

## A CASE STUDY OF TRANSLATING ENGLISH QUALITATIVE ADJECTIVES IN ATTRIBUTIVE POSITION INTO ARABIC AT BISHA UNIVERSITY

**Abdulbari Mahboob Ahmed Al-Hassaani**

Department of English, College of Education, Aden, University of Aden, Yemen and  
Department of English, College of Science and Arts, University of Bisha, Bisha, Saudi Arabia

---

**ABSTRACT:** *This study has focused on the undergraduate Saudi learners at Bisha University. Our main concern of this paper is translation of qualitative adjective sentences from English into Arabic by Saudi learners. This study applied the quantitative research method for gathering data. This paper was undertaken with the intention of investigating how and to what extent can the learners in two colleges translate the qualitative adjective sentences in attributive position from English into Arabic. As we all know that translation plays an important role in conveying messages from one language to another. Therefore, students should be encouraged and motivated enough to learn and practice translation from the source language to the target language to increase their understanding in this field. The objective of this study was to find out the major problems and difficulties the students faced in their study of translation in the classroom in general and in their translation the qualitative adjective sentences from English language into their mother tongue language in particular. It was clear that tasks, activities, and practice of the learners were insufficient and they need more and more practice in translation the different types of English qualitative adjective sentences in attributive position. Data analysis in this study revealed that most of the students had major problems and difficulties in translating the qualitative adjective sentences in attributive position from English into Arabic because of their mother tongue interference and the two languages have grammatical and structural differences. However, many students have tried their best and done fairly well in translating some of the adjective sentences in the students' translation test. It was possible to conclude that the classes of translation were largely teacher-centered and teacher dominated rather than student-centered. Besides, the learners should be given a lot of tasks and assignments to improve their level of translation.*

**KEYWORDS:** Translation Studies, English Qualitative Adjectives, Attributive Position, Mother Tongue Interference, Arabic, Bisha University

---

## INTRODUCTION

This paper has studied the translation techniques used by Saudi learners in their Bachelor Program, Colleges of Sciences and Arts (Boys' college and Girls' College), Bisha University. Our main concern of this paper is translation of qualitative adjectives in attributive position at the sentence level from English into Arabic by Saudi learners in two colleges, English Departments, Bisha University. The subjects of this study were 160 learners from both colleges; 90 students girls and 70 students boys. This paper was undertaken with the intention of investigating how the students in the two colleges translate qualitative adjective sentences in attributive position from English into Arabic. As we all know that translation plays an important role in conveying messages from one language to another. Besides, conveying meaning is the first and final goal of translation. According to Ghazala (1995) "Translation refers to all the process and the methods used to convey the meaning of the source language

into the target language. They can be used in attributive or in predicative position. Quirk, et al.(1986) said that "A word that cannot be used attributively or predicatively is not an adjective word. Crystal (1985), described the term "attributive" as the term normally used to refer to the role of adjectives and nouns when they occur as modifiers of the head of the noun phrase. The present study has tried to find out the major problem and difficulties faced the learners in translation and to examine the students' ability in translating the qualitative adjective sentences in attributive position from English into Arabic at Bisha University. It is hoped that the findings of this study will benefit all those who are concerned in the educational process in general and those who are related to the translation process in particular.

### **Objectives of the Study**

1. To find out the problems and difficulties that face the learners in translating sentences of qualitative adjectives in attributive position from English into Arabic at University of Bishah.
2. To investigate to what extent the learners of English Departments can use translation techniques and to examine their ability of translation adjective sentences from English into Arabic.
3. To examine the sufficiency of the current tasks, activities, and assignments in the teaching of adjective sentences types translation from English into Arabic in the translation course syllabus; in Colleges of Sciences and Arts, University of Bisha.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Definitions of Translation**

According to Aziz (1989) " Translation is replacing a text in one language by another text in another language ". Catford (1993) defined translation as "a field which makes relating between different languages". He also defined translation as " the replacement of textual material in one language (source language SL) by equivalent textual in another language (target language TL). Both definitions were based on text-translation. They explain that translation should include two languages: the source language ( the original language) and the target language; the language in which the text is translated. Ghazala (1995) defined translation by saying: "Translation refers to all the process and methods used to convey the meaning of the source language into the target language. Nida and Taber ( 1982) wrote: "Translation consists in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the message of the source language, first in terms of meaning, and in terms of style. Accordingly, the centrality and relativity of the notion of equivalence in translation is very obvious in the previous definitions which focus on both content and form of the message to reproduce the same effect of the source text. A key term in all the above definitions is meaning, so meaning is the main goal in translation. There are two types of meaning:- 1) "Denotative meaning" is the one which associated with the literal sense of a word. This type is a worldly entity that a linguistic unit can be used to denote. For example, the word needle denotes the property of being needle; i.e. its common physical features which are shared between people. 2) "Connotative meaning" which is purely associated with the non-literal sense of a word. That is a word can convey more than its literal meaning.

## **Methods of Translation**

Ghazala ( 1995 ) defined a method of translation " as the way we translate " whether we translate literally or freely, the words or the meaning, the form or the content, the letter or the spirit, the manner or the matter, the form or the message, the direct meaning or the implied meaning, in context or out of context, and so on. Ghazala ( 1995 ) also stated that "writers on translation have suggested different methods based on the two major old-new methods of translation. These methods are:- 1. Literal translation. 2) Free translation.

