Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies

Volume 7, Issue 1, Page 100-115, 2024; Article no.AJL2C.112592

Students' Awareness of Translating the Pragmatic Aspects of the English Language

Soheil Atashian [a++*] and Shamsa Al-Maamari [a#]

[a] Department of Foreign Languages, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Nizwa, Oman.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

Open Peer Review History:
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/112592

Original Research Article

Received: 25/11/2023
Accepted: 31/01/2024
Published: 03/02/2024

ABSTRACT

The current paper addresses the link between the pragmatic aspects of the language and its impact on translation. It further aims to assess and measure the overall pragmatic competence of English students and its relevance to the translation precision. A quantitative approach was used to achieve the objectives. 40 undergraduate translation students at the University of Nizwa participated in this study. The participants were given a pragmatic-translation test that consists of 4 different texts and 4 MCQs per text that examine their pragmatic competence and awareness. The answers were marked and classified into four levels based on Rafieyan's [1] Classification of Levels. The results showed that there is a positive relationship of 40% between the pragmatic awareness and the translation precision. It was concluded that there is considerable extent of relationship between pragmatic awareness and translation quality.

Keywords: Pragmatics; translation quality; competence; awareness.

[++] Lecturer;
[#] B.A. Student;
**Corresponding author: E-mail: soheil@unizwa.edu.om;*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The quality of translation varies from one translator to another depending on many facts. One of these facts that this study assumes to have an impact is pragmatic awareness. A major part of the ability of producing a good quality of a translation might rely on pragmatic comprehension of the text, or there might not be any relationship at all. To indicate the significance and sensitivity of pragmatics, it is to be stated that even physical damage to the brain may cause serious issues of the pragmatic competence as illustrated by Ouerchefani et al [2].

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Many studies have been conducted in Oman in translation and linguistics, but only a few have shed light on the pragmatic aspects and its link to translation. The translator of the pragmatic senses needs to deal with cultural differences. According to Nida and Taber [3], one of the types of equivalence in translation is Dynamic Equivalence, in which the translator tries to provide almost the same impact on the target readers as the one delivered to the source readers. Given the distinction between western and Arabic culture, translating the pragmatic aspects of English into Arabic gains considerable significance.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

This research highlights some crucial points related to translating the pragmatic aspects:

1- To measure the pragmatic awareness of University of Nizwa (UoN) translation students,
2- To assess the quality of UoN students' translation in relation to their pragmatic awareness, and
3- To ascertain the relationship between pragmatic awareness and translation quality.

1.4 Theoretical Framework

The problem statement of this study argues that the differences in cultural senses between Arabic-speaking countries (Omani in particular) and English-speaking countries might affect the process of translation. Nida was among the first scientists to highlight the core of pragmatic knowledge in translation when he came up with the "dynamic equivalence" translation theory. Nida [4] in his theory, emphasized that the natural meaning has priority above all in translation. This fact goes in line with the pragmatic purpose of targeting the natural meanings and concentrating on the language in use in the first place. Nida's theory has a very superficial relationship with pragmatics particularly, but after Nida, many scientists confirmed the relationship between pragmatics and translation. For instance, [5]. draws attention to the significant role of pragmatics in translation by stating that "translation is not only a matter of words, but also of cultures, situations, and pragmatic factors." She argued that translators need to be aware of the pragmatic aspects of the source and target languages to produce an effective translation. Ho [6] also seems to agree with Malmkjar by emphasizing the importance of pragmatics in translation. He mentioned, "The translator must not only translate the words of the original but also recreate in the target language the social and pragmatic context that produced the original" [6]. He argued that the translator's recreation of the pragmatic context in the target text relies on their knowledge and awareness of the pragmatic dimensions in the source and target cultures. Consequently, it can be concluded that [5] and [6] agree with the same fact that translation issues result from pragmatic differences between source and target languages. This is because utterances hold cultural meanings. Therefore, their actual meanings differ from one culture to another. After that, Hatim and Mason [7] established their general pragmatic approach by assuming that a good translation depends on maintaining the same pragmatic effect of the source text as the target text. They argued that translation is not a random process of transferring words from one language to another but also transferring the meanings of pragmatic effects. They pointed out that the same exact words in different contexts may hold different pragmatic meanings across texts. As a result, a translator must consider the source and target text's differences regarding the pragmatic aspects. Hatim and Mason emphasized the importance of cultural and pragmatic knowledge for translators, as they need to grasp and be able to convey the cultural senses and pragmatic aspects of both the source and target languages. Another theory in translation was proposed by Sperber and Wilson [8], which is the theory of relevance. The theory

