



Translation Students' Editing Ability: The Case of IAPLL Guidelines

 **Hediye Mansouri¹,**
 **Mohammad Reza Falahati**
Qadimi Fumani²

¹M.A. in English Language
Translation, Freelance Translator.

²Faculty Member of the Department
of Computational Linguistics, Islamic
World Science and Technology
Monitoring and Citation Institute
(ISC), Shiraz, Iran

Corresponding Author: Mohammad Reza
Falahati Qadimi Fumani

E-mail: mrfalahat@yahoo.com

Article Citation: Mansouri, H. , Falahati
Qadimi Fumani, M. R. (2023). Translation
Students' Editing Ability: The Case of IAPLL
Guidelines, *Journal of English Literature
and Cultural Studies*, 4 (1): 33–46.

Received Date: January 10, 2023

Accepted Date: March 16, 2023

Online Date: May 25, 2023

Publisher: Kare Publishing

© 2023 Journal of English Literature and
Cultural Studies

E-ISSN: 2667-6214



This work is licensed under a Creative
Commons, Attribution-NonCommercial-
NoDerivatives 4.0 International

ABSTRACT

In translation process, editing plays a key role in conveying the right meaning of a text. Accordingly, the present study intended to investigate the ability of B.A. and M.A. students of English language translation in identification and correction of errors in a sample Persian text based on Iran's Academy of Persian Language and Literature's editing guidelines. A researcher-made text was administered to the students in which errors had been intentionally embedded to assess their editing ability in error identification and correction. Using whole group sampling, two groups of 35 B.A. level and 35 M.A. students of English language translation were used as participants. The results indicated that the mean of the total score in B.A. group was significantly lower than the medium level; the mean of the total score in M.A. group was at the medium level; recognition score of the M.A. group was significantly higher than the B.A. group; correction score of the M.A. group was significantly larger than the B.A. group, and the total score of the M.A. group was significantly larger than the B.A. group. In general, it was found that the participants' editing ability was very low. This could have many reasons including lack of qualitative teaching or courses on IAPLL rules and regulations in English language translation syllabus. The findings of this study are in line with findings reported by Zare and Falahati Qadimi Fumani (2020) who reported that students of English language translation in Iran were weak at editing skills and specifically know very little about the terms approved by IAPLL. The findings of this research could be used by different groups such as students of English language translation, Persian language and literature students, university professors, instructors, writers and policy makers.

Key words: Translation problems, Editing problems, IAPLL, Error identification, error correction, translation assessment.

1. Introduction

Language is an inherent feature of human beings. As put by Fishman (1996), it is through language that we communicate with other people within our society or from other nations. Language studies cover a wide range of issues, including teaching, translation, testing, etc. From among these, translation further covers a wide range of research topics including theories of translation, translation of poetry, translation software, etc. No matter what type of translation we deal with, editing is always there as a fixed and necessary component. In fact, no translation work is presented without pre and post editing.

The availability of different components in translation activity reveals that translation is a process rather than a result, that is, to render a text/speech from one language into another, a number of steps are involved. In general, any translation activity could broadly be classified into two classes, translation and editing, or as stated by Esposito (2018) into three classes namely translation, editing and proofreading. During translation, the translator extracts the meaning of the source text and expresses it by equivalent meaning in the target text. During the editing phase, however, formatting modifications are made. It is in this process that spell and grammar checks are made. Further, in this step correct application of punctuation marks are checked. Finally, during the proofreading phase, final revisions are made before sending the text for publication.



Figure 1.1. Three phases in translation cycle (Esposito, 2018).

Editing involves several types including 'content', 'line', 'copy', and 'proofreading'. As put by Esposito (2018), in content edit the flow and structure of the whole body of work is inspected. Similarly, in line edit wording checks are made and sentence structure are looked for confusing and repetitive word combinations. In the same way, in copy edit the mechanics of applying style manual rules for grammar and punctuation are dealt with. Finally, in proofreading edit, which acts as a final check, cases like extra spaces, misspelled words and missing periods are found and corrected.

This brief introduction reveals that editing is not an easy task and editors need to take into consideration a long list of items, i.e. correct word choice, accuracy, style, consistent use of vocabulary, punctuation marks, grammar, etc. Further, when some large texts are translated by more than one translator, it is the job of the editor to review and revise the entire translation to ensure consistent use of terminology and style. Editors, as a prerequisite, should also have a good command of both the source and the target languages and they are not free to make unbounded changes to the source text (Newmark, 1991). Further, as put by West (1983, p. 286), deficiencies in proofreading skills lies in "a lack of instruction rather than "carelessness, laziness, lack of motivation, dishonesty or even mediocre verbal skills". Also, poor editing results in poor translation. Despite the great importance of the role of editing in the translation process, not much work has been undertaken on assessment of editing ability of translators, translation professors as well as translation students (Mohammadian, 2013).

Having specified the gap in the literature, the present researchers decided to investigate the degree to which B.A. and M.A. students of English language translation could identify and correct potential problems in the sample Persian text based on Iran's Academy of Persian Language and Literature (IAPLL) editing guidelines. From this broad objective, the following research questions were proposed:

Q1) To what extent do Iranian B.A. students master the editing principles based on IAPLL guidelines?

Q2) To what extent do Iranian M.A. students master the editing principles based on IAPLL guidelines?

Q3) Is there any difference between Iranian M.A. and B.A. students in the recognition of editing errors based on IAPLL guidelines?

