

Original Paper

Personality Traits and Translation Quality: An Investigation of the Relationship in Iran Context

Zohreh Tavajoh¹ & Mojde Yaqubi^{2*}

¹ Islamic Azad University, Shahr-e Qods Branch, Shahr-e Qods, Iran

² School of Translation and Interpretation, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

* Mojde Yaqubi, School of Translation and Interpretation, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

Received: September 25, 2019 Accepted: October 9, 2019 Online Published: October 16, 2019

doi:10.22158/sll.v3n4p267

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/sll.v3n4p267>

Abstract

Different translators with different personality traits make variant decisions in their translations. In this study, the effect of personality traits of Iranian translators on their performance quality was explored from a psychological perspective. In the first step, the BFI Test (Big Five-Factor Inventory) was administered to the 30 MA translation students in Tehran Islamic Azad University. In the second step, the researcher distributed two different English source texts among the participants for the purpose of translation. Having finished the task of translating, the target texts produced by the students were assessed to investigate the correlation between personality traits and the quality of the translation. Hence, three instructors of translation were recruited to evaluate the translations and correspondingly score them on the basis of Farahzad's (1992). The analysis of the acquired results proved both of the hypotheses of the study. First, there was a positive relationship between personality traits and translators performance quality in different text types and also, Psychological model of translators' personality had a significant effect on assessing the translated works.

Keywords

translation, personality traits, text types, translation quality assessment, Farahzad's Model (1992)

1. Introduction

The concept of personality is basic to the study of people and their behavior is the basis for the personality concept. The study of individual and personality differences is a central theme in psychology as well as the areas of social and behavior. There is no certain definition for the term personality. However, this term has been defined in different ways. For example personality is defined as an individual trait that determines all behaviors of a person. Personality trait is a durable disposition,

shown in a particular way in a variety of situations. Trait is called as a specific singularity and relative independence reactions of every mental process. Traits are some responses to specific stimuli and under a particular stimulus and a particular response must be defined. Therefore, personality trait is complex and varied and on this basis, each person may display different behaviors. In other words we can say personality trait includes the characteristic patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that make a person unique.

Translation is an interdisciplinary field of study. In fact, it relates to the psychology of language and studies the relationship between linguistic factors and its psychological aspects. The relationship between translation studies and the psychology as a field of study has been determined in recent years. Studies on the psycho-linguistic analysis of translation by many scholars indicate the inter-dependency of translation and psychology (Maier, 2009). Chesterman (2009) argues that translation is a phenomenon beyond the transfer of source language to target language. In other words, beyond a translated text there is a human being with consciousness, feeling, culture, and belief who is named translator. Hence considering such factors like translator, cultural situation, gender differences, level of knowledge and skill in understanding the source language and convey it to the target text, psychological traits, style and many other items in a translation quality assessment are inevitable.

The basic concept of translation quality is associated with the relationship between the Source Text (ST) and the Target Text (TT). It means translation quality seeks in a translation a set of correspondences between the translated and the original text. Therefore, a translation is successful if it renders the original text well—if it transfers what is important for the ST, if it is a faithful, accurate and precise representation of the ST. This study aims at 1) showing the effectiveness of personality traits on the quality of translation, 2) providing the psychological model for assessing a given translation and explaining the importance of psychological models for evaluating translators.

From a general perspective, the translation process varies due to the individual differences of the translators (Coba, 2007). In other words, each translator has his or her own individual traits that uniquely affect his or her behavior in the act of translating. When translators translate the same source text from the Source Language (SL) to the Target Language (TL), their produced translations differ from one another. Similarly, different translation students of the same university level can translate a specific English text into Persian differently and with various qualities. Even they may find some texts more difficult to translate or feel more tendencies to translate certain texts. In this regard, one of the most important and effective factors on the process of individual's translation is personality trait which has a determining role on individual's behaviors. The personality traits are important to study of individuals, and their behaviors. Brody (1994) stated that personality traits are casual. They genotypically influence latent characteristics of people that determine the way in which individuals respond to the social world, they encounter. Similarly, translator's personality traits which affect different behaviors, cause translators' success or failure in their process of translation. Robinson (2003)

stated that the psychology of translation is still undeveloped. To fill the gap, in this study, translators' personality traits and its possible impact on translation quality are discussed. This research seeks to address the following questions:

- 1) Is there any relationship between personality traits and Translators' performance quality in translating different text types?
- 2) To what extent, can translators' personality traits serve as a valid model of assessing the quality of translated works?

