the sentence in an effective way. However, it is not always possible to place old information in a short initial constituent. In cases where this is not possible, English language makes use of dummy subjects, such as, *it* and *this*. This principle builds on the accessibility principle and explains how the writer can convey the known information in the sentence in an effective way.

House’s book *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present* describes her refined model for translation quality assessment as well as recent developments which influence translation studies. According to her definition of translation, translation is “at its core a linguistic act” (House, 2). This indicates the importance of a linguistic analysis of a text. However, there are also other factors which influence translation and these factors have to be considered as well when one looks at translation. House lists “interacting factors” which include “the structural characteristics [...] of the two languages involved in translation” and “the target language norms internalized by the translator” (House, 2). These examples show that House acknowledges that factors related to the structure of the text and the structure pattern are relevant in considering translation. This indicates that House’s model and Hannay and Mackenzie’s approach have certain shared points.

House distinguishes overt and covert translation as a basic division. The thorough description of covert translation as well as the focus on covert translation in other chapters of the book and in the example analysis seem to indicate that House prefers covert translation. The term ‘overt translation’ is applied to texts that have an “established status in the source language community” but are also of “general human interest” (House, 54). An example of texts that require overt translation are texts on historical events. These texts cannot have the same function in the target language and will therefore obtain a “second-level function” (House, 55). In covert translation, on the other hand, the target text will receive the status of an original source text and will have an equivalent function (House, 56). Equivalence in translation is often a problematic term. Baker takes the reader of the target text into account when stating that the main difficulties related to equivalence “seem to be concerned with the ability to assess the target readers’ range of knowledge and assumptions about various aspects

of the world, and to strike a reasonable balance between, on the one hand, fulfilling their expectations and, on the other hand, maintaining their interest in the communication by offering them new or alternative insights” (Baker, 263). Her emphasis is on achieving a balance and this is the focus of the advice she gives to translators. Baker states that the translator should explain certain concepts but should also consider that the reader is likely to be prepared to encounter a different world view or perspective since the reader knows the text is translated (Baker, 263). The disadvantage is that this only applies when the reader is aware that the text has been translated and this balance could thus be more difficult to achieve in covert translation. Jakobson states that there never can be full equivalence (127). However, it is important to examine equivalence for “equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics” (Jakobson, 127). House can be seen as a researcher who examines and defines equivalence. Her definition of equivalence in function implies that the source and target text will have equivalent purposes (House, 66). This notion of equivalent purposes is similar to Nida’s dynamic equivalence. Nida describes two types of equivalence: functional equivalence and dynamic equivalence (Nida, 144). Functional equivalence focuses on the content and form of the source message and dynamic equivalence focuses on the “receptor response” (Nida, 150). Nida explains that “the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message” (Nida, 144). This corresponds with House’s statement on covert translation where she states that the source and target language addressees are “equally directly addressed”(House, 66). This equivalence in function can be obtained in texts which are “not particularly tied to the source language and culture” (House, 56). The examples that are mentioned include scientific texts and journalist texts (House, 56). One can argue that translators who practice covert translation will benefit from the five principles of Hannay and Mackenzie. The five principles aim to adapt the text to the grammatical pattern of the target language. However, the translator will have to apply a “cultural filter” with which the translator views “the source text through the eyes of a target culture member” (House, 57). This cultural filter serves to achieve an equivalent function of the target text. House explains that the cultural filter is “a means of capturing socio-cultural differences in expectation norms and stylistic conventions between the source and target linguistic- cultural communities” (House, 68).

The mode of translation quality assessment House developed aims to analyse and compare original and translated texts (House, 124). The application starts with an analysis of the source text. This analysis concludes with a statement of function (e.g. House, 135).

Subsequently, the target text is analysed and compared with the source text. This analysis concludes with a statement of quality (e.g. House, 141-2). This statement of quality is rather a statement of equivalence since equivalent function seems to be an important topic of the statement. The analysis focuses on field, tenor and mode, falling under register. Field refers to the “subject matter and social action” of the text (House, 124). For field, lexical means, lexical fields and processes are analysed (House, 130). Tenor refers to the “participant relationship” and includes “author’s provenance and stance, social role relationship, and social attitude” (House, 124). For each aspect, the lexical means and syntactic means are examined (House, 131-2). Mode refers to the medium of the text and the participation. For both can be indicated whether they are simple or complex (House, 124). In her analysis, House uses “medium and connectivity” as the subtopic of Mode (House, 133). The analysis of “medium and connectivity” is divided over an analysis of lexical, syntactic and textual means (House, 133). Besides register, the analysis also focuses on genre or the generic purpose of the text (House, 124). Overall, House provides a useful model for analysis of source and target text. One question that needs to be asked, however, is whether House considers lexical means more important in her analysis than syntactic means for the example analyses seem to focus more on lexical means than on syntactic means.

Grammatical adaptation and adaptation of the information structure to the standards of the target language is promoted by several researchers. Hervey, Higgins, and Loughridge argue that: “At the extreme of the SL bias is interlineal translation, where the TT attempts to respect the details of SL grammar by having grammatical units corresponding point for point to every grammatical unit of the ST” (Hervey, 12). Exact grammatical correspondence forms the extreme and is considered to be something that is not to be preferred by translators because of the Source Language bias. Drugan writes about professional translation and from her reasoning appears that the criterion of an adapted grammar and adapted information structure is in line with the “idea that translations should read like original STs, written in the target language by an educated speaker, marketing professional or other equivalent of the ST author(s)” (Drugan, 43). This idea describes covert translation, where the text has the status of an original source text. According to Drugan, the idea of a translation that reads like an original is a theoretical assumption that is “entirely uncontroversial in the translation industry” (Drugan, 43). Thus, the fact is that the covert translation as Drugan defines it here is undisputed within the industry. The fierce statement of Drugan shows that theorists and translators agree on the preference for covert translation. In short, Hervey provides additional

support for the grammatical adaptation from a theoretical perspective. Drugan, on the contrary, provides additional support from the professional perspective.

The importance of using the correct grammatical pattern finds its basis in the unique character of each language. Grammatical patterns differ per language and determine which aspects of an experience must be expressed (Jakobson, 129). Jakobson offers the example of the word *worker*, which in Russian needs to include information on the gender of the worker. According to Jakobson, the focus of the native speakers of a language is on those elements that are compulsory in their verbal code (Jakobson, 129). Consequently, native speakers are very likely to notice inconsistencies or errors in the grammatical pattern. When one considers this information, one can conclude that the five principles serve as an important tool in creating a text that will read like an original English text. This information underlines the importance of adjusting the grammatical pattern as much as possible to the pattern of the target language.

The grammatical structure of a text may have important rhetorical effects in the source language. These effects will have to be considered if the translation aims to reproduce the effect of the source text in the target language. Hervey, Higgins, and Loughridge point out that translators must keep “a close eye on grammatical structure – contrast and recurrences in syntactic patterning can be used as devices creating special textual effects” (56). This points to the rhetorical effects of specific grammatical choices. However, these effects are also significant in the argued text for the author aims to convince the reader of his perspective. Hervey, Higgins, and Loughridge do not comment on this type of texts but he does refer to rhetorical speeches as part of the “much less blatantly playful texts” (56). Unfortunately, these speeches are not further specified. For this text is assumed that speeches are related to spoken word. They can be seen as related to the argued text when considering one of Biber’s dimensions. Biber’s sixth dimension is on-line informational elaboration. “This dimension refers mainly to spoken registers” (Baumgarten, 69). The main characteristic is that the speaker not only presents information but also his “stance towards the content” (Baumgarten, 69). This can be seen as the spoken variant of the argued text as defined by Hannay and Mackenzie. In relation to rhetorical speeches, Hervey states that it would be a “serious stylistic error not to recognize the textual importance of [the] grammatical devices” (57). This underlines that grammatical choices can create rhetorical effects and it emphasizes that the rhetorical effects form a cardinal element of speeches and the argued text.

The unique character of grammatical patterns can cause problems during the translation process and may result in translation loss. Hervey, Higgins, and Loughridge states

that “wherever the grammatical structures of the ST cannot be matched by analogous structures in the TT, the translator is faced with the prospect of major translation losses” (55). The authors here emphasize the necessity of finding a target text structure that represents the one used in the source text. In addition to this, the statement shows the problem that occurs when the target text does not have a similar structure: loss. Although there is the prospect of loss, there are possibilities to solve this problem. Jakobson refers to the solution of finding a semantic construction. This is in line with the solution Hervey, Higgins, and Loughbridge offer: “as a rule semantic considerations override considerations of grammatical translation loss, priority being given almost automatically to the most just and to constructing grammatically well-formed TL sentences. Nevertheless, translators should be aware of grammatical differences between SL and TL, and aware of them as potential sources of translation loss, for there are exceptions to the ‘rule’ mentioned above, namely STs with salient textual properties manifestly resulting from the manipulation of grammatical structure” (55). The authors agree that semantic solutions can be useful but at the same time their statement shows that the creation of grammatically correct sentences should always have priority over semantic solutions. In a certain way, the statement offers a second solution when it refers to the importance of awareness. This awareness of the situations may help the translator to find solutions and to avoid major translation loss.

Until this point, the emphasis has mainly been on the differences between languages and how these influence writing and translating. However, the different grammatical patterns also show similarities which can be useful in the translation process. An example of this is the regularity in the English and Dutch patterns that is examined from a construction grammar perspective by Verhagen. His article accounts for a regularity in grammar for it shows that while the way in which constructions are formed may not be identical, the way in which they function can be identical. Besides Verhagen, Hannay and Mackenzie also pay some attention to similarities. An example mentioned by them is the existential construction (Hannay and Mackenzie, 148). This construction is used “to introduce a focused subject into the discourse” and “where an initial element is to be understood as an adverbial rather than a complement” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 149). The following example shows how this construction is formed in English and in Dutch.

2. There are two possibilities.

In Dutch this construction is formed with *er*. This can be seen in the following sentence.

3. Er zijn twee mogelijkheden.

In both sentences the subject is placed at the end of the sentence. This creates the expectation that “the focused subject will be further developed in subsequent text” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 148). These examples show that the languages are closely related and thus lead to the assumption that grammatical differences are probably not as big as they seem to be.