Q4) Is there any difference between Iranian M.A. and B.A. students in the correction of editing errors based on IAPLL guidelines?

Q5) Is there any difference between Iranian M.A. and B.A. students in total score of editing errors based on IAPLL guidelines?

From these five research questions, five hypotheses were extracted as follows:

H0.1. English B.A. students master the editing principles at the medium level based on IAPLL guidelines.

H0.2. English M.A. students master the editing principles at the medium level based on IAPLL guidelines.

H0.3. There is a significant difference between English M.A. and B.A. students in recognition of editing errors based on IAPLL guidelines.

H0.4. There is a significant difference between English M.A. and B.A. students in correction of editing errors based on IAPLL guidelines.

H0.5. There is a significant difference between English M.A. and B.A. students in total score of editing errors based on IAPLL guidelines.

2. Literature review

The term translation has already been defined by many researchers. According to Hatim and Mason (1997, p. 25) translation involves “the negotiation of meaning between producers and receivers of the text.” Similarly, based on the research conducted by Bell (1991), translation is a procedure of conveying oral and written messages from one language to another. Maier (1994) defined translation as “an activity of multiple mediations or ‘refractions’ that includes both translator and reader (p. 193).” Further, Lambert (1998) asserts, “A translation is the fruit of a substantial creative effort by the translator, who is the key agent in the subjective activity and social practice of translation” (p. 130). According to Catford (1965, p. 20); “translation is the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL).” Catford’s definition (1965) implies that translation is a process in the sense that it is an activity performed by people through time when expressions are reworded and paraphrased into simpler ones in the same language, or they are translated from one language into a different language.

Based on the studies of Kelly (2005), translation is defined as the ability of comprehending the source text and transferring it to the target text by utilizing the register, the background knowledge, and other language resources according to the intended goals. According to Newmark (1981, p. 7), translation is a skill that aims to substitute a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message or statement in another language; that is, a written communication in a second language having the same meaning as written communication in a first language.

As mentioned in the introduction of this paper, translation is a process with a number of components – editing being a single but an important one. A review of the literature within translation studies shows that the first publications on revision appeared two to three decades ago, and most of them were handbooks or practical guides for students and practicing translators (Thaon & Horguelin, 1980; Mossop, 2019). A second wave of publications came in the 2000. These were based on empirical research, but tended to draw on indirect methodologies in the form of surveys and interviews (Shih, 2006). “Only in a third wave of research on revising, observational methodologies begun to appear on the scene” (Brunette et al. 2005).

Revision is considered to be a type of editing. The main task of a reviser is to read and evaluate a text, correct the text and produce a final draft of the text that is free of vocabulary, grammar, etc. errors. (Roussey & Piolat, 2008).

But, what is it that editors should find and revise in a text? Mossop (2019) in his book *Revising and Editing for Translators* introduced a short list of translation error types and 12 revision parameters which were finally classified into 4 groups of Transfer (focusing on accuracy and completeness), content (dealing with logic and facts), language (covering items like smoothness, tailoring, sublanguage, idiom, and mechanics) and presentation (including items like layout, typography, and organization). Mossop (2019) states that an experienced reviser actually checks those 12 parameters simultaneously by instinct when going through each sentence. Mossop’s model for translation revision is not only useful for revisers, but it is also useful for translators, because questions asked in each of the four groups of parameters help to produce a better translation. Accuracy, completeness, and logic are the main parameters to check. Among them, accuracy is the most important feature of a translation.

A lot of studies have investigated and compared the effect of direct versus indirect strategies in helping learners in accuracy and overall writing quality (Robb, Ross, & Shortreed, 1986). Direct or explicit feedback occurs when the teacher identifies an error and provides the correct form, while indirect strategies refer to situations when the teacher indicates that an error has been made but does not provide a correction, thereby leaving the student to diagnose and correct it.

Error detection or identification is an indicator of error correction potential: If you identify an error, you can potentially correct it, and the correction is, potentially, an improvement. You cannot correct a mistake until you have found it.” (Mossop 2019, p. 165).

Finally, Zare and Falahati Qadimi Fumani (2020) investigated the application of IAPLL approved terms by Iranian B.A English translator training students and showed that they did not use the terms much mainly due to the unavailability of such courses on application of IAPLL approved terms in the higher education system. They also asserted that due to missing of such trainings on IAPLL approved terms, almost all Persian texts need to undergo sort of editing and revisions. In fact, compatibility of terms in a text to IAPLL approved terms is a constant type of practice all editors should exercise.

2.1. Foundation of IAPLL

Iran's Academy of Persian Language and Literature is not the only academy in the world. In fact, there are a large number of academies over the globe. One major function of such academies is that they care for the language and try to preserve and improve it in a systematic manner, i.e. often by introducing guidelines for application of local terms rather than the foreign ones. They may, at times, introduce new local terms to replace foreign borrowed words. In what follows, IAPLL is briefly introduced.

The Academy of Persian Language and Literature is an Institute the main task of which is to establish rules and principles and adjust the necessary regulations to guide the development and preserving of language. The interrelationship among different nations and languages has resulted in the availability of a large number of foreign borrowed terms in Persian. Hence, a big problem in Iran is how to express such foreign terms in Persian. In fact, the kind of linguistic awareness that arose among Iranian researchers led to the emergence of the academy in Iran (Iran's Academy of Persian Language and Literature [IAPLL], 2023). Further, the effort of Iranian scholars to preserve Persian against rival global languages was another motivation for establishment of Iran's Academy of Persian Language and Literature (IAPLL).