assumes that translation is all about communication conducted by principles of relevance. In other words, the translator's job is to deliver a communicative speech related to the listener, and the listener's job is to infer the meaning that is related to them. In pragmatic and translation contexts, the theory of relevance concentrates on the significance of understanding the intended meaning in the context in order to produce an effective translation. Many theories discussed translation in relation to pragmatics. All these facts make the relevance theory the most suitable framework for this study.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The findings can be permeated to other texts where translation of the pragmatic aspects is concerned. This step will help universities determine the extent to which their translation students should be exposed to pragmatics. The study can also be used in the future to provide students with solutions to avoid making translation errors while translating the pragmatic aspects.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Local Studies

Research in the Sultanate of Oman on pragmatic awareness and its impact on translation are almost non-existent. This gives this research an opportunity to expand the scope of research on this topic and provide local data on it. However, there are a few studies in Oman that addresses pragmatics separately or might examine its relationship to fields other than translation. One of these studies was conducted by Al Rubai'ey [9] highlighted the relationship between identities and the pragmatic choices that Omani EFL learners make in L2. The results of this study showed that Omani students make more pragmatic choices in English than Omani. On the other hand, research claim otherwise. It was stated that people tend to make pragmatic choices L1 no matter how much they were aware of the cultural, societal, pragmatic aspects of L2 [10]. Hence, there are two contradictory ideas that must be more explored.

2.2 The Relationship between Pragmatic Awareness and Translation

A study conducted in Iran entitled "Students' Causes of Errors in Translating Pragmatic Senses" revealed that there is a relationship between the two variables. They concluded this fact by examining the students' main problems in translation. The students were English learners whose native language is Persian. By using Na Pham's error analysis, the researchers found out that the understanding the pragmatic aspects t in L2 topped the other types of errors. Their translation was affected badly because of the low awareness of pragmatic aspect [11].

Another study conducted in Iran and entitled "Relationship between Pragmatic Comprehension and Translation of Culture-Bound Texts" rejected the assumption that there is no relationship between pragmatic awareness and translation. The study measured the pragmatic comprehension and abilities of 60 Iranian students who are studying English as a foreign language. Their pragmatic awareness was assessed in the L2 based on the students' comprehension on the given task. The study classified 4 levels of awareness: poor, weak, strong, optimal pragmatic comprehension. It was concluded that the students who showed a high level of pragmatic comprehension provided a high quality of translation. Hence, the study proved that a strong relationship between the two variables exists [1].

The two studies agreed on having a strong relationship between pragmatic awareness and translation in Iran. However, we are still lacking such data in Oman, especially at the UoN.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Date Collection Tools

The study adopted a mixed method approach to achieve its objectives. That is because each goal requires a certain type of approach to collect its data. The measurement of the pragmatic awareness was done by using a quantitative methodology to generalize the numeric data to all translation students at the UoN. A pragmatic-translation test (see Appendix), consisting of multiple-choice questions, measured the pragmatic comprehension of the students. After that, the researchers assigned marks to each question and classified the number of participants into 4 levels based on the total mark that the students got. The other goal of the study, which is assessing the translation quality in relation to pragmatic awareness, used a qualitative and quantitative approach at the same

time. Qualitative methodology was employed because the translations are not measurable kind of data. The translations produced by the students depended on thoughts, ideas, interpretations, and beliefs. Furthermore, the researchers evaluated the translations herself, assigned 4 marks for each text, and classified them into 4 levels as well, based on her own process of evaluation that relies on the chosen theoretical framework of the study. Using numbers to express the quality of the translations means adopting a quantitative approach in this regard.

3.2 Participants

40 undergraduate Omani translation male and female students at the Department of Foreign Languages in the University of Nizwa participated in the study. Their ages varied from 20-24. The students had passed almost all translation courses in their study plan such as Media Translation, Legal Translation, Literary Translation, and Business Translation. This fact ensures that the students have high translation skills and abilities. Most of the students had also taken at least 3 of linguistics courses such as an Introduction to Linguistics, Semantics, Discourse Analysis and Foreign Roots of English Words. This means they have enough theoretical and practical background about the language, the use of language and its building. None of students lived or studied in an English-speaking country. Therefore, their paralinguistic and sociolinguistic awareness of the source language is supposed to be identical.