In this literature review, the aim was to provide an overview of literature on three topics: writing in English, grammatical features, and translation. Hannay and Mackenzie provide an important guideline as their work contains five clear principles for authors. These principles are: the accessibility principle, the principle of end focus, the thematic patterning principle, the principle of end weight, and the initial subject principle. Several of these principles are found in other literature, for instance, in Baker’s course book on translation. They can also be connected with the seven dimensions of Biber. The overview of the five principles was followed by an overview of House’s Translation Quality Assessment. This showed that application of the five principles in translation combines best with covert translation. Another observation is that the model House has developed offers room for syntactic analysis. However, her study might have been more relevant if she would have included a more extensive syntactic analysis in her examples.

Besides the overview, it was found that several theorists support the adaptation of the grammatical patterns of a text. Hervey, Higgins, and Loughridge offer support from theory while Drugan offers support from the translation industry. In addition to this, the application of a correct grammatical pattern is of great importance since each language has unique patterns. Native speakers of the language have a thorough knowledge of these patterns and will therefore immediately notice inconsistencies. Furthermore, rhetorical effects are created by syntactic devices. This implies that when a translation aims to achieve a similar effect in the target language, the structure has to be adapted. The process of finding similar constructions in the target language may be problematic. However, the review ends positively by showing that Dutch and English have grammatical similarities.

Chapter 3: Results

In this section, I will describe the results of the questionnaire. This is structured in the following way. Firstly, the focus will be on the response rate. The other paragraphs will describe the results on the different sets of questions. These are the background questions, questions on the beliefs about translation and the translation process, and questions on the translations. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix 1. (Note: Question numbering may differ since this chapter numbers statements as separate questions.) Some small tables can be found in the text whereas other tables can be found in Appendix 2.

Responses for this questionnaire are as follows: 28 persons participated, but only 13 completed the questionnaire. The different points at which respondents left the questionnaire are represented in table 1. It should be noted that 11 of 15 participants who stop the questionnaire have stopped by question (hereafter: Q) 17. Strikingly, respondents tend to leave at the end of a set of questions. Two respondents left after the introduction question. Four respondents left after the block with questions on the background of the participants. Another five respondents left at the end of the set of general questions. An exception to this are the respondents who left during the questions on texts. Two of the respondents left after text 2 and the other two left after text 4.

Table 1

Number of participants according to the question after which they left the questionnaire.

<i>Question after which participant stopped</i>	Number of participants
<i>Introduction question</i>	2
<i>Information questions</i>	4
<i>General questions</i>	5
<i>Texts</i>	4
<i>Total number of participants</i>	15

Information on the respondents

Experience

There were 26 responses to Q1 on the number of years' experience. This is a "specific open question", where respondents are asked to give the rounded number of years (Dörnyei, 107). The average number of years of experience is 17. The answers range from 2 to 45+. Table 1 of Appendix 2 provides an overview of the results of Q1-5.

Native Language

Questions 2-4 focus on languages. Question 2 asks respondents to indicate their native language. Respondents were presented three options: 'Dutch', 'English', and 'other, namely'. Twenty six respondents filled out this question. Out of these 26, 23 chose Dutch as their mother tongue. The other 3 respondents chose English as their mother tongue. One respondent who chose Dutch as mother tongue also filled out Hungarian as mother tongue. This means that 1 of 26 respondents indicates bilingualism.

Question 3 asks respondents to indicate the target languages of their translations and Q4 focuses on the source languages of their translations. The questionnaire does not use academic terms but describes SL and TL in everyday language. Respondents were presented 6 options: 'Dutch', 'English', 'German', 'French', 'Spanish' and 'other, namely'. Respondents had the opportunity to indicate more than one option.

Question 3 was filled out by 26 respondents. All 26 respondents said to translate into their native language. One respondent (R11) is bilingual and translates into both native languages. Out of the 26 respondents, 2 (R19, R24) translate into another language besides their native language. Both R19 and R24 are Dutch and translate into Dutch and English. No respondent indicated other target languages than Dutch, English and Hungarian.

Question 4 was filled out by 26 respondents. Twenty one out of 26 indicated English as source language of their translations. Other languages included, amongst others, German, French and Italian.

Areas

In Q5, respondents are asked to indicate on which areas they translate texts. They are given the choice between the following options: 'literary', 'academic', 'technical', 'legal', and 'financial'. In addition to this, respondents can add other areas of translation at the option 'other, namely'. Twenty six respondents filled out this question. The following estimations do not include the answers to the open question since some respondents refer to more than one area in their answer. The average number of areas is 1.5. Of the 26 respondents who filled out this question, 17 respondents chose 1 area, 6 respondents chose 2 areas, 1 respondent chose 3 areas, 1 respondent chose 4 areas and 1 respondent chose 5 areas.

Seventeen respondents chose literary translation. Out of these 17, 10 indicated that they only translate literary texts. Of the 3 respondents who chose academic translation, all indicate that they combine this with translation in other areas. The following combinations are found in their answers: 1 respondent (R7) combines academic and literary translation whereas the other 2 (R15 and R26) combine academic with technical, legal, and financial translation.

Three respondents chose technical translation. This is in all cases combined with a variety of other areas of translation. Although each of these 3 respondents has a unique combination of areas, it is found that every respondent includes the area of financial translation.

Three respondents chose legal translation and all 3 (R11, R15, R26) combine this with other types of translation. These types vary from literary (R11) to technical and financial translation (R26).

Four respondents chose financial translation. This area is in all 4 cases (R2, R8, R15, R26) combined with other types of translation.

Lastly, 11 respondents filled out 'other, namely'. Five out of 11 respondents indicated they focus solely on this type of translation. For instance, R20 indicated to only translate comics. Four respondents (R13, R23, R24, R25) mentioned more than one area in answer to this open question. Three out of 4 respondents indicated clearly the different areas in their answer whereas 1 respondent used "van alles" (all sorts) which is rather vague but shows that there are multiple areas. An area that was frequently mentioned is non-fiction, 4 out of 11 respondents mentioned this in their answer.

Table 2

Number of participants according to number of areas mentioned in response to Q4

<i>Number of areas</i>	<i>Number of participants</i>
1	17
2	6
3	1
4	1
5	1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	26

General questions: Beliefs about translation and the translation process

In Q6, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with the following statement: "In my opinion, a translation should read like an original text". Respondents who agree with this are likely to be in favour of target text oriented translation, also called acceptable translation (Toury, 56-59). Statement 1 is based on Hannay and Mackenzie who aim to help authors to write effective English texts (13-14). Statement 1 is also related to House's theory on covert and overt translation. It is in particular related to functional equivalence. When the respondent agrees with this statement, it can be concluded that he is in favour of covert translation. The

table below shows that all respondents chose agree or ‘strongly agree.’ None of the respondents chose ‘neither disagree nor agree’, ‘disagree’, or ‘strongly disagree’.

Table 3

Number of participants according to preferred choice on Q6

Response choice	Number of participants
<i>Strongly agree</i>	12
<i>Agree</i>	10
<i>Total number of participants</i>	22

Question 8 focuses on lexical adequacy and acceptability. Participants are asked to respond to the following statement: “Expressions in the source text should be translated literally”. Respondents who agree with this statement are likely to be in favour of source text oriented translation, also called adequate translation (Toury, 56-9). The statement is based on House’s distinction between covert and overt translation. The results of Q8 are summarised in table 4.

Table 4

Number of participants according to preferred choice on Q8

Response choice	Number of participants
<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	2
<i>Disagree</i>	5
<i>Strongly disagree</i>	15
<i>Total number of participants</i>	22

Question 9 asks participants to indicate the importance of grammar in the translation process. This is related to grammatical adequacy and grammatical acceptability. The statement is related to the principles from Hannay and Mackenzie. The table below shows that none of the respondents chose ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’. Grammar is found to be important to a large majority of the participants.

Table 5

Number of participants according to preferred choice on Q9.

Response choice	Number of participants
<i>Strongly agree</i>	10
<i>Agree</i>	10
<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	2
<i>Total number of participants</i>	22

Question 11 asks respondents to indicate the importance of lexical choices and lexical differences in the translation process. This is related to lexical adequacy and lexical acceptability (Toury, 56-9). No respondents indicated disagreement with this statement. The results of Q11 are presented in table 6.

Table 6

Number of participants according to preferred choice on Q11

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>Strongly agree</i>	11
<i>Agree</i>	9
<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	2
<i>Total number of participants</i>	22

Question 7 asks respondents to indicate to what extent they agree with the following statement: “I find cultural differences important in the translation process”. This is based on House’s cultural filter (57). House states that “the translator has to view the source text through the eyes of a target culture member” (57). The table below shows the results of Q7. Almost all respondents score ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’. The neutral option was preferred by only 3 respondents.

Table 7

Number of participants according to preferred choice on Q7

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>Strongly agree</i>	7
<i>Agree</i>	12
<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	3
<i>Total number of participants</i>	22

Question 12 focuses on information structure and readability. Respondents are asked to what measure they agree with the following statement: “For the readability of a translation, I consider it important that the message is phrased clearly”. This is related to the literature of Hannay and Mackenzie whose principles provide a “communicative writing strategy” (111). Table 8 presents the results of Q12 with a majority choosing ‘very important’.

Table 8

Number of participants according to preferred choice on Q12.

Response choice	Number of participants
<i>Very important</i>	15
<i>Important</i>	6
<i>Moderately important</i>	1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	22

Question 13 connects readability with linguistic adequacy. It asks respondents to indicate the importance of correct grammar for the readability of a translation. Table 9 shows that none of the respondents finds this moderately important or of no importance.

Interestingly, all respondents consider this ‘important’ or ‘very important’.

Table 9

Number of participants according to preferred choice on Q13

Response choice	Number of participants
<i>Very important</i>	16
<i>Important</i>	6
<i>Total number of participants</i>	22

Question 14 focuses on the readability of a text in the target language. Respondents are asked whether and how important it is that a text is easy to read in the target language. The results of this question are found in table 10. It is interesting to see whether there is a relation between the choice of the respondent in this question and the topics mentioned in answer to the open questions on the translations.

Table 10

Number of participants according to preferred choice on Q14

Response choice	Number of participants
<i>Very important</i>	16
<i>Important</i>	5
<i>Moderately important</i>	1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	22

Question 10 and Q15 are related as they pay attention to the same topic but use different wording. Question 10 states that a translation should have the same effect on its readers as the source text whereas Q15 states this in a more subjective statement. Besides this, Q10 measures agreement and Q15 measures importance. The tables show that none of the

respondents finds this moderately important or of little importance. The scores on both questions are very similar.

