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Abstract
Translation like any concept in humanities is a controversial notion which defies definition. Examples include the concept of cultural translation introduced by Homi Bhabha, the cultural translation known in British Social Anthropology, the term translation in casual American English, and the one referred to in source-oriented and target-oriented translation studies. This phenomenological descriptive study intends to shed light on the perception of translation and some of its related notions construed by the prospective Iranian translators. The used sample comprises of sixty-six Iranian MA and PhD students of English translation at three Iranian universities. The results demonstrate that the understanding of some dimensions of the notion of translation is apparently more straightforward than their internationally discussed definitions in the literature. The study mainly focuses to seek students’ interpretation in terms of ethics of translation, translation and manipulation, translator in the society, and translator-translation relation.
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1. Introduction
Translation is a social and purposeful activity in which the translators always deal with numerous challenges. Some of these challenges relate to ethical issues; that is, translators always have to observe a myriad of moral issues while translating, such as fidelity and faithfulness to the source text as well as the author of the original text due for translation which has been for a long time the commitments of the translator. The ethical rules, however, are fairly shady, and translators at often times are relatively perplexed of what to do.

It is assumed that the variety of translation theories and their implications for ethical and professional conduct of the translator of the time can have a confusing effect of the trainee and fledgling translators. This study aimed at investigating the perceptions and understanding of the graduate translation students at a number of Iranian universities in terms of how they construe a number of main translational concepts using a less direct way of data collection, namely, metaphor analysis.

The research for the current design, using this method of data collection was to reach as deep as possible beyond the doctored and forged superficial, pure theory-infected layers which clouds the actual perception of the students of the concepts. In the following, initially, a background of basic notions in modern translation studies is reviewed and then to address the research questions of the study, the data collected in the form of translational metaphors are discussed and analyzed.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Translators, Intervention, Ethics

Translation, like other disciplines deals with ethics. It means that translators should observe ethical points and moral boundaries while engaged in any type of translatorial activity. But the problem is that these ethical lines are not as lucid and clear as one expects, and translators are always confused of what to do. As ethics in translation is unclear, there are just few scholars who have addressed the problem.

Chesterman (1997a, 1997b) regards norms of translation in relation to professional ethics. He contends that translation calls for the creation of a truthful resemblance between the original and the translated text, preservation of trust between the parties involved in the translation and minimization of misunderstanding. Chesterman (2001) also proposes that translators and interpreters need to be required to take to a Hieronymic oath.

Pym has addressed numerous ethical aspects of translation (1992, 2002, 2004, 2010). He believes that ethics is concerned mainly with what individuals do in concrete
situations, and the proposed moralities are but abstract principles which are secondary in such situations. To him, as translation is cross-cultural transaction, the translator should attempt to achieve mutual benefit and trust of the two parties involved in the cooperation.

In terms of ethics of translation on a larger scale, Venuti (2008) advocates Berman (1992) and suggests ‘minoritizing’ or ‘foreignizing’ translation. Spivak (2004, 2005) also encourages the translator to go beyond transferring content and to submit themselves to the original and use a literal (English) translation language.

According to Mossop (1983), the translator can be regarded as re-enunciator. In this view, the translator does not just redirect pre-existing messages; they re-voice the new text, intervene, and also change (Munday, 2012). From different moral perspective, Kingscott (1990, p. 84, cited in Pym, 2010) contends that the translator in terms of professional ethics resemble a legal counselor. The translator or interpreter, when he or she is translating and interpreting, is in the same position as an advocate. An advocate, during the course of his career, may occasionally appear on behalf of an unfortunate victim, but it is more than likely that his client will be a double-dyed villain who would make him shudder with disgust if he had not learnt to take an attitude of professional detachment. Our clients rely on us to put their case, in the foreign language, as they would like to see it put, not as we would like to see it put.

