

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA

MENTOURI UNIVERSITY- CONSTANTINE

FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES

**Foreign Learners' Difficulties in Translating the Arabic
Discourse Marker 'Fa' into English
The Case of Third Year Students of Translation at the
University of Constantine**

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements of a Master Degree in
Applied Language Studies

Submitted by:

Miss Imen CHAALAL

Examined by: Dr. Nacif LABED

Supervised by:

Dr. Youcef BEGHOUL

2009-2010

Dedications

To my parents

To my grandfather:

Belkacem

To my twin brother and lovely sisters:

Mohamed, Zahra, Amani and Nour El Houda

To my friend of childhood:

Amel Hind Mehenni

Acknowledgements

First of all, words cannot express my deep appreciation and sincere gratitude to my supervisor Dr Youcef Beghoul. I would like to thank him a lot for his patience, motivation and guidance in helping me write this dissertation. He has provided me with sound advice and very helpful suggestions. Working with him has been both instructive and entertaining. It has been an honour to have such a kind and competent person as a supervisor.

I am also grateful to Pr Zahri Harouni and Dr Nacif Labeled for the invaluable references they have provided me.

I wish to thank Mrs Boukaoud and Mrs Chelli, at the Department of Translation, University of Constantine, for their kindness and precious contribution while administering the test.

My special thanks and appreciation go to my colleague Boudjemaa Denden for his help and constant support.

I am greatly indebted to many of my friends for their support in writing this dissertation. My sincere thanks go to Asma Temim, Fatima Zohra Maleki, Amina Boubidi and Fairouz Souici.

I wish to express my love and appreciation to my parents for helping me get through the difficult times, and for all the emotional support. I wish to express my sincerest gratitude to my mother, whose love is limitless and to my father who is my model in life. This dissertation would have been impossible without them.

Finally, I would like to thank all the people who have had any role whatsoever to play in conceiving, writing and binding this dissertation.

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine the effect of the awareness of the Algerian EFL learners of the conjunctive devices on their translations, and, particularly, the translation of the Arabic conjunction 'fa' into English. The translation of this conjunction seems to pose many difficulties because it is of a multifunctional nature and has many semantic properties. That is why we supposed that if EFL learners do not assume that Arabic 'fa' is a mono-functional conjunction, they will produce accurate translations in terms of both cohesion and coherence. So, in order to achieve this objective, data have been collected through the administration of a test and a questionnaire for a group of third year students of translation at the University of Constantine. The results have revealed that, because of the students' unawareness that 'fa' is a multifunctional conjunction, their translation products have lacked the necessary cohesion. Therefore, this study recommends explicit teaching of the various types of conjunctions, their categories and their functions across the two languages in order to help students overcome these difficulties.

List of Tables

Table 1: Translation of Adversative ‘Fa’	44
Table 2: Translation of Causal ‘Fa’	47
Table 3: Translation of Resultative ‘Fa’	49
Table 4: Translation of Explanatory ‘Fa’	52
Table 5: Translation of Sequential ‘Fa’	54
Table 6: Gender	55
Table 7: Age Range	55
Table 8: Year of Baccalaureate Award	56
Table 9: Baccalaureate Speciality	56
Table 10: Importance of English	57
Table11: Justifying the Importance of English	58
Table 12: Reading in English	59
Table 13: Materials Students Read in English	60
Table 14: Reading in Arabic	61
Table 15: Materials Students Read in Arabic	62
Table16: Reasons for Learning Translation	63
Table 17: Recognition of Translated Materials	64
Table 18: Criteria for Recognizing Translated Materials	66
Table19: Experience in Translation	67
Table 20: Materials Students Translate	68
Table21: Translation and the Mastery of Languages	69
Table 22: Difficulties in Translating Arabic ‘Fa’ into English	70
Table 23: Recognition of the Multiplicity of Arabic ‘Fa’	71
Table24: Importance of Conjunctions when Translating	72

List of Abbreviations

CA: Contrastive Analysis

CAH: Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

DM: Discourse Markers

EA: Error Analysis

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

SL: Source Language

TL: Target Language

Phonetics Symbols

Transcription adopted for the presentation of Arabic pronunciation as appears in Al-Qahtani's *Semantic Valence of Arabic Verbs* (2004):

Arabic Alphabet	Symbols
ء	ʔ
ب	b
ت	t
ث	θ
ج	ʒ
ح	.h
خ	χ
د	d
ذ	ð
ر	r
ز	z
س	s
ش	ʃ
ص	.s

Arabic Alphabet	Symbols
ض	.d
ط	.t
ظ	ð.
ع	ʕ
غ	ġ
ف	f
ق	q
ك	k
ل	l
م	m
ن	n
ه	h
و	w
ي	j

Consonantal Symbols

Vowels		Symbols
Short	اَ	a
	اُ	u
	اِ	i
Long	اَـ	a:
	اُـ	u:
	اِـ	i:

Vocalic Symbols

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I: Translation: An Overview	6
Introduction	6
I.1. Cohesion in Discourse and Translation	6
I.1.1. Text	7
I.1.2. Context	9
I.1.3. Texture	10
I.1.4. Ties	13
I.1.5. Cohesion	13
I.1.6. Cohesion and Coherence	15
I.1.7. Cohesion in Translation	18
I.2. Contrastive Analysis	21
I.2.1. Definition	21
I.2.2. CA Hypothesis	21
I.2.3. From CA towards EA	23
I.2.4. Applications of Contrastive Analysis	24
I.3. Contrastive Study of English and Arabic Conjunctions	25
I.3.1. Conjunctions in English and Arabic	25
I.3.2. Some Differences between Arabic and English Conjunctions	31
I.3.3. Students' Difficulties when Translating Conjunctions	33
I.3.4. The Discourse Marker 'Fa'	34
Conclusion	39
Chapter II: Description and Analysis of the Test and the Questionnaire	41
Introduction	41