Table 11

Number of participants according to preferred choice on Q10

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>Very important</i>	11
<i>Important</i>	11
<i>Total number of participants</i>	22

Table 12

Number of participants according to preferred choice on Q15

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>Very important</i>	12
<i>Important</i>	10
<i>Total number of participants</i>	22

Question 16 focuses on native speaker standards. Respondents are asked to indicate the importance of a native speaker judging the translation. This is related to Hannay and Mackenzie's theory, in which they take the native speaker as the starting point (14). If their theory is considered useful for translators, this will be a point where translators will score positively. The table below shows that respondents indeed score positively with 17 participants scoring 'important' or 'very important'.

Table 13

Number of participants according to preferred choice on Q16

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>Very important</i>	10
<i>Important</i>	7
<i>Moderately important</i>	4
<i>Of little importance</i>	1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	22

Question 17 asks respondents to indicate the importance of a translation staying close to the original text. This question is based on the concept of covert and overt translation as developed by House. If a respondent considers it very important that a translation stays close to the original text, he is expected to prefer overt translation over covert translation. The table below shows that respondents are more divided over this topic as 12 respondents consider it

‘important’ or ‘very important’ and 10 respondents consider it ‘moderately important’ or ‘of little importance’. This question was followed by an open question where respondents could write down any additional factors they consider important in translation that had not been mentioned before. Six respondents replied and their answers are found in Table 2 in Appendix 2. Respondents referred, amongst other things, to cultural differences.

Table 14

Number of participants according to preferred choice of Q17

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>Very important</i>	4
<i>Important</i>	8
<i>Moderately important</i>	8
<i>Of little importance</i>	2
<i>Total number of participants</i>	22

Texts and translations

This part contains 10 Dutch texts and their English translations. Most texts are manipulated examples from Hannay and Mackenzie. Each text has 2 translations and there is 1 preferred translation, which applies one or more of the five principles. Respondents can indicate that one, both, or neither of the translations is/ are grammatically correct. This open question is followed by a closed question on the readability of both translations.

The first principle of Hannay and Mackenzie is the accessibility principle, which is tested in Texts 8 and 10. Text 8 focuses on sentence organization and is based on an example provided by Hannay and Mackenzie (115). The lexical items of the original sentence have been changed. Translation EN1 is marked as “grammatical but unsuitable” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 115). This is related to the overload of information at the start of the sentence. Translation EN2 is the preferred option for the sentence is formulated according to the accessibility principle. In addition to this, the text also shows the principle of end focus. The new information concerning the fatigue has been moved to the end of the sentence. “It has been separated from the other prominent information in the sentence” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 115). The results show that the majority of the respondents preferred EN2. Three out of the 9 respondents who chose EN2 did not provide an explanation. One of the 3 (R24) provided an improvement of EN2 according to the initial subject principle. Six respondents provided an explanation. In their explanations, the respondents referred to different issues: R19 and R27 referred to grammar, R19 also referred to lexical choices, R12 and R18 referred to the use of the verb “to find”. In contrast to this, R6 and R20 used more vague explanations.

R6 mentioned that EN2 was “mooier en duidelijker” (more beautiful and clearer) and R20 mentioned that EN1 “klinkt niet Engels” (sounds un- English).

EN1 was not chosen as preferred translation. Four respondents indicated that neither of the translations was preferred. Three out of 4 explained their choice. R8 and R26 referred to lexical choices. The comment of R14 included: “ik denk niet dat Engelsen dit zo zouden zeggen” (I don’t think the English would say it this way). The other respondent (R4) only wrote down suggestions for improvement.

Table 15

Number of participants according to preferred choice on grammatical correctness
Text 8

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>EN2</i>	9
<i>Neither</i>	4
<i>Total number of participants</i>	13

The question about readability shows that the majority of the respondents considered EN1 to be ‘bad’ or ‘very bad’ in terms of readability. As the table below shows, the opinions on EN2 are divided over the options from ‘very good’ to ‘bad’.

Table 16

Number of participants according to preferred choice on readability of Text 8 EN1 and EN2

<i>Response choice</i>	EN1	EN2
<i>Very good</i>		3
<i>Good</i>		3
<i>Not good/ not bad</i>	2	4
<i>Bad</i>	9	3
<i>Very Bad</i>	2	
<i>Total number of participants</i>	13	13

Text 10 is based on teaching material and also tests the accessibility principle. EN1 shows the violation of this principle, which results in double orientation. The solution is found in EN2, where the time and place adjunct are separated. Thirteen respondents answered this question. Eight out of 13 preferred EN2. Of the 8 respondents who chose EN2, 5 provided an explanation. The answers show great diversity as respondents refer to punctuation (R18), grammar (R19), readability (R24, R27). However, two respondents (R12, R19) mentioned word order. As the table below shows, 5 respondents indicated that both translations are correct. Three out of these 5 explained their answer. In these explanations, 2 of the

respondents (R18 and R26) indicate that both translations are correct but that respectively EN1 and EN2 are preferred. R18 preferred EN1 for reasons of clarity. R26 preferred EN2 because this was found more natural. Besides this, improvement is often addressed in explanations. Four out of the 8 respondents who provided an explanation mention improvements.

Table 17

Number of participants according to preferred choice on grammatical correctness
Text 10

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>EN2</i>	8
<i>Both</i>	5
<i>Total number of participants</i>	13

The scores on readability of Text 10 are represented in table 18. None of the respondents considered EN1 or EN2 to be ‘very bad’. In the table can be seen that the scores of respondents are divided over the positive and negative options.

Table 18

Number of participants according to preferred choice on readability of Text 10 EN1 and EN2

<i>Response choice</i>	EN1	EN2
<i>Very good</i>	1	3
<i>Good</i>	5	5
<i>Not good/ not bad</i>	2	4
<i>Bad</i>	5	1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	13	13

The second principle is the principle of end focus, which is tested in Text 3,6,9. Text 3 shows the violation of this principle, namely frontal overload. The text is based on the example given by Hannay and Mackenzie. It is an example of the first type of overload errors Hannay and Mackenzie identify: “The subject is in initial position but is in focus and is weighty” (126). EN1 is marked as “grammatical but unsuitable” and EN2 shows that a change from passive to active is the solution to this error (Hannay and Mackenzie, 126). EN2 is to be preferred.

Fifteen respondents answered this question. It is apparent from the table below that a very large majority preferred EN2. No respondents chose EN1 or both of the translations. Only 1 respondent indicated that neither translation was to be preferred. This respondent (R24) reported some improvements for the source text and only stated that the English of both

translations is poor. Out of the 14 respondents who chose EN2, 13 provided an explanation. Interestingly, almost half of the group mentions word order and/ or grammar. It also appears that there is a mistranslation, which is noticed by half of the group.

Table 19

Number of participants according to preferred choice on grammatical correctness
Text 3

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>EN2</i>	14
<i>Neither</i>	1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	15

Readability scores show that the respondents considered the readability of EN1 ‘very bad’ or ‘bad’. This contrasts with the scores on the readability of EN2 where 10 of 15 score ‘very good’ or ‘good’. The table below shows the readability scores of Text 3.

Table 20

Number of participants according to preferred choice on readability of Text 3 EN1 and EN2

<i>Response choice</i>	EN1	EN2
<i>Very good</i>		3
<i>Good</i>		7
<i>Not good/ not bad</i>		5
<i>Bad</i>	12	
<i>Very Bad</i>	3	
<i>Total number of participants</i>	15	15

Text 6 also tests the principle of end focus. The problem in this text is double orientation. EN1 is the preferred option “because the beginning of the clause has been unburdened, and only one perspective is offered before the mention of the subject” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 128). The double orientation is solved through an adjustment: the adjunct has been reformulated as a subject modifier (Hannay and Mackenzie, 128).

Thirteen respondents answered this question. As the table shows, the answers vary. All respondents who chose EN1 explained their answer. Out of the 6 respondents who preferred EN2, 3 explained their answer. Two out of 3 (R18 and R19) refer to word order. One of the 2 respondents who said both translations are grammatically correct explained the answer. Both respondents who indicated neither of the translations is correct suggested improvements.

Table 21

Number of participants according to preferred choice on grammatical correctness
Text 6

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>EN1</i>	3
<i>EN2</i>	6
<i>Both</i>	2
<i>Neither</i>	2
<i>Total number of participants</i>	13

The scores on readability of Text 6 show that none of the respondents considered the readability of EN1 or EN2 ‘very bad’. Table 22 gives an overview of the results of Text 6 and shows that there are small differences in the readability scores on EN1 and EN2.

Table 22

Number of participants according to preferred choice on readability of Text 6 EN1 and EN2

<i>Response choice</i>	EN1	EN2
<i>Very good</i>	1	2
<i>Good</i>	5	1
<i>Not good/ not bad</i>	4	6
<i>Bad</i>	3	4
<i>Total number of participants</i>	13	13

Text 9 is based on teaching material and is the last text on the principle of end focus. The violation is found in EN1 where the time adjunct causes a problem. This is solved in translation EN2 where the time adjunct is moved to sentence initial position. Out of the 13 respondents who answered this question, 5 chose EN2. Out of these 5, 2 respondents (R19 and R27) explained their answer. Four respondents stated that both translations are grammatically correct. Three out of 4 explained their response and all 3 indicated a slight preference for one of the translations. Two participants, who both explained their choice, indicated that neither of the translations was grammatically correct. Two respondents (R8 and R24) wrote a reaction to this question but their reaction does not show a clear preference.

Table 23

Number of participants according to preferred choice on grammatical correctness
Text 9

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>EN2</i>	5
<i>Both</i>	4
<i>Neither</i>	2
<i>Neutral/ no opinion expressed</i>	2
<i>Total number of participants</i>	13

The readability scores are shown in the table below. Interestingly, none of the respondents considered the readability of EN1 to be ‘very good’ and none of the respondents thought the readability of EN2 was ‘very bad’. In addition to this, 9 out of 13 respondents score EN1 negatively whereas only 7 out of 13 score EN2 positively.