3.3 Procedure

To measure the students' pragmatic awareness, the researchers used a pragmatic-translation test that consists of four texts that contain pragmatic aspects. The students were asked to translate the texts and answer multiple-choice questions after each text. The questions were testing their comprehension of the pragmatic aspects and the understanding in the translation process.

To analyze the results, the researchers depended on a previous research data analysis method. Rafieyan, [1] has prepared a pragmatic comprehension test and assigned one mark for each correct answer of the MCQs. The test was out of 40. After that, they classified the pragmatic comprehension into levels: poor level for those who got 0-10, weak level (11-20), strong level (21-30), and optimal level (31-40). The same exact classification was used in this study, illustrated as follows:

Table 1. Classification of the levels based on grades out of 40

Poor level	**0 – 10**
Weak level	11– 20
Strong level	21 - 30
Optimal level	31 – 40

The previous classification was used for the whole test including its two parts under study: pragmatic awareness and translation quality. Nevertheless, the researchers had a new classification for each part in separate. Each part was out of 20, therefore the numbers of were converted to be as follows:

Table 2. classification of the levels based on grades out of 20

Poor level	**0 – 5**
Weak level	5.5 – 10
Strong level	11 - 15
Optimal level	15.5 – 20

To assess the translations' quality, the researchers read the translations carefully, figured out the errors of translating the pragmatic aspects, and classified the translations into the same exact aforementioned four groups: (poor, weak, strong, and optimal) based on the adherence to the theory of relevancy, cooperative principles, translation basic roles, and based on the quality of the translations in general. The researchers counted how many translations fell under each level and compared the results to the pragmatics' data to conclude the relationship between the two variables.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Data Analysis

As the study is based on a mixed-method approach, the researchers used certain methods that suit each approach to analyze the data. Tables with numbers and percentages are used to present the quantitative kind of results, as we are dealing with two variables and having a comparison between them. On the other hand, some other tables are used as a classification of the qualitative data, in this context, students' translation levels. These tables show examples taken from the test and are categorized into levels based on the quality of collected data

therein. Note that the levels of translation's quality refer to certain short sentences, chunks, and parts but not the translation in whole. A student might have a strong level for translating a certain expression but a weak level for the whole translation. The findings of the test, in their basic form, are presented into 3 main parts: the results of the whole test, the results of pragmatic awareness, and the results of the translation's quality. Besides that, a detailed presentation of the findings and results was provided in 4 other parts: results of text no. 1, 2, 3, and 4 individually.

4.2 Findings and Results

This section is only a presentation of the results collected by the researchers.

4.2.1 Basic findings of the test

The researchers dealt with two variables within the same test. Therefore, the results of each variable were separated to be presented Tables 4 and 5.

There were some students whose pragmatic awareness level was equal to their translation's quality one or at least very close to it, whereas some other students showed a higher level of pragmatic awareness than their translation's quality. A few numbers of students had a higher translation quality level than their pragmatic awareness level. Results are presented in Table 6.

4.2.2 Findings and results of text no. 1:

Text 1:

*Two friends are having a very **informal** conversation

> A: I'm dying to see the fireworks, DJs, and the new-brand theater. C'mon dear, let's make it to Cali and rave together!
> B: Eh! I am good, man.

Table 3. Results of the test

Test	Number of students	Percentage
Poor level	1	2.5%
Weak level	13	32.5%
Strong level	15	37.5%
Optimal level	11	27.5%

Students showed different levels of pragmatic awareness, most of them had a weak and strong level (the two average levels). As for translation quality, most of the students showed a very poor level of translation. 28 students, forming 70%, fell under the lowest two levels. The phrase, "Eh! I am good, man" in this text was translated in many ways in Table 8.

Table 4. Results of pragmatic awareness

Pragmatic awareness	Number of students	Percentage
Poor level	1	2.5%
Weak level	8	20%
Strong level	16	40%
Optimal level	15	37.5%

Table 5. Results of translation's quality

Translation's Quality	Number	Percentage
Poor level	13	32.5%
Weak level	8	20%
Strong level	10	25%
Optimal level	9	22.5%

Table 6. Results of compatibility of pragmatic awareness with translation quality

P>T	P=T	P<T
22 (55%)	16 (40%)	2 (5%)

Table 7. Results of Text No. 1

Text 1	Pragmatics	Translation
Poor level	5	18
Weak level	13	10
Strong level	14	6
Optimal level	8	6