II.1. Subjects	41
II.2. Research Tools	41
II.2.1. Test	42
II.2.2. Questionnaire	42
II.3. Analysis	43
II.3.1. Test	43
II.3.2. Questionnaire	55
II.4. Summary of the Findings	72
Conclusion	74
General Conclusion	75
References	78
Appendices	82

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

As it is well known, Arabic and English belong to distinct language families. That is why many difficulties may arise when it comes to translation. The distinction at the Discourse level, for example, explains why novice translators and students of translation have the tendency to translate the source text by breaking it into pieces without taking into consideration the text's organizations. Such a way distorts the translation product and violates the unity of the translated version. As a result, the interpretation of the intended meaning loses its accuracy and leads to breakdowns of ideas.

To clarify, one of the problems that foreign language learners are challenging during this process is the translation of cohesive devices or more precisely the translation of sentence connectors. The problem here is that there are some Arabic conjunctions that are misunderstood or used in their wrong sense which leads later to poor production in the target language i.e. English. That is why the present study intends to explore the translation problems with which learners of translation are confronted when translating sentences containing the conjunction 'fa' into English. In this respect, the analysis of literary works of Mostaghanemi (1993) and Bakir et al. (1962) will be undertaken in order to identify the functions of the discourse marker 'fa' in Arabic, and then to see how FL learners consider its equivalent translation in English.

Background of the Study

During the four years of studying translation at the department of English, we have so many problems when translating the conjunction 'fa' into English. The main cause behind such deficiency was the ignorance that the DM 'fa' in addition to its initiating nature it can function as an explanation, result, cause, sequence of time and even as an

adversative. However, the usual translation was the insertion of no conjunctions .As a result, the produced text was ambiguous since it lacked the necessary cohesion.

Aim of the Study

The main objective of this research is to shed light on the importance of the use of conjunctive devices in both languages Arabic and English. This is for the sake of enhancing the learners' translation production at this level.

Research Questions

The research questions can be stated as follows:

- 1- Is it because of the learners' assumption that the discourse marker 'fa' is a mono-functional conjunction that they, as a result, translate inaccurately?
- 2- Is it because of the differences between Arabic and English categorizations of conjunctive devices that learners produce inappropriate translation?
- 3- Is it because of the students' belief that conjunctions are of less importance in text organizations that they produce inadequate translation?

Research Hypothesis

We hypothesize that if EFL learners do not assume that the discourse marker 'fa' is a mono-functional conjunction, they will produce faithful translation products in terms of both cohesion and coherence.

Investigating Tools

a- Choice of the Method

In order to test the stated hypothesis and to obtain the information which fit the objective of this study, two main tools will be used. Firstly, a test will be oriented for the subjects in order to identify the possible errors they make in tackling the translation of conjunctive 'fa'. Then, a questionnaire will be administered for the same subjects in order to support the test results. In this case, the different attitudes students have towards the

translation of conjunctions into English and the difficulties they may encounter will be observed.

b- Population and Sampling

The sample of this research is a group of 3rd year students of translation at the University of Constantine. The reason behind the selection of this particular category is that students at this level are supposed to be knowledgeable about the importance of cohesion among sentences, and, as a result, they will be able to produce accurate translations. However, because the programs of translation at the department of translation do not include theoretical courses based on Discourse Analysis studies, we expect different results to be obtained.

Structure of the Study

The present research is divided into two chapters.

Chapter one consists of three main sections. The first one will focus in some details on the theoretical background underlying cohesion and its relation to translation. The second is devoted to exploring the procedure of Contrastive Analysis. The third will examine the difference between Arabic and English conjunctions, their categorizations, functions and their role as cohesive markers and it will deal with, as a particular instance, the Arabic discourse marker 'fa', its different functions, and its appropriate equivalents in English.

Chapter two will deal with the analysis of the students' translation of sentences containing the conjunction 'fa' and the analysis of the students' questionnaire.

CHAPTER I

Translation: An Overview

Introduction	6
I.1. Cohesion in Discourse and Translation	6
I.1.1. Text	7
I.1.2. Context	9
I.1.3. Texture	10
I.1.3.1. Cohesion	11
I.1.3.2. Coherence	11
I.1.3.3. Intentionality	11
I.1.3.4. Acceptability	11
I.1.3.5. Informativity	12
I.1.3.6. Situationality	12
I.1.3.7. Intertextuality	12
I.1.4. Ties	12
I.1.4.1. Types of Cohesive Devices	13
I.1.5. Cohesion	13
I.1.5.1 Semantic Property of Cohesion	15
I.1.6. Cohesion and Coherence	15
I.1.7. Cohesion in Translation	18
I.1.7.1. Textual Equivalence	19
I.1.7.2. Pragmatic Equivalence	19
I.2. Contrastive Analysis	21
I.2.1. Definition	21
I.2.2. CA Hypothesis	21