To Ladmiral (1979, p.15, cited in Pym, 2010) the moral responsibility of the translator and as a result a translation is to serve a particular purpose; “the purpose of a translation is to enable us to go without reading the original text.” Venuti (2008) ethically rejects fluency in the translated text because it erases the otherness of the source text. Likewise, the strategy of naturalness or fluency in the translation language makes the translator invisible.

The summary of the code of ethics for the translator to observe according to the Association des Traducteurs Litteraires des France (ATLF), 1988 are the following (Pym, 2010, pp. 167-168):

A translator:

1. Must have adequate linguistic competence.
2. Must have knowledge of the pertinent subject matter.
3. Must refuse to translate from a TT unless with the consent of the author.
4. May only alter a text with the author’s consent.
5. Have the right to accept or refuse a translation.
6. May demand the documents necessary for the translation.
7. Must respect professional secrets.
8. Must translate personally and ensure that their name appears on TT.
9. In the case of co-translation, the names of all the translators must appear on TT.
10. Must demand the same conditions if co-translating.
11. Must refuse work detrimental to a fellow translator.
12. Must not accept work conditions inferior to those established by the profession.

Pym (2010) criticizes that despite the clear priority given to the author over the translator no guarantee of equivalence is even conceivable. Another code of ethics has been provided by the National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters Ltd. (NAATI). According to this code of ethics, translators or interpreters should:

1. Respect their clients’ right to privacy and confidentiality.
2. Disclose any real or perceived conflicts of interest.
3. Decline to undertake work beyond their competence or accreditation levels.
4. Relay information accurately and impartially between parties.
5. Maintain professional detachment and refrain from inappropriate self-promotion.
6. Guard against misuse of inside information for personal gain.

2.2 Translation Dichotomies
A myriad of dichotomies of translation approaches and strategies have been proposed in the past few decades. To Vinay and Darbelnet (1995), there are two methods of translation: direct and oblique translation, which closely resemble the infamous literal versus free translation, respectively. Newmark (1981) suggests semantic and communicative translation. Nida’s formal and dynamic translations are another of the widely recognized dichotomies (Nida & Taber, 1969). House (1997) discusses overt and covert translation. Similarly, Nord (2005a) classifies documentary versus instrumental translation. Following Schleiermacher’s (2004) alienating and naturalizing methods of translation, Venuti (2008) suggests foreignization and domestication translation methods. The methods among numerous others lie within the usual two extremes of source-orientedness and target-orientedness, and the proposing scholars have usually favored one side. For example, Schleiermacher’s preferred strategy was alienating. Toury (1995) is the forerunner of the scholars with a target-oriented position. Dryden (1992 cited in Munday, 2012) also belittled the word for word translation which he called metaphrase.

Lefevere (1992) regards translation as rewriting, while the translator can even improve the source text. On the other hand, others found it imperative for the translator to be loyal to the source text, like Kelly (1979) who advocates fidelity as being faithful to the source text meaning. Cicero and also Horace emphasized producing an aesthetically pleasing and creative text in the target language and as such they disapproved of the word for word translation, since it would not result in a beautifully designed text (Munday, 2012). Likewise,
Jerome assimilates transferring the ST meaning to the TT, to a prisoner who is marched into the TL by its conqueror (Munday, 2012).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The present study is based on a cross-sectional, phenomenological design (Lunenburg & Irby, 2007). This descriptive study draws on metaphor analysis to tap into the cognition of the participants in a less hindered and filtered way. Metaphor analysis as a method of research in psychology and applied linguistics has been used for a long time. Yet the advantages of this method seem not to have been benefited in translation research. Metaphors are a considerable way of making sense of the world by constructing analogies and making connections between older ideas. Metaphors are also an important way of using language to explain conceptual and abstract ideas or get feelings across (Cameron & Maslen, 2010). As metaphors entail the projection of the metaphor source domain onto the metaphor target domain (Moser, 2000), they facilitate the understanding of a more complicated subject in terms of a simpler one. Metaphors can convert the complex structure of qualitative research findings to more comprehensible patterns (Schmitt, 2005). “The multifaceted properties of metaphors allow for the study of micro-interactions between cognition and culture in open and qualitative research designs” (Moser, 2000, p. 87).