Table 8. Student's translation samples of text no. 1

Text 1	TT
Poor level	"إه أنا رجل جيد"
	"أنا بخير يا رجل"
	"حسنًا، أنا رجل بارع"
	"اه أنا رجل صالح"
	"أنا رجل مكتفي"
	"أنا موافق يا رجل"
Weak level	"اه لا داعي يا رجل"
Strong level	"اه، لا يا رجل"
	"أنا بخير هكذا"
Optimal level	"للأسف، لا أشعر برغبة في ذلك"
	"لا، لا أريد"
	"لا أريد ذلك"
	"لا أعتقد بأنني أريد الذهاب"
	"أنا مرتاح هكذا، لا أريد الذهاب"

Table 9. Results of text no. 2

Text 2	Pragmatics	Translation
Poor level	3	11
Weak level	9	5
Strong level	12	11
Optimal level	16	13

Table 10. Student's translation samples of text no. 2

Text 2	ST	(students') TT
Poor level		"..وانتهيت من التعامل معك"
	I honestly lost hope in you, and I am so done with you.	"قد انهي العلاقة معك .."
		"وعملت معك كثيرا .."
		"لقد انتهت علاقتي معك.."
		"و عملت الكثير من أجلك .."
	I have been waiting for the documents forever	"انتظرت المستندات دائما.."
		"كنت انتظر ملفك للأبد ..."
	Are you getting them done any soon?	"هل أنجزتهم ولو لمرة؟ .."
	Rest assured. I have got it under my control.	"لقد انهيتهم تحت سيطرتي"
		"كن مطمئنا حصلت عليهما تحت سيطرتي"
		"لقد حصلت عليها وتحت سيطرتي"
		"لقد تسلمتها رغمًا عني"
		"ارتحت أكيد وإنها تحت السيطرة"
Weak level	I honestly lost hope in you, and I am so done with you.	"لقد انتهيت منك.."
	I have been waiting for the documents forever	"انتظرت لإنهاء المستندات"
	Are you getting them done any soon?	"هل ستجهزهم قريبًا؟"
		"هل سوف تنتهي به في أي وقت قريب؟"
	Rest assured. I have got it under my control.	"هي تحت سيطرتي"
Strong level	I honestly lost hope in you, and I am so done with you.	"لقد فقدت أملي فيك، وأيست من
	I have been waiting for the documents forever	"سوف أبقي انتظر هذه الوثائق إلى الأبد"
	Are you getting them done any soon?	".. هل ستحضرهم بوقت قريب؟"
		"هل انهيت العمل عليهم؟"
	Rest assured. I have got it under my control.	"كن مُطمئن، الأمر تحت سيطرتي"
		"لا تقلق، الأمور تحت السيطرة"
		"اطمئن لقد حللت الأمر"
Optimal level	I honestly lost hope in you, and I am so done with you.	"بصراحة لقد فقدت الأمل بك ولا أرتجي منك شيئا"
		"... لقد يأست منك"
		"بصراحة أنا فقدت الأمل فيك، واكتفيت منك"
		" ولقد طفح الكيل منك"

Text 2	ST	(students') TT
	I have been waiting for the documents forever	"هل يجب عليّ الانتظار إلى الأبد؟" " لقد انتظرت الوثائق لفترة طويلة" "لقد انتظرت كثيرا من أجل الوثائق"
	Are you getting them done any soon?	"هل ستنجزهم قريبا؟" "هل سوف تكملهم في أي وقت قريب؟" "هل قاربت على الانتهاء؟"
	Rest assured. I have got it under my control.	"هدئ أعصابك أنا مسيطر على الوضع" "سأسيطر على الأمر" "قد شارفت على الانتهاء" "اطمئن سأنجزها قريبًا "

Table 11. Results of text no. 3

Text 3	Pragmatics	Translation
Poor level	11	15
Weak level	2	11
Strong level	14	5
Optimal level	13	9