1.1 Translation Quality

Having a clear definition of what translation quality means and how it can be measured is essential to learn how to assess it properly. However, we cannot find any direct answer to this question. Many translation experts have tried to define the principles of good translation over the years but there are, in fact, no fixed rules that guarantee a good result. The perception of what is good is highly subjective and depends on a number of various factors. For that reason, it is virtually impossible to devise a universal set of criteria to measure the translation quality objectively. This issue has also been drawing attention of scholars in the field of Translation Studies. They have been trying to find an answer to the difficult question of what translation quality actually is and how to measure it on the basis of translation theory and its application to translation criticism.

House (1997) defines that the quality of a translation depends largely on the translator's subjective interpretation and transfer decisions, which are based on his linguistic and cultural intuitive knowledge and experience. Thus, it is interesting to examine what techniques translators do in dealing with various problems in the process of translating, in order to produce high quality of translations. A high quality of translation refers to translation product that meets certain standards and criteria, as it is declared in the influence of translation techniques on the quality of the translation.

The quality of translation is determined by the accuracy of the delivery of messages from the source language to the target language. It means the quality of a translation has to be measured by the degree of accuracy with which the translator has captured the meaning of the author, and by the skill with which he has found the equivalent words and phrases, which will reproduce the meaning.

In the influence of the translation techniques on the quality of a translation, Acceptability is associated with compliance with the prevailing system of text in the target language, readability refers to whether or not a translation is easy to read and understand by readers. Therefore, quality in translation means that experience by a reader of the translation which transports him to the atmosphere contained in the original through the medium of his own language.

1.2 Translation Evaluation

Translation quality evaluation is of important topics in Translation Studies. Translation quality evaluation is a disputed issue in translation studies. There is no doubt in the role of evaluation and assessment in many fields of science and it can be said that there could be no science without

measurement. Therefore, apart from the debate over the case that translation is an art or a science, it can be claimed that evaluation is also important in translation whether we call it an art or a science. House (2001) claims translation quality is a “problematic concept if it is taken to involve individual and externally motivated value judgment alone” (p. 255). Indeed it is difficult to have a fair judgment relates to the quality of translation that can fulfill all of the scientific objectivities. The main problem is how to evaluate the quality or what measures should be used to evaluate the translation. The measures used will be different, depending on the purpose of the evaluation and on the theoretical framework applied to evaluating the translation quality.

Lauscher (2000) puts forward that translation scholars have tried to improve practical translation quality assessment by developing models which allow for reproducible, intersubjective judgment. He argues that “they [the translation scholars] hoped to achieve this goal [improving a practical translation quality assessment] by building their models on scientific theories of translation, which can provide a yardstick, and by introducing a systematic procedure for evaluation”.

Translation quality assessment focuses on the inter-relationships between the ST and TT. We consider all inter-relationships for example lexical, grammar, syntax, and semantics of both texts. Assessment of translation quality must be based on a testable, reliable, valid, applicable, and definable model. Therefore, evaluation of translation can be carried out with many different objectives and accordingly different criteria and factors acquire varying importance.

1.3 Farahzad's Model of Translation Evaluation

The first step in translation assessment is to establish a model of quality and then to transform it into a set of metrics that measure each of the elements of that quality. Farahzad (1992) introduced her model for translation quality evaluation. She introduced the following criteria:

- 1) Accuracy which refers to information of source text precisely and translation transfers the norms of ST.
- 2) Appropriateness which refers to the sentences sound fluent and native and are correct in terms of structure.
- 3) Naturalness means the end product of translation must be natural in the target text.
- 4) Cohesion refers to the transitional and appropriate use of pronouns, linkage, and etc.
- 5) Style refers to the choice of words, grammatical structure, and etc.