### **Literal Translation**

Literal translation refers to word to word or one to one translation. What happens in literal translation is that "the denotative meaning of the word is taken as if straight from the dictionary ( that is out of context ), but the target language grammar is respected and because the target language is respected; literal translation very often un avoidably involves grammatical transposition". Dickens, et. al. ( 2002 ). In literal translation the source language grammar shall be considered and this sometimes causes difficulties in translation because the source language grammar may be totally different from the target language grammar.

### **Word for Word Translation**

Newmark (1988) said " This method ignores the target language completely, making it subject to the source language wholly and entirely. It transfers the primary (or common) meanings of words, it dismiss the possibility of any polysomous, especial, indirect or metaphorical use of words. Besides, this method regards translation to be a translation of individual word. Each English word translated into an equivalent word in Arabic which is kept the same as, and in line with that of English.

### **One to One Literal Translation**

"This method of translation means to translate each source language word or phrase into an identical word or phrase in the target language, with the same number, grammatical class and type of language".Ghazala (1995). That is, a noun translated into a noun, two nouns into two nouns, and so on. Therefore, it is perhaps more acceptable and better than word-for-word translation. Both methods are questionable. Actually, sometimes one to one translation is unsatisfactory, because it transfers the source language grammar and word order, regardless of the target language grammar and word order. It starts all the Arabic versions with a subject, then a verb each, ignoring nominal sentence, and translating all personal pronouns. Besides, it insists on having the same number and types of the source language words and lexical groups in target language.

### **Direct Translation**

This type of translation has been described by Newmark (1988) as " going beyond of one-to-one translation. It is basic translation of both communicative and semantic translation. Ghazala (2006) describes this type of translation as " full translation of meaning" because it focuses on translating meaning in context. Moreover, it considers the grammar, the word order of the target language, the metaphorical words and the special uses of language.

## Free Translation

Free translation is associated with translating the spirit, or the message, not the letter or the form of the context. Newmark (1988) said : " as a translation that reproduce the matter without the manner or the content without the form of the original". That is to say in free translation the source language grammar shall not be regarded, reproduced or imitated in the target language.

## Newmark's Communication and Semantic Translation

Newmark (1988) has distinguished the following types of translation:- 1) Semantic Translation: In this type of translation, the translator focuses more on transferring all meaning of the source language including the contextual meaning. Newmark also said that this translation attempts to render as closely as the semantic and syntactic structure of the second language allow the exact contextual meaning of the original. 2) Communicative Translation: The focus in this translation is not only in the source language meanings, but also on the target language reader's feelings. Newmark (1988) said that communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original. This indicates that if the source language text influences the source language reader's emotions or behaviors, the target language should have the same influence on the target language readers.

## Translation Equivalence

Richard, et. al.(1985)defined translation equivalence as the degree to which linguistic units (e.g. words, syntactic structure) can be translated into another language without loss of meaning. Catford (1965) said that the central problem which faces the translator during the practice of translation is to find the target language translation equivalents. The majority of translators agree that translation depends on equivalence between the source and the target texts.

## Types of equivalence

As a form of communication, translation tries and aims to establish equivalence between the source language and the target language. Most of the translation theories depend on some types of equivalence. Here are some of these types discussed below:-

- a) Equivalence According to Catford (1965) distinguished two types of equivalence: textual equivalence and formal correspondent. A textual equivalence is any target language text or a portion of a text. A formal correspondent is any target language category which can be said to occupy, as nearly as possible.
- b) Equivalence According to Nida; Nida and Taber (1982) distinguished two types of equivalence: the formal correspondence and the dynamic equivalence, the formal correspondence is to translate word by word, noun by noun, and verb by verb. But the dynamic equivalence is the degree to which the receptors of the message in the receptor language responds to it in substantially the same manner as the receptors in the same language.
- c) Equivalence According to Baker:

Baker (1992) distinguished many types of equivalence. 1.Equivalence at word level:- Baker in this level focused in word and defined it as the smallest unit of language tha

can be used by itself. She said that a word in a language has different types of meanings. a. prepositional meaning, b. expressive meaning, c. presupposed meaning; and d. evoked meaning. 2. Equivalence above the word level:- Words rarely occur on their own; they almost occur in the accompany of other words. The words are not strung together at random in any language; there are always restrictions on the way they can be combined to convey meaning. The combined words come in three lexical patterns; 1. collocation, 2. idioms ; and 3. fixed expressions. 3. The grammatical equivalence:- Grammar is the set of rules which determine the way in which units such as words and phrases can be combined in a language and the kind of information which has to be made regularly explicit in utterances. The differences in the grammatical structures of the source and target language often result in some change in the information content of the message during the process of translation. If the target language lacks a grammatical category which exists in the source language, the information expressed by that category may have to be ignored.