3.2 Participants

Using purposive sampling, over 80 graduate English translation students were invited to participate in the study to complete a 14-item questionnaire, and in the end 66 completed questionnaires were obtained. The participants, as can be seen in table 1, were graduate students in translation studies (English) at Imam Reza University, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, and Ferdowsi University of Mashhad (Main and International Campus). The Iranian male and mostly female participants were native of Persian language and in their early or mid-twenties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imam Reza University</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Campus</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Main Campus</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Main Campus</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Participants in the Study based on Place of Education in Iran
3.3 Instrument
The study used a 14-item questionnaire which was originally designed and applied for data collection. Each item comprised of an incomplete statement which indicates to a translational concept or relation. The statements are followed by a series of five options the first four of which could be chosen by participants as a metaphor which closely or remotely shares a point of similarity with the concept or relation stated in the item’s statement. The fifth option is none, in order to give the liberty to the participants not to have to choose any of the first four options. The fifth option served as disclaimer that the participants did find a commonality between the translational concepts in the statements and the selected metaphors and they did have the possibility to choose none.

After the researchers selected several key translation-related concepts and relations from the literature and their intuitions, four possible metaphors for each were chosen and the items and their corresponding options were subjected to the comments and revisions of a number of scholars in translation and intercultural studies. The comments and suggestions were reviewed and several revisions and rewritings were applied. In a pilot stage, a number of potential participants were asked to review the items of the questionnaire and after choosing the most appropriate answer in their opinion, justify their answers and write a brief commentary about the item of their choice as well as the other options. The purpose of this stage was to make sure that the items and the options are readable, reasonable, and comprehensible to the target population of the study. The recent stages resulted in further revision of some of the options.

3.4 Procedures
After the construction of the initial version of the questionnaire, it was subjected to the comments and revisions of a number of potential participants and translation studies scholars to establish face and content validity. Later, a cluster of PhD students and four clusters of MA students in translation studies from three universities in Iran were selected and invited to complete final revised version of the questionnaire. After explaining the task and giving an example other than the items of the instrument, they were given as much time as they needed. By the end of data collection procedure, sixty-six completed questionnaires were achieved and used for analysis. For the ease of discussion, the percentages were rounded up, when necessary. The frequency and percentage of the answers to the questionnaire items were calculated and reported. To address the research question, the highest and the lowest rated answers to each question was marked. To establish response validity of the answers given qualitatively (Dörnyei, 2007), a number of participants were invited for an interview in terms
of their understating of the questionnaire items and selected answers. Eventually, the implications of the answers of the participants were discussed in the light of the earlier seminal theoretical insights from the translation research literature.

4. Presentation and Analysis of the Data
In the following, the results of the study are presented and discussed. Initially, the items are thematically divided into four categories under which each item and the percentage of the ratings for the options are reported. Next, the implications of the participants’ most and least frequent responses are discussed in consideration of the seminal translation theories in the literature.

4.1 Translator to Translation
Q1- The relation of the translator to the translation is like that of …. a) A doctor to a patient (12%), b) An employer to an employee (3%), c) An architect to a building (46%) d) A photographer to a photo (30%), e) None (9%)

As for the first item, over 46% of the students consider the relation of the translator to the translation like that of an architect to a building. In follow up interviews to establish response validity, the participants’ understanding of an architect’s job and the point of similarity between the architect and the translator was asked. The participants in different ways indicated to the fact that an architect designs a building based on an intended function and purpose and considers aesthetics and practically in their design to fit the location of the building, and so does a translator. A translator also designs the translated text based on a function and gives it a proper form to be acceptably natural sounding, functional, and pleasing. This view of the participants to translation reminds of the opinions of scholars like Cicero and Horace who would emphasize on producing an aesthetically pleasing and creative text in the target language (Munday, 2012), as well as the instructions of functional translation theorists like Nord (2005b) who stressed on the functionality of the translated text based on a pre-determined goal and purpose sought in the target culture.