Farahzad (1992) believes that scoring a long text can be done in two different ways:

- 1) It can be scored holistically. Since the item assesses a wide variety of competencies, the examiner may find it convenient to approach the text as the unit of translation and adopt this system, especially with a large number of students. According to a rubric for translation assessment, the examiner may, for instance, come up with the scheme as demonstrated in Table 1:

Table 1. Scoring Based on the Text as the Unit of Translation (Farahzad, 1992)

Items	Score
Accuracy	20 Percent
Appropriateness	20 Percent
Naturalness	20 Percent
Cohesion	20 Percent
Style of discourse/choice of words	20 Percent

2) It can be subjected to objectify scoring. In this system, the target text must be read two times, first to check the accuracy and appropriateness, then for cohesion and style (the details of which appear in Table 2). Although time-consuming, this system is more reliable. Farahzad continues that sentence and clause might be the units of translation. Thus each verb in the source language text marks a score. The main clause receives one score and each sub-clause another score.

Table 2. Farahzad's Model Based on Sentence and Clause as the Unit of Translation

Accuracy and Appropriateness	Cohesion and style						
	main clause	sub clause	Transitional	appropriate use of pronouns	linkages	choice of words	grammatical structures
1							
2							
3							
...							

As suggested by Dollerup and Lindegaard (1994), cohesion and style cannot be checked and scored at the sentence and clause level. The elements of cohesion (e.g., transitional, appropriate use of pronouns, linkages, etc.) are spread all over the text as are the elements which form the style of discourse (e.g., choice of words, grammatical structures, etc.). If for instance, the source text is fairly neutral, one may allow a smaller number of points to it than in other cases where the preservation of style is important. Rahimi (2004) states efficiency and adequacy of a translation are based on the use of the natural form of the receptor language.

1.4 Five Personality Traits

With reference to development of personality in early and middle adulthood, McCrae and Costa (1999, p. 145) argue "traits develop through childhood and reach mature form in adulthood; thereafter they are stable in cognitively intact individuals". As a result of a thorough research on Cattell's (1965) and

Eysenck's (1952) personality trait theories, the Big Five theory was formulated by John and Srivastava (1999). This theory incorporates five different variables into a conceptual model for describing personality. These five different factors are often referred to as the "Big Five" (Ewen, 1998, p. 140). Popkins (1998) declares, "as it became evident to many psychologists that, mathematically, combinations of five factors were useful in describing personality, there was a need to clearly define what these factors were". This five-factor model of personality represents five core traits that interact to form human personality. The Big Five traits have been subjected to rigorous testing over the past several decades. According to the five-factor theory, personality traits are "insulated from the direct effects of the environment" (McCrae & Costa, 1999, p. 144). In this theory each dimension exists as a continuum and an individual's personality can lie at any point on that continuum for that particular trait. In personality test, the five traits assessed by the big five personality test are Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism, which are easily remembered by using the acronym "OCEAN" as follow:

1) Openness: In general, openness refers to how willing people are to make adjustments in notions and activities in accordance with new ideas or situations. People who like to learn new things and enjoy new experiences usually score high in openness. Openness includes traits like being insightful and imaginative and having a wide variety of interests.

2) Conscientiousness: Refers to how much a person considers others when making decisions. People that have a high degree of conscientiousness are reliable and prompt. Traits include being organized, methodic, and thorough.

3) Extraversion: Extroversion also is sometimes referred to as social adaptability. In five big factor model, extroversion is defined as "a trait characterized by a keen interest in other people and external events, and venturing forth with confidence into the unknown" (Ewen, 1998, p. 289). Extraverts get their energy from interacting with others, while introverts get their energy from within themselves. Extraversion includes the traits of energetic, talkative, and assertive.

4) Agreeableness: Agreeableness measures how compatible people are with other people, or basically how able they are to get along with others. These individuals are friendly, cooperative, and compassionate. People with low agreeableness may be more distant. Traits include being kind, affectionate, and sympathetic.