### **Translation Problems**

Most students of English Department, Colleges of Sciences and Arts (boys and girls), University of Bisha, face a major problem in translating qualitative adjectives in attributive position at the sentence level from English into Arabic, the reason for this problem is that English and Arabic have different grammar system and rules. This variation causes many problems to Arab learners, besides their mother tongue interferences. Many students translated inaccurately in the students' test translation of the students' questionnaire, when they translated the 15 adjective sentences in attributive position at the sentences level from English into Arabic. Generally speaking, translators may face problems while translating a piece of writing which might lead them to stop translation. They start searching for needed equivalents by thinking and rethinking or even by using dictionaries to solve these problems. Ghazala (1995) claims that translation problems are resulted to grammatical, lexical, stylistics, and phonological differences. Students face lexical problems due to misunderstanding the words in direct and clear way. Concerning lexical problems, major lexical problems could arise from literal translation, synonyms, idioms, and polysemy.

### **Definitions of Adjectives**

Adjectives are words that modify nouns or pronouns. Adjectives in the first position before nouns are called attributive adjectives, while those in the second position after the nouns are called predicative adjectives. Crystal (1985) defined an adjective as a term used in the grammatical classification of words to refer to the main set of items, which specify the attributes of nouns. Biber, et.al. (2002) said: "Adjectives commonly modify nouns, so they add to the informational density of registers like academic prose. Beyond their overall distributions, there is a great variation in the form, meaning, and syntactic rules of adjectives.

### **Classification of English Adjectives**

Colins, w (1990) classified adjectives according to their jobs into two types:- a) Qualitative adjectives. b) Classifying adjectives. These two types are discussed below.

### **Qualitative Adjectives**

In the present study our concern is qualitative adjectives, which are the most typical common adjectives in noun phrase. According to Collins (1990) Qualitative adjectives are used to



indicate a quality that someone or something has, such as "sad", "pretty", "small", ...etc. They add to the meaning of the noun they modify by conveying sense impressions. For example, "red shoes", "rough plaster", ...etc, by naming size (a tall boy, a large room), by indicating shape ( a round face, a straight back), by giving judgments (a difficult word, an easy test). Such qualitative adjectives are gradable, which mean that the person or the thing referred to quality which may have, either more or less of the quality.

#### 1.5.1.2 Classifying Adjectives

Adjectives that you can use to identify the particular class that something belong to; e.g. "financial help" you are using the adjective "financial" to classify the noun "help". These adjectives such as "Indian, wooden, ... etc; they are not gradable in the way that descriptors adjectives are. Things that either in a particular class or not in it.

#### Form of Adjectives

As far as my knowledge is concerned, English adjectives have the same form for singular and plural, masculine and feminine nouns. For instance, a pretty girl, pretty girls, a nice baby, nice babies. The only exceptions are the demonstrative adjectives 'this' and 'that', which change into 'these' and 'those' before plural nouns. For example, this man becomes these men, and that boy becomes those boys, ... etc.

#### Position of Adjectives

Adjectives are usually called according to their position, whether they are attributive adjectives or predicative adjectives. Quirk, et. al.(1972) suggested that the major positions of adjectives are the attributive and the predicative. They concede the major syntactic functions of adjectives " since a word that cannot function either attributively or predicatively is not recognized as an adjective".

#### Adjectives in Attributive Position

Our concern in this study is the adjectives in attributive position. Adjectives which are commonly occur before the noun and directly appear beside the noun are called attributive, because they attribute a quality to the noun they modify, such as in these examples:- a) The clever teacher of mathematics solved the difficult problem. b) They have got nice babies.

#### Adjectives in Predicative Position

Adjectives in the second position after the noun are called predicative. For example, the adjective 'happy', in the sentence , "the boy was happy" can only occur predicatively. Biber, et. al.(2002) recognize two syntactic functions with which predicative adjectives perform; "subject predicative adjectives and object predicative adjectives". Subject predicative adjectives occur as a complement of a copula verb, so it describes a noun phrase in a subject position. For example:- a) The time is not enough for the exam. b) They are happy to meet you today. An object predicative adjective normally follows the direct object, occurring with complex transitive verbs. It describes the object rather than the subject of the sentence. For example:- a) The teacher said that you have all your answers right. b) He makes it nice.

## **Syllabus**

A language syllabus is part of the general curriculum and it is an educational document; in fact it is a record of commitment and accountability. It directs progress and indicates destination. Hence, to serve these purposes, it needs to be adequate (complete) in containing the requirements as a guide for the teaching / learning process, relevant (suitable) to the situation it intends to serve, and effective (yielding) in producing expected learning outcomes. A discussion on designing a language syllabus and its uses involves in one way or another, issues related to curriculum development. On such occasions, some people use one for the other; a syllabus for curriculum. Experts in language teaching and learning such as Corder (1975), Wilkins(1976), Widdowson (1983), Stern (1983); Yalden(1983), White (1988), Ritchards (1990) share the view that a curriculum indicates an overview educational cultural philosophy which appeals across subjects, provides a broad description of a general goals and thereby deals with the totality of a content to be taught in school or educational system. A syllabus, on the other hand translates the philosophy of the curriculum into a more detailed and operational statement of teaching and learning for each subject. Although, these hierarchical distinction places a syllabus in a subordinate position to curriculum and syllabus complete each other and never show any conflict. However, what is clear is that condition as to which components of a language syllabus ( objectives, content, methodology, evaluation) should be in depth in the design of teaching English. However, each of the objectives of the English language syllabus in high schools and university level is very broad. The ultimate aim of language teaching is to develop students' communicative ability, so that, they can use the language at ease and with confidence. For instance, ask or give information, explain a process, describe a situation, make reference, agree or disagree to ideas, and so on. Therefore, the present day English syllabus should focus on communicative English language teaching to attain this aim. Students were asked about their opinions on the syllabus for the translation course. This was largely concerned with finding out if it was relevant and appropriate for the needs of the learners. Besides, it was also to check if there was a match between the units allotted for syllabus completion and the time available to teachers for completing syllabus. Generally, the purpose of the questions on syllabus was to elicit students opinions of the content, topics, and sub-topics in the translation course, which the students study in their colleges.

