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Abstract - The present study investigates the probable relationship of Literary Intelligence (LI) and Literary Translation (LT) on English non-translation students. The purpose of the research is to see if LI is so strong for them having not taken translation courses to affect the quality of their LT, as they have proved their positive relationship in English translation students based on recent research. 105 Iranian English literature and teaching students participated in this research and were given the LI questionnaire and a literary text to translate from English into Persian. Their translations were rated by two university instructors according to Waddington Translation Assessment Model C. After performing Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for the normality of the data, Pearson Correlation Test was run and the results showed a lack of any significant relationship between LI and LT in English non-translation students. The result affirmed that for LT, LI is not a determining factor and translation knowledge cannot be overlooked.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Translation is an abstract task that nobody knows who may be successful in before beginning it. For translation profession, we need a scale to predict capable students who are good future literary translators. Also, the lack of a special device to measure psychometric aspects of the required probable skill of the prospective translators is felt. Innate or acquired, which is outside the scope of this study, based on the previous surveys that literary intelligence (LI) does exist in some people may or may not discovered.

For LI and literary translation (LT), most previous researches have demonstrated their connection on translation students, but no research has been conducted on non-translation students to see if it is powerful to help other students having not enough translation knowledge to cope with literary text’s translation.

According to Dornyei (2005) intelligence, like aptitude, is another synonym for ability, but it refers to a general sort of aptitude that is not limited to specific performance area but transferable to many sorts of performance. As LI varies among individuals, it describes the commonalities of the various abilities; translation is one of such abilities the achievement of which may differ among students.

In LT courses, some students of English seem unsuccessful despite being skillful in other types of translation. One reason may be referred to a new known intelligence called literary
intelligence. A few English students could translate a poem to a poem, a particular style and a specific genre to the same style and genre while others reject such delicate tasks or if they accept, they change a poem to a prose, a particular style and specific genre to another style and genre. Is it related to the lack of LI or other reasons may cause it while they have the LI but are not aware of it?

Before taking a LT course, a student hesitates whether s/he could succeed in it. An LI questionnaire designed by Rostami (2012) which is explained later in this paper, could be a good predictive device to introduce probable literary translators, as it confirmed its reliability and validity and its relationship with translation quality. If such a relationship is found in non-translation students by this study, the questionnaire would reinforce its efficiency as a scale to anticipate whether non-translation students who wish to start LT as a profession would be successful or not.

The survey is, in fact, to take another look at translation and draw attentions to its psychological aspects rather than evaluating only the text. It is to introduce a scale that can be used before LT courses at universities and profession to give students an opportunity for discovering their ability in both literature and LT.

A. Research Question & Hypothesis

Thus, to meet the aforementioned purposes, the following research question is proposed: *Is there any significant relationship between the LI and LT quality of non-translation students?*

Based on the proposed research question, the following research hypothesis is formulated: *There isn’t any significant relationship between the LI and LT quality of non-translation students.*

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Literary Translation

LT may be affected by some factors like translator’s literary sense or his flair, but according to Lefevere (1992; as cited in Landers, 2001), two factors basically determine the image of an LT. These two factors, in order of importance are the translator’s ideology and the poetics dominant in the receiving literature at the time the translation is made. The prime helps the translator to find solutions to problems concerned with both the “universe of discourse” in the original text such as concepts and customs belonging to the world that was familiar to the writer of the original, and the language of the original text itself. Another factor including the literature rules, concepts and acceptability of cultural elements such as words constrains a translator. If s/he takes advantage of LI, which was introduced later and is dealt with in the current study, a translator will be successful, since LI can be categorized in both factors.

B. Intelligence

Intelligence was firstly measured and formed in a test in 1904. Intelligence tests were being developed and widespread after decades to the present objective intelligence test which is called IQ (Intelligence Quotient). Later on, Gardner (1983) introduced seven basic intelligences
which have been already developed to nine since 1999 known as Multiple Intelligences (MI). MI extended the border of intelligence beyond the IQ score, which was qualified through the practice of taking a person out of his natural learning environment and asking him to do tasks he had never done before. Instead, he proposed intelligence something more than solving problems and fashioning products in a content-rich and naturalistic setting (Armstrong, 2000).