On the other hand, just 3% of these students believe that the relation of the translator to the translation is like that of an employer to an employee. In this kind of relationship, the employer is dominant over the employee and has the possibility to exert power and interventions, indicating that regarding translation, the translator possesses the ability of intervening and manipulating to fairly extended scope. It brings the Jerome’s military image—the original text, a prisoner being marched into the TL by its conqueror—explaining
the concept of transferring the ST meaning to the TT, and says it is like (Robinson 1997, p. 26, cited in Munday, 2012). Thus, as the very low percentage suggests, this is not a prevalent understanding among the participants.

Q5- The relation of the translator to the translation is like that of …. a) An author to their book (40%), b) A father to his child (21%), c) God to the Holy Book (2%), d) A language editor to their assigned book (15%), e) None (22%)

As for the fifth item, over 40% of the participants consider the relation of the translator to the translation like that of an author to their own original book. It can be understood that the participants consider original authority for the translator in terms of the text they have at hand. To them, like what Lefevere (1992) regarded, translation is creative improvement and re-writing to promote the work to the highest deserving level. To them, translator is as rightful and caring for the text as the original author of the work. Just around 2% of the participants consider the relation of the translator to the translation like that of God to the Holy Book. It seems that few consider an absolute yet learned power for the translator as God has on the Holy Book which is His own word. Yet, the idea is shared with too few of the participants.

Q6- The relation of the translator to the translation is like that of …. a) A wolf to a sheep (2%), b) A dog to a cat (2%), c) A cat to a rat (17%), d) A shepherd dog to a sheep (43%), e) None (36%)

As for the sixth item, over 43% of the students consider the relation of the translator to the translation like that of a shepherd dog to a sheep. As a shepherd dog can and takes care of the sheep, a translator by directing and redirecting the message takes care of it and makes sure that it is not lost. This choice of nearly half of the participants represent their perspectives to translator-translation relation in which the translator may and will change paths in the course of translation, but they aim at reaching the proper destination. Nearly 2% of the answers consider the relation of the translator to the translation like that of a wolf to a sheep, indicating to possible destructive force of the translator over the translation.

Q10- The relation of the translator to the translation is like that of a … to a film. Critic (14%), b) Actor (20%), c) Audience (9%), d) Director (54%), e) None (3%)

As for the tenth item, 54% of the participants considered the relation of the translator to the translation like that of a director to a film. It seems that to over half of the participants, as a director controls every aspects of the course of film production; the translator also handles different dimensions of the process of translation production. The director intervenes in the script and alters it according to one’s own vision of the work, and so does the
translator. The translator intervenes in the translation to produce a fluent target text. Venuti (2008) refers to the invisibility of the translator as the tendency of the translators to intervene and change in the text to translate fluently and in order to produce the most reader-friendly target text. In some ways, such modifications in the translation resemble what House (1997) advocates, as she determines two types of approaches to translation: overt versus covert translation. Covert translation is a translation that is fluent and has the status of the original text in the target culture—like a well-received movie by the public audience, thanks to the director in particular. Nearly 3% of the participants cannot find a relevant metaphor among the options.