Table 12. Student's Translation Samples of Text no. 3

Text 2	ST	(students') TT
Poor level	A: I should work like a mule, otherwise I will be a BBC reporter	"يجب أن أعمل مثل الحصان لأنني سأكون مذيع صحفي تابع لـ بي بي سي" "يجب على العمل كالحمار وسأكون على تقرير بي بي سي"
	B: Haha. I can't agree more, and I am sure you can help it.	"لا أستطيع أنا أتفق معك بشدة.." "أنا لا أتفق معك ومتأكد من أنك تستطيع المساعدة" "لا أستطيع موافقتك..." "لقد يمكنني موافقتك أكثر..." "متأكد بأنك ستساعد في ذلك .."
Weak level		
	A: I should work like a mule, otherwise I will be a BBC reporter	" يجب أن أعمل بجهد كالبغل غير ذلك سوف أعمل في الأخبار.."
	B: Haha. I can't agree more, and I am sure you can help it.	"متأكد بأنك ستعمل بجهد وستساعد نفسك" "لا عليك أنت قدها"
Strong level	A: I should work like a mule, otherwise I will be a BBC reporter	"يجب علي أن أعمل كالبغل خلاف ذلك سوف أصبح مقدم بي بي سي"
	B: Haha. I can't agree more, and I am sure you can help it.	"هذا صحيح فإنك ستكون مناسبا هناك"
Optimal level	A: I should work like a mule, otherwise I will be a BBC reporter	"يجب أن أعمل بجد وإلا سأكون مراسل في بي بي سي "
	B: Haha. I can't agree more, and I am sure you can help it.	"اتفق معك حقًا ومتأكد بأنك تستطيع تجاوز الأمر" "متأكد من أنك تستطيع تحقيق ذلك .." "متأكد من أنك تستطيع فعلها .."

Table 13. Results of text no.4

Text 1	Pragmatics	Translation
Poor level	3	19
Weak level	16	12
Strong level	14	7
Optimal level	7	2

Table 14. Student's translation samples of text no.4

Text 2	ST	(students') TT
Poor level	H: it is drafty in here	"عزيزتي ان المكان حار هنا" "عزيزتي، هنا مسودة" "عزيزتي، هل هناك أي ملفات؟"
	W: I am in the kitchen	أنا في المطبخ
	H: blame your beauty for my badness, I got this	"عليك لوم جمالك لسوئي حدث هذا" "ألوم جمالك لقبحي، هكذا" "اللوم على جمالك على شر موقفي" "يجب أن تشكر جمال لسوء حظي"
	W: You are good	"أنت شخص محترم" "أنت بارع"
Weak level	H: it is drafty in here	"عزيزتي الجو بارد هنا" "يوجد تيار هواء هنا" "المكان معرض للتيارات الهوائية هنا"
	W: I am in the kitchen	""أنا في المطبخ الآن"
	H: blame your beauty for my badness, I got this	"أوه أخطأت في ذلك، أنا فهمت"
	W: You are good	"أنت جيد"
Strong level	H: it is drafty in here	"عزيزتي، الرياح تهب هنا" "هناك عاصفة تهز الأبواب والنوافذ" "إن الرياح عاتية هنا" "الجو عاصف"
	W: I am in the kitchen	"أنا في المطبخ، اعذرني" "أنا مشغولة في المطبخ"
	H: blame your beauty for my badness, I got this	"جمالك هو سبب بلاهتي، سأتعامل مع الأمر" "فليعذرني جمالك على خطئي، سأتولى الأمر"
	W: You are good	" حسنا"
Optimal level	H: it is drafty in here	"عزيزتي عل يمكنك غلق النافذة من فضلك؟" "عزيزتي، هل بإمكانك أن تغلقي النوافذ؟"
	W: I am in the kitchen	"أنا في المطبخ حاليا، لا أستطيع أن أغلق النافذة"
	H: blame your beauty for my badness, I got this	"اعذريني، سأتولى أمر ذلك بنفسي" "لا تقلقي عزيزتي، سأهتم بذلك" "أريحي جمالك، سأغلقها بنفسي"

Text 2	ST	(students') TT
		"لا مشكلة"
		"لا بأس "
	W: You are good	"لا عليك"

4.2.3 Findings and results of text no. 2:

Text 2:

*A conversation between two co-workers

A: I honestly lost hope in you, and I am so done with you. I have been waiting for the documents forever. Are you getting them done any soon?
B: Rest assured. I have got it under my control.

For pragmatic awareness, about 70% of students had a strong and optimal level, while the percentage of translation quality was quite equal in almost all levels except the weak level with only 5 students. The translation quality provided in this text by students is better than the translations in the previous text. However, this fact does not deny that there is a percentage of students who provided bad quality of translation for the same text.

4.2.4 Findings and results of text no. 3:

Text 3:

*Two classmates in a media class

A: I should work like a mule; otherwise I will be a BBC reporter
B: Haha. I can't agree more, and I am sure you can help it.

Students' pragmatic awareness varied in different levels equally to a certain extent except for the weak level where we had only 2 students. For translation, the numbers in the poor and weak level are higher than in strong and optimal level.

4.2.5 Findings and results of text no. 4:

Text 4:

*A husband and wife at home

A husband was working with his computer in the living room when a fierce wind started to knock on the door and move the opened windows.