I.2.2.1. Strong Version	21
I.2.2.2. Weak Version	22
I.2.2.3. Criticism of CAH	22
I.2.3. From CA towards EA	23
I.2.4. Applications of Contrastive Analysis	24
I.3. Contrastive Study of English and Arabic Conjunctions	22
I.3.1. Conjunctions in English and Arabic	25
I.3.1.1. Conjunctions in English	25
I.3.1.2. Conjunctions in Arabic	29
I.3.2. Differences between Arabic and English Conjunctions	31
I.3.3. Students' Difficulties when Translating Conjunctions	33
I.3.4. The Discourse Marker 'Fa'	34
I.3.4.1. Functions of 'Fa'	34
I.3.4.2. Possible Equivalents of 'Fa' in English	36
Conclusion	39

Chapter I

Translation: An Overview

Introduction

In this chapter, we aim to investigate cohesion, a particular aspect of discourse, and show how efficient is the impact of text cohesion upon text interpretation. In other words, how this linguistic aspect ensures the unity of texts and enables readers to derive a coherent discourse. Moreover, Newmark (1987:295, cited in Baker, 1992:180) stressed that cohesion has always been considered as an important element in discourse analysis applications to translation. That is why our emphasis will be on matters of translation, i.e. examining how translation is concerned with cohesion. For this reason, we will explore one type of cohesive devices, which is conjunctions, a particular feature of cohesion and see how the inappropriate use of these devices can lead to the misinterpretation and breakdowns of ideas in the translated version. Then, we will examine the procedure of Contrastive Analysis at the level of conjunctive devices in order to overcome such problems.

I.1. Cohesion in Discourse and Translation

In fact, our main interest is to tackle textual cohesion in written discourse since it is simply related to matters of translation. That is why we will introduce, firstly, some particular characteristics of written discourse such as text and texture as a background to the investigation of cohesion.

The starting point of this discussion of cohesion is exploring the notion of text: what a text is, what its various features are, and how it is related with context.

I.1.1. Text

In fact, there is a tendency for new researchers to shift their attention from a sentential approach towards a textual one. This means that researchers such as De Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) and Van Dijk (1972) brought new insights to the study of language at the text level (cited in Carstens, 1999:580). Various definitions were brought ahead, since they were tackled in relation to other disciplines, like Grammar, Linguistics and Discourse Analysis. Our main concern in this study is to relate texts with discourse on the one hand, and to understand how textual cohesion can affect the translation of texts, on the other one.

For John Lyons (1980: 198, cited in Madoui, 2004: 18), for instance, “a text is not merely considered as simply a jumble of sentences but rather a sequence of units creating connected sentences in an appropriate way by means of properties of cohesion and coherence.”

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976:1-2), a text is “a unit of language in use.”; “It refers to any passage spoken or written of whatever length, that does form a unified whole... It is not a grammatical unit like a clause or sentence. A text is best regarded as a semantic unit: a unit not of form but of meaning.” They put forward this definition in order to assert that a text is indeed an example of language in use rather than language as an abstract system of meaning (i.e. sentences or clauses).

De Baugrande and Dressler (1997:10, cited in Tanskanen, 2006: 4) also asserted that a text is not only a random collection of sentences, but it is a unified whole that aims to communicate an intended message. They stated that a text is “a *communicative* event wherein linguistics, *cognitive and social locations converge*, and not just as the sequence of words that were uttered or written.”

To reiterate, Halliday and Hasan (1976:12) proposed a more thorough definition. They stated the following:

A text is a unit of language in use. It is not a grammatical unit, like a clause or sentence; and it is not defined by its size. A text is sometimes envisaged to be some kind of super-sentence, a grammatical unit that is larger than a sentence but is related to a sentence in the same way that a sentence is related to a clause, a clause to a group and so on: by *consistency*, the composition of larger units out of smaller ones. But this is misleading. A text is not something that is like a sentence, only bigger; it is something that differs from a sentence in kind. A text does not consist of sentences; it is realized by or encoded by sentences.

So, we can say that a text is composed of sentences which are of any size, any length and of any organization. The public notice ‘No Smoking’, for instance, is a sentence in its own right, and simple texts of this kind aim to get things done directly. However, this is not always the case with all texts. That is, many texts which exceed one sentence like newspapers, novels and poems constitute one text. Hence, when a speaker or writer relates the sentences and utterances he/she has and creates a unified stretch of language then, we can say that this piece of language makes up a text (Widdowson, 2007).

As expressed earlier, what characterized text’s nature is text meaning. This means, text meaning or communicative meaning is referred to as text. In this view, text is no more considered as an abstract pattern but rather a semantic unit that conveys meaning. It is claimed that text meaning is determined by means of the expression of texts’ proposition, sentence conveyed message and the distribution of information in a sentence through a context (Yowell & Muftah, 1995). In this respect, text is called text when it achieves its communicative nature.

Moreover, Widdowson (2007) confirmed that any piece of language is identified as a text whenever it is produced for a communicative purpose. Therefore, “texts in this view do not contain meaning but are used to mediate it across discourse.” (2007: 6-7). As we

noted above about notices, the mediation in this kind of language is easy to make and straightforward, that is why communication will take place i.e. a text is used to mediate some convergence between discourses. Otherwise, no communication would take place at all (Widdowson 2007).

However, in order to determine the nature of text, other factors should be taken into consideration. Features of context, textuality and cohesion are basically required for text unity.