**MI and LT.** Multiple Intelligences introduced by Gardner encompass naturalist, musical, logical-mathematical, existential, interpersonal, intrapersonal, bodily-kinesthetic, spatial and linguistic intelligences. Although his model sounds comprehensive and creates a wider concept of intelligence, it could be criticized for very detailed and normal behaviors of one’s life it includes. For example, the naturalist intelligence which he introduces relates to knowledge of the nature that one can discover it by study. If such an issue could be titled as intelligence, there would be hundreds kinds of intelligence; as many other researchers have proposed its other kinds which are according to Armstrong (2000) spirituality, moral, sensibility, humor, intuition, creativity, culinary (cooking ability), olfactory perception (sense of smell), an ability to synthesize the other intelligences, mechanical ability and maybe sexual intelligence in the future, not mentioned by him, as well as the subject of this study literary intelligence. Moreover, since the intelligences identified here could overlap and affect each other, one could underlie and encapsulate the other and hence they (i.e. the affected abilities) are not intelligence itself. For instance, if one had a high existential intelligence and knew well where he’d organized from and where he would go, his behavior would be developed by that belief and he would be morally and interpersonally intelligent. Of course, Gardner has identified a number of basic criteria for a mental ability to be categorized as intelligence, but intelligences’ overlaps and unity need to be distinguished and the possibility of existing very few types of intelligence (like IQ and EQ, Emotional Quotient) which comprise and control other abilities considered.

With the notion of Gardner’s MIs, a research by Abaszadeh (2012) found LT is correlated with verbal-linguistic and interpersonal and not with other MIs including naturalist, musical, logical-mathematical, existential, bodily-kinesthetic, intrapersonal and spatial. In this study MIs are compared with literary and non-literary translation that unlike literary, non-literary translation has no relationship with MI subscales. Based on regression analysis of the research interpersonal and musical-rhythmic intelligences could predict the accuracy of translation. Accordingly, interpersonal intelligence predicts the accuracy level positively, but musical-rhythmic predicts it negatively. The naturalness of translation is predictable by verbal-linguistic and visual-spatial intelligences. By that verbal-linguistic intelligence can predict the naturalness positively while visual-spatial can do it negatively. In regard to the task completion level of translation, the result shows the positive prediction of it and interpersonal and negative prediction of it and visual-spatial intelligences.

**C. Literary Intelligence and Literary Translation**

A research by Saboormaleki (2011) validated a ten-item questionnaire which evaluated students’ interest, conception and creativity in literature. It showed that the individuals’ flair for literature differs meaningfully. The result proved that the more intelligent the translation students in literature, the more successful in literary translation quality.

Another research by Rostami (2013) on validating and constructing an LI questionnaire and its relation to LT was conducted on 115 translation students indicating the positive
relationship between LI and LT quality. She developed a more complicated questionnaire with 25 literary items such as student’s enthusiasm about literature, ability to memorize poems, the stability of nice and fluent verses in their mind, their interest towards literature genre, style and rhyme and instant understanding of the content. The students’ intelligence was then compared with their translation score which revealed the positive relationship between LI and LT among translation students.

III. METHOD

A. Participants

105 university students of the two English fields of literature and teaching are randomly chosen from two universities. Respecting their level, they are junior and senior from Khayyam and Tabaran Universities.

As compared within their own groups separately and not with each other, teaching students are from Tabaran and literature students from Khayyam University; it does not matter they are from two universities not under the exactly same educational system.

The age of them is between 19 and 24 and both males and females participate in this research, but females are more.

B. Instruments

One questionnaire and one literary text are adopted for data collection. The LI questionnaire, which includes aforementioned items about literature and was designed by Rostami (2013), is provided for the subjects to measure their intelligence of literature.

The literary prose text called Treasure Island, which has intermediate difficulty, is given to the participants to translate from English into Persian. They are provided by the texts’ difficult words’ full meanings on an attached paper in order not to refer to a dictionary.

C. Data Collection

For the task, the participants were applied with LI questionnaire to fill in the class and to render the English literary text ‘Treasure Island’ by Robert Louis Stevenson to Persian at home for the lack of enough time.

The translations are then rated by two university instructors according to Waddington Translation Assessment Model C, which is an objective holistic model.

The questionnaire and text for translation are distributed among 105 students, but they had great attrition to 43 at the end.

D. Data Analysis

This survey is descriptive and co-relational. To examine the normality of the variables, Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test is firstly performed. Then for the two groups in which literary
questionnaire scores are correlated with their translation scores the data is analyzed by Pearson Correlation Test.

IV. RESULT

To analyze the collected data, the mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum and plot parameters are statistically described as well as inferential statistics to measure the hypothesis by Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Pearson Correlation tests.

A. Descriptive Statistics

In the table below, the descriptive statistics of each variable (minimum, maximum, the mean, and standard deviation) is presented. As observed, the mean score of LI and LT of teaching and LI and LT of literature are 93.76, 15.33, 90.86 and 16 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI in teaching</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>93.76</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT in teaching</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI in literature</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>90.86</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT in literature</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. The Variables’ Normality Test

To perform statistical methods and to account logical inference about the study hypothesis, knowing how the data are distributed takes priority. In this regard Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test is used to examine the normality of the data. The statistical hypotheses of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of normality are as follows:

H₀: The data are normally distributed.
H₁: The data are not normally distributed.