Table 24

Number of participants according to preferred choice on readability of Text 9 EN1 and EN2

<i>Response choice</i>	EN1	EN2
<i>Very good</i>		3
<i>Good</i>	3	4
<i>Not good/ not bad</i>	1	2
<i>Bad</i>	7	4
<i>Very bad</i>	2	
<i>Total number of participants</i>	13	13

The thematic patterning principle is the third principle and is tested in Text 4. The example is taken from teaching material from Leiden University. The lexical items have been changed. The thematic patterning principle is related to paragraph progression and violation of results in a problem with the textual fit, as can be seen in EN1. This is solved in EN2 by a change from active to passive. Six respondents indicated that translation EN2 is grammatically correct. Half of this group gives extra comments or an explanation of the answer. Five out of 15 indicated that both translations are grammatically correct. Three out of 5 explained their choice. Three out of 15 chose EN1 as grammatically correct. All three explained their answer or commented on the translation. One respondent (R8) did not express his opinion and gave suggestions for improvement.

Table 25

Number of participants according to preferred choice on grammatical correctness
Text 4

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>EN1</i>	3
<i>EN2</i>	6
<i>Both</i>	5
<i>Neutral/ no opinion expressed</i>	1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	15

The table below (table 26) presents the readability scores of Text 4. Strikingly, the large majority scores neutral on the readability of EN1 and good on EN2.

Table 26

Number of participants according to preferred choice on readability Text 4 EN1 and EN2

<i>Response choice</i>	EN1	EN2
<i>Very good</i>	1	3
<i>Good</i>	5	8
<i>Not good/ not bad</i>	8	2
<i>Bad</i>	1	2
<i>Total number of participants</i>	15	15

The fourth principle is the principle of end weight, which is tested in Text 1 and 5. Text 1 shows that violation of the principle results in frontal overload. The text is based on an example of “the second type of overload error” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 126). There is “an adjunct in initial position followed by a subject which is again in focus” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 126). According to Hannay and Mackenzie, EN1 is not fully acceptable and EN2 is to be preferred. Strikingly, a vast majority of the respondents chose EN2 as grammatically correct. Out of the 11 respondents who chose EN2, 10 gave an explanation or comment. The choice for EN1 is not explained by any of the participants. One respondent stated that both translations are grammatically correct whereas another respondent stated that none of the translations was to be preferred. There was 1 respondent who did not indicate a preference and explained that this was due to insufficient command of the language.

Table 27

Number of participants according to preferred choice on grammatical correctness
Text 1

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>EN1</i>	3
<i>EN2</i>	11
<i>Both</i>	1
<i>Neither</i>	1
<i>Neutral/ no opinion expressed</i>	1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	17

The readability scores of EN1 and EN2 can be found in the table below. The results show that none of the respondents thought that EN1 or EN2 was ‘very good’ in terms of readability. However, the table shows that the number of respondents who score ‘bad’ or ‘very bad’ decreases by half for EN2.

Table 28

Number of participants according to preferred choice on readability Text 1 EN1 and EN2

<i>Response choice</i>	EN1	EN2
<i>Good</i>	2	6
<i>Not good/ not bad</i>	5	6
<i>Bad</i>	6	5
<i>Very bad</i>	4	
<i>Total number of participants</i>	17	17

Text 5, which also tested the principle of end weight, is based on the example given by Hannay and Mackenzie (150-151). This text shows another violation of the principle, namely the discontinuous structure. The main issue is that the “object is so long that the subsequent complement is difficult to link back to the main verb” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 150-151). Translation EN2 shows that the solution comes with extraposition. Hannay and Mackenzie point out that this is done “at the expense of creating a discontinuous object” (151). They also note that “the sentence ends with the largest element it contains” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 151). This is in line with the principle of end weight. The results show that the scores of respondents are divided over the options. All 5 participants who chose EN2 as grammatically correct explained their choice. Three out of 5 referred to the discontinuous structure (R12, R18, R24). One out of the 3 respondents who chose EN1 explained their decision (R27). One out of the 3 respondents who indicated that both translations are correct explained their decision and mention a slight preference for EN2 (R26). The respondent who considered

neither translation to be correct (R19) refers in their explanation to the expression “into exile”, which is incorrect in their opinion. One respondent did not indicate a preference (R8) and commented on the translations.

Table 29

Number of participants according to preferred choice on grammatical correctness
Text 5

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>EN1</i>	3
<i>EN2</i>	5
<i>Both</i>	3
<i>Neither</i>	1
<i>Neutral/ no opinion expressed</i>	1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	13

The readability scores of Text 5 are found in table 30. It would be interesting to investigate whether the people who are rating ‘bad’ and ‘very bad’ are the same respondents. It is also striking that half of the group of respondents considers EN1 to be ‘not good/ not bad’ in terms of readability.

Table 30

Number of participants according to preferred choice on readability of Text 5 EN1 and EN2

<i>Response choice</i>	EN1	EN2
<i>Very good</i>		2
<i>Good</i>	4	6
<i>Not good/ not bad</i>	7	3
<i>Bad</i>	1	1
<i>Very bad</i>	1	1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	13	13

The fifth principle is the initial subject principle and is tested in Text 2 and 7. Text 2 is based on an example from Hannay and Mackenzie, which is used to illustrate the use of non-agent subjects (Hannay and Mackenzie, 136-7). The example aims to show that “the choice of a locative or instrumentals subject can make the clause more idiomatic” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 136-7). The adjunct is made heavier through the addition of place adjuncts. In this way, the example also relates to the principle of end weight. EN1 is the preferred option. Results show that 9 of the 17 respondents chose EN1 as grammatically correct. Eight out of 9 explained their choice. The answers refer to different aspects such as word order (R16, R26). Five respondents chose EN2 and all 5 explain their answer. Three out of 5 refer to

correspondence in meaning between the source text and target text. Strikingly, 2 of the 9 respondents from EN1 (R19, R21) also refer to correspondence in meaning. And 1 out of 3 who considered both translations to be grammatically correct (R5) explains their choice. In the explanation, the respondents mention a difference in meaning between EN1 and EN2.

Table 31

Number of participants according to preferred choice on grammatical correctness
Text 2

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>EN1</i>	9
<i>EN2</i>	5
<i>Both</i>	3
<i>Total number of participants</i>	17

The table below shows the readability scores. Strikingly, the scores on readability show that a large majority of the respondents considers the readability of EN1 to be ‘good’ or ‘very good’.

Table 32

Number of participants according to preferred choice on readability of Text 2 EN1 and EN2

<i>Response choice</i>	EN1	EN2
<i>Very good</i>	3	
<i>Good</i>	11	5
<i>Not good/ not bad</i>	3	7
<i>Bad</i>		4
<i>Very bad</i>		1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	17	17

Text 7 is also based on an example from Hannay and Mackenzie (125). EN1 is the best option for “it results from the combined operation of the initial subject principle, the accessibility principle, and the principle of end focus” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 125). The EN2 translation provides a textual fit but “is not a very idiomatic formulation” (Hannay and Mackenzie, 125). Out of the 7 respondents who chose EN1, 5 explained their answer. Explanations referred, amongst others, to the use of the correct verb (R19). Two out of 5 (R24, R27) stated that EN2 was (too) literally translated. The respondent who chose EN2 (R8), also referred to literal translation. The connection between literal translation and grammatical correctness is interesting to explore. Four respondents stated that both of the

translations are grammatically correct. Two out of 4 (R6, R14) explained this. One respondent (R4) indicated neither of the translations was correct and commented on the lexical choices.

Table 33

Number of participants according to preferred choice on grammatical correctness
Text 7

<i>Response choice</i>	Number of participants
<i>EN1</i>	7
<i>EN2</i>	1
<i>Both</i>	4
<i>Neither</i>	1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	13

Readability scores for this text are found in the table below. Interestingly, the scores on the readability show that whereas the majority of the respondents score EN1 as ‘good’ or ‘very good’, the scores on the readability of EN2 vary more.

Table 34

Number of participants according to preferred choice on readability of Text 7 EN1 and EN2

<i>Response choice</i>	EN1	EN2
<i>Very good</i>	3	2
<i>Good</i>	7	6
<i>Not good/ not bad</i>	3	3
<i>Bad</i>		1
<i>Very bad</i>		1
<i>Total number of participants</i>	13	13

Chapter 4: Discussion

This chapter will analyse the findings of the questionnaire. The first part of the chapter focuses on general findings. One instance is the number of participants who left the questionnaire before the last question. The second part focuses on the findings in relation to the research question and claims.

General findings

Analysis shows that several participants left after the last closed question. Bryman offers a possible explanation for the fact that several participants leave after the last closed question. The transition from closed questions to open questions may avert respondents because open questions “require greater effort from respondents” (Bryman, 232). The task may be considered too difficult since respondents have to think of an answer instead of choosing one of the possible answers designed by the researcher. Because of this effort, Bryman states, “many prospective respondents are likely to be put off by the prospect of having to write extensively, which may exacerbate the problem of low response rates” (232). When this is compared to the questionnaire, one can say that respondents are indeed asked to write their answers. However, the open question consists of two separate questions. The first asks respondents to indicate which translation they prefer. The second asks respondents to explain their reasons. This leaves respondents the choice whether they want to write a short answer or to “write extensively” as Bryman calls it. Both options can be seen in the results.

A study specific reason for the decline in response rate is the length of the questionnaire. Respondents have to answer a total of 37 closed questions and 14 open questions. Three of the open questions were not compulsory. The amount of questions could have made the questionnaire time consuming. Time has not been tested in the pilot or kept trace of in the actual questionnaire. This means that there is no actual data on time and duration. In addition to this, research has not shown whether length has a negative influence on the response rate of a questionnaire. Berdie conducted research on this topic and found that “questionnaire length was not related at a statistically significant level to response rate”(280). A similar finding is presented by Lund and Gram. They conducted research on response rate and the influence of the title and length of a questionnaire. Five questionnaires of different lengths were distributed. It was found that “although the shortest questionnaire had the highest response rate, the most extensive survey instrument did not have the lowest response rate” (Lund and Gram, 159). This indicates that length does not necessarily cause a low response rate. Bryman connects response rate also with the personal interest of respondents

for the topic when he points out that respondents are often willing to answer many questions on a topic that interests them (221). This might mean that length is less important when respondents are interested in the topic. However, this may cause bias in the response. Length and time are factors that could have influenced the response rate. However, the combination of length and personal interest in the topic is also a possible explanation for the low response rate.

An interesting finding is that the majority of the respondents indicated to do literary translation. Seventeen of the 24 respondents who answered this question chose 'literary' as the only area or one of the areas in which they translate. This finding was unexpected since the questionnaire was spread among both literary and legal translators.