5) Neuroticism: Neuroticism is the other trait to play a role in most of the contemporary factor models for personality. Mc Popkins in some studies believes that an adjustment is examined as a factor, instead of neuroticism. In this case, higher scores will indicate a positive result, consistent with the other four factors. Popkins (1998) mentions that the bases of neuroticism are levels of anxiety and volatility. Within the bounds in five big factor models, neuroticism is "a dimension of personality defined by stability and low anxiety at one end as opposed to instability and high anxiety at the other end" (Pervin & John, 1989, p. G-7). Neuroticism is also sometimes called Emotional Stability. It means this

dimension relates to one's emotional stability and degree of negative emotions. People who score high on neuroticism often experience emotional instability and negative emotions. Traits include being moody and tense.

The Big-Five framework enjoys considerable support and has become the most widely used and extensively researched model of personality. Several rating instruments have been developed to measure the Big-Five dimensions. The most comprehensive instrument is Costa and McCrae (1992) 240-item NEO Personality Inventory, Revised (NEO-PI-R), which permits measurement of the Big-Five domains and six specific facets within each dimension. A very brief measure of the big-five personality domain refers that taking about 45 min to complete, the NEO-PI-R is too lengthy for many research purposes and so a number of shorter instruments are commonly used. Three well-established and widely used instruments are the 44-item Big-Five Inventory (John & Srivastava, 1999), the 60-item NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI; Costa & McCrae, 1992), and Goldberg's instrument comprised of 100 trait-descriptive adjectives (TDA; Goldberg, 1992). According to a very brief measure of the big five personality domains, John and Srivastava (1999) have estimated that the BFI, NEO-FFI, and TDA take approximately 5, 15, and 15 minutes to complete, respectively. Recognizing the need for an even briefer measure of the Big Five, Saucier (1994) developed a 40-item instrument (40 item questionnaire motivation construct study), derived from Goldberg's (1992) 100-item set.

2. Method

A sample of 30 MA translation students at the Islamic Azad University of Tehran, regardless of their gender, were chosen as the participants of this study, based on a convenient sampling method. Two instruments were used to gather data in the current study a follow:

(A) Personality Traits Inventory: It is one of the most widely used personality assessment in the world. In addition, the evidence indicates that Big Five is fairly stable over time (Digman, 1989). The first adopted instrument for data collection is the personality Trait inventory. The personality inventory has 49 items to measure five domains of personality. It is 5-point scale, ranges from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". The Big Five questions used on this site are from an instrument known as the Big Five Inventory (BFI) developed by John and Srivastava (1999). The respondents were asked to respond to the questions within 5 minutes. The time that assigned for participants was determined according to the results obtained from the source site.

The BFI measures the five personality traits of openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism by creating a scale that averages each domain. The BFI consists of 44 questions that are on a Likert response scale. The BFI uses short phrases as it has been found that short phrases that have been elaborated upon are answered more consistently than single adjectives from which people choose (Goldberg & Kilkowski, 1985). This is a self-report inventory where the taker may answer the following: 1 for disagree strongly, 2 disagree a little, 3 neither agree or disagree, 4

agree a little, to 5 agrees strongly.

The BFI is in public domain and may be used for non-commercial research. The items for the BFI were selected based upon a factor analysis using a large sample of college students. In samples from the United States and Canada, the Cronbach's alpha reliabilities ranged from .75 to .95 and averages above .80. Three-month test-retest reliability ranged from .80 to .90 with the average being .85 (John et al., 2008). Evidence of the validity included extensive convergent correlations (John & Srivastava, 1999).

Convergent correlations were measured with self-reports and three separate peer ratings on the BFI. The validity of convergent correlations were .60 for openness, .47 for conscientiousness, .67 for extraversion, .48 for agreeableness, and .52 for neuroticism (John et al., 2008). The respondents were asked to respond to the questions within 5 minutes. The time that assigned for participants was determined according to the results obtained from the source site. A score of 5.0 is the highest a person can score in a personality trait using the BFI.

Different English Texts: Two scientific text and poem selected to serve the aforementioned translated text types respectively. "A Poison Tree" by William Blake (1974) as a poem and a scientific text from "Depression in Children and Young People: Identification and Management in Primary, Community and Secondary Care" received from ncbi.nlm.nih.gov will be selected. They will be given to the students, in order to test their translation ability and quality. The direction of the translation is Mother Tongue Translation, from English into Persian.

The scoring procedure for the translations will be that of Farahzad's (1992) model which is based on a text as a unit of translation.