The rejection of H₀ means that the data is not normal. The table here shows the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test’s result.
Table 2: One-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LI in teaching students</th>
<th>LT in teaching students</th>
<th>LI in literature students</th>
<th>LT in literature students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With reference to the meaningful significance level, all the variables are more than 0.05 and hence, the normality of the data is accepted and all has normal distribution. The parametrical methods are applicable for data analyses.

C. The Hypothesis

To find the probable relationship between LI and LT among non-translation students, the hypothesis is:

H₀: There is not any significant relationship between LI and LT quality of non-translation students.

The rejection of null-hypothesis proves their relationship and acceptance of it its lack. The results are presented in the table below:

Table 3: Correlations between LI and LT in Literature and Teaching Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LT in Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI in Teaching</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (two-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI in Literature</td>
<td>LT in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (two-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accordingly, the significance level of the Pearson Correlation Test in literature students is .336 and in teaching students .759. Both are more than .05 and the null-hypothesis is accepted; there is not any significant relationship between LI and LT among non-translation students.
Unlike translation students who have already demonstrated their LI’s relation with LT positively, this study doesn’t show such relation. Of course, as rare researches including the present one could be exhaustive, an alike study on LI and LT’s connection might show another result in respect to divergent factors as age, level, gender, place, L2 translation, etc.

V. DISCUSSION

LI could not be so powerful to help non-translation students in LT. Generally speaking, literature students are interested in literary texts and literary works, so their LI may be in one range and they could not show a considerable difference among themselves.

Translation knowledge for LT cannot be put aside and LI cannot be only relied on as a determining factor based on the findings. In contrast, translation students have confirmed a positive relationship between LI and LT with the overwhelming influence of their translation knowledge in previous studies.

Intelligence and knowledge are beneficial when used together, otherwise one of the two could not strongly lead human to success. However, experience should not be overlooked as another important factor, because there are many professional translators having not studied translation academically have achieved in their job by their experience. Studies on the role of experience on translation have already rarely conducted to the best of the researcher’s knowledge. To give an example, by a qualitative research on comparison between two groups of ESL Japanese students, Iida (2008) proved English students who had been living in the United States for study longer outperformed their counterparts having been living there in shorter time in written translation. That is the more experienced students used more words variety and more natural structure resulting in more qualified translation pragmatically in less time. In conclusion, a translator who utilizes the three factors of knowledge, intelligence and experience sounds the best mostly not of students during education, but after graduation.
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Appendix A

Text: Treasure Island

An Excerpt from Treasure Island by Robert Louis Stevenson

He was concealed by this time, behind another tree trunk; but he must have been watching me closely, for as soon as I began to move in his direction he reappeared and took a step to meet me, then he hesitated, drew back, came forward again and at last, to my wonder and confusion, threw himself on his knees and held out his clasped hands in supplication. At that I once more stopped.

"Who are you?" I asked.

"Ben Gunn", he answered, and his voice sounded hoarse and awkward, like a rusty lock, "I'm poor Ben Gunn, I am; and I haven't spoken with a Christian these three years".

I could now see that he was a white man like myself, and that his features were even pleasing. His skin, wherever it was exposed, was burnt by the sun; even his lips were black; and his fair eyes looked quite startling in so dark a face.

Of all the beggar-men that I had seen or fancied, he was the chief for raggedness. He was clothed with tatters of old ship's canvas and old sea cloth; and this extraordinary patchwork was all held together by a system of the most various and incongruous fastenings. Brass buttons, bits of stick, and loops of tarry gaskin. About his waist he wore an old brass-buckled leather belt, which was the one thing solid in his whole accoutrement.

"Three years!" I cried. "Were you shipwrecked?"

"Nay mate," said he - "marooned".

I had heard the word, and I knew it stood for a horrible kind of punishment common enough among the buccaneers, in which the offender is put ashore with a little powder and shot and left behind on some desolate and distant island.