IAPLL does not have a long history in Iran in deed. But its whole life could be divided into three eras (IAPLL, 2023). The first academy, called the Iranian Academy, was founded in 1935 until 1953 with the objective to replace foreign words with Persian ones. The second Iranian academy, named Iranian Academy of Language, was founded in 1970 with the objective to introduce Persian terms for new foreign scientific, technical, and cultural concepts; and to conduct studies on all languages and dialects of Iran to get a better knowledge of Persian (IAPLL, 2023). By 1976, almost 35,000 new Persian words had been proposed by the academy. Then, "the third academy, under the title of Academy of Persian Language and Literature (IAPLL), was established in 1991, with an active word-selection committee" (Spolsky, 2004, pp. 37-38). This Academy is an independent institution functioning under Presidential Foundation and its approvals are further approved by the president of Iran. The academy members are academics of Persian literature and linguistics from Iran, Tajikistan, Afghanistan, and Uzbekistan. This third Academy has three sub Academies namely: Academy of Sciences, Academy of Medical Sciences, and Academy of Art.

English, as a lingua franca, has certainly impacted almost all languages of the world including Persian. To safeguard Persian, IAPLL played an important role by setting its objectives as follows: To keep the power and originality of Persian language; to develop a refined expressive language to express scientific and literary ideas; to promote Persian language and literature and to spread out its domain inside and outside of the country and to create vitality and growth in Persian language with regard to requirements of human life and the advance of science and technology while maintaining its originality.

As stated in this brief literature review, in order to fill in the gap in research on revising of Persian document, studies need to be undertaken. In an effort to reduce this gap in the literature, the present researchers decided to investigate the degree to which B.A. and M.A. students of English language translation could identify and correct potential problems in the sample Persian text based on Iran's Academy of Persian Language and Literature (IAPLL) editing guidelines.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

In this study, a descriptive quantitative research design was used to assess the ability of the participants in identification and correction of editing errors in a sample Persian text. To select the sample participants, first Zand Institute of Higher Education (<https://edu.zand.ac.ir/Sess/16428651193>) was selected. This institute was selected since the needed number of students of English language translation were available there (B.A. students= 35, and M.A. students=35). To select the participants, whole group sampling was used. The B.A. level senior students were 38 and there were also 37 M.A. level students of translation (who had passed all their courses and were working on their theses). Three students from the B.A. level class and 2 students from the M.A. level class were discarded since they were males – because the majority of the students were female, only female students were used as participants in this study. This led to 35 B.A. level and 35 M.A. level students who were used as the ultimate participants of the study.

3.2. Instrument

A researcher-made instrument was used in this study. The instrument was a Persian text (including 200 words and 20 errors). The term error here means violation of IAPLL rules. These rules are as follows:

1. Missing of short vowels and superscripts resulting in pronunciation difficulty. For example, in Becket, بکت should be used rather than بکت
2. Missing Tanvin in words rooting in Arabic. Like ظاهرأ should be used rather than ظاهرا
3. Joining and disjoining plural marker ها and های. Plural marker should be written with half space after the root like: نوشته های rather than نوشته های
4. No space should be left between a word like اینکه in fact این که is wrong

5. Tanvin should not be deleted from words rooting in Arabic. Like: حتماً should be used rather than حتما
6. Tashdid should not be missed if its deletion causes ambiguity in pronunciation of words like: على should be used rather than على if it means 'cause' or 'reason'.
7. No space is left between the two components of complex words like: همكار so هم كار is wrong.
8. Prefixes like همى, نمى, مى are joined to the main part of the verb by half space like: مىگویند rather than مى گویند.
9. Marker تر is presented by no space like: " بیشتر rather than, تر, بیشتر " or " کمتر rather than, کمتر, کمتر "
10. The problem with homophones. The word امپراطور should be written as امپراتور or تراز should be written as طراز.

The researchers embedded errors from all the 10 categories above in the sample text. Two errors from each category (totally 20 errors) were embedded in the text. Then, the text was given to 3 experts with at least 10 years of experience in editing to check the text and issue their comments regarding the clarity and coverage of the problems. Their modifications were minor and concerned only error spacing or word spacing which were immediately revised by the researchers. Then, the text was distributed among the participants to detect and identify the errors. They had 40 minutes to finish their editing job.

3.3. Scoring

The following procedure was used to score each paper corrected by each participant. In all, there were 20 editing problems in the text. For each identification of the problems a 0.5 was assigned. For each correction of the problems identified again a 0.5 was assigned. Since there were 20 editing errors, the optimum score a student could get from both identification and correction was 20 meaning that the student had identified all the 20 editing problems and had successfully corrected them. The minimum score was 0 meaning that the student had failed to identify even a single editing problem. Nor had the student been able to correct any of the problems embedded intentionally into the text. To clarify the issue, imagine that a student had been able to identify 12 out of 20 problems and out of the 12 problems identified, s/he had been able to correct 8 based on IAPLL guidelines. The score of this student could be computed as follows:

$12 * 0.5 = 6$ the identification score out of 10 (60% success)

$8 * 0.5 = 4$ the correction score out of 10 (40% success)

Total score = 10 out of 20 (50% success)

3.4. Data Analysis Procedure

In order to analyze the data, IBM SPSS version 22 was used. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were drawn on. To find the quality of performance of B.A. and M.A. students, descriptive statistics (means, frequency and standard deviations) was used to describe data collected throughout the research process. Also, in order to analyze the performance of each group of students on identification and correction of editing errors an *Independent samples t-test* was used. In order to check the inter-coder validity of the data extracted, three editors with at least 10 years of editing history were requested to read the instrument (sample text produced) and comment on it.