I.1.2. Context

It has been suggested that every text is characterized by means of certain features that are found within sentences. For example, it was claimed that phenomena like deixis, anaphora and definiteness are difficult to study without the combination of text and context. That is why Brown and Yule (1983:25-26) explained that “a sentence can be fully analyzed without taking context into account has been seriously questioned.” (cited in Carstens, 1999). In other words, every passage of language would be considered as a text when it is relevant to a context. The interpretation of text is based on the relationship between text and context. Otherwise, problems of misinterpretation will emerge when contextual connections cannot occur (Widdowson, 2004). Therefore, context must include all the relevant factors needed for the interpretation of the intended meaning.

As we have just stated above, text and context combination is of great importance since it guarantees the appropriate interpretation of texts. Cook (1989) claimed that it is impossible to give a piece of discourse its unity without considering the world at large ‘context’ i.e. our knowledge of the world outside language. So, contextual properties of language must be included. Linguistic and situational contexts are the prominent ones to illustrate. We mean by *linguistic context* or *co-text* the internal relations that link the linguistic components (words or sentences) with each other within a text. Whereas,

situational context or the *context of situation* is the actual circumstances of time and place in which language use is situated. It is clearly difficult for speakers or writers to formulate their apposition out of its situational context. If someone asks you to express your linguistic knowledge, for example your competence of a given language, you will find yourself inevitably lost in what way you are going to express. The main reason behind this is that every language is considered to be a natural process, spontaneous and quite restricted to every context (Widdowson, 2007).

Moreover, it is worth noting that in addition to the linguistic and situational contexts, cultural context and shared values between participants affect seriously the unity of text. Hence, Widdowson (2007:25) pointed out the following:

Context can be thought of as knowledge of the world that text is used to refer to, but of the world as it is known by a particular group of people. And this has not only to do with what these different groups know about as matters of fact, but also with their distinctive way of thinking about these things.

I.1.3. Texture

The concept of texture or textuality refers to the “property of being a text” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 2). That is to say every text has features of organization that help people distinguish between a text and a random collection of sentences and utterances. It is, in fact, a matter of cohesion that textuality is called so. In other words, by means of cohesive ties, people relate sentences in a particular sequence in order to convey their intended meaning. For example, by means of ‘anaphora’, a specific phenomenon of reference, readers make relationships between the actual sentences and the preceding ones. To illustrate this, Halliday and Hasan (1976) proposed the following example: “Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fire proof dish.” Here, in the second sentence the element ‘them’ refers back to ‘six cooking apples’. As a result these two sentences hang together semantically and create a unified text.

In this view, De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) tackled the issue of texture and its constituents. They asserted that a text will be defined as communicative occurrence which meets seven standards of textuality. In addition to the linguistic units, other factors such as readers, message, and the context of occurrence should be mentioned for achieving the communicative function of texts. And, if one of these standards has not been included, texts will not be communicative (cited in Carstens, 1999:589).

The seven standards of textuality are (cited in Al-Amri, 2008:10-14):

I.1.3.1. Cohesion

The first standard of textuality is called cohesion. It refers to the network of surface relations between sentences in a text.

I.1.3.2. Coherence

It is like cohesion, a network of relations, but it is a conceptual one which underlies the surface text and which establishes the relevance of sentences to text meaning.

I.1.3.3. Intentionality

It is mainly concerned with the producers of texts. Speakers and writers have the intention to produce a text in order to achieve a given purpose and to communicate their intended meaning in an appropriate and successful way.

I.1.3.4. Acceptability

It refers to the ability of the text's receiver to perceive relevance of the text, i.e. the receiver's ability to add any missing or unmentioned information. When readers or listeners identify this relevance, they will not be able to recognize the textuality of the text. So this standard is much related to social and cultural background of texts. For example,

jokes are not always accepted and appreciated by people belonging to different cultures and nations¹.

I.1.3.5. Informativity

Every text should be informative. It must contain new or given information. In fact, there must be a balance in the use of these two kinds. Texts should not be written without any reference to given information, which builds up a background; and texts should not lack the sense of newness, which brings some bright insights to the text.

I.1.3.6. Situationality

It focuses on the important role of the context. That is, it is concerned with factors that make a text relevant to a situation of occurrence. Every text is relevant to a particular social or pragmatic context. So, it is important to determine what is said, by whom, when, why and where.

I.1.3.7. Intertextuality

The last standard of textuality refers to the “relationship between a given text and other relevant texts, texts encountered in prior experience” (Neubert and Shreve, 1992: 117). Thus, text users can recognize a poem, a scientific report or a newspaper on the basis of their previous encounter with materials of the same type and this would help them to process the information in an effective way.

I.1.4. Ties

As it has been said earlier, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), what distinguishes a text from a non-text is its texture. Texture is ensured by means of the cohesive relations existing between linguistic elements in the text and which are

¹ The two standards of ‘Intentionality and Acceptability’ are regarded as a ‘pair principle’. When the producer has to produce a text, the receptor on his turn has to accept this text as a communicative one. In fact, these two participants should adhere to the pragmatic cooperative principle in order to achieve successful textuality.

contributing to its total unity. That is texture is formed by means of cohesive ties. In the previous example; the relation between ‘them’ and ‘six cooking apples’ creates a tie. Thus, these ties refer to the occurrence of two related items in a cohesive way. These cohesive ties are also known as cohesive devices.

I.1.4.1 Types of Cohesive Devices

Halliday and Hasan (1976) identified five major types of cohesive devices in English. They are, namely, reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunctions and lexical cohesion.

They developed this organization on the basis of grammatical and lexical cohesion. That is, reference, ellipsis, substitution, and conjunctions are referred to as ‘grammatical cohesion’ whereas; ‘lexical cohesion’ is dependent on vocabulary studies above the sentence level (McCarthy, 1991).