Q11- The relation of the translator to the source text is like that of … a) Scissors to a piece of paper (6%), b) An eraser to a piece of writing (10%) c) A stone to a piece of glass (7%), d) A camera to a picture (60%), e) none (17%)

As for the eleventh item, around 60% of these students consider the relation of the translator to the source text like that of a camera to a picture. It seems most of the participants see that a translator transfers every aspects of the ST like a camera to the picture, yet the angle and framing chosen to accommodate the picture can differ from one photographer to another. So still using the same camera and the same scene, different pictures may be resulted. Therefore, as the picture is a document of the source scene, a translation is a document of the source message and yet it is one of the several possible ones. This reminds us of the documentary translation of Nord (2005a) which “serves as a document of a source culture communication between the author and the ST recipient” (p. 80). Just 6% of these participants consider the relation of the translator to the ST like that of a pair of scissors to the paper. They seem to think that as the scissors cuts out a desired piece out of a piece of paper, the translator also takes a preferred portion of the ST. Yet, as the ratings show, this is not a prevalent understanding among the sample of the students.

4.2 Ethics in Translation

Q2- Ethics in translation is more like …. a) Driving regulations (28%), b) Divine revelations (3%), c) Laws of Physics (6%), d) Friends’ promises (44%), e) None (19%)

As for the second item, around 44% of the students consider ethics in translation like friends’ promises. This understanding of the ethics in translation shows the significance of translational ethics as a sacred bond between true friends yet possible to bend at certain dilemmas as it happened between friends. It is implied that ethics in translation is not as critical as divine revelations, nor unexceptional as laws of physics. It also seems to indicate that ethical issues in translation are not fixed and differ in various circumstances. As in
friendship relations people determine the rules and these rules are somehow changeable, ethical issues in translation are variable and assigned by translators themselves. Similarly the ethical codes specified by the National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters Ltd. (NAATI) are not indicated as hard-and-fast musts, and NAATI does not prescribe the codes of ethics for the profession. The organization merely wishes that all translators are conscious of these points and consider them (Pym. 2010). Nearly 3% of the participants surprisingly consider ethics in translation as important as divine revelation and holy rules. In their opinions, the ethical issues must not be violated and the translator must observe them throughout their translatorial profession. Yet, as unlikely as this interpretation of translation ethics seems, it is not a prevalent thought among the participants.

Q3- The translator who observes the ethical issues is more like … a) A sportsman (12%), b) A loyal friend (30%), c) A fair salesperson (22%), d) A wise man (27%), e) None (9%)

As for the third item, 30% of the participants view the ethical translator as a loyal friend. They believe that as a good friend is loyal to their friend, the translator also should be loyal to the original author and the source text. To the participants, friendship is not legally binding, yet a friend chooses to think of the best interest of one’s friend; in the same way, even though a translator has the possibility of exercising interventions and changes, they are not after that and they try to stay as close to the source text meaning as possible. This view recalls the ideas of Kelly (1979) on the concept of fidelity as being faithful to the source text meaning among other scholars with similar ST equivalence-based beliefs (e.g., Newmark, 1981; Nida & Taber, 1969). However, there has been a close distribution of the answer among all the options, and close ratings can be noticed for other options, like translator as a wise man or a fair salesperson.

Q7- The importance of ethical issues in translation is like that of … a) Medicine for a patient (32%), b) A pen for a writer (33%), c) A shovel for a construction worker (3%), d) A ball for a soccer player (8%), e) None (24%)

As for the seventh item, over 33% of the students consider the importance of ethical issues in translation like the importance of a pen for a writer. They seem to assume that as a pen is a prerequisite for a writer, ethical considerations are also necessary for the translator. They think of ethics as the basic tool for proper creation. On the other hand, almost 3% of the students consider the importance of ethical issues in translation like that of a shovel for a worker, without which worker cannot work. The highest and lowest rated metaphorical equivalents seem to share a lot, yet the two differ in term of creativity of the tools in question,
and the choice of the participants show their recognition of the element of creativity and ingenuity in translation.