H: it is drafty in here
W: I am in the kitchen
H: blame your beauty for my badness, I got this
W: You are good

The results of this text are quite the same as the results of text no. 1 and text 2 where the highest numbers of pragmatic awareness are centered in the average levels (weak and strong) while the translations' quality are high in the poor and weak levels.

4.3 Discussion of Findings

It is expected that one translation student among every 40 in the University of Nizwa has critical difficulties in pragmatics and translation. This piece of information leads us to the fact that it is rarely common to find students with very poor pragmatic awareness and translation abilities.

As for pragmatic awareness, students showed a strong and optimal level. Only a few were at weak and poor levels, which is a good sign that UoN's translation students have a good pragmatic awareness, can infer the meaning, deduce it beyond what is said and understand the language in use. There are so many factors explaining why students of the UoN have a high level of pragmatic awareness. One of them is that students are provided with good quality of teaching for linguistics' courses including pragmatic, discourse analysis and semantics.

On the other hand, in translation, most of the students fell under the poor level, which is the lowest level in the classification. Having over 10 students at a poor level in translation while most of them got a strong and optimal level in pragmatic awareness is the most surprising part of the study and its results. As a clear statement, we can say, students showed enough pragmatic awareness, but their translation abilities did not help them to translate their comprehension and convey the meaning in a good manner. What is worth mentioning is that the researchers expected that the students might have difficulties with translating the pragmatic aspects, but it turned out that some students lack the basics of translation, in general. Therefore, the evaluation of their translation was affected by the quality of translation as whole and was not confined to

translating those phrases and sentences with pragmatic aspects.

As an attempt to analyze the qualitative data 'translations' and try to align them with the quantitative results, and to align the pragmatic awareness with translation quality, we would analyze the 4 texts as follows:

For instance, in text no. 1, 80% of translations of "eh, I'm good, man," itself, fell under the poor level. Most of the students translated the sentence literally as "أنا رجل جيد"and "أنا بخير"while the intended meaning is completely different. Only a few tried to deliver the meant purpose and translated it in a creative, good, accurate manner. For those who attempted to convey the refusal purpose of the sentence, their translations were considered an optimal level of translation quality e.g., "للأسف، لا أشعر برغبة في ذلك" and "لا أعتقد بأنني أريد الذهاب". There were only 6 students out of 40. Students at the strong level seem to understand the purpose, but the sentence was not really translated in a way that the reader can understand it. There were also 6 students. Translations at the weak level were ambiguous. 10 students fell under this level. Translations at the poor level were translated literally, showed a poor level of relevance as a response or the addition strategy was used in an inappropriate way e.g., "حسنًا، أنا رجل بارع" and "أنا رجل مكتفي". The biggest number of students belonged to this level.

In text no.2, the exception can be seen at the weak level with only 5 students, while other levels are almost equal. 11 students were at the poor level for their translations were off the contextual meaning e.g., "وعملت الكثير من أجلك" as a translation for "I am done with you" or for the poor quality of the language itself "لقد انهيتهم تحت سيطرتي". For the strong level, were quite understandable but not as perfect as the translations provided at the optimal level. For instance,"هدئ أعصابك أنا مسيطر على الوضع" is stronger than "لا تقلق، الأمور تحت السيطرة". That is why the former translation was considered strong, but the latter was optimal. The provided translations of this text were generally better than the previous one.

The quality of translations returns to becoming poor and weak again in text 3 despite having strong and optimal pragmatic awareness, which goes in line with text 1's results. Most students seem to be aware of the pragmatic aspects, as they answered the questions assigned to this text correctly, yet their translations were poor. For example, most of the students answered "solidarity" for the question that says "the expressions "I can't agree more" shows:" whereas their translations were something similar to "لا أستطيع أنا أتفق معك بشدة" or " لا أستطيع موافقتك أكثر" while the meaning is just showing solidarity as they answered. One of the facts that can be concluded is that students can understand the pragmatic aspects, but they cannot utilize their comprehension in translation. On the other hand, few students translated "I cannot agree with you more" in a manner that reflects their understanding. For instance, "اتفق معك حقًا ومتأكد بأنك تستطيع تجاوز الأمر".