Hence, thanks to cohesion, a speaker or writer relates the sentences and utterances he/she has and creates a unified stretch of language. Consequently, we can say that this piece of language makes up a text.

I.1.5. Cohesion

As already noted above, “cohesion is one aspect of the study of **texture**, which can be defined as the process whereby meaning is channelled into a digestible current of discourse ‘instead of spilling out formlessly in every possible direction’.” (Halliday 1994: 311, cited in Martin, 2007). Thus, cohesion is the aspect of linking parts of text together semantically by means of various devices. These devices are the result of the relationship between the text’s components which occur at a linguistic level and which aim to interpret each other.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976:4), “cohesion occurs when the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one

presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it.” So, some linguistic elements are interrelated with their references in order to form a text. Consider the same example:

“Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them in a fire proof dish”

In this example the item ‘them’ refers to ‘six cooking apples’. That is, our understanding of the second sentence is dependent on the first one which helps us to know what ‘them’ stands for. Thus, the item ‘them’ is considered as a signpost for the decoder indicating that elements in the texts are used for the sake of interpreting some others (Madoui, 2004).

Moreover, Halliday and Hasan (1976:8) stated that:

Cohesion relations have in principle nothing to do with sentence boundaries. Cohesion is a semantic relation between an element in the text and some other element that is crucial to the interpretation of it. But its location in the text is in no way determined by the grammatical structure. The two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed may be structurally related to each other, or they may not.

They explained that cohesion is usually defined in relation to boundaries between sentences i.e. intersentential relation. However, cohesion already exists within the confines of a single sentence, but it is of less importance because the sentence is naturally cohesive thanks to its grammatical structure. If we consider the sentence ‘if you happen to see the admiral, don’t tell him his ship’s gone down’ we notice that ‘his’ and ‘him’ are referring to the ‘admiral’. So cohesion within the confines of sentences is governed by structural rules such as the rules of pronominalization. Another example is the sentence ‘John took John’s hat off and hang John’s hat on a peg’ which can never occur in normal language use or usage. The identity of reference must be specified by using pronominal forms to make it clear that we are talking about the same John and the same hat (Halliday & Hasan 1976:8).

I.1.5.1. Semantic Property of Cohesion

As we have seen, Halliday and Hasan (1976:8) defined cohesion as “a semantic relation between an element in the text and some other element that is crucial to the interpretation of it.” They claimed that there is a difference between the semantic relation of sentences in isolation and the semantic relation of sentences in combination in the interpretation of elements. To exemplify, the sentence ‘He said so’ is semantically and grammatically correct. However the items ‘he’ and ‘so’ are not clearly referring to any known elements. Therefore, this sentence would be easily understood when we look for its interpretation in the surrounding linguistic context. Whereas, a sentence such as ‘John said everything’ is not an easy one to interpret because we do not know who is John and what John said. These examples are different; in the first one, the items ‘he’ and ‘so’ refer to other elements existing in the surrounding context which are easy to recognize; in the second sentence, there is no obvious indication for its interpretation. However, when it takes place within a larger discourse then, the elements ‘he’ and ‘so’ will be anaphoric reference for other elements. Therefore, we will end up with the statement made by Halliday and Hasan (1976:8), which is that “cohesion is ‘relational concept’ because it is not the presence of a particular class of item that is cohesive, but the relation between one item and another.”

I.1.6. Cohesion and Coherence

Researchers shifted their attention towards the study of discourse and focused on matters of linguistics at the text level. That is, researchers became concerned with the properties of textual cohesion, on the one hand and interested in matters of coherence occurring in the reader’s mind, on the other hand. Almost all researchers agreed that there is a difference between cohesion and coherence, but the points that differentiate between the two are not agreed upon. Tanskanen (2006:7) stated:

It is generally accepted, however, that cohesion refers to the grammatical and lexical elements on the surface of a text which can form connections between parts of the text. Coherence, on the other hand, resides not in the text, but is rather the outcome of a dialogue between the text and its listener or reader. Although cohesion and coherence can thus be kept separate, they are not mutually exclusive, since cohesive elements have a role to play in the dialogue.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976) cohesion is the principle component of text construction resources. They advanced the idea that cohesive relations such as reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunctions and lexical cohesion are the ones that guarantee texts unity. However, this is not the only way to do so. Widdowson (1978:26), for example argues that a text can be coherent without “overt linguistically signaled cohesion.” He pointed out that while communicating people do two things. They express a proposition and at the same time they perform some kind of illocutionary act. He explained that lack of cohesive devices linking texts elements together will not limit the interpretation of discourse. He used the following example:

- a. That’s the telephone.
- b. I am in the bath.
- a. OK.

Here we notice that although this exchange does not contain cohesive ties, readers are able to interpret its meaning. Thus, there is coherence. These sentences make sense and have meaning when they form a text. However when they are in isolation, they do not. From this exchange, we can recognize the performance of the illocutionary acts, i.e. when a’s request was replied by b’s excuse, a’s in his turn again accepted b’s excuse. Therefore,

we can say that this text is coherent (Widdowson, 1978, cited in Yeh, 2004). Thus, besides cohesion; coherence is also of great importance for the unity of texts.