A further interesting finding concerns the statements. There seems to be a correlation between the answers to question (hereafter: Q) 12 and Q16. Question 12 focuses on the message of the text and Q16 on the importance of a native speaker who would assess the translation. The expectation was that respondents who choose important or very important on Q12 will also choose important on Q16 since one could say that the native speaker knows the target language very well and can therefore add a valuable contribution to the clarity of the message. The results show that 11 out of the 15 respondents who score very important on Q12 also find Q16 important or very important. This is a little more than two third. This balance changes for the respondents who score important on Q12. Five out of 6 respondents score important or very important on Q16. This is almost the entire group. The balance changes further as the table shows that the respondent who considers the message moderately important still scores important on the assessment by a native speaker. Over all, this shows that the more the scores on Q12 move to unimportant, the more the scores on Q16 move to important. One might therefore say that the respondents who score very high on Q12 value the message whereas the respondents who score high on Q16 value phrasing. A possible explanation for this is that respondents who value the message of a text tend to be closer to adequate translation whereas the respondents who value the assessment of a native speaker tend to be closer to acceptable translation. One could therefore say that the respondents who score very high on Q12 value the message whereas the respondent who score high on Q16 value the acceptability of a translation.

Table 35

Number of participants according to preferred choice on question 12 and preferred choice on question 16

	Response Q12	Response Q12	Response Q12
Response Q16	Very important	Important	Moderately important
Very important	7	3	
Important	4	2	1
Moderately important	3	1	
Of little importance	1		
Not important at all			

Another interesting finding is that there is a consistency in the answers to Q9 and Q13. Both questions focused on grammar. Question 9 focused on grammar in the translation process and Q13 focused on correct grammar in a translation. The results show that the ultimate is that respondents consider both very important. The results show that respondents who find grammar very important in the translation process also find correct grammar very important for the readability of a translation. It is very clear that the grammar has to be correct for the readability. The large majority of the respondents who answered question 9 considers correct grammar very important for readability. For respondents who score very important on Q9 this is 8 out of 10 and for respondents who score important on Q9 this is 7 out of 10. These results show that respondents value grammar in the translation process but it is even more important for the readability of a translation. This correlates with the results in table (Q12-Q16). A possible explanation is that all respondents consider grammar to be important because it helps to communicate the message of a text in a clear way.

Table 36

Number of participants according to preferred choice on question 9 and question 13.

	Response Q9	Response Q9	Response Q9
Response Q13	Very important	Important	Moderately important
Very important	8	7	1
Important	2	3	
Moderately important			
Of little importance			
Not important at all			

Another general finding concerns the correlation between grammatical correctness and readability. This can be seen in the answers to the different texts. Respondents who considered a text to be grammatically correct gave that specific text a higher score on

readability than respondents who considered the text to be grammatically incorrect. As the results on Text 4 show, respondents who consider EN2 grammatically incorrect choose rather negative options for the readability of EN2. This shows that once the grammar is incorrect, it is difficult for a text to still get a positive score on readability. This contrasts with respondents who considered EN2 to be correct. They scored very positive on the readability of EN2. Their results thus underline that correct grammar is an important factor for the readability of a translation. Remarkably, one participant who considered both translations grammatically correct scores the readability of EN2 as ‘bad’.

Table 37

Number of participants according to their choice on which translation is grammatically correct and their scores on the readability of translation EN2 of Text 4

Text 4	Response grammatical correctness	Response grammatical correctness
Response readability	EN2 Correct	EN2 Incorrect
Very good	3	
Good	7	2
Not good/ not bad		1
Bad	1	

A similar correlation between grammatical correctness and readability is seen in the results of Texts 3, 6, and 9. The table below shows the results on these texts. About two third of the respondents who considered the preferred option grammatically correct indicate the readability of the text as good or very good. This shows that correct grammar is an important factor in determining the readability of a text. Text 6, however, is an exception to this. Although these respondents consider the translation grammatically correct, they score rather low on readability. A possible explanation can be found in the answers to the open questions. In their answers to the open questions, several respondents mention a problem with punctuation in both the preferred and the not preferred option. This may be one of the factors that has contributed to the fact that they consider the readability as neither good nor bad or bad. In short, the results show that correct grammar is an important factor for the readability of a translation but it is not the only factor.

Table 38

Number of participants according to their choice on which translation is grammatically correct and their scores on the readability of translations of Text 3, 6, and 9

	Text 3 – Preferred option grammatical correct	Text 6- Preferred option grammatical correct	Text 9 – Preferred option grammatical correct	Total
Response Readability	EN2	EN1	EN2	
Very good	3	2	3	8
Good	7		5	12
Not good/ not bad	4	2	1	7
Bad		1	1	2
Very bad				

Further support for the finding that grammar is an important factor in determining the score on readability can be found in the following table. This table shows the number of participants according to their choice on grammatical correctness and their scores on the readability of the preferred option. This table focuses on the participants who consider the preferred option as grammatically incorrect. The results show that the majority of the respondents who consider the translation grammatically incorrect gives the translation a neutral or negative score on readability. This can be explained as follows: once a text is grammatically incorrect it gets very difficult to obtain a positive score on readability. A possible explanation for this is that respondents do not consider the other factors, which possibly are correct, as important as grammar. Respondents may be distracted by the incorrect grammar and consider the incorrect grammar more important than other factors which contribute to readability.

Table 39

Number of participants according to their choice for the grammatically incorrect translation and their scores on the readability of translations of Text 3, 6, and 9

	Text 3 – Preferred option grammatical incorrect	Text 6- Preferred option grammatical incorrect	Text 9 – Preferred option grammatical incorrect	Total
Response Readability	EN2	EN1	EN2	
Very good				
Good		1		1
Not good/ not bad	1	4		5
Bad		3	2	5
Very bad				

Findings related to research questions

Besides these general findings, there are also findings specific to the research questions. The first and main research question focused on how naturalized texts are assessed by professional translators. The open questions aimed to provide insight into the factors which determine the assessment of a translation. Please consult the Excel-sheet for all the details on the answers to the open questions. The results show that when respondents are asked which translation is grammatically correct they mention amongst others the following factors: improvements, mistranslations, word order, grammar. Strikingly, word order is mentioned by 8 respondents of the 17 who started the questions on translations. One respondent consistently mentions word order. This is respondent 12, who has only 7 years of experience as a translator. This is an interesting finding for the expectation was that respondents with a lot of experience would mention word order several times.

The findings of the open question are compared to Karoubi's diagram for the linguistic description of the problematic item in a translation (150). The comparison shows that respondents often refer to structural issues, for instance grammar. The open question focuses on grammar so all respondents to some extent involve grammar in their answers. However, answers are often not explained or refer to lexical issues and not directly grammatical issues. Two respondents also mention punctuation errors. Respondents do often refer to the lexical issues, for instance the meaning of a sentence is mentioned by 7 respondents.

Another sub question of the main question is whether respondents recognize the preferred option as the best option and thus agree with the theory provided by Hannay and Mackenzie. The results show that whether or not participants recognized the preferred option varies per principle. The table below provides an overview of the number of respondents who recognized the preferred option from Hannay and Mackenzie as the grammatically correct option. In the table, respondents who chose 'both' are counted under 'not recognized'. Respondents who did not clearly express an opinion have been excluded.

Based on the preference indicated in the open question it can be said that principle 1 is clearly recognized by the majority of the respondents. This is true for both translations of principle 1. Explanations on the first text show that several respondents noticed a lexical error in the translation. Despite this lexical error, they still chose the preferred option. This can be explained in several ways. The grammar of the other translation may have been considered of such a bad quality that respondents chose the preferred option and did not really consider the lexical error in their assessment. Another explanation can be that the grammar of the preferred option was overall so good that the lexical error did not weigh that much. Explanations on the second text show that respondents did not find a lot of errors they wanted to report. The only error that is mentioned is the bad quality of the Dutch source text. So when the scores are combined with the errors pointed out, one can see that the majority of the respondents expresses that there are no major errors in this text.

Principle 2 is slightly more complicated. The results of the first text show that almost all respondents chose the preferred option. However, the second text is rather dramatic with a majority who does not recognize the preferred option. This may be explained, as was stated earlier, by the other factors which contribute to the quality of Text 6. In response to the third text, the majority of the participants did not recognize the preferred option. These findings suggest that respondents are capable of recognizing the principle but their capability is highly dependent on the text that tests the principle. The influence of errors may be seen here and may have influenced the judgement on the preferred option. However, one has to be cautious in drawing this conclusion since one is dependent on the information provided by the respondents in answer to the open question. A consequence of this is that respondents may not have provided information that they would have provided if the question had been closed and more leading.

The same idea from principle 2 seems to apply to principle 4 as a very large majority recognizes the preferred option in the first text but not in the second text. The second text was text 5 in the questionnaire. Several respondents mentioned that the Dutch text was of a very

bad quality. Based on this finding, the quality of the source text may have influenced the judgement of the target text. However, this cannot be stated with certainty since other factors may have contributed to the judgment. Respondents may not have mentioned all different factors in their answer.

The responses to the translations in which principle 5 was applied show that the scores for both texts are almost the same. Half of the group of respondents recognized the preferred option whereas the other half did not recognize it. This means that there is little variation between the answers to both texts. Principle 5 can be said to be recognized rather well by respondents.

Table 40

Number of participants who recognized the preferred translations of the texts (Results are ordered according to principle).

	Principle 1		Principle 2			Principle 3	Principle 4		Principle 5	
Text	(8)	(10)	(3)	(6)	(9)	(4)	(1)	(5)	(2)	(7)
Recognized	9	8	14	3	5	6	11	5	9	7
Not recognized	4	5	1	10	8	8	5	7	8	6
Total	13	13	15	13	13	14	16	12	17	13

Another expectation related to recognizing the principles concerns respondents who indicated English as their native language. The expectation was that respondents who have English as their native language will recognize the principles and choose the preferred option. Three native speakers filled out the questions on the translations. Their answers can be found in Table 3 in Appendix 2.

The native speakers often score different on the readability question than non-native speakers. In general, the native speakers are more negative than the non-native speakers. Text 1 EN1 is a clear example of this. The non-native speakers score the readability of this text on average between ‘neither good nor bad’ and ‘bad’. In contrast to this, the native speakers unanimously score this translation as ‘very bad’.

A striking exception to the rule is text 3 where all respondents agree in their judgment. Over all, the respondents mark translation EN1 as ‘bad’ and EN2 as ‘good’. This is also visible in the answers to the open questions. The native speakers here mentioned lexical errors but did not include those in their judgment. A possible explanation for this is that the grammar of translation EN2 was very good in comparison to the grammar of EN1. Grammar is shown to be of greater importance for readability than other factors so that may explain their choices.