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

The sample consisted of 35 Bachelor and 35 Master's students. Their task was to recognize and correct 20 word errors in a sample text with 200-words. These words were representatives of 10 types of errors as specified by IAPLL.

Table 1. Distribution of recognition of different types of errors by BA and MA students

Error Type Recognition	Score	Group			
		Master		Bachelor	
		N	%	N	%
Type1	0	17	48.6%	19	54.3%
	0.5	15	42.9%	13	37.1%
	1.0	3	8.6%	3	8.6%
Type2	0	5	14.3%	7	20.0%
	0.5	16	45.7%	12	34.3%
	1.0	14	40.0%	16	45.7%

Type3	0	12	34.3%	14	40.0%
	0.5	18	51.4%	14	40.0%
	1.0	5	14.3%	7	20.0%
Type4	0	18	51.4%	25	71.4%
	0.5	9	25.7%	7	20.0%
	1.0	8	22.9%	3	8.6%
Type5	0	4	11.4%	4	11.4%
	0.5	21	60.0%	13	37.1%
	1.0	10	28.6%	18	51.4%
Type6	0	8	22.9%	6	17.1%
	0.5	11	31.4%	18	51.4%
	1.0	16	45.7%	11	31.4%
Type7	0	2	5.7%	12	34.3%
	0.5	11	31.4%	13	37.1%
	1.0	22	62.9%	10	28.6%
Type8	0	20	57.1%	24	68.6%
	0.5	14	40.0%	11	31.4%
	1.0	1	2.9%	0	0.0%
Type9	0	5	14.3%	8	22.9%
	0.5	7	20.0%	14	40.0%
	1.0	23	65.7%	13	37.1%
Type10	0	14	40.0%	24	68.6%
	0.5	11	31.4%	7	20.0%
	1.0	10	28.6%	4	11.4%

*Type 1: Missing of short vowels and super scripts resulting pronunciation difficulty, Type 2: Missing Hamza in words rooting in Arabic, Type 3: Joining and disjoining plural marker ها and های, Type 4: No space should be left between a words like "Inkeh" اینکه based on the rules of compound nouns, Type 5: Tanvin should not be deleted from words rooting in Arabic, Type 6: Tashdid should not be missed if its deletion causes ambiguity in pronunciation, Type 7: No space should be left between the two component of complex words, Type 8: Prefixes like همی، نمی، نمی should be joined to the main part of the verb by half space, Type 9: Marker تر should be added to the root by no space, Type 10: The problem with homophones.

Table 1 shows the distribution of different types of errors recognized by B.A. and M.A. students. In type 1 error and for master students, it indicates that 17 students (48.6% within M.A. group) had a score of 0, while 15 students (42.9%) received 0.5 and 3 students (8.6%) obtained 1 (complete score) for type 1 error. Similarly, for type 1 error and in B.A. group, 19 (54.3%), 13 (37.1%) and 3 (8.6%) students received 0, 0.5 and 1 respectively.

Table 2. Distribution of correction of different types of errors by B.A. and M.A. students

Error Type Correction	Score	Group			
		Master		Bachelor	
		N	%	N	%
Type1	0	17	48.6%	21	60.0%
	0.5	15	42.9%	11	31.4%
	1.0	3	8.6%	3	8.6%
Type2	0	6	17.1%	8	22.9%

	0.5	15	42.9%	13	37.1%
	1.0	14	40.0%	14	40.0%
Type3	0	22	62.9%	21	60.0%
	0.5	11	31.4%	11	31.4%
	1.0	2	5.7%	3	8.6%
Type4	0	23	65.7%	30	85.7%
	0.5	4	11.4%	3	8.6%
	1.0	8	22.9%	2	5.7%
Type5	0	4	11.4%	5	14.3%
	0.5	21	60.0%	14	40.0%
	1.0	10	28.6%	16	45.7%
Type6	0	10	28.6%	12	34.3%
	0.5	12	34.3%	15	42.9%
	1.0	13	37.1%	8	22.9%
Type7	0	4	11.4%	17	48.6%
	0.5	13	37.1%	11	31.4%
	1.0	18	51.4%	7	20.0%
Type8	0	23	65.7%	28	80.0%
	0.5	11	31.4%	7	20.0%
	1.0	1	2.9%	0	0.0%
Type9	0	9	25.7%	16	45.7%
	0.5	11	31.4%	12	34.3%
	1.0	15	42.9%	7	20.0%
Type10	0	19	54.3%	26	74.3%
	0.5	12	34.3%	8	22.9%
	1.0	4	11.4%	1	2.9%

Table 2 shows the distribution of different types of errors corrected by B.A. and M.A. students. In type 1 error and for master students, it indicates that 17 students (48.6% within M.A. group) got 0, while 15 students (42.9%) received 0.5 and 3 students (8.6%) obtained a score of 1 (complete score) for type 1 error. Similarly, for type 1 error and in B.A. group, 21 (60%), 11 (31.4%) and 3 (8.6%) students received 0, 0.5 and 1, respectively.