Moreover, Carrell (1982) strongly challenges Halliday and Hasan's assumption that textual cohesion leads inevitably to text coherence. According to Carrell:

Text cohesion is not necessarily a textual property that is manifested by means of grammatical and lexical connectives, but rather that cohesion is an outcome of coherence when readers of text are able to derive the connectivity of ideas from their knowledge of the world. (Carrell, 1982, cited in Hinkle, 2001:112)

She further reported that "when readers are able to connect text's ideas without relying on explicit cohesive devices, explicit cohesive ties are not needed to unify text's ideas" (Carrell, 1982:484, cited in Hinkle, 2001:112). She gave the following example: "The picnic was ruined. No one remembered to bring a crock new." Here, we recognize from our knowledge or memory that picnics and crock news match together. That is, Halliday and Hasan failed to take the reader into account i.e. the fact that readers do not only depend on surface text properties but also on the world knowledge.

Blum-kulka (1986) reiterated that cohesion is merely a surface relationship that holds the text's elements hanging together. It is not sufficient for a text to be cohesive. However, coherence is a semantic relationship between elements that aims to interpret meanings expressed by the participants. She stated again the following:

Coherence can be viewed as a *covert potential meaning relationship among parts of a text, made overt by the reader or listener through a process of interpretation...* Cohesion, on the other hand, will be considered as *an overt relationship holding between parts of the text, expressed by language specific markers.* (1986:17)

To sum up, the majority of researchers asserted that cohesion is not a leading process governing coherence. Coherence as well plays a major role for ensuring text's unity.

All these linguists agreed upon one main point: that there are semantic relations that help create its coherence. However, the distinction lies in 'explicitness'. That is, Halliday and Hasan (1973) emphasized the explicit expressions of semantic relations, whereas the others stressed "the underlying semantic relation ... that actually has the cohesion power" (Halliday & Hasan, 1973, cited in Yeh, 2004).

I.1.7. Cohesion in Translation

As noted before, cohesion devices contribute to textuality in the sense that they are linking elements and bridging text's sentences together for the aim of constructing a unified text. These devices, therefore, are language specific because of language's different origins; these devices may pose great challenges for translators. Therefore, translators should take into consideration the texture features existing in each language while interpreting the communicative meaning. Hatim and Mason (1990) expressed clearly this point as follows:

The various activities of translation criticism, translation assessment and revision all run the risk of concentrating on features of texture without relating them to the communicative process which engendered them. Texture needs to be seen an integral part of what one is doing with one's language. (1990: 94, cited in Madoui, 2004)

Hence, the translator should consider the different textual features existing in a source text and the reason behind the choice of a given device rather than another.

Therefore, cohesion deals with matters of objectivity when considering textual devices in use; however, coherence is more likely to be subjective since it relies on the

reader listener interpretation. That is, readers depend on their world knowledge and their way of reading. Readers do interpret the same text in different ways. Therefore, while the translator is a reader of a source text he/she makes shifts of cohesion and coherence when translating this text. However, as Engenek Bristow (1977: XV) pointed out, ‘even within the skin of his own language, every person translates what he sees or reads, from his own experience.’ (cited in Blum-kulka, 1986:24).

I.1.7.1. Textual Equivalence

According to Baker (1992), during the process of translation, translators should operate with lexical items and grammatical structures. That is why it is necessary to take into account the text’s unity both at the beginning and the end of the process. In other words, good translators read the whole text at least one time, in order to get the most important meaning of the message, before starting translation. Accordingly, translators produce the target version in a way that makes it a text in its own right. She emphasized that thanks to the features of text organization which are language and culture specific; readers are able to distinguish between the ‘natural’ text as translations or as ‘foreign’ one (Baker, 1992).

The main purpose of translation is to guarantee a degree of equivalence at the text level, rather than at the word or sentence level. That is, translators aim to produce natural translated texts in their own right, without feeling that they are translated versions. For this reason, translators are asked to make alternation on the features existing in the source text so that to fit the organization of target texts (Baker, 1992).

I.1.7.2. Pragmatic Equivalence

As we have noted earlier, what makes a text is not merely the use of cohesive devices, but the ability to understand the semantic relations that exist in a particular

utterance. (Hoey, 1991, cited in Baker, 1992) summed up the difference between cohesion and coherence as follows:

We will assume that cohesion is a property of text and that coherence is a facet of the reader's evaluation of a text. In other words, cohesion is objective, capable in principle of automatic recognition, while coherence is subjective and judgments concerning it may vary from reader to reader. (1991:12)

Therefore, cohesion is the surface expression of coherence relations; it helps ensure explicitness. To illustrate this, the conjunction 'therefore' expresses a reason or a consequence. However, if the reader does not recognize these semantic relations joined by 'therefore', he/she will not be able to understand the text. Hence, the mere occurrence of cohesive devices does not guarantee a coherent text; they do only reflect the conceptual relations which make sense (1992:118).

As you can see, we have tried to identify one linguistic aspect of text unity which is cohesion. We have seen that cohesion plays a major role for ensuring the communicative meaning between participants, either within the same language or across languages while translating. Different views of various researchers have been dealt with concerning this aspect. However, our interest relied on Halliday and Hasan's concept of text cohesion. Even though this is not the only way to achieve a better understanding of text, cohesive markers, however, are also of great importance.

Therefore in the following discussion we will consider the importance of cohesive markers and in particular conjunctive devices for ensuring text unity crosslinguistically. However, before tackling this issue, we would like to throw light on some particular aspects related to Contrastive Analysis in order to uncover the similarities and differences between Arabic and English at this level.