Thanks a lot

Conceal: پوشاندن، مخفی کردن، پنهان کردن، هیئت، قایم کردن؛ از انظار پنهان داشتن، درپرده نگه داشتن، سربورگ داشتن، کتمان

Trunk: تنه

Hesitate: ۱. تردید کردن، تردید نشان دادن، درخواست دادن، مورد داشتن، دولدندادن، بزرگ‌دردیدن، دویدن

Hold out: ۱. اتست ویژه، دراز کردن، جلو آوردن، بیش از ویژه

Clasp: ۱. محاکم گرفتن، بچکی، انداختن به، قلاب کردن، بافتگی

Supplication: (رسمی) استغاثه، تولید، تضرع، تقسیم

hoarse: یک نواحی صداگرفته، بکر

Awkward: ۱. زیاده، ایزارد، بدن‌ناچسب، نیاز، بی‌توجه، غیر، سخت

Rusty: ۱. زنگ زده، زنگ‌گرفته، زنگ گرفته، بوسیده
Feature:
1. قسمت صورت، چهره، بخش صورت
2. (در جمع) چهره، سیما، قیافه، صورت، و ژن

Pleasing:
1. خوشایند، مطبوع، لذت‌بخش، دلپذیر، خوشحال کننده

Expose:
1. در معرض دید دادن بیرون، نشان دادن

Fair:
1. بور، بلوند، طلایی
2. پاک، تمیز، روشن، صاف
3. (کهنه) زیبا، خوب‌رود

Fancy:
1. (در ذهن) مجسم کردن، تجسم کردن
2. (ماجرای) مغز کردن، خیال کردن
3. (فقط بصورت امر) ببین، نگاه کن

Bit:
1. سرد، دهنه، آبخوری
2. کهنه، لته، کهنه

Stick:
1. چوب، عصا، لول، قطعه گچ، دینامیت و غیره
2. تیکه، اثاثیه و غیره

Loop:
1. حلقه، گره
2. دسته (گرد

Gasket:
1. واشر، لایی
2. بادبان بند

Buckle:
1. سگک، کچک‌ترین، خرید، چپ
2. تاب، کجی
3. بستن، محکم کردن
4. تاب ورداشتن، کج و کوله شدن

Accoutrements:
1. تجهیزات، سازوبرگ
2. لوازم، اسباب

Shipwreck:
1. کشتی شکستگی، غرق
2. کشتی شکستگی

Be shipwrecked:
1. کشتی (کسی) غرق شد، سوانح

Nay:
1. کهنه، چنین

Mate:
1. دوست، رفیق، یار
2. معاون ناخدا
3. دستیار، معاون، وردست کمک کار، کمک‌کننده
4. همسر، شریک زندگی

Maroon:
1. یکه و تنها رها کردن
2. تنها گذاشتن

Marooned:
1. پرت افتاده، منزوی، تک و تنها

Buccaneer:
1. دریادری، م مجرم

Ashore:
1. در ساحل به ساحل

Shot:
1. گلوله، تیر، زره‌پز
2. عکاسی
3. عکس‌گیری
4. تیراندازی
5. بیلبورد
6. ساختن
7. پرتاب وزنه
8. چپ
9. محاوره
10. بررسی

canvas:
1. تکه‌کشی
2. میل کردن
3. میل کردن
4. نگاه کردن
5. روشن کردن
6. صاف کردن
7. صاف کردن
8. روشن کردن
9. نگاه کردن
10. چپ کردن
Appendix B

Literary Intelligence Questionnaire

Appendix B: LTI Questionnaire

1. I enjoy reading literary text.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

2. I can feel and recognize harmony and rhythm in a piece of literary work like a poem.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

3. I can easily memorize a piece of poetry, with thinking about relations that are present among words.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

4. Sometimes I can guess the second verse of a poem, when I hear the first verse.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

5. I usually think of secondary meanings of words and sentences when I read a piece of literature.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

6. I enjoy watching movies that are based on literary novels.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
7. I used to write poetry and/or short stories when I was a child and even now I keep on writing.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

8. I find it easy to remember poems or song lyrics that I have memorized many years ago.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

9. Sometimes I really feel like reading poetry.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

10. I am very good in telling stories and jokes.
    a) Absolutely agree
    b) Agree
    c) No idea
    d) Disagree
    e) Absolutely disagree

11. I often use idioms in my everyday talk and they help me a lot in conveying myself.
    a) Absolutely agree
    b) Agree
    c) No idea
    d) Disagree
    e) Absolutely disagree

12. Different everyday life happenings usually remind me of a piece of literature or poetry or story.
    a) Absolutely agree
    b) Agree
c) No idea                      d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

13. I usually got the best grades at school in literature.
   a) Absolutely agree          b) Agree
   c) No idea                  d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

14. Literature makes me happy.
   a) Absolutely agree          b) Agree
   c) No idea                  d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

15. I really enjoy reading very much.
   a) Absolutely agree          b) Agree
   c) No idea                  d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

16. I am a good liar (if I want to be).
   a) Absolutely agree          b) Agree
   c) No idea                  d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