4.3 Manipulation in Translation

Q4- Manipulation in translation is like …. a) Theft (12%), b) Giving a hard sell (30%), c) Selling defective goods (15%), d) Redecoration (34%), e) None (9%)

As for the fourth item, 34% of the participants consider manipulation in translation simply like redecoration. In this opinion, manipulation of the ST is not a destructive act. As a decorator adds, removes, and moves around to embellish a scene and improve the beauty, the translator also promotes the ST message and re-presents it in a better and more intriguing format. This idea reminds one of the notion advocated by Mossop (1983) that the translator is re-enunciator. In this view, translators do not just redirect pre-existing messages, but they give new voice to the new text, intervene, and change it, as they should, to promote. The view also reminds us of the opinions of scholars like Cicero and Horace who would emphasize on producing an aesthetically pleasing and creative text in the target language (Munday, 2012). Around 9% of the students agree with none of the options, and they do not consider manipulation of the ST neither as theft, giving a hard sell, selling defective goods, nor redecoration. Again, the answers to this item are also widely dispersed, and no single view is particularly held by the majority.

Q8- Changing the ST meaning by the translator is like what a … does. a) Hair stylist (33%), b) Cook (14%), c) Forger (29%), d) Painter (21%), e) None (3%)

As for the eighth item, about 33% of these students consider changing of the ST message by the translator like the work of a hair stylist. As a hair stylist improves the appearance of an individual, the translator also adorns and improves the original text by certain modifications. This view is to some extend reminiscent of the view of Kingscott (1990, cited in Pym, 2010) who considers the translator as an advocate who is employed to improve a given text on behalf of the victim/client. Approximately, 3% of the students agree with none of the available options, and they do not consider manipulation of the ST as the work of a hair stylist, a cook, a forger, or a painter.

Q12- Free translation is more like …. a) Photoshopping (30%), b) Flying (48%), c) Captivity (0%), d) Walking (16%), e) None (6%)

As for the twelfth item, around 48% of sample seems to believe that free translation is more like flying in that the translator does not limit themselves to the source text and expands and extends to any sides they see fit in a limitless way.
Q13- Literal translation is more like looking … . a) In the mirror (42%), b) At water (21%), c) At a piece of glass (6%), d) At a wall (19%), e) none (12%)

As for the thirteenth item, around 42% of these students believe that literal translation is more like looking in the mirror. It seems that as the mirror shows every detail without any change, this type of translation also attempts to reflect every detail of the ST without any change, addition, or deletion, just like what Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) would refer to as direct translation. Just about 6% of these students consider the literal translation as looking in a piece of glass. It seems that they think as a piece of glass shows a vague image; this type of translation also shows a vague and unclear image of the ST.

4.4 Translator and Society

Q9- The responsibility of the translator to the society is like that of a …. a) President to the society (8%), b) Guard to the border (30%), c) Teacher to a class (42%), d) Policeman to the public (6%), e) None (14%)

As for the ninth item, over 42% of the students believe that the responsibility of a translator to the society is like that of a teacher to a class. It is understood by nearly half of the participants that a translator, like a teacher who is responsible for the development and upbringing of the students, is responsible for the development of a given message in text. The implication of the response is partly reminiscent of Toury’s (1995) law of interference and his consideration that the interference from the ST to the TT is a kind of default. Just 6% of these participants consider the responsibility of a translator to the society like that of a policeman to the people. It is implied that as a policeman defends the people from harms, a translator also has the responsibility of defying harm to the message in translation, but that is not as can be seen a prevalent thought.

14- The relation of the translation to the social norms is like that of …. a) Nuts and bolts (55%), b) Thread and needle (9%), c) Wrench and screwdriver (22%), d) Nail and hammer (11%), e) None (3%)

As for the fourteenth item, around 55% of the responses choose the metaphor of nuts and bolts for the relation of translation and norms. Toury (1995) defines translation norms, as “the general values or ideas shared by a community—asto what is right or wrong, adequate or inadequate—intoperformance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations” (p. 55). In the follow-up interviews for the purpose of establishing response validity, the representing participants generally in different ways indicated that if the bolt fits the grooves of the nut, the two will secure tightly. Similarly, if a translator follows the
product or expectancy norms (Chesterman, 1997a), the social expectations, the outcome will result in success.