However, one has to be careful since the information provided in the open questions is not very elaborate.

The responses to Text 8 are interesting in comparison to the responses of non-native speakers. Both native and non-native speakers agree that the text 8 EN1 is 'bad'. However, Text 8 EN2 gets lower marks from the native speakers than from the non-native speakers. On average, non-native speakers mark positively in terms of readability. Six non-native speakers find this translation 'good' or 'very good' in terms of readability. When their scores of years of experience are compared, one sees that experience probably does not play a role in this. Two respondents who chose this option have less than 10 years of experience. However, there are also 2 respondents with 30 years of experience who chose 'good' or 'very good'. Native speakers score this translation as 'neither good nor bad' or 'bad'. The response to the open question shows that native speakers are probably distracted by lexical errors in the translation. This distraction may explain their scores. It is likely that because of the lexical errors they did not get to consider the actual question. So when this is connected to the answers on grammatical correctness and other factors, it is likely that the other factors here are of great importance. A more explicit question could probably prevent respondents from getting distracted since the question then instructs them on the issues they have to consider.

In short, this chapter analysed the main findings of the questionnaire. Firstly, the number of open questions and the length of the questionnaire may account for the large number of respondents who left the questionnaire. Secondly, the statements show several interesting correlations. The scores show a correlation between the importance of a clear message and the importance of the assessment of a translation by a native speaker. The less important respondents score the message, the more important they score the assessment by a native speaker. The scores on the statements also indicate a correlation between grammar and readability. The results show that respondents value grammar in the translation process but consider grammar even more important for the readability of a translation. In addition to this, the scores on readability and correct grammar show that correct grammar is an important factor for readability, although it is not the only factor. Thirdly, findings related to the research questions were discussed. The unexpected findings on matters mentioned in the open questions have been discussed. Besides this, the chapter discussed which principles are recognized by respondents. Findings show that principle 1 and 5 are recognized by respondents as grammatically correct. Lastly, the response of native speakers has been discussed. The questionnaire found that native speakers in comparison to non-native speakers give a more negative score on the readability of translations.

Conclusion

This research sets out to investigate the assessment of translations in which the five principles for effective writing in English are applied. In this way, it aims to research whether these five principles could be useful for translators too. On a larger scale, the thesis aims to contribute to the inclusion of all aspects of a language in translation quality assessment. The main research question is formulated as follows: how do translators assess Dutch to English translations in which the five principles for effective writing in English as developed by Hannay and Mackenzie have been applied? In relation to this question, two claims are formulated. The first claim focuses on overall results: Translators will assess the Dutch to English translations in which the five principles have been applied more positively than the translation in which these principles have not been applied. The second claim focuses on the respondents who are native speakers of English. It is expected that especially native speakers of English will recognize the use of these principles in translated texts and will consider these texts as grammatically correct. The first section of the conclusion will synthesize the findings and the research question. The second section will synthesize the findings and the claims. This will be followed by a reflection on the limitations of this questionnaire. Lastly, the conclusion will offer recommendations concerning further research on this specific topic.

The main research question focuses on how translators assess the quality of translations in which the five principles of Hannay and Mackenzie are applied. The following findings provide an answer to this question. Firstly, respondents pay attention to a variety of factors. The main factors which relate to the principles of Hannay and Mackenzie are grammar and word order. Results show that half of the respondents mention word order at some point in their assessment of the texts. However, word order is not consistently mentioned. Secondly, respondents value grammar in the translation process but consider grammar even more important for the readability of a translation. This implies that grammar has an important place in quality assessment. However, results also show that grammar is not the only factor which determines the readability. Other factors are lexical matters, punctuation matters, and native speaker standards.

Two claims are made about the assessment of the translations in which the five principles were applied. The first claim is that translators will assess the translations in which the five principles are applied more positively than translations which do not apply the five principles. It is found that this positive assessment only applies to a select group of principles. Since most of the principles occur more than once in the questionnaire, there is a possibility to check

whether the positive assessment is consistent or not. This varies per principle. The results show that principles 1 and 5 are recognized and rated positively in terms of readability. Strikingly, there is a clear relation between these principles for both focus on the information in sentence initial position. Principle 1 focuses on placing accessible information in sentence initial position and principle 5 focuses on placing the subject in sentence initial position.

The second claim focuses on those respondents who indicated that they are native speakers of English. It was expected that especially native speakers will recognize the application of the five principles in translated texts and will consider these texts as grammatically correct. This research found this hypothesis not to be true for it is found that native speakers of English in comparison to non-native speakers of English are more rigid in terms of their assessment. This difference is seen in two aspects of the responses to the question on grammatical correctness. Firstly, the non-native speakers' assessment of the texts shows less nuance. For instance, native speakers are more inclined to state that neither of the texts is correct whereas non-native speakers tend to state that neither of the texts is of good quality but that one is preferred over the other. Besides this, native speakers also consider non-grammatical errors in their assessment of the grammatical correctness of a text. Once they notice a punctuation or lexical error, they tend to judge the text as not grammatically correct. This contrasts with non-native speakers, who state in their response that they notice the lexical error but exclude it from their judgment on grammatical correctness. These findings imply that native speakers are more strict when it comes to errors and non-native speakers are more tolerant. However, it could also mean that non-native speakers are more able to separate the different aspects of a language in their quality assessment. It is interesting to consider this in relation to the theory of Hannay and Mackenzie, who implied that application of the principles would lead native speakers to judge the text as acceptable. The results of this research seem to show that native speakers not necessarily judge the texts which use the principles as being of good quality.

Although this research results in interesting findings, it also has some limitations. One limitation is the number of respondents to the questionnaire. Since there is only a small number of respondents, these results cannot be said to be true for the majority of translators who translate from Dutch to English. The questionnaire results in findings which could be tested and examined further on a larger scale. From that perspective, this thesis provides a start to see how principles for effective writing can be of use for translators in quality assessment. If further research on this is conducted, one will be able to say more about the

relevance of the principles and already existing knowledge of the principles among translators.

Another factor that can be considered a limitation is the fact that the open questions are not leading. When respondents are asked to give their judgment on the translation, this questionnaire uses an open question which does not specify the matters to which respondents are expected to pay attention in their answer. This choice has been made to avoid bias and to enable a great variety of responses, which is very valuable for the character of this research. In relation to the formulation, two limitations are found. Firstly, some respondents do not offer an explanation of their choice, which does not provide further insight in their reasoning. Secondly, mainly native speaker respondents are sometimes distracted by lexical errors and punctuation errors to such an extent that they do not get to consider the sentence structure. This means that other aspects of the language dominate their assessment. Therefore, a recommendation is to ask a leading open question. In this way, one can specify the matters which respondents should take into account and thus provide more specific results or investigate whether this will lead to more insights in quality assessment.

A third factor that can be considered a limitation is the fact that out of the groups of literary and legal translators mainly literary translators respond to the questionnaire. Further research could focus on the inclusion of more legal translators to investigate their perspective on the five principles as tools for quality assessment. One may consider using a different means of data collection and see whether that will lead to more response from legal translators.

Some recommendations have already followed from the limitations. However, there is one final recommendation in relation to the findings on native and non-native speakers of English. Since there seems to be such a great divide between the assessment by native speakers of English and non-native speakers of English, it would be useful to conduct further research with only non-native speakers. In this way, one can find out whether non-native speakers have the ability to separate different categories in their quality assessment of translations. Another interesting question is whether there is a relationship between the teaching non-native speakers receive in the English language and the teaching native speakers receive. This could give more clarity on whether training has any influence on the ability to separate different factors in translation quality assessment.

Works Cited

- Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: a Coursebook on Translation*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2011. Print.
- Baumgarten, Nicole, and Julia Probst. "The interaction of spokenness and writtenness in audience design." *Multilingual Communication*. Eds. House, Juliane, and Jochen Rehbein. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2004. Print.
- Berdie, Douglas R. "Questionnaire Length and Response Rate." *Journal of Applied Psychology* .58.2 (1973): 278-280. Web.
- Bryman, Alan. *Social Research Methods*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.
- Chafe, Wallace L. "Givenness, Constrativeness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View". *Subject and Topic*. Ed. Li, C.N. London: Academic Press, 1976. 25-55. Print.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Print.
- Drugan, Joanna. *Quality in Professional Translation: Assessment and Improvement*. London etc: Bloombury Academic, 2013. Print.
- Greenbaum, Sidney, and Randolph Quirk. *A Student's Grammar of the English Language*. Essex: Longman Group UK Limited, 1990. Print.
- Hannay, Mike, and J. Lachlan Mackenzie. *Effective Writing in English: A Sourcebook*. Bussum: Uitgeverij Coutinho, 2002. Print.
- Hervey, Sándor, Ian Higgins, and Michael Loughridge. *Thinking German Translation: A Course in Translation Method: German to English*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- House, Juliane. *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*. New York: Routledge, 2015. Print.
- . *Translation Quality Assessment: a Model Revisited*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen, 1997. Ebook.
- Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation". *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Venuti, Lawrence. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 2012. 126-133. Print.
- Johnsen, Sören. *Getting it Across: A Guide to Effective Academic Writing*. Amsterdam: Techne Press, 2011. Print.
- Karoubi, Behrouz. *Assessor-Centered Translation Quality Assessment: A Theoretical Model and a Case Study*. Leiden: Leiden University Institute for Area Studies, 2016. Print.

- Lindsay, David. *Scientific Writing = Thinking in Words*. Collingwood, Australia: CSIRO Publishing, 2010. Ebook.
- Lund, Eiliv, and Inger Torhild Gram. "Response Rate According to Title and Length of Questionnaire" *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health* 26.2 (1998): 154-160. Web.
- Nida, Eugene. "Principles of Correspondence" *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Venuti, Lawrence. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 2012. 141-156. Print.
- Nord, Christiane. *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1991. Print.
- Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies – And Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 1995. Print.
- Turley, Richard Marggraf. *Writing Essays: A Guide for Students of English and the Humanities*. New York: Routledge, 2000. Ebook.
- Van den Broeck, Raymond. "Second Thoughts on Translation Criticism. A Model of its Analytic Function" *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*. Ed. Theo Hermans. London & Sydney: Croom, 1985. Print.
- Verhagen, Arie. "English Constructions from a Dutch Perspective: Where are the Differences?" *Structural Functional Studies in English Grammar: in Honour of Lachlan Mackenzie*. Eds. Hannay, Mike, and Gerard J. Steen. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007. 257-264. Print.
- Wray, Alison, and Aileen Bloomer. *Projects in Linguistics: A Practical Guide to Researching Language*. 2nd ed. London: Hodder Arnold, 2006. Print.