I.2. Contrastive Analysis

I.2.1. Definition

CA was introduced in order to overcome the difficulties resulting from language transfer; and as a result it gained a good reputation in the late decades because of the new insights it has brought for the studies of linguistics and applied linguistics.

In fact, the main objective of CA is to compare and contrast two or more languages in order to describe the similarities and differences between them. (Lehiste, 1988, cited in Bouchair, 2003:24) put forward:

The systematic study of transfer of elements from language A to language B, when the speaker attempts to produce B is called CA. The basic assumption of CA is that by contrasting the structure of the “Source language” (A) and the “Target language” (B), one will be able to predict the errors made by the learners of Target language, and it will therefore be possible to design teaching materials to take account of the anticipated errors.

Moreover, Lado (1957: 2, cited in Aarts, 1980:50) stated that “Individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture.” That is CA is based on the assumption that L1 learners have the tendency to transfer to the L2 lexical, semantic, syntactic and phonological features of their L1.

I.2.2. CA Hypothesis

Wardhaugh (1970) classified CA Hypothesis into two versions: the strong and weak version.

I.2.2.1. Strong Version

This version claims that the difficulties L2 learners encounter are the result of comparing and contrasting the first and second language. Lee (1968:186, cited in Aarts, 1980:50) explained a number of points. First, the main cause of difficulty in foreign

language learning is the interference from the learners' native language. Second, the difficulties are basically the result of language differences. Third, the fact that the greater the difference between the native language and foreign language, the greater the difficulty is. Fourth, the results of CA between the two languages are required for the prediction of difficulties occurring in learning a foreign language. Fifth, the results of CA can be used in the preparation of teaching materials and classroom courses.

I.2.2.2. Weak Version

This version is different from the first one in that it does not need the prediction of difficulties. Instead, through their linguistic knowledge linguists are expected to explain the observed interference phenomena. (Wardhaugh, 1970:120, cited in Aarts, 1980:54) admitted that the weak version 'has proved to be helpful', and considered the weak version of the contrastive analysis as the posterior approach which forms the field of error analysis.

I.2.2.3. Criticism of CAH

Among the criticisms that challenged CA are the ones proposed by Mackey (1966) and Corder (1973).

Mackey (1966:201, cited in Aarts1980: 51), for example, challenged strongly the contribution of CA in language teaching. He claimed that "all the mistakes of language learner are due to the makeup of his native language ...is demonstrably false". He explained that the teachers' prediction of errors based on their experience is much more reliable than the predictions based on CA in the sense that this latter sometimes over predict or under predict the difficulties.

Another important criticism was proposed by Corder (1973). He refuted the assumption that all what is different is difficult and what is similar is easy to learn and explained the following. First, there is not necessarily a connection between differences and difficulties. That is to say, because difficulty is a psycholinguistic matter, it is hard to predict the features in L2 that are difficult or easy to learn. Second, it is important for

learners to explore the similarities between languages besides the differences (cited in Aarts1980: 51).

In fact, the critics and studies revealed that the main weaknesses of CA is the over prediction and under prediction of mistakes. For this reason Beghoul (1984) summarized this point as follows:

Besides questioning the validity of interference as a source of errors, there were two other weaknesses of Contrastive Analysis as a discipline in Applied Linguistics; first, the failure of most studies in predicting all areas of difficulty and second the theoretical problems of making adequate comparisons between languages. (1984:9, cited in Bouchair, 2003:27)

I.2.3. From CA towards EA

As a result of the different reactions proposed against CA, EA has appeared to be its substitute. EA is concerned with the study of learners' errors, instead of predicting them. That is to say, it aims to analyze and examine the errors themselves in order to investigate their sources and significance.

EA aims both to check the validity of theories, more particularly the psycholinguistic theory of transfer, and to contribute in the teaching planning of languages. According to Corder (1973) this procedure analyzes the errors and identifies the difficulties encountered by learners; so that to make alternations on the teaching methods and materials if there is a serious need. In this respect Corder (1973:265, cited in Aarts, 1980:54) stated:

Errors provide feedback, they tell the teachers something about the effectiveness, of his teaching materials and his teaching techniques, and show him what parts of the syllabus he has been following have been adequately learned or taught and need further attention. They enable him to

decide whether he can move to the next item or the syllabus he has been working on.

James (1971) discussed whether CA and EA are alternatives or they complete each other. He claimed that “if it is true that CA can predict errors which fail to materialise. It is equally true that EA can fail to recognize errors which have materialised.” Thus, the analysis of errors requires the learners’ background, and this implies CA. For this reason, the two procedures complement each other (James, 1971, cited in Aarts, 1980:54).

In fact, EA aims to discuss the origins of errors, the influence of the mother tongue on the acquisition of L2, and the strategies that learners use in this acquisition. Moreover, it aims to compare the stages the learners use in both the mother tongue and the foreign language (Bouchar, 2003).

I.2.4. Applications of Contrastive Analysis

In fact, the applications of CA were mainly pedagogical i.e. they were based on the preparations of text books, syllabus designs and the development of pedagogical experimentations. Mackey (1965) explained that CA is relevant to language teaching because the difficulties in L2 are the result of the differences between L1 and L2. Hence, if the characteristics of L1 were taken off from those of L2, what is left is a list of the learners’ difficulties. Therefore, CA has been determined in order to predict the errors committed by L2 learners, and to design teaching materials taking into consideration these errors (James, 1981:45, cited in Bouchar, 2003:30). Therefore, through the applications of CA in teaching a foreign language, new insights were brought ahead in developing the skill of translation.