Table 3. Distribution of miss-recognition of a correct word as an incorrect one by B.A. and M.A. students

Correct words	Score	Group			
		Master		Bachelor	
		N	%	N	%
Word1	0	27	77.1%	24	68.6%
	1	8	22.9%	11	31.4%
Word2	0	30	88.2%	22	62.9%
	1	4	11.8%	13	37.1%
Word3	0	33	94.3%	35	100.0%
	1	2	5.7%	0	0.0%
Word4	0	34	97.1%	34	97.1%
	1	1	2.9%	1	2.9%
Word5	0	33	94.3%	33	94.3%
	1	2	5.7%	2	5.7%
Word6	0	30	85.7%	30	85.7%
	1	5	14.3%	5	14.3%
Word7	0	35	100.0%	33	94.3%
	1	0	0.0%	2	5.7%

Word8	0	33	94.3%	35	100.0%
	1	2	5.7%	0	0.0%
Word9	0	34	97.1%	29	82.9%
	1	1	2.9%	6	17.1%
Word10	0	28	80.0%	29	82.9%
	1	7	20.0%	6	17.1%
Word11	0	33	94.3%	23	65.7%
	1	2	5.7%	12	34.3%
Word12	0	18	51.4%	34	97.1%
	1	17	48.6%	1	2.9%
Word13	0	30	85.7%	33	94.3%
	1	5	14.3%	2	5.7%
Word14	0	33	94.3%	29	82.9%
	1	2	5.7%	6	17.1%
Word15	0	32	91.4%	33	94.3%
	1	3	8.6%	2	5.7%

Table 3 shows the distribution of mistakenly identifying a correct word as an incorrect one by B.A. and M.A. students. For example, for word No. 1, in master students group, 27 students (77.1% within M.A. group) recognized the word as a correct one (0 score), while 8 students (22.9%) mistakenly as an incorrect word (1 score). Similarly, for word 1 and in B.A. group, 24 students (68.6%) recognized the word as a correct one and 11 students (31.4%) as an incorrect one.

Table 4. Statistics for research variables in M.A. and B.A. groups

Variable	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Recognition	Master	3	5.10	1.566	2.5	8.5
	Bachelor	5	0	2	1.0	8.5
Correction	Master	3	4.30	1.430	2.0	7.5
	Bachelor	5	0	8	.5	7.0
Total-score	Master	3	9.40	2.947	4.5	15.5
	Bachelor	5	0	6	1.5	14.0
Miss-Recognition	Master	3	1.74	1.314	0	5
	Bachelor	5	3	1.97	1.361	0

Table 4 presents statistics for research variables including recognition, correction, total score and miss-recognition. It shows that recognition, correction and total scores means were greater in the M.A. group than the B.A. For miss-recognition, the mean score of M.A. group was less than the B.A. which indicates that Master students had fewer mistakes in identifying a correct word as an incorrect.

4.2. Inferential Statistics

To investigate the research questions, the normality of research variables was tested by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test.

Table 5. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of normality for research variables

Variable	Z	Sig.
Recognition	0.096	0.186
Correction	0.099	0.084
Total-score	0.098	0.094
Miss-Recognition	0.186	0.000

Table 5 shows results for the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. Since the statistics were not significant (Sig.>0.05) for recognition, correction and total score, they had normal distribution. In contrast, the test was significant (Sig.<0.05) for miss-recognition which means that its distribution was not normal. So, for the miss-recognition we can only use non-parametric tests.

Question 1: To what extent do English B.A. students master the editing principles based on IAPLL Guidelines?

Hypothesis 1: English B.A. students master the editing principles at the medium level based on IAPLL Guidelines.

To examine this hypothesis, we considered the medium level as 50% of the complete score. Then, we compared the variable mean with this 50% score using the one-sample t-test.

For recognition and correction, fifty percent of the complete score is 5, so we considered the test value to be 5. For the total score (recognition + correction) the complete score is 20, so we considered the test value to be 10.

Table 6. The one-sample t-test for recognition and correction in B.A. group

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Test value = 5			
				Mean Diff.	T	df	Sig.
Recognition	35	4.171	1.9057	0.8286	2.572	34	0.015
Correction	35	3.243	1.6059	1.7571	6.473	34	0.000

-Recognition:

According to Table 6, the mean of recognition in B.A. group (M=4.171) was less than the test value 5. As shown in Table 6, the t-test was significant (Sig.<0.05). Thus the mean of recognition in B.A. group was significantly lower than the medium level (5).

-Correction:

According to Table 6, the mean of correction in B.A. group (M=3.243) was less than the test value 5. As shown in Table 4.6, the t-test was significant (Sig.<0.05). Thus the mean of correction in B.A. group was significantly lower than the medium level (5).

Table 7. The one-sample t-test for total score in B.A. group

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Test value = 10			
				Mean Diff.	T	df	Sig.
Recognition	35	7.414	3.1071	2.5857	4.923	34	0.000

-Total score:

According to Table 4.7, the mean of total score in B.A. group (M=7.414) was less than the test value 10. As shown in Table 7, the t-test was significant (Sig.<0.05). Thus, the mean of total score in B.A. group was significantly lower than the medium level (10).

Question 2: To what extent do English M.A. students master the editing principles based on IAPLL Guidelines?

Hypothesis 2: English M.A. students master the editing principles at the medium level based on IAPLL Guidelines.

To examine this hypothesis, we considered the medium level as 50% of the complete score. Then, we compared the variable mean with this 50% score by the use of the one-sample t-test.

For recognition and correction, fifty percent of the complete score is 5, so we considered the test value to be 5. For the total score (recognition + correction) the complete score is 20, so we considered the test value to be 10.