## **Tasks**

### **Definition of Task**

Task is defined as a piece of meaning-focused work involving learners in comprehending, producing, or interacting in the target language (Numan,1989). Usually, language lessons are often involve learners for doing specific tasks and homework assignments. In tasks which was part three of the students' questionnaire, the learners were asked some yes-no questions type on English adjectives translation tasks and the rest about how do they rate their proficiency level in translating different types of adjectives from English into Arabic. Generally, this part of the questionnaire addressed questions to learners on specific types of English adjectives translation that learners were expected to master. Learners were required to answer whether there were enough tasks and activities incorporated into the teaching material that focused on the types of English adjectives. The next logical question to figure was the satisfaction level of the learners with the lessons in the teaching material in the translation course. A closely related question wanted learners to say if their instructors of the translation courses give them a lot of tasks, assignments and practice to translate different types of English adjective sentences into

Arabic. Finally, the students were asked if they need more practice in translating the different types of English adjective sentences into Arabic.

### **Significance of the Study**

Translation is one of the most difficult and slippery areas within the realm language studies and one of its difficulties lies in the lexical items, especially attributive adjectives. The current study is an attempt to investigate the problems and difficulties that face students when translating English qualitative adjectives in attributive position sentences into Arabic in English Departments, College of Sciences and Arts (boys) and College of Sciences and Arts (girls), University of Bisha. This study tried to obtain accurate data of the student's problems in learning translation of English adjective sentences into Arabic. Therefore, this study will contribute to the process of identifying the problems encountered English Department students in translation at University of Bisha, so that they could set relevant strategies to cope with their students. As a result, this study will help, syllabus designers and teachers to understand the difficulties of the teaching / learning translation of adjective types from English into Arabic and vice versa.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The method used for collecting data and information for this study was quantitative method. The research tools adapted in this study were the students' questionnaire and students' translation test. The respondents of this study were English Department students from two colleges; College of Sciences and Arts (boys) and College of Sciences and Arts (girls), Bisha University. According to Sarantakos (1998) said standards that constitute the principles of quantitative research in the following terms: "The purpose of quantitative research is to explain data collected from questionnaire; aims at theory testing, is interested in why things happen, employs random sampling and deductive approach". The instruments of the research were given to university expert teachers in ELT field for their comments and suggestions. Their feedbacks were adapted in the final draft research tools before administering them in the class rooms to ensure the validity and reliability of the research instruments. The participants of this study were from English Department, College of Sciences and Arts (boys and girls) at Bisha University. The total number of respondents were 160 students of whom 90 participants were female and 70 participants were male.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This study used a quantitative method for data collection. The students' questionnaire was administered to the students in their respective colleges ( Colleges of Sciences and Arts, English Departments, boys and girls ) at Bisha University. Totally, 180 copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the students boys and girls, however, 20 copies were rejected because they were not properly filled by the students. The research instruments used in this study were the students' questionnaire, open-ended questions which only used to ensure and check the validity and reliability of the information obtained from the students' questionnaire and the last instrument of the research was the students' translation test, in which the students tried their best to translate fifteen qualitative adjective sentences in attributive position from English into Arabic. The collected data and information were tabulated, analyzed and



interpreted with statistical figures and percentages to reflect the results of this study better. The first item in section one of the students' questionnaire, the students were asked about their sex (male or female). Table no.1 below shows the 160 respondents male and female who participated in this study, of whom 90 respondents (56.25%) were female and 70 respondents (43.75%) were male. The author observed that more women than men took part in this study. It is a good sign that women are making rapid strides in the field of education and compete with their brothers men

**Table 1. Sex of the Students .**

| Responses  |           |       |
|------------|-----------|-------|
| Sex        | Frequency |       |
| Percentage |           |       |
| Female     | 90        | 56.25 |
| Male       | 70        | 43.75 |
| Total      | 160       | 100   |

In item 2 of the students' questionnaire, students were asked about their ages. The following table classified the respondents according to their age level.