Translations were poor and weak as well in text no. 4. Most of the students who chose "refusal" for the question that says, "the purpose of 'I am in the kitchen' is making a\an:" translated the sentence literally as "أنا في المطبخ" and did not use their understanding of the intended purpose to produce a better translation. However, those in optimal level translated it as " أنا في المطبخ حاليا، لا أستطيع أن أغلق النافذة". Furthermore, they answered "request\order" for the question saying "the purpose of 'it is drafty' is making a\an:" but they did not take advantage of this fact in their translations. Over 70% translated literally as "عزيزتي، الرياح تهب هنا" and "إن الرياح عاتية هنا". These translations cannot be considered wrong but are in a lower level than the optimal level in which the translations were " عزيزتي عل يمكنك غلق النافذة من فضلك؟" and "عزيزتي، هل بإمكانك أن تغلقي النوافذ؟". The target reader can obviously see the consistency between speaker H's utterance and speaker W's response through the optimal translations. Translations provided at the optimal level are adhered to all of Grice's maxims of cooperative principles theory, in contrary to those at the poor and weak level where they either float or violate them. They are also written in a good quality, are relevant, and conveyed the intended meaning or purpose.

As a comprehensive analysis of the data, it was concluded that the there are three types of students' performance in the test:

1- Pragmatic awareness is higher than translation quality level. A huge contradiction between the two variables was remarked with 55% of students of this study. Most of the students showed enough understanding of the texts and their intended meaning, but their translations, on the other hand, were poor.

There might be so many reasons why students have a good pragmatic awareness but a disoriented translation, on the other hand. One of them, as the researchers noticed, is that students were not aware of the fact that as a translator, they should not tie themselves to the source text, and instead, they should avoid literal translation and be creative in translating the meaning not words, despite the fact that students were noted that they should be creative, avoid ambiguity, avoid literal translation, and they can add and delete as they wish. Another reason why a big percentage of students had a poor level in translation is their linguistic catastrophic mistakes in Arabic, although they are all native speakers of Arabic. Note that, students' translations were not only evaluated based on their translation of pragmatic aspects, but the translation as whole. One reason why Students have poor Arabic could be the poor exposure of translation students to Arabic. Therefore, this fact puts the DFL at the UoN in a critical stage in which they might need to reconsider the study plan of the translation bachelor students.

2- Pragmatic awareness is close\equal to translation quality level. Around 40% of the students have compatible results between PA and TQ, which shows that there is a certain extent of a positive relationship between the two variables as there is no one to one correspondence. The translations of this type of student relied on pragmatic comprehension. Students with a high level of pragmatic awareness showed better quality of translation than others.

3- Translation level is higher than the pragmatic awareness one. Only a few (5%) fell under this type. The translation quality was much better than the pragmatic awareness. Although this sample of students is not common and rare, it can be justified in reliance on many facts. One of them is that the distracters in the MCQs succeeded in confusing students, and hence, they chose the wrong answer. Another fact could be students spending a lot of time in translation and did not have enough time to focus on the MCQs. It could also be the personal abilities and differences in achieving in opened questions better than objective questions.

Taking into account the objectives of the study, the findings further depicted the fact that the students majoring in English Translation have an acceptable level of pragmatic awareness of competence; in most cases, they were able to detect the indirect speech and pragmatic aspects of the sentences and were not merely inclined to do a word-by-word translation. Moreover, the quality of the translation and its precision is augmented once the students are aware of the pragmatic aspects.

According to the results, there is a tight relationship of 40% between PA and TQ. Furthermore, it is recommended that the quality of teaching translations courses for translation students at the University of Nizwa must get more sophisticated. They also should be exposed to Arabic language courses.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary of the Findings

It was concluded through this study that there is an extent of a tight positive relationship between pragmatic awareness and translation quality, as a good number of students show correspondence between two variables. However, the ability of the translators is important to translate the pragmatic aspects. A higher percentage of students have a good pragmatic awareness level but are not able to translate them in a good way. Few students, forming 5%, had a better translation quality than pragmatic awareness. The results of the test show that the translation students at the University of Nizwa are more aware of the pragmatic aspects in English (SL) than they are able to translate them to Arabic (TL).