Table 8. *The one-sample t-test for recognition and correction in M.A. group*

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Test value = 5			Sig.
				Mean Diff.	T	df	
Recognition	3	5.10	1.566	0.100	0.37	3	0.70
Correction	3	4.30	1.430	-	-	3	0.00
	5	0	8	0.7000	2.894	4	7

-Recognition:

According to Table 8, the mean of recognition in M.A. group (M=5.100) was greater than the test value 5. As shown in Table 8, the t-test was not significant (Sig.>0.05). Thus, the mean of recognition in M.A. group was at the medium level (5).

-Correction:

According to Table 8, the mean of correction in M.A. group (M=4.300) was less than the test value 5. As shown in Table 8, the t-test was significant (Sig.<0.05). Thus, the mean of correction in M.A. group was significantly lower than the medium level (5).

Table 9. *The one-sample t-test for total score in M.A. group*

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Test value = 10			Sig.
				Mean Diff.	T	df	
Recognition	35	9.400	2.9476	-	-	34	0.237
				0.6000	1.204		

-Total score:

According to Table 9, the mean of total score in M.A. group (M=9.400) was less than the test value 10. As shown in Table 9, the t-test was not significant (Sig.>0.05). Thus, the mean of total score in M.A. group was at the medium level (10).

Question 3: Is there any difference between English M.A. and B.A. students in recognition of editing errors based on IAPLL Guidelines?

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant difference between English M.A. and B.A. students in recognition of editing errors based on IAPLL Guidelines.

To examine this hypothesis, we compared two groups of M.A. and B.A. students by the independent t-test.

Table 10. *The independent t-test for comparison of recognition between M.A. and B.A. students*

variable	group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	T	df	Sig.
recognition	MA	3	5.1	1.5	0.9	2.2	6	0.0
		5	00	662	286	27	8	29

BA	3	4.1	1.9
5	71	057	

The result of independent sample t-test as presented in Table 4.10 shows that there was a significant difference between the two groups ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that recognition score of M.A. group was significantly greater than B.A. groups.

Question 4: Is there any difference between English M.A. and B.A. students in correction of editing errors based on IAPLL Guidelines?

Hypothesis 4: There is a significant difference between English M.A. and B.A. students in correction of editing errors based on IAPLL Guidelines.

To examine this hypothesis, we compared two groups of M.A. and B.A. students by the independent sample t-test.

Table 11. The independent t-test for comparison of correction between M.A. and B.A. students

variable	group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	T	df	Sig.
correct ion	MA	3	4.3	1.43	1.05	2.9	6	.0
	5	00	08					
	BA	3	3.2	1.60	71	08	8	05
	5	43	59					

The result of independent t-test as presented in Table 4.11 shows that there was a significant difference between the two groups ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that correction score of the M.A. group was significantly greater than the B.A. group.

Question 5: Is there any difference between English M.A. and B.A. students in total score of editing errors based on IAPLL Guidelines?

Hypothesis 5: There is a significant difference between English M.A. and B.A. students in total score of editing errors based on IAPLL Guidelines.

To examine this hypothesis, we compared two groups of M.A. and B.A. students by the independent sample t-test.

Table 12. The independent sample t-test for comparison of total score between M.A. and B.A. students

variable	group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	T	df	Sig.
total score	MA	3	9.4	2.94	1.98	2.7	6	0.0
	5	00	76					
	BA	3	7.4	3.10	57	43	8	08
	5	14	71					

The result of the independent sample t-test as presented in Table 12 shows that there was a significant difference between the two groups ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that the total score of M.A. group was significantly greater than the B.A. group.

5. Discussion and Concluding Remarks

In this section, the research questions are discussed in the context of other works introduced in the literature. But before that one the research questions and also the results obtained during the study are restated for ease of reference.

Q1) To what extent do English B.A. students master the editing principles based on IAPLL Guidelines?

Data analysis showed that the mean of the total score in B.A. group ($M = 7.414$) was less than the test value 10. As shown in Table 4.7, the t-test was significant ($\text{Sig.} < 0.05$). Thus, the mean of the total score in the B.A. group was significantly lower than the medium level (10).

Q2) To what extent do English M.A. students master the editing principles based on IAPLL Guidelines?

According to Table 4.9, the mean of the total score in the M.A. group ($M=9.400$) was less than the test value 10. As shown in Table 4.9, the t-test was not significant ($\text{Sig.}>0.05$). Thus, the mean of the total score in the M.A. group was at the medium level (10).

Q3) Is there any difference between English M.A. and B.A. students in recognition of editing errors based on IAPLL Guidelines?

The result of the independent sample t-test as presented in Table 4.10 shows that there was a significant difference between the two groups ($p<0.05$). This indicates that recognition score of the M.A. group was significantly greater than the B.A. group.

Q4) Is there any difference between English M.A. and B.A. students in correction of editing errors based on IAPLL Guidelines?

The result of the independent sample t-test as presented in Table 4.11 shows that there was a significant difference between the two groups ($p<0.05$). This indicates that correction score of the M.A. group was significantly greater than the B.A. group.

Q5) Is there any difference between English M.A. and B.A. students in total score of editing errors based on IAPLL Guidelines?

The result of the independent sample t-test as presented in Table 4.12 shows that there was a significant difference between the two groups ($p<0.05$). This indicates that the total score of the M.A. group was significantly greater than the B.A. group.