Data for this study will be collected at two stages. At first stage, the participants will be asked to answer personality inventory and the result of this stage will be collected by the researcher. At the second stage, the target texts will be distributed among the participants to be translated from English to Persian. Preventing any bias and achieving a more accurate result in TQA process, three raters, will be selected to evaluate the translations, under the supervision of Kanoon-e-Kargrouhaye Hamyari Noor-e-Afarineshn which deals with different experts and skillful Instructors, in various fields.

The scoring procedure for the translations was that of Farahzad's model which is based on a text as a unit of translation, categorized into five items:

- 1) Accuracy which is defined by Rahimi (2004) as the suitable and detailed explanation of the source message and the transmission of that message as exactly as possible. If in a translation, according to Rahimi, some pieces of information inadvertently is omitted, or added, and makes the analysis of the text inappropriately, it will be inaccurate.
- 2) Appropriateness which refers to fluency and nativity of sentences and correctness of sentences in terms of structure.
- 3) Naturalness which is defined by Khomeijani Farahani (2005) as the extent to which a work of

translation sounds natural in the target language. He states that all readers have experienced texts which are instantly acknowledged as translation and sound very artificial in the target language, and alternatively there are translated texts that sound quite natural and amazingly enjoyable to read.

4) Cohesion which is defined as the network of lexical, grammatical, and other relations which link various parts of a text. These relations or ties organize and, to some extent, create a text, for instance, by requiring the reader to interpret words and expressions by reference to other words and expressions in the surrounding sentences and paragraphs.

5) Style of discourse refers to appropriate choice of words, grammatical structures and, etc. In this method the raters read the translation once and considered 20 percent of the total score for each index.

This study is a descriptive research that will be used the qualitative method and analytical linguistic for data analysis. Collected data will be analyzed for correlation and regression through the statistical package of SPSS to identify the strength and direction of the relationship between variables.

The degree that quantitative variables are linearly related in a sample is assessed by the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r). Each individual or case must have scored on two quantitative variables (i.e., continuous variables measured on the interval or ratio scales). When a linear relationship exists between the two variables in the population, the significance test for r is applied. The appropriate correlation coefficient depends on the scales of measurement of the two variables being correlated.

SPSS© computes the Pearson correlation coefficient, an index of effect size. The index ranges in value from -1.00 to +1.00. This coefficient indicates the degree that low or high scores on one variable tend to go with low or high scores on another variable. As it is showed in Understanding the Pearson Correlation, a score on a variable is a low (or high) score to the extent that it falls below (or above) the mean score on that variable.

The values of the Pearson Correlation range from -1 to +1 with negative numbers representing a negative correlation (as one variable increases, the other variable decreases) and positive numbers representing a positive correlation (as one variable increases, the other also increases). The closer the value is to -1 or +1, the stronger the association is between the variables.

3. Results and Data Analysis

3.1 First Question Analysis

In this study, three raters were selected for evaluation of the translated texts based on Farahzad's (1992) model. By applying Pearson's Correlation, the raters' marks of participants' translations are analyzed and inter-reliability is checked. Based on the Results shown in Table 3, all three raters enjoyed a significant inter-rater reliability and there was an acceptable correlation among these three raters.

Table 3. Correlation between Raters' Marks

	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3
Rater 1 Pearson Correlation	1	.427	.673
Sig. (2-tailed)		.015	.000
N	30	30	30
Rater 2 Pearson Correlation	.427	1	.826
Sig. (2-tailed)	.015		.000
N	30	30	30
Rater 3 Pearson Correlation	.673	.816	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
N	30	30	30

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Based on Table 4, Openness, agreeableness, and extraversion personality types have the highest mean among other types of personality types of BFI.

Table 4. Students' Personality Type Based on Big Five Inventory (BFI) Developed by John and Srivastava (1999)

Personality	Number of translators	Mean	SD
Openness	10	5.6	1.50
Agreeableness	6	4.25	2.61
Conscientiousness	3	3.24	1.48
Extraversion	6	5.24	1.90
Neuroticism	5	1.23	2.92
	30		

Pearson product-moment correlation test was computed in order to determine if there was a relationship between the translators' scores and their personality type based on BFI personality inventory. The closer the value is to -1 or +1, the stronger the association is between the variables. In this research, we hypothesized a positive relationship between the acquired scores and translators' personality types. For this research participants, openness, agreeableness, and extroversion were the most frequent and significant types of BFI.