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

Kwaliteitsbeoordeling vertalingen

Bedankt dat u mee wilt doen aan mijn onderzoek naar de kwaliteit van vertalingen. Dit onderzoek is deel van mijn scriptie voor de MA Linguistics: Translation in Theory and Practice aan de Universiteit Leiden. Ik schrijf deze scriptie onder supervisie van dhr. mr. A.A. Foster. Ik ben in dit onderzoek met name geïnteresseerd in de percepties en de overwegingen van vertalers. Na wat algemene vragen krijgt u vertalingen voorgelegd en wordt uw mening gevraagd. Ik wil u echter eerst vragen om de instemmingsverklaring goed door te lezen, en hiermee akkoord te gaan. Als u niet akkoord gaat, kunt u helaas niet deelnemen aan dit onderzoek.

Start

www.thesistools.com

Kwaliteitsbeoordeling vertalingen

1.

Dit onderzoek is gericht op de kwaliteitsbeoordeling van vertalingen. U krijgt straks een aantal bronteksten en vertalingen daarvan te zien op basis waarvan u zal worden gevraagd om uw mening over de kwaliteit ervan te geven. Hiervoor zal ik u enkele vragen stellen die betrekking hebben op verschillende aspecten die van invloed kunnen zijn op uw overwegingen. Dit onderzoek is geen test van uw intelligentie of vertaalvaardigheid. Er zijn dus geen goede of foute antwoorden. Deelname aan dit onderzoek is geheel vrijwillig. U kunt op elk moment stoppen als u dat wilt en u hoeft daar geen reden voor op te geven. Alle gegevens worden anoniem bewaard en behandeld. Het onderzoek duurt maximaal 10-15 minuten. Na afloop van het onderzoek zal ik u meer achtergrondinformatie geven over het onderzoek. Door hieronder akkoord aan te vinken, geeft u aan dat u bovenstaande uitleg hebt gelezen, begrijpt en akkoord gaat met deelname aan dit onderzoek.*

akkoord

Volgende

U krijgt nu eerst een aantal algemene vragen over uw werk als vertaler.

2.

Hoeveel jaren werkervaring heeft u als vertaler? Geef hieronder het afgeronde aantal jaren aan.*

3.

Wat is uw moedertaal?

Nederlands

Engels

Anders, namelijk

4.

Naar welke talen vertaalt u?

- Nederlands
 Engels
 Duits
 Frans
 Spaans
 Anders, namelijk

5.

Vanuit welke talen vertaalt u?

- Nederlands
 Engels
 Duits
 Frans
 Spaans
 Anders, namelijk

6.

Op welke gebieden vertaalt u vooral?

- Literair
 Academisch
 Technisch
 Juridisch
 Financieel
 Anders, namelijk

Volgende

7.

Geef aan in welke mate u het met de stelling eens bent.

	Helemaal eens	Eens	Niet mee eens/ niet mee oneens	Oneens	Helemaal oneens
Naar mijn mening moet een vertaling lezen als een originele tekst.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In het vertaalproces vind ik culturele verschillen tussen de cultuur van de brontaal en de doeltaal belangrijk.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Uitdrukkingen in de brontekst moeten letterlijk vertaald worden.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In het vertaalproces vind ik grammatica belangrijk.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Een vertaling moet hetzelfde effect op de lezer hebben als de brontekst.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In het vertaalproces vind ik woordkeuze en lexicale verschillen belangrijk.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8.

Voor de leesbaarheid van een vertaling vind ik het volgende belangrijk:

	heel belangrijk			helemaal niet belangrijk	
Dat de boodschap duidelijk verwoord is.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dat de grammatica klopt.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dat de tekst in de doeltaal soepel leest.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9.

Ik vind het belangrijk dat een vertaling:

	Heel erg			Helemaal niet	
Hetzelfde effect heeft op de lezer als de oorspronkelijke tekst.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beoordeeld wordt door een native speaker van de doeltaal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dicht bij de oorspronkelijke tekst blijft.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10.

Zijn er nog kenmerken die u belangrijk vindt in een vertaling die hierboven niet genoemd zijn?

Volgende

Nu krijgt u tien Nederlandse bronteksten en hun Engelse vertalingen te zien. Bij elke tekst wordt uw mening gevraagd. U kunt aangeven welke vertaling u correct vindt. Dit kan een van de vertalingen zijn of allebei. Daarnaast wordt u gevraagd uw mening toe te lichten.

11.

Tekst 1:**NL:** Veel ouderen vinden het vanzelfsprekend dat met elite de aristocratie bedoeld wordt.**EN1:** Many elderly people take it as a matter of course that by elite the aristocracy is meant.**EN2:** Many elderly people take it as a matter of course that what is meant by elite is the aristocracy.**Welke vertaling is naar uw mening grammaticaal correct? Waarom?***

12.

Geef aan in welke mate u de vertalingen van Tekst 1 leesbaar vindt:

	Heel goed	Goed	Niet goed/ niet slecht	Slecht	Heel slecht
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN1 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN2 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13.

Tekst 2:**NL:** In een beroemde tapasbar dichtbij de haven in Barcelona werd de hoogste economische groei gemeten.**EN1:** Barcelona recorded the highest level of economic growth in a famous tapas bar near the docks.**EN2:** In a famous tapas bar near the docks in Barcelona the highest level of economic growth was recorded.**Welke vertaling is naar uw mening grammaticaal correct? Waarom?***

14.

Geef aan in welke mate u de vertalingen van Tekst 2 leesbaar vindt:

	Heel goed	Goed	Niet goed/ niet slecht	Slecht	Heel slecht
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN1 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN2 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Volgende

15.

Tekst 3:

NL: De journalisten kregen toegang tot alle relevante documenten. Hoe het mogelijk was dat bedrijven jaarlijkse controles vermeden werd met name onderzocht.

EN1: The companies were allowed access to all the relevant documents. How it was possible for the companies to avoid annual inspections was mainly looked at.

EN2: The journalists were allowed access to all the relevant data. They mainly looked at how it was possible for the companies to avoid annual inspections.

Welke vertaling is naar uw mening grammaticaal correct? Waarom?*

16.

Geef aan in welke mate u de vertalingen van Tekst 3 leesbaar vindt:

	Heel goed	Goed	Niet goed/ niet slecht	Slecht	Heel slecht
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN1 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN2 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17.

Tekst 4:

NL: Veel mensen geloven dat de pil borst-, lever- of baarmoederhalskanker veroorzaakt. Volgens sommige onderzoekers worden deze vormen van kanker veroorzaakt door het hormoon progesteron. Echter, andere onderzoekers beweren dat dit hormoon eigenlijk bestaande tumoren bestrijdt.

EN1: Many people believe that the pill causes breast, liver, or cervical cancer. According to some researchers, the hormone progesterone causes these forms of cancer. However, other researchers claim that this hormone might actually combat existing tumours.

EN2: Many people believe that the pill causes breast, liver, or cervical cancer. According to some researchers, these forms of cancer are caused by the hormone progesterone. However, other researchers claim that this hormone might actually combat existing tumours.

Welke vertaling vindt u grammaticaal correct? Waarom?*

18.

Geef aan in welke mate u de vertalingen van Tekst 4 leesbaar vindt:

	Heel goed	Goed	Niet goed/ niet slecht	Slecht	Heel slecht
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN1 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN2 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Volgende

19.

Tekst 5:

NL: Stalin stuurde drie kunstenaars die grappen hadden gedurfd te maken over leden van de regering in ballingschap.

EN1: Stalin sent three artists who had dared to make jokes about government officials into exile.

EN2: Stalin sent three artists into exile who had dared to make jokes about government officials.

Welke vertaling vindt u grammaticaal correct? Waarom?*

20.

Geef aan in welke mate u de vertalingen van Tekst 5 leesbaar vindt:

	Heel goed	Goed	Niet goed/ niet slecht	Slecht	Heel slecht
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN1 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN2 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

21.

Tekst 6:

NL: Het rapport schat dat in 2050 in de meeste sectoren 80 procent van de producten van gerecycled plastic gemaakt zal worden.

EN1: The report estimates that by the year 2050 80 percent of the products in most sectors will be made of recycled plastic.

EN2: The report estimates that by the year 2050 in most sectors 80 percent of the products will be made of recycled plastic.

Welke vertaling vindt u grammaticaal correct? Waarom?*

22.

Geef aan in welke mate u de vertalingen van Tekst 6 leesbaar vindt:

	Heel goed	Goed	Niet goed/ niet slecht	Slecht	Heel slecht
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN1 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN2 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23.

Tekst 7:

NL: De oorzaak van diabetes werd duidelijk in de analyse.

EN1: The analysis revealed the cause of diabetes.

EN2: The cause of diabetes became apparent from the analysis.

Welke vertaling vindt u grammaticaal correct? Waarom?*

24.

Geef aan in welke mate u de vertalingen van Tekst 7 leesbaar vindt:

	Heel goed	Goed	Niet goed/ niet slecht	Slecht	Heel slecht
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN1 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN2 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Volgende

25.

Tekst 8:

NL: Het totaal aantal deelnemers aan de marathon was 500. Bij 139 van de 500 deelnemers werd uitputting geconstateerd.

EN1: The total number of participants at the marathon was 500. Of the 500 participants in 139 cases fatigue was found.

EN2: The total number of participants at the marathon was 500. Of the 500 participants, 139 turned out to be suffering from fatigue.

Welke vertaling vindt u grammaticaal correct? Waarom?*

26.

Geef aan in welke mate u de vertalingen van Tekst 8 leesbaar vindt:

	Heel goed	Goed	Niet goed/niet slecht	Slecht	Heel slecht
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN1 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN2 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

27.

Tekst 9:

NL: Veel studenten moeten na een periode van solliciteren en afgewezen worden een baan aanemen die ze niet leuk vinden en meestal is deze baan beneden hun niveau.

EN1: Many students have to accept a job that they do not like after a period of applying and being rejected, and most of the time this job is beneath their standards.

EN2: After a period of applying and being rejected, many students have to accept a job that they do not like, and most of the time this job is beneath their standards.