**Table 2. Ages of the Students in Two Colleges(Boys and Girls)**

| Responses  |           |       |
|------------|-----------|-------|
| Age        | frequency |       |
| Percentage |           |       |
| 20         | 50        | 31.25 |
| 21         | 30        | 18.75 |
| 22         | 35        | 21.9  |
| 23         | 25        | 15.6  |
| 24         | 20        | 12.5  |
| Total      | 160       | 100   |

Data analyses revealed that 50 of the respondents (31.25%) were 20 years old when they enrolled to their colleges; 30 of the students (18.75%) were 21 when they enrolled their colleges; 35 of the subjects (21.9%) were 22 when they joined to their colleges, 25 of the respondents (15.6%) were at the age of 23 when they enrolled to their colleges; 20 of the participants (12.5%) were at the age of 24 when they pursued their education in their colleges. The data tells us that the learners are mature adults who are receptive to teaching and quiet touchy in matters concerning academics. Those students who reported that they were 22,23 and above which might be for certain reasons; such as poor performance, distance of schools, or lack of financial support and the like they may started their education at late ages. In item 3, the students were asked about their educational background at high school level, see table no. 3 below.

**Table 3. Educational Background of the Students at High School**

| Status      | Responses |            |
|-------------|-----------|------------|
|             | Frequency | Percentage |
| Rural area  | 95        | 59.37      |
| Urban area  | 60        | 37.5       |
| No response | 5         | 3.13       |
| Total       | 160       | 100        |

Statistical and data analysis revealed that 95 respondents (59.37%) studied their high school in rural areas, while 60 respondents (37.5%) reported that they had their schooling in urban areas. Only 5 of the participants (3.13%) did not respond. This implies that education in Saudi Arabia is a top priority and the rural areas are keeping pace with urban areas in providing education to all students. In item 3 of the students' questionnaire, the students were required to indicate the grade at which English was introduced in their schools in Saudi Arabia. As table no, 4 below reports that 90 students (56.25%) started studying English in grade 5. Only 10 students (6.25%) had English in grade 2 and grade 3; 35 students (21.87%) began to study English in grade 7, while 15 students (9.38%) had their English in grade 4. It goes without saying that students are aware of the importance of English and the necessity to learn it. It is in account of this realization that they are in favor of introducing English in either grade 2 or 3. The following table shows the statistical figures and its percentages.

**Table 4. The Grade at which English was Introduced**

| Grade | Responses |            |
|-------|-----------|------------|
|       | Frequency | Percentage |
| 2     | 10        | 6.25       |
| 3     | 10        | 6.25       |
| 4     | 15        | 9.38       |
| 5     | 90        | 56.25      |
| 7     | 35        | 21.87      |
| Total | 160       | 100        |

In item 4, the students were asked to give their opinions on the syllabus of the "Translation Course" which they studied at their colleges. This item consisted of five sub-items. Table no, 5 below shows the details of these sub-items and the discussion follow it.

**Table 5. Opinions of the Students on the Syllabus for the Translation Course**

| Item   | Responses      |       |       |       |            |       |          |       |                   |       |
|--|----------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------|----------|-------|-------------------|-------|
|  | Strongly agree |       | Agree |       | No opinion |       | Disagree |       | Strongly disagree |       |
|  | F              | %     | F     | %     | F          | %     | F        | %     | F                 | %     |
| a. The topics/sub-topics in the syllabus are appropriate to the stated objectives  | 20             | 12.5  | 30    | 18.75 | 20         | 12.5  | 80       | 50    | 10                | 6.62  |
| b. The topics/sub-topics in the syllabus are sufficient for the translation course | 10             | 6.62  | 15    | 9.38  | 15         | 9.37  | 90       | 56.25 | 30                | 18.75 |
| c. The syllabus is relevant to the students  | 12             | 7.5   | 20    | 12.5  | 18         | 11.25 | 90       | 56.25 | 20                | 12.5  |
| d. The syllabus is appropriate to the academic level of the students               | 10             | 6.25  | 30    | 18.75 | 10         | 6.25  | 85       | 53.12 | 25                | 15.63 |
| e. The time allotted to each unit is adequate                                      | 25             | 15.63 | 35    | 21.87 | 9          | 5.63  | 80       | 50    | 11                | 6.87  |

In the first sub-item of the students' questionnaire, the students were asked if they found the topics/sub-topics in the syllabus appropriate to the stated objectives, 80 learners (50%) disagreed, it was not in keeping with the stated objectives, while a mere 30 students (18.75%) agreed. Only 20 participants (12.5%) strongly agreed about the appropriateness of the topics/sub-topics in the syllabus to the stated objectives of the "Translation Course". However, on the other hand 10 respondents (6.25%) strongly disagreed about the appropriateness of the topics/sub-topics in the syllabus to the stated objectives. 20 respondents (12.5%) viewed their opinion that they had no idea whether the topics/sub-topics in the syllabus are appropriate to the stated objectives. This can only mean that the units chosen did not go down well with the learners. In the second sub-item of the students' questionnaire, the learners were asked if the topics/sub-topics were sufficient or adequate for the translation course. 90 respondents (56.25%) disagreed, while 15 learners (9.38%) agreed about the sufficiency of the topics/sub-topics for the translation course. This figure is again supported with those 30 respondents (18.75%) who strongly disagreed that the topics in the syllabus are not sufficient; and 30 learners (18.75%) who strongly agreed to the situation. Only 15 learners (9.37%) had no opinion about the sufficiency or insufficiency of the syllabus for the translation course. In the third sub-item of item number four of the students' questionnaire; the learners were asked if they found the syllabus relevant to the students' level or not. The statistical data in the above table shows that 90 respondents (56.25%) disagreed that they found the syllabus relevant. 20 respondents (12.5%) agreed that they found it relevant. On the other hand, 20 respondents (12.5%) strongly disagreed that it was not relevant. While 12 respondents (7.5%) strongly agreed. In the fourth sub-item of the questionnaire, students were asked about the appropriateness of the syllabus to the academic level of the students. As it is shown in table 5 above, 85 respondents (53.12%) disagreed with the view that the syllabus matched the academic level of the students. On the