5. Conclusion

The paper has used metaphor analysis as the method of data collection, which has an advantage over the more direct ways of data collection in terms of obtaining data which are less filtered and self-censored. This advantage assumes more significance as self-report questionnaires are most suited for the Western society which self-expression and individualistic opinions are more easily expressed and declared. However, the Iranian public is more reserved and conservative and indirect ways of expressing opinion are thought to work better.

The present qualitative study uses a fairly small sample of sixty-six participants of graduate translation students in Iranian universities, prospective English translators and future intercultural mediators. It is of critical value to realize their understanding of the concept of translation, as a social and cultural activity as well as their realization of the main related notions like ethics and interventions. The results indicated that the ethics of intervention, despite their fuzzy and controversial nature, in translation is fairly straight-forward and figured out for the sample of the students, as they consider it allowed and ethically acceptable as long as the manipulation is for a justified reason, and the intervention aims to improve the language of the target text.

The translation for the participants is understood as a social activity which is based on rules that are common social agreements rather than fixed principles and can be bent if justified in terms of the intended function. The translator is construed as a social actor which is expected to enlighten and guide and is most successful if conform to the norms and implied expectations of the society. Translation is also understood as a creative activity which should aim at improving the original text aesthetically and functionally.

Considering the qualitative nature of the research and as such the small non-random sample employed, the study cannot and does not intend to generalize the findings. However, as any qualitative description, the study provided insights which can shed light on the current interpretation of the future Iranian translators and the way they construe the relevant notions like morality and intervention.
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Appendix

Translation Metaphors Questionnaire

1- The relation of the translator to the translation is like that of ….
   a) A doctor to a patient
   b) An employer to an employee
   c) An architect to a building
   d) A photographer to a photo
   e) None

2- Ethics in translation is more like ….  
   a) Driving regulations
   b) Divine revelations
   c) Laws of Physics
   d) Friends’ promises
   e) None

8- Changing the ST meaning by the translator is like what a … does.
   a) Hair stylist
   b) Cook
   c) Forger
   d) Painter
   e) None

9- The responsibility of the translator to the society is like that of a ….
   a) President to the society
   b) Guard to the border
   c) Teacher to a class
   d) Policeman to the public
   e) None
3- The translator who observes the ethical issues is more like …
   a) A sportsman
   b) A loyal friend
   c) A fair salesperson
   d) A wise man
   e) None

10- The relation of the translator to the translation is like that of a … to the film.
   a) Critic
   b) Actor
   c) Audience
   d) Director
   e) None

4- Manipulation in translation is like …
   a) Theft
   b) Giving a hard sell
   c) Selling defective goods
   d) Redecoration
   e) None

11- The relation of the translator to the source text is like that of …. 
   a) Scissors to a piece of paper
   b) An eraser to a piece of writing
   c) A stone to a piece of glass
   d) A camera to a picture
   e) None

5- The relation of the translator to the translation is like that of …. 
   a) An author to their book
   b) A father to his child
   c) God to the Holy Book
   d) A language editor to their assigned book
   e) None

12- Free translation is more like …. 
   a) Photoshoping
   b) Flying
   c) Captivity
   d) Walking
   e) None

6- The relation of the translator to the translation is like that of …. 
   a) A wolf to a sheep
   b) A dog to a cat
   c) A cat to a rat
   d) A shepherd dog to a sheep
   e) None

13- Literal translation is more like looking …. 
   a) In the mirror
   b) At water
   c) At a piece of glass
   d) At a wall
   e) None

7- The importance of ethical issues in translation is like that of …. 
   a) Medicine for a patient
   b) A pen for a writer
   c) A shovel for a construction worker
   d) A ball for a soccer player
   e) None

14- The relation of the translation to the social norms is like that of …. 
   a) Nuts and bolts
   b) Thread and needle
   c) Wrench and screwdriver
   d) Nail and hammer
   e) None