In what follows the findings of the study discussed. A number of researchers observed that language users preferred non-IAPLL rules in certain domains. Accordingly, findings of the present study are in line with findings of Bagheri Haghighi (2014) who investigated 700 English terms and their equivalents as introduced by IAPLL. He found out that most of the engineering community in Iran did not use IAPLL's guidelines. Honarjooyan, (2013) also stated that the rate of application of IAPLL rules by translators and editors was very low, meaning that they almost ignored the terms introduced by IAPLL. Moreover, 62.6% of the users were not familiar with half spacing on their keyboard (lack of background knowledge) which confirms why they did not observe IAPLL rules on spacing.

Findings of this thesis are also in line with Kolahdoozan, Mo'ini, Papi, Asgari and Zolfaghari (2004), Zolfaghari (2007) and Arabzadeh (2013) who worked on sources like theses, journals and personal websites. They showed that lack of knowledge by editors on principles of IAPLL was a major problem. This again emphasizes the role of training in this issue since in universities and formal academic settings marginal attention is paid to the guidelines of IAPLL in finding equivalents and also in typesetting. So, when the translators, editors and students are not well equipped with such skills and knowledge it is axiomatic that they will not be able to follow IAPLL's rules.

Even regarding the quality of IAPLL approved terms, Tasnim News Agency (2016) asserted that IAPLL's equivalents looked so unusual which was why people do not use them in their everyday speech and texts. For example, کَش لقمه for pizza. Further, Daneshgar (2016) asserted that we should start from families to publicize IAPLL terms. In the same vein, Amini (2016) believed that one reason why we have failed to publicize IAPLL guidelines is that we had not considered real language user's attitudes towards language terminology. All these pieces of evidence showed that there is a lot to be done on institutionalization of IAPLL rules in the writings of the scientific community, as well as in the mindset of translators and editors.

The purpose of this research was to assess B.A. and M.A. students of translation's editing ability. The results indicated that students lacked proper editing knowledge due to lack of proper training at the university. This study had a number of pedagogical implications. The first point was that the results of this research could be used by students of translation as well as students of Persian language and literature. Having shown low performance in observing IAPLL guidelines, the students can equip themselves with knowledge on IAPLL rules and guidelines (esp. the IAPLL approved terms). The second implication was for university professors, in general, and instructors of English language translation and Persian language and literature, in particular. Because it appears that even their familiarity with IAPLL approved guidelines was low. University professors and instructors could include in their syllabi some portion on such rules and put more emphasis on such editing guidelines and rules within their classrooms. The third implication was for policy makers in the higher education system. There is a need to embed some portion on IAPLL guidelines in the curricula of courses like translator training, Persian language and literature, etc. The findings in this study were also useful for authors of books. Different authors could choose this topic to compile a book and hence produce some source material besides those delivered by IAPLL to publicize application of IAPLL guidelines by the scientific community. The availability of these sources could help students and also university professors to work harder and more systematically on this topic.

Like any other work the present study had also some limitations. First, because of the time limitation, the researchers worked on a small sample of participant. Certainly, bigger samples could produce better results. Second, gender was not considered in this research as a variable due to dearth of male participants in the population of English translation students. If we had considered both genders, this could have resulted in other findings. Third, from the

scale of level of education only B.A and M.A students were used as participants and A.A. and Ph.D. students were not considered.

Certainly there is no end to research and what was undertaken in this study is not the end. Other researchers may use the findings of the present study as a basis for their further research works. For example, here the researchers focused on B.A. and M.A. students, so other researchers could also include Ph.D. students or other scholars or also universities instructors and then make comparisons between and among these groups. Other researchers could also consider gender as a variable. The researcher worked on senior translation students, other researchers could include freshmen, sophomore and junior students as well. Here, a piece of academic text was dealt with. Other researchers could use other types of texts or even poetry, drama, etc. Other researchers could also collect their data from students of majors other than English translation like chemistry, mechanical Engineering, etc.