other hand, 25 respondents (15.63%) strongly disagreed about the appropriateness of the syllabus to the academic standard of the learners. There was only 10 respondents (6.25%) who felt there was a harmony between the syllabus and the academic level of the students. In the fifth sub-item of item number four of the students' questionnaire; students were asked about adequacy of time allotted to the units in the syllabus. 80 respondents (50%) believed that the time allotted for completion of the syllabus units was inadequate. Only 35 respondents (21.87%) agreed that the time allotted was adequate. The opinions of the students seem in harmony with what was reported by them, where learners complained that too much had to be done in too little time. In section two of the students' questionnaire, the students were asked many questions to respond. In the first item of this section, the students were asked to rate their proficiency level in translating the different types of English adjectives into Arabic. In table number 6 below shows the students rating of their proficiency in different types of English adjective translation.

**Table 6. Rate of Proficiency in Translation Different Types of English Adjectives**

| How do you rate your proficiency level in translating the following types of English adjectives ? |                                 |       |                                 |       |                                   |       |                              |       |                                    |      |
|---|---------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-------|------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|------|
| Responses   | Attributive Adjective Sentences |       | Predicative Adjective Sentences |       | Comparison of Adjective Sentences |       | Order of Adjective Sentences |       | Other Types of Adjective Sentences |      |
|   | F                               | %     | F                               | %     | F                                 | %     | F                            | %     | F                                  | %    |
| a.Excellent   | 7                               | 4.38  | 8                               | 5     | 11                                | 6.88  | 5                            | 3.13  | 4                                  | 2.5  |
| b.Above average   | 23                              | 14.37 | 22                              | 13.75 | 19                                | 11.88 | 16                           | 10    | 6                                  | 3.75 |
| c.Average   | 60                              | 37.5  | 70                              | 43.75 | 65                                | 40.63 | 19                           | 11.88 | 10                                 | 6.25 |
| d.Below average   | 50                              | 31.25 | 50                              | 31.25 | 60                                | 37.5  | 90                           | 56.25 | 120                                | 75   |
| e.Extremely poor  | 20                              | 12.5  | 10                              | 6.25  | 5                                 | 3.11  | 30                           | 18.75 | 20                                 | 12.5 |
| Total   | 160                             | 100   | 160                             | 100   | 160                               | 100   | 160                          | 100   | 160                                | 100  |

The statistical data analysis revealed that most of the learners rated their performance below average or just average. For instance, in connection to attributive adjective sentences, 50 students (31.25%) claimed that they were below average, and 20 learners (12.5%) rated themselves extremely poor. Only 60 (37.5%) considered their proficiency average and 23 students (14.37%) labeled themselves above average. As far as proficiency in predicative adjective sentences, 50 learners (31.25%) were of the opinion that they were below average, and 10 students (6.25%) were honest enough to label themselves extremely poor. On the other hand, 70 learners (43.75%) chose average and 22 learners (13.75%) went in for above average. Where comparison of adjective sentences were concerned, 60 learners (37.5%) chose to call themselves below average and 5 students (3.11%) extremely poor. But there were 65 students (40.63%) who considered themselves average. 19 students (11.88%) above average and 11 respondents (6.88%) excellent. In connection to order of adjective sentences, 90 (56.25%) thought themselves below average, and 30 respondents (18.75%) extremely poor. There were

also 19 respondents (11.785%) who said that their rate of proficiency was average, 16 learners (10%) above average and 5 students (3.13%) excellent. Where other types of adjectives went, 120 respondents (75%) were of the opinion that they were after all, below average, and 20 learners (12.5%) extremely poor. On the other hand, only 10 learners (6.25%) labeled themselves average, 6 respondents (3.75%) above average, and 4 learners (2.5%) excellent. Statistics data, revealed that many learners considered their proficiency level below average, average, and extremely poor as far as most of the adjective types went. As far as all types of adjectives went, mostly learners considered their proficiency level below average, average and extremely poor showing that they are not that much introduced to these types of adjectives shown in the above table. In item 6 of section two of the questionnaire, the learners were asked about their satisfaction with tasks and assignments on translating the various types of adjectives, which is shown below in table number 7.