17. Sometimes I feel like to be alone.
   a) Absolutely agree          b) Agree
   c) No idea                  d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

18. I usually have a supportive role for my family and friends when they face a problem.
   a) Absolutely agree          b) Agree
   c) No idea                  d) Disagree
19. I never regret what I have decided and usually my decisions come to be effective.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

20. I have a high tolerance of ambiguity.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

21. I am very professional in specifying the best choice among others.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

22. I am very precise in performing delicate actions and never do them cursory.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

23. I am very patient in studying and learning things that is new for me.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

24. I don't mind sitting in a quiet place for hours in order to think and write.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree

25. I can analyze well and establish logical connections between events.
   a) Absolutely agree
   b) Agree
   c) No idea
   d) Disagree
   e) Absolutely disagree
Appendix C

Waddington's Translation Assessment Model C

Christopher Waddington

4.2. Method A

Method A is the work of Hurtado (1995); she draws up a list of possible errors which are divided into three categories:

i) Inappropriate renderings which affect the understanding of the source text; these are divided into eight categories: contresens, faux sens, noun sens, addition, omission, unresolved extralinguistic references, loss of meaning, and inappropriate linguistic variation (register, style, dialect, etc.).

ii) Inappropriate renderings which affect expression in the target language; these are divided into five categories: spelling, grammar, lexical items, text and style.

iii) Inadequate renderings which affect the transmission of either the main function or secondary functions of the source text.

In each of the categories a distinction is made between serious errors (-2 points) and minor errors (-1 point). There is a fourth category which describes the plus points to be awarded for good (+1 point) or exceptionally good solutions (+2 points) to translation problems. In the case of the translation exam where this method was used, the sum of the negative points was subtracted from a total of 110 and then divided by 11 to reach a mark from 0 to 10. For example, if a student gets a total of -66 points, his result would be calculated as follows: 110-66=44/11=4 (fail).

4.3. Method C

Method C is a holistic method of correction with the following features:

i) It presents a unitary scale which considers the translation competence as a whole, instead of dividing it into various sub-scales representing different sub-competences.

ii) The descriptors do not use terminology that would presuppose specialist knowledge (such as applied linguistics) on the part of the correctors.

iii) It includes only five main levels in an attempt to achieve maximum consistency between raters (see Pollitt 1991:90), although there are two marks within each level in line with the traditional Spanish system of marking (from 0 to 10).

The correctors are asked to apply the scale shown in Fig. 2. The scale is unitary, but requires the corrector to consider different aspects: accuracy of transfer from source to target text, quality of expression in the target language and degree of task completion. There are two reasons for this decision. The first is theoretical: overall translation competence is split into accuracy of transfer and quality of expression, in line with findings published in Stansfield et al. (1992), who claim to have empirically identified the presence of these two separate components. Degree of task completion was added because the text the students were asked to translate gave clear instructions to the students, following recommendations made by Nord.
(1991:164) and Hatim & Mason (1997:201). The second reason for designing a unitary scale with different aspects is practical: the scale offers the corrector a series of levels which are clearly differentiated, in an attempt to achieve more consistent marking. It also offers the possibility of placing students between two levels: in the event of a student translation only partially fulfilling the requirements laid down for level 4, for instance, then the corrector can award either the lower mark (7) at that level, or the higher mark at the next level down (that is, 6 at level 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Accuracy of transfer of ST content</th>
<th>Quality of expression in TL</th>
<th>Degree of task completion</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Complete transfer of ST information; only minor revision needed to reach professional standard.</td>
<td>Almost all the translation reads like a piece originally written in English. There may be minor lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Almost complete transfer; there may be one or two insignificant inaccuracies; requires certain amount of revision to reach professional standard.</td>
<td>Large sections read like a piece originally written in English. There are a number of lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.</td>
<td>Almost completely successful</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transfer of the general idea(s) but with a number of lapses in accuracy; needs considerable revision to reach professional standard.</td>
<td>Certain parts read like a piece originally written in English, but others read like a translation. There are a considerable number of lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transfer undermined by serious inaccuracies; thorough revision required to reach professional standard.</td>
<td>Almost the entire text reads like a translation; there are continual lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Totally inadequate transfer of ST content; the translation is not worth revising.</td>
<td>The candidate reveals a total lack of ability to express himself adequately in English.</td>
<td>Totally inadequate</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. Unitary scale for Method C (holistic)

4.4. Method D
Method D is not a new method in itself, but consists of combining error analysis Method B and holistic Method C in a proportion of 70/30; that is to say, Method B accounts for 70% of the total result and Method C for the remaining 30%.