Welke vertaling is naar uw mening grammaticaal correct? Waarom?*

28.

Geef aan in welke mate u de vertaling van Tekst 9 leesbaar vindt.

	Heel goed	Goed	Niet goed/ niet slecht	Slecht	Heel slecht
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN1 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN2 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

29.

Tekst 10:

NL: Daarom lijkt het onvermijdelijk dat tenminste in de nabije toekomst het in sommige landen noodzakelijk wordt om olifanten te doden, hoe tegenstrijdig dit ook mag lijken.

EN1: It therefore seems inevitable that, at least in the near future, in some countries the killing of elephants will be necessary, however contradictory this may seem.

EN2: It therefore seems inevitable that, at least in the near future, the killing of elephants will be necessary in some countries, however contradictory this may seem.

Welke vertaling is naar uw mening grammaticaal correct? Waarom? *

30.

Geef aan in welke mate u de vertalingen van Tekst 10 leesbaar vindt.

	Heel goed	Goed	Niet goed/ niet slecht	Slecht	Heel slecht
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN1 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De leesbaarheid van vertaling EN2 vind ik	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

31.

U heeft nu alle vragen beantwoord. Bedankt voor het invullen! Hieronder kunt u eventuele vragen en/of opmerkingen plaatsen.

32.

Wilt u informatie over de uitkomsten van dit onderzoek ontvangen? Vul dan hieronder uw emailadres in.

U bent nu aan het einde van de vragenlijst gekomen. Heel erg bedankt voor uw deelname!

In dit onderzoek kijk ik naar de mening van vertalers over de kwaliteit van een vertaling en de rol die zinsstructuur en grammatica daarin speelt. Het doel van dit onderzoek is om de bevindingen uit de literatuur met betrekking tot zinsstructuur, grammatica, en vertalingen te testen in de praktijk.

Appendix 2: Results

Table 1

This table provides an overview of the results of questions 1-5. These questions asked respondents for background information.

Respondent	Years	Native Language	Source Languages	Target Languages	Areas
1					
2	18	Dutch	English	Dutch	Literary, Financial
3	6	Dutch	Dutch, French, Italian	Dutch	Literary, "ondertiteling en niet-literaire boeken"
4	12	English	Dutch	English	Literary
5	17	Dutch	English	Dutch	Literary
6	30	Dutch	English, French	Dutch	Literary
7	8	Dutch	English, German	Dutch	Literary, Academic
8	15	English	Dutch, German, French	English	Technical, Financial, "wetenschappelijk"
9	15	Dutch	English	Dutch	"populair wetenschappelijk"
10	20	Dutch	English	Dutch	Literary
11	20	Dutch and Hungarian	English, Hungarian	Dutch and Hungarian	Literary, Legal
12	7	Dutch	English, Swedish	Dutch	Literary, "populaire non-fictie"
13	20	Dutch	English, German	Dutch	Literary
14	10	Dutch	English	Dutch	"Chicklit en andere fictie die niet literair te noemen is"
15	18	Dutch	English, German, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Danish, Norwegian, Sami, Italian	Dutch	Academic, Technical, Legal, Financial, "van alles"
16	30	Dutch	Norwegian, Danish, Swedish	Dutch	Literary
17	21	Dutch	English	Dutch	Literary
18	12	Dutch	English, Italian	Dutch	Literary

Respondent	Years	Native Language	Source Languages	Target Languages	Areas
19	16	Dutch	English, Hebrew	Dutch and English	Literary
20	2	Dutch	English, French, Italian	Dutch	“strips”
21	31	Dutch	English	Dutch	Literary, “non-fictie”
22	26	Dutch	English	Dutch	Literary
23	13	Dutch	English	Dutch	“non fictie op allerlei gebied. Bouquet”
24	45+	Dutch	Dutch, English, German	Dutch and English	“theologisch + Young Adult”
25	20	Dutch	English	Dutch	“non fictie, meest historisch”
26	8	English	Dutch, German, French	English	Academic, Technical, Legal, Financial
27	30	Dutch	English	Dutch	Literary
28					

Table 2

Table showing the results to the optional, open question which followed the statements on translation and translation process.

Respondent	Answer
8	Te vaak worden culturele verschillen e.d. wegvertaald, waardoor het wel soepel loopt maar je geen gevoel meer hebt voor de setting.
15	Technische, medische, etc. vertalingen, gebruiksaanwijzingen, IT-scripts e.d. moeten exact zijn en niet kiste wat koste worden verfraagd, waardoor de betekenis vaak onherroepelijk teniet gedaan wordt.
18	Een vertaling moet inhoudelijk kloppen (inclusief [vermeende] intentie v/d auteur, logisch en intern coherent zijn, kloppen met de werkelijkheid, de stijl van het origineel imiteren (literaire fictie) of in het geval van non-fictie, soms juist aangepast worden aan de stilistische normen van de doelcultuur (zeker bij teksten uit het Italiaans), afwijken waar de brontekst afwijkt (en zoveel mogelijk op dezelfde manier, en als dat niet kan, elders of anders compenseren), niet vervlakken, enzovoort.
22	Het juiste register. De juiste toonzetting. (Melancholiek, ironisch, intellectueel, of hoe dan ook)
24	Stommiteiten die in het origineel geslopen zijn eruit halen en '\verbeteren'\...
26	Geen feitenfouten bevat (dit komt nogal eens voor in de bronteksten).

Table 3

Table showing the results of the native speakers of English on the questions concerning the texts. The first row per text shows the responses to the open question and the second and third row show the results on the closed question on readability.

Text number	Respondent 4	Respondent 8	Respondent 26	Preferred option
1	EN2 maar er ontbreekt een woord - het moet 'the' elite zijn, ook is 'matter of course' een tikje te letterlijk. Het zin leest ook niet erg soepel, het kan beknopter.	I don't like either much. But the second is better (the first is Dungleish)	EN2 is grammaticaal correct. Maar ik zou zelf aanhalingstekens zetten om 'elite'	EN2
Readability EN1	Very bad	Very bad	Very bad	
Readability EN2	Not good/ not bad	Bad	Bad	
2	EN1 - famous is een beetje raar - het kan idiomatischer - renowned/popular.	Tweede; eerste bekt makkelijker, maar kan ook iets anders betekenen (Barcelona in vergelijking met andere steden)	EN1. Volgorde in EN2 klopt niet. (Maar NL zin is wat vreemd - een horeca-onderneming heeft geen economische groei, wel groei in omzet)	EN1
Readability EN1	Good	Good	Not good/ not bad	
Readability EN2	Not good/ not bad	Bad	Very bad	
3	EN2 - maar elke keer gaat het over het verschil in woordvolgorde/zinsopbouw. Er zijn ook andere varianten/verschillen in vertalingen. 'the' companies zou alleen 'companies' moeten zijn.	Tweede (afgezien van het foutieve woord in de eerste).	EN2. 2e zin klopt niet in EN1. Maar EN2 klopt niet qua vertaling (data moet documents zijn, inspections moet audits zijn).	EN2
Readability EN1	Bad	Bad	Very bad	
Readability EN2	Not good/ not bad	Not good/ not bad	Good	

Text	Respondent 4	Respondent 8	Respondent 26	Preferred option
4	EN1 - toch zijn geen van beide helemaal idiomatisch. Waar in het Nederlands 'of' vaak gebruikt is, zou je vaker 'and' zien in het Engels. Ook klinkt 'this hormone' als translatorese, beter 'the hormone'.	Maakt niet uit. Weer allebei voor verbetering vatbaar (o.a. "or" in de eerste volzin zou eigenlijk "and" moeten zijn, of "can cause").	Beide goed. Kleine voorkeur voor EN2 omdat de 2e zin beter aansluit bij de 3e.	EN2
Readability EN1	Not good/ not bad	Good	Good	
Readability EN2	Not good/ not bad	Good	Very good	
5	EN1	Maakt niet uit. Zelf zou ik wrsch eerder nummer twee schrijven, om "sent into exile" dichterbij elkaar te houden.	Beide correct. Voorkeur voor EN2 omdat je niet zo lang hoeft te wachten op 'into exile'.	EN2
Readability EN1	Good	Not good/ not bad	Not good/ not bad	
Readability EN2	Not good/ not bad	Good	Very good	
6	EN2 maar correcte interpunctuatie ontbreekt in beide zinnen.	Allebei kunnen beter: "the year" is overbodig, komma ergens voor de duidelijkheid nodig...	EN1. EN2 heeft Dungleish volgorde	EN1
Readability EN1	Bad	Bad	Good	
Readability EN2	Not good/ not bad	Bad	Bad	
7	Geen van beide, analysis is te breed voor deze context. Tests showed what had caused diabetes. (Maar context is ook belangrijk - kan ook zijn 'the diabetes' als het over een patient gaat).	Tweede is letterlijker.	Beide OK.	EN1
Readability EN1	Not good/ not bad	Good	Good	
Readability EN2	Not good/ not bad	Good	Good	

Text	Respondent 4	Respondent 8	Respondent 26	Preferred option
8	Allebei zijn fout. The total number of marathon participants was 500. 139 of the 500 participants were found to be suffering from fatigue/exhaustion.	Zelfde verhaal: allebei niet best. Participants in the marathon, uitputting is exhaustion...	Beide niet correct. Moet 'in the marathon' zijn. Zin 2 wel correct in EN2. (hoewel woordkeuze niet goed - 'were found to be' in plaats van 'turned out to be')	EN2
Readability EN1	Bad	Bad	Bad	
Readability EN2	Bad	Bad	Not good/ not bad	
9	Geen van beide. EN2 is iets beter, maar beneath their standards is geen goed Engels.	en weer: "beneath their standards" is niet goed, "meestal" waarschijnlijker "mostly" ...	Beide correct. EN2 beter omdat het de nadruk legt op de periode van solliciteren. 'beneath their standards' klopt niet qua vertaling (standards = normen), beter zou zijn 'for which they are overqualified'	EN2
Readability EN1	Bad	Bad	Good	
Readability EN2	Bad	Bad	Good	
10	het kan allebei	Tweede. Interpunctie in de eerste is onvoldoende. Echter voor de leesbaarheid beter "that" na de future-clausule, voor "the killing"	Beide, EN2 meer natuurlijk (en ik zou 'will' cursief schrijven)	EN2
Readability EN1	Not good/ not bad	Bad	Good	
Readability EN2	Not good/ not bad	Not good/ not bad	Very good	