Table 5. Correlations

		Scores	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness	Extraversion	Agreeableness
Scores	Pearson Correlation	1					
	Sig. (2-tailed)						
	N	30					
Conscientiousness	Pearson Correlation	.152	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.247					
	N	30	30				
Neuroticism	Pearson Correlation	-.040	.152	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.760	.247				
	N	30	30	30			
Openness	Pearson Correlation	.121	-.040	.525**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.358	.760	.000			
	N	30	30	30	30		
Extraversion	Pearson Correlation	.262*	.121	.303*	.466**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.043	.358	.019	.000		
	N	30	30	30	30	30	
Agreeableness	Pearson Correlation	.368**	.262*	-.068	-.057	.170	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.043	.603	.664	.193	
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As it is showed in Multidisciplinary Studies in Knowledge and Systems science, and clarified from the correlation table,* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). The acquired results are bolded on the table to show this relationship between the scores and BFI types. This positive correlation is confirmed in *Openness, agreeableness, and extraversion personality types*. As a whole, there were statistically significant correlations between scores and subcomponents of BFI. Pearson r correlation coefficients between each pair of variables based on Cohen (1988) Guideline for reading the correlation:

$r = .10$ to $.29$ or $r = -.10$ to $.29$ small

$r = .30$ to $.49$ or $r = -.30$ to $.49$ medium

$r = .50$ to 1.0 or $r = -.50$ to 1.0 large

So, there is a positive small correlation between the two variables of scores and BFI subcomponents.

4.2 Second Question Analysis

Having proved the existence of a positive correlation between the two variables of the study (translators' scores and BFI personality indicator), now the results of regression analysis are brought in to see if the BFI variable is a predictor of learners' translation quality. Table 6 presents the model summary findings of regression.

Table 6. Variables Entered/Removed

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Translated works	.	Enter

a. All requested variables entered.
b. Dependent Variable: BFI

As the Table 7 reveals, .175 percent of the variance in the learners' scores is explained by the combination of the two variables namely translated works grades and BFI components ($R^2=.175$). Besides, to see whether the coefficient of the regression demonstrated by R^2 is significant or not, Table 7 is brought.

Table 7. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.419 ^a	.175	.168	16.63541

a. Predictors: (Constant), BFI

The Table 8 demonstrates that the coefficients reported by R^2 is significant (Sig.=.000). Now to pinpoint the Beta value of the variable, Table 8 needs to be examined.

Table 8. ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6948.376	1	6948.376	25.108	.000 ^a
	Residual	32654.949	118	276.737		
	Total	39603.325	119			

a. Predictors: (Constant), scores
b. Dependent Variable: BFI

The Table 9 indicates that BFI is a predictor of translators' translation quality. In other words, by examining the Beta value reported in the same table it can be inferred that with regard to translators' scores, the BFI significantly contributed to the prediction of translation quality, $\beta = .366$, $p < 0.01$.

Table 9. Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	25.916	13.508		1.919	.057
	BFI	.489	.098	.419	5.011	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Scores

4.3 Discussion, Conclusion and Pedagogical Remarks

In the present study, the researcher would endeavor to investigate the relationship between the translator's personality traits under study (neuroticism, extroversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) and the quality of translation in a scientific text and a poem through the psychological test Big Five Inventory (BFI). The acquired results proved both of the hypotheses of the study that psychological model of translators' personality has a significant effect on assessing the translated works and also there is a positive relationship between personality traits and translators performance quality in different text types. The findings confirmed that MA students' personality traits guide their process of translation.

The researcher suggests the following pedagogical guidelines, according to the achievements of the current study:

Firstly, the impact of personality on the quality of translation should not be ignored. That is why translation students should be given opportunities for self-awareness and a better understanding of their own personality by being offered the psychological courses at the university. As it has been declared in Individual Differences and Quality of Translations, they can find their own strengths and weaknesses, leading to their success and helping them develop their potential abilities. Hence, curriculum designers of translation courses must pay a specific attention here.