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Rafieyan V. Relationship between Pragmatic comprehension and translation of culture-bound texts. Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research. 2016; 3(3):257-267.
2. Ouerchifani R, Ouerchifani N, Rejab ML, Gall D. Pragmatic language comprehension: Role of theory of mind,

executive functions, and the prefrontal cortex. Noropscychologia. 2024;194.
3. Nida EA, Taber CR. The Theory and Practice Translation. E.J. Brill, Leiden; 1982.
4. NIDA, Eugene A. Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E. J. Brill; 1964.
5. Malmkjar K. Linguistic and cultural aspects of translation. John Benjamins Publishing. 1998;6.
6. Ho ML. On some problems of translating English into Chinese. Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology. 1971;42(1):83-106.
7. Hatim B, Mason I. Discourse and the translator. Longman; 1991.
8. Sperber D, Wilson D. Relevance: Communication and cognition. Blackwell; 1986.
9. Al-Rubai'ey F. Identity and pragmatic Transfer: The role of Omani EFL learners' identities in their pragmatics choices in English. York University; 2016.
10. Kasper G, Schmidt R. Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. Studies in second language acquisition. 1996;18(2):149-169.
11. Ardeshiri M, Zarafshan M. Students' causes of errors in translating pragmatic senses. International Journal of English and Education. 2014;3(4):238-253.

APPENDIX

Pragmatic-translation Test

This test was prepared by a researcher to test translation students' pragmatic awareness and assess the quality of their translation to conclude the relationship between the two variables. Participation in this study is **totally optional**. However, your choice of participation will require providing us with some information about you (excluding your name).

1. Study year:
2. Gender:
3. Age:
4. Courses taken in linguistics so far:

   - Introduction to linguistics
   - Discourse Analysis
   - Semantics
   - Sociolinguistics

Other courses……

5. Courses taken in translation so far:

   - Practice in translation
   - Media translation
   - Business translation
   - Literary translation
   - Interpretation
   - Legal translation

Other courses……

6. Have you ever been to an English-speaking country?
   - No
   - Yes

If yes, how long? And what was the purpose?

- Note that all information provided will be confidential and used for research purposes only.
- Before proceeding with the test, remember the following:

- Only good results are rewarded and will be part of your total grade in the course.
- Avoid ambiguity in your translation.
- Be creative!
- Make sure the translation is coherent.
- Avoid literal translation.
- You should render the meaning.
- You may add and omit as you wish.

*Two friends are having a very **informal** conversation

A: I'm dying to see the fireworks, DJs, and the new-brand theater. C'mon dear, let's make it to Cali and rave together!

B: Eh! I am good, man.

Translation:

1. Speaker A is:

a) angry
b) bored
c) excited
d) tired

2. The purpose of "I am good" is making a\an:

a) Refusal
b) Apology
c) promise
d) Order

3. Speaker A had a prior idea about speaker B's decision:

a) True
b) False

4. Speaker A and B seems to be in California:

a) True
b) False

*A conversation between two co-workers

A: I honestly lost hope in you, and I am so done with you. I have been waiting for the documents forever. Are you getting them done any soon?

B: Rest assured. I have got it under my wraps.

Translation:

1. Speaker A is:

a) angry
b) bored
c) excited
d) tired

2. The purpose of speaker B's response is making a\an:

a) Refusal
b) Apology
c) promise
d) denial

3. Speaker B behaves constantly that way:

a) True
b) False

4. Speaker B seems to be confident:

a) True
b) False

*Two classmates in a media class

A: I should work like a mule otherwise I will be a BBC reporter
B: Haha. I can't agree more, and I am sure you can help it.

Translation:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1. Speaker A is being:

a) arrogant
b) humble
c) sarcastic
d) hypocrite

2. The expressions "I can't agree more" shows:

a) solidarity
b) disagreement
c) paradoxicality
d) denial

3. Speaker A wants to be a BBC reporter:

a) True
b) False

4. Speaker A and B seems to have a certain stereotype:
a) True
b) False

*A husband and wife at home

A husband was working with his computer in the living room when a fierce wind started to knock on the door and move the opened windows.

H: Honey, it is drafty in here

W: I am in the kitchen

H: blame your beauty for my badness, I got this

W: You are good

Translation:

1. The purpose of "it is drafty" is making a\an:
   a) refusal
   b) request
   c) denial
   d) order

2. The purpose of "I am in the kitchen" is making a\an:
   a) Refusal
   b) Apology
   c) promise
   d) denial

3. The purpose of " blame your beauty for my badness" is making a\an:
   a) Refusal
   b) Apology
   c) promise
   d) denial

4. The purpose of " blame your beauty for my badness" is making a\an:
   a) Refusal
   b) Apology
   c) promise
   d) denial

5. We expect the husband to leave his computer and perform an action:
   a) True
   b) False

6. We expect the wife to leave the kitchen:
   a) True
   b) False

7. The wife is not satisfied about her husband:
   a) True
   b) False

8. "you are good" was meant for forgiveness:
   a) True
   b) False

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/112592