**Table 7. Degree of satisfaction of the Students with Tasks on Translation**

| Are you satisfied with tasks and assignments on translating the different types of adjectives ? |           |            |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Responses   | Frequency | Percentage |
| a. Yes  | 61        | 38.12      |
| b. No   | 99        | 61.88      |
| Total   | 160       | 100        |

When students asked if they were satisfied with the tasks and assignments, 99 students (61.88%) replied they were not, while the remaining said they were satisfied. This implies that the majority of learners were not satisfied with the activities on different types of English adjectives translation. Generally, this tell us that the majority of the learners are not familiar with English. In item 7 of the students' questionnaire, the learners were asked on the difficulty level of translating the various types of English adjectives into Arabic, most of their responses were negative, as it is indicated in the following table.

**Table 8. Difficulties Faced Students in Translating Types of English Adjective Sentences**

| Do students find difficulty in translating adjective sentences from English into Arabic? |           |            |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Responses  | Frequency | Percentage |
| a. Yes   | 97        | 60.63      |
| b. No  | 63        | 39.37      |
| Total  | 160       | 100        |

In this item, 97 students (60.63%) claimed unfair degree of familiarity with translating the different types of English adjectives from English into Arabic, and the remaining of the learners 63 (39.37%) did not list it as a problem area. This implies that most of the learners who study translation course face difficulty in translating the different types of English adjectives into their mother tongue language that is Arabic. In item 8 of the questionnaire, information was sought if instructors gave students practice in translating English adjective types in the form of homework, activities, or assignments, etc.



**Table 9. Practice in Translating Types of English Adjective Sentences into Arabic**

| Do instructors give you practice and assignments in Translating Different Types of English Adjectives into Arabic? |           |            |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Responses  | Frequency | Percentage |
| a. Yes   | 45        | 28.12      |
| b. No  | 115       | 71.88      |
| Total  | 160       | 100        |

In this connection, as indicated in table 9 above, 115 learners (71.88%) answered they never did, while 45 learners (28.12%) said that the instructors did give them enough practice. This implies that the classes were largely teacher-centered and teacher dominated offering the learners to learn on their own or through pair and group work. Some of the major problems students include: 1) the difficulty level of the English language rules, 2) newspapers, journals, etc., were not available in translation classes. 3) the instructors did not give them with many exercises, tasks and practice in and outside the classroom. 3) the word order of English and that of their first language (Arabic) is different, etc. In section 3, of the students' questionnaire, the students were required to translate 15 English qualitative adjective sentences in attributive position into Arabic. As with College of Science and Arts ( boys), the translation test was also taken by students of College of Science and Arts ( girls) at University of Bisha, Saudi Arabia. The translation test that learners were asked to come up with was the same for both colleges . Analysis of statistical data is discussed below.

**Table 10. Results of the Students' Test in Translating English Adjective Sentences in Attributive Position into Arabic**

| English Qualitative Adjective Sentences in Attributive Position | Frequency of Accurate Translation | %     | Frequency of In-accurate Translation | %      |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------|--------|
| 1. A strong smell was rising from the gas container .           | 40                                | 25    | 120                                  | 75     |
| 2. She had a hard task when her husband died.                   | 60                                | 37.5  | 100                                  | 62.5   |
| 3. The small boat sank in the sea.                              | 50                                | 31.25 | 110                                  | 68.75  |
| 4. Lion is a strong animal.                                     | 70                                | 43.75 | 90                                   | 56.25  |
| 5. There is a beautiful garden beside the house.                | 55                                | 34.37 | 105                                  | 65.63  |
| 6. Heavy traffic causes problems.                               | 50                                | 31.25 | 110                                  | 68.75  |
| 7. Saudi Arabia is an open area for international trade.        | 65                                | 40.63 | 95                                   | 59.37  |
| 8. The peace talks in Yemen is an open question.                | 45                                | 28.13 | 115                                  | 71.87  |
| 9. Political leaders delivered important speeches.              | 61                                | 38.13 | 99                                   | 61.875 |
| 10. Our duty is to help poor countries.                         | 72                                | 45    | 88                                   | 55     |
| 11. They are not good even at making small talks.               | 75                                | 46.87 | 85                                   | 53.13  |

|  |    |       |     |       |
|--|----|-------|-----|-------|
| 12. He has got a bad memory.                         | 80 | 50    | 80  | 50    |
| 13. A young boy still has a poor heart.              | 45 | 28.13 | 115 | 87    |
| 14. The farmer bought a dry cow.                     | 40 | 25    | 120 | 75    |
| 15. A strong wind was blowing for one day in Jeddah. | 65 | 40.63 | 95  | 59.37 |