Secondly, students should also take a test of personality upon their arrival at university so that their individual peculiarities can be revealed and the translation educational system can meet the needs of students through providing them with the appropriate training in both theory and practice with regard to their personality types. It is believed that personality inventories should not be neglected in academia since individual differences in personality and higher learning programs are interrelated.

There are many specific hypotheses that can be tested about translators' personality type and its effect on translation quality. For example, with a greater sample we should be able to identify gender

orientations in the act of translation: female translators are expected to interact more with the person under the core text, while male translators are assumed to see the text more as an object. Other studies could be done with the role of various demographic factors such as gender, age, and socioeconomic background, which may have an influence on the quality of translation and their interaction with academic experience.

For further researches, other variables of individual characteristics like self-esteem can be accounted to be investigated. Learners can be classified into different proficiency levels. Further analysis can also focus on the type of translation problems, and thus greater or lesser propensity to risk-taking associated with the personality types. On these issues, we hope to be the witness of more reports in the near future. What is more, translation educators should not ignore is the important role of their students' personality types in the act of translation. They should not expect all students to translate all text types equally well. Some are more capable of translating texts of certain functions. Remembering the students' personalities, the Different approaches should be offered for translator training. It is also recommended that the translation educational system develops a comprehensive curriculum for the benefit of all students with respect to their personality types to restructure the curriculum for supporting all students and increase their output.

It is hoped that the findings of the present study will open new horizons for the translation trainees and translation trainers, leading to a better insight into the role of individual differences in the act of translating.

References

- Brody, N. (1994). Heritability of traits. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5(2), 117-119.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0502_3
- Cattell, R. B. (1965). *The scientific analysis of personality*. Baltimore: Penguin Books.
- Chesterman, A. (2009). The name and nature of translator studies. *Hermes*, 42, 13-22.
<https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlc.v22i42.96844>
- Coba, N. C. (2007). *The latina value scales: Translation and cultural adaptation* (Doctoral dissertation). University of New Jersey, New Brunswick.
- Costa, P. T. Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.41.020190.002221>

- Dollerup, C., & Lindegaard, A. (1994). Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2. In *Insights, Aims, Visions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.5>
- Ewen, R. B. (1998). *Personality: A topical approach*. Mahweh, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1952). *The scientific study of personality*. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.03.020152.001055>
- Farahzad, F. (1992). Testing achievement in translation classes. In C. Dollerup, & A. Loddegaard (Eds.), *Teaching translation and interpreting: Training, talent, and experience* (pp. 271-278). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4(1), 26-42. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.26>
- Goldberg, L. R., & Kilkowski, J. M. (1985). The prediction of semantic consistency in self-descriptions: Characteristics of persons and of terms that affect the consistency of responses to synonym and antonym pairs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(1), 82-98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.48.1.82>
- House, J. (1997). *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hubscher-Davidson, S. E. (2009). Personal diversity and diverse personalities in translation: A study of individual differences. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 17, 175-192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09076760903249380>
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin, & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Khomeijani, F. A. (2005). A Framework for Translation Evaluation. *Translation Studies*, 3(9), 75-87.
- Lauscher, S. (2000). Translation Quality Assessment: Where Can Theory and Practice Meet? *The Translator*, 6(2), 149-168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2000.10799063>
- Maier, C. (2009). Issues in the Practice of Translating Women's Fiction. *BHS LXXXV*, 95-108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/000749098760110657>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1999). A Five-Factor theory of personality. In L. A. Pervin, & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 139-153). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Munday, J. (2001). Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications. *Iranian EFL Journal*, 322.
- Pervin, L. A., & John, O. P. (1989). *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Popkins, N. C. (1998). *The five-factor model: Emergence of a taxonomic model for personality psychology*.

- Rahimi, R. (2004). Alpha, Beta and Gamma Features in Translation: Toward the Objectivity of Testing Translation. *Translation Studies*, 2(1), 53-64.
- Robinson, D. (2003) *Performative Linguistics: Speaking and Translating as Doing Things with Words*. London and New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203222850>
- Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-Markers: A brief version of Goldberg's Unipolar Big-Five Markers. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 63, 506-516. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6303_8