References

- Amini, E. (2016). Foreign scientific terms should be replaced by Persian terms approved by IAPLL. Retrieved on February 24, 2019 from <http://www.khabaronline.ir/news/564136>
- Arabzadeh, M. (2013). *Evaluating Persian blogs based on blogging criteria*. In A. Gholifamian (editor), Proceedings of the First Seminar of Persian Language. Tehran: Neveeseh Parsi publications. (in Persian)
- Bagheri Haghighi, H. (2014). A critical analysis of Persian equivalent terms introduced for English engineering terms in Iran (M.A. Thesis, School of Humanities, University of Arak, 2014). Retrieved on Jan. 12, 2019, from <http://ganj-beta.irandoc.ac.ir>
- Bell, R T (1991). *Translation and translating. Theory and practice*. London: Longman, coll.
- Brunette, L. Gagnon, Ch., & Hine, J. (2005). The GKEVIS project: Revise or court calamity. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 6(1), 29-45.
- Catford, J G (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Daneshgar, M. (2016, July, 25). Presence of 10000 foreign words in student's text books. Retrieved on June 14, 2018, from <http://www.tasnimnews.com/fa/news/1395/05/04/1138382>
- Esposito, E. (2018). Translation, editing and proofreading. A must for good translation? Retrieved April 17, 2023 from <http://www.alphatrad.net/translation-editing-and-proofreading-a-must-for-good-translation/>
- Fishman, J. (1996). What do you lose when you lose your language? In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing indigenous languages* (pp.80-91). Flagstaff, AZ: North-ern Arizona University.<http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/miscpubs/stabilize/iii-fami-lies/lose.htm>.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.
- Honarjooyan, Z. (2013). *Investigating the Diversity of Persian Writing Patterns and their impact on the recall of information retrieval*. M.A. Thesis, Shiraz University, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Department of Information Science, Shiraz. (In Persian)
- Iran's Academy of Persian Language and Literature. Retrieved March 12, 2023 from <https://ias.ac.ir/index.php/electronic-services/2015-09-16-15-02-40/2015-09-16-14-18-04/background/351-2016-04-20-22-52-19>.
- Kelly, P. J. (2005). Practical suggestions for community interventions using Participatory action research. *Public Health Nursing*, 22(1), 65-73.
- Kolahdoozan, Mo'ini, Papi, Asgari and Zolfaghari (2004). The study of the conformity of writing behavior of the authors and users in Persian scientific databases to guidelines of the Academy of Persian Language and Literature in terms of writing words continuously, semi-spacely and separately. *Library and Information Science*, 22(3), 164-187.
- Lambert, M. (1998). Supply chain management: Implementation research opportunities: *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, 9(2), 22-34.
- Maier, M. Keenan, D. (1994). Teaching tools: Cooperative learning in economics. *Economics Inquiry, Western Economic Association International*, 32(2), 358-61.
- Mohammadian, T. (2013). The effect of shyness on Iranian EFL's learner language learning motivation and willingness to communicate. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 11, 2036-2045.
- Mossop, B. (2019). *Revising and editing for translators*. London: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd., New York.
- Newmark, P. (1991). About translation. *Multilingual matters, Hertfordshire. Open Access Library Journal*, 9, 241-255.
- Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL Writing Quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 83-93.
- Roussey, J-Y, & Piolat, A. (2008). Critical effort during text revision. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*. Retrieved Jan. 2022 from <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=cfd5e70-c201-4465-a5ac-154cd8ceee0e%40sessionmgr104&vid=2&hid=103>. ISSN 15351556.
- Shih, C. Y. (2006). Revision from translators point of view: An interview study. *Target*, 18(2), 295-312.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). Language policy. Cambridge University Policy. *Open Access library Journal*, 3(2), 168-180.

Tasnim News Agency. <https://www.tasnimnews.com/en>

Thaon, B. M., & Horguelin, P. A. (1980). *A practical guide to bilingual revision*. Linguattech Publishing.

West, L. J. (1983). Review of Research on proofreading. *The Journal of Business Education*, 58(8), 284-288.

Zare, SH., & Falahati Qadimi Fumani, M. R. (2020). An investigation into the application of IAPLL approved term by Iramian B.A. English translator training students. *ALR Journal*, 4(8), 169-179.

Zolfaghari, H. (2007). Pathology of the Press Language. *Media journal*. 1(18), 42-9. (In Persian).

Appendix:

Error Recognition and Correction Questionnaire

به نام خدا

*. دانشجوی گرامی، متن زیر برای انجام یک پایان‌نامه کارشناسی ارشد در رشته مترجمی زبان انگلیسی تهیه شده و هدف آن سنجش میزان مهارت دانشجویان کارشناسی و کارشناسی ارشد مترجمی زبان انگلیسی با اصول ویراستاری مطابق مصوبات فرهنگستان علوم است. لطفاً متن را مطالعه کرده زیر کلماتی که نگارش آنها دارای خطای احتمالی می باشد خط کشیده سپس صورت درست هر کلمه را شفاف زیر آن بنویسید. همچنین این ویرایش باید تمام آن نکاتی را که در مصوبات خط فرهنگستان علوم آمده شامل شود. تشخیص این نکات به عهده شما دانشجوی گرامی است. احتمال اینکه در متن خطایی وجود نداشته باشد، هست.

** در صورت نیاز برای نشان دادن فاصله کامل بین اجزای یک کلمه از علامت + استفاده کنید. برای نیم فاصله هم از علامت # بین دو جزء استفاده نمایید. برای مثال برای کلمه خطای «کتابخانه» اگر فرض کنید «کتابخانه» درست است می توانید از صورت «کتاب#خانه» استفاده کنید و اگر فرض کنید صورت درست این کلمه «کتاب خانه» است می توانید از صورت «کتاب+خانه» استفاده کنید.

*** ضمناً در این متن علائم نشانه گذاری مورد نظر نبوده است.

مقطع تحصیلی: کارشناسی/کارشناسی ارشد جنسیت:

تاریخ:

بکت (Becket) محقق برجسته و تراز اول جهان در طول عمر خود کتابهای مختلفی را در مورد فرمالیستها و روابط علی نوشت که نسبتاً کتاب‌هایی بنیادین هستند. او غم‌خوار بینوایان بود و در طول عمر خود دو بار از امپراتور جایزه گرفت. او حتی در مورد دیرمقان هم تالیفی را به دنیای علم معرفی کرده است. در کتاب مشاهیر جهان دو صفحه به او اختصاص داده شده است. برخی اعتقاد دارند که او ظاهراً با زبان‌های زیادی آشنایی داشته و همین نکته باعث تنوع نوشته های او شده است. این که او چگونه توانسته در زمانی کوتاه این تعداد کتاب را بنگارد جای بحث دارد و در این جا فرصت پرداختن به آن نیست. او در طول عمر خود بیش از بیست سال در منصب رییس کار کرد. چیزی که بیش از هر چیزی جلب توجه میکند تنوع موضوعاتی است که او بر روی آنها کار کرده است. برخی می گویند او بیش تر دوست داشت تنها و بدون دخالت دادن هم‌کار، کتاب خود را بنویسد و درست به همین دلیل کم‌تر با مردم کوچک و بازار در تعامل بود.