In translating the first sentence, 40 learners (25%) came up with the accurate translation, while 120 students (75%) turned inaccurate translation. 60 learners (37.5%) translated the second sentence accurately, while 100 learners (62.5%) were not successful in translating it. To the third sentence, 50 respondents (31.25%) gave accurate translation, while 110 respondents (68.75%) turned in wrong translation. For the fourth sentence, 70 learners (43.75%) were accurate in their translation, while 90 learners (56.25%) turned inaccurate translation. For the fifth sentence 55 students (34.37%) got the accurate translation, while 105 learners (65.63%) got the inaccurate translation. 50 respondents (31.25%) translated the sixth sentence correctly, while 110 respondents (68.75%) translated it incorrectly. To the seventh sentence, 65 students (40.63%) translated it accurately, while 95 students (59.37%) translated it inaccurately. 45 learners (28.14%) translated the eighth sentence accurately, while 115 students (71.87%) translated it wrong. For the ninth sentence, 61 learners (38.13%) translated it accurately, while 99 learners (61.88%) translated it inaccurately. To the tenth sentence 72 respondents (45%) did it in wrong translation, while 88 respondents (55%) translated it accurately. To the eleventh sentence, 75 students (46.87%) translated it accurately, while 85 learners (53.13%) got the wrong translation. 80 learners (50%) got the correct translation in the twelfth sentence, while the remaining 80 of the respondents (50%) got the incorrect translation. To the thirteenth sentence, 45 respondents (28.13%) translated it accurately, while 115 (71.87%) did it inaccurately. In the fourteenth sentence, only 40 students (25%) got the accurate translation, while 120 students (75%) translated it inaccurately. The fifteenth and the last sentence of the students' translation test, 65 respondents (40.63%) translated it accurately, while 95 respondents (59.37%) translated it inaccurately. From the data analysis, it is clear that the majority of the learners were not familiar with basic rules of translation and grammar. Many respondents failed in their attempt to translate accurately all the fifteen qualitative adjective sentences in attributive position from English into Arabic. This implies that learners have major problems in translation with both English and their L1, because of their mother tongue interference and the two languages have structural differences.

## FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Most of the students faced a major problem in translating English qualitative adjectives sentences into Arabic. Besides, they misinterpreted the additional meanings of English adjectives in attributive position that lie outside the core meaning. The learners used literal translation as dominant strategy when translating English adjective sentences in attributive position and they substitute unsatisfactory alternative equivalents in their translation. The common translation errors committed in translating the fifteen adjective sentences in the translation test from English into Arabic show that most of the students have used word-for-word translation to solve their problem, they have not followed the free translation strategy. Furthermore, many students have insufficient translation skills in finding the exact equivalent

meaning of attributive adjectives in the source language sentences. The data analysis revealed that the tasks on translation the types of English adjective sentences were insufficient and boring. The learners lack the appropriate knowledge on the semantic features of English adjectives. Their practical experience is still very limited in translation. In the existing traditional classes, opportunities for active learner participation are lacking. The method of teaching continues to be traditional lecture method which fails to involve learners in the process of learning. The classrooms, thus remain teacher-centered and the learners play a passive role most of the time.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION**

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study, I arrived at the following recommendations:-

- a. Necessity for giving the students more tasks, assignments and more practice inside and outside the classroom in translating the different types of adjectives from English into Arabic at the sentence level to improve their level of translation.
- b. Feedback is useful, so that students must not only realize their errors but also learn to produce improved and better translation.
- c. The methodology of teaching translation courses requires shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered.
- d. The existing methods of teaching/learning the translation course and syllabus need a change.
- e. The syllabus designers must dispense with top-down approach and opt instead for bottom-up approach that will generate a dovetailing of syllabus requirements with design of material. Besides, the syllabus must take room for innovation and creativity.

### **CONCLUSION**

The present study has explored the difficulties which the students faced while translating the English qualitative adjectives at attributive position sentences into their own L1 (Arabic) due to the differences of contextual meanings of adjectives between English and Arabic at Bisha University. Most of the learners misinterpreted the English qualitative adjectives in attributive position at the sentences level during the students' translation test and translated the sentences into Arabic literally out of context. The data analysis of the study revealed that the learners lack the appropriate background knowledge about the semantic features of English adjectives. Besides, they lack practice in translation and lack of good knowledge in translation strategies. Furthermore, few tasks and assignments were given to them during the classroom lectures. Instructors should concentrate on such difficulties and use good methods and strategies to improve the level of the learners in the translation course in general, and in translating the English qualitative adjective sentences at attributive position into Arabic in particular. This study will enable educationalists to realize that no course is useful and fruitful unless it is interesting and can make a progressive change in the ability level of the students.

## REFERENCES

- Aziz, Y.Y. (1989). *A Contrastive Grammar English and Arabic*. AL-Mosul: University of Mosul.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Biber, D & Conrad, S and Leech, G. (2002). *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Catford, L. (1965). *Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford Press.
- Collins, W. (1990). *Cambridge English Grammar*. Birmingham: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Crystal, D. (1985). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Ghazala, H. (1995). *Translation as Problems and Solutions : A Course book for University Students and Trainee Translator*. Valetta Malta. ELGA Publishers.
- Koller, W. (1989). *Equivalence in Translation Theory*, in Chesterman, A. (ed.) *Readings in Translation*, Oy Finn Lecture Ab Helsinki.
- McCarthy, M. (2002). *English Vocabulary in Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *Approaches to Translation*. New York: London Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E.A. and Taber, C.R. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. London: Brill.
- Quirk, R. et al. (1986). *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quirk, R. et al. (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: William Clowes and Sons Limited.
- Richards, J.C., Platt, J. and Richards, et al. (1985). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. England: Longman.
- Ruth, Wajnryb. (1992). *Classroom Observation Tasks: A Resource Book for Language Teachers and Trainees*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Sarantakos, S. (1998). *Social Research*. Hong Kong: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Thakur, D. (1999). *Linguistic Simplified Semantics*. India: Baharati Bahawan Publishers and Distributors.