I.3. Contrastive Study of English and Arabic Conjunctions

As it is well known, Arabic and English belong to different language families. That is why many difficulties may arise when it comes to translation. The translation of conjunctive devices, for example, seems to pose one of these problems. For this reason, we will discuss the differences between Arabic and English conjunctions, their categorizations and their functions. We will also deal with one particular conjunction, the Arabic 'fa', its different functions and its appropriate equivalents in English.

I.3.1 Conjunctions in English and Arabic

I.3.1.1. Conjunctions in English

a. Terminology

Conjunctions are called differently depending on the various textbooks. For example, according to Biber et al. (2002: 237), 'linking adverbials' refer to conjunctions. Other terms such as the ones suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1976) are labelled as conjunctive adjuncts or conjunctive expressions. Schiffrin (1986, cited in Müller 2005, p.5) referred to conjunctions as discourse markers (DM) or simply discourse particles. They are called so particularly when they are used by researchers working on different languages.

According to Schiffrin (1987), discourse markers refer to sequential relationships between utterances aiming to indicate the coherence of texts. Therefore, she defined the concept of discourse markers both operationally and theoretically. She put forward that discourse markers are 'sequential dependent elements which bracket unit of talk' (1987:31, cited in Onodera, 2005:16). From the operational point of view, the phrase 'unit of talk' referred to the different elements of speech like: tone groups, sentences, actions and so on. That is to say, this definition is quite general. As a result, these units are based on the researchers' objectives. For this reason, Schourup (1988, cited in Onodera, 2005:16)

explained that this definition should be related to a particular type of units rather than making it too general. Theoretically speaking, she defined DM as ‘contextual coordinates’. That is markers are indicators of the produced utterances occurring in their local contexts (Schiffrin, 1987: 40, cited in Onodera 2005:16).

b. Categorization of Conjunctions

Grammatically speaking, conjunctions are words or phrases used to link parts of discourse together and to indicate the relationship between them. Conjunctions can have different forms; they may be coordinating conjunctions such as ‘and’, ‘but’ and ‘so’; they may be subordinating conjunctions like ‘after’ and ‘because’; they may also be adverbials such as ‘as well’, ‘as’ and ‘afterwards’ (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman,1999).

From the semantic point of view, conjunctions are classified under several types of relations since there is no unique inventory of classification. In this discussion, we shall accept the categories suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1976: 238-239). Their scheme included four main categories: additive, adversative, causal and temporal. Here is one example for each type; from a to d in the following are possible continuations of the following sentence using conjunctions:

For the whole day he climbed up the steep mountainside, almost without stopping.

- a. *And* in all this he met no one. (Additive)
- b. *Yet* he was hardly aware of being tired. (adversative)
- c. *So* by night time the valley was far below him. (causal)
- d. *Then*, as dusk fell, he sat down to rest. (temporal)

The first type is additive relation, it shows that the two clauses or sentences complete each other; and is expressed by conjunctions such as ‘and’, ‘or’, ‘in addition’ and ‘likewise’. Second, adversative relations, are used to express the contrary of what is being said, and they are characterized by conjunctions like ‘but’, ‘however’, ‘instead’ and ‘on the

contrary'. Third, causal conjunctions express a reason or result of what is being said; they include 'because', 'for', 'so', 'therefore', etc. The final type is temporal relation; it relates the clauses or sentences in time and bears a sequential sense by means of conjunctions such as 'next', 'then', 'after that' and the like (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 243) .

c. Conjunctions as Cohesive Devices in English

As we have discussed earlier, Halliday and Hasan (1976) proposed a set of cohesive devices which aim to create unified and well formed texts. According to their classification, these cohesive devices are used to ensure cohesion and coherence, although most researchers claim that cohesive texts are not necessarily coherent ones.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) referred to conjunctions as 'text building devices'. They are linguistic expressions which link between two parts of discourse, either between sentences, clauses or paragraphs. These expressions indicate a cohesive effect but which is different from other devices .They stated that:

Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in discourse (p. 226)

In other words, conjunctions are distinct from reference, ellipsis and substitution in the sense that there is no need for readers to add some missing information by looking for it in the text or by filling structural 'slots'. They asserted that with conjunctions, however, the semantic relations are a specification of the way in which what follows is systematically connected to what has gone before. That is to say, conjunctive relations are not related to any specific sequence. For example if two sentences are joined together by means of a conjunction, they are not necessarily restricted to that order. In this respect, the same relations are sometimes interdependent through the meaning of two continuous parts

of texts. In this view, Schiffrin (1986) agreed with Halliday and Hasan (1976) that such expressions show that the interpretation of one clause is determined by the information derived from the prior clause (cited in Schiffrin, 2003).

Hence, conjunctions as cohesive devices are not restricted merely to the semantic relations, but focus on one specific aspect which is their function i.e. the function conjunctions have are occurring in a succession without being related structurally (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). By contrast, Schiffrin (1986) claimed that conjunctions have both structural and cohesive roles. They are structural elements since they join parts of sentences together and cohesive because they guarantee the interpretation of the whole sentence (cited in Schiffrin, 2003).

d. Multiplicity of Functions

It is worth noting that one of the problems of studying the functions of conjunctions in natural language is the multiplicity of its meaning (Fareh, 1998). As a matter of fact, this multiplicity is not found in one specific direction which is 'function to form'. For example, causal relations can be expressed through the use of different conjunctions such as 'because' and 'so'. But it is also directed from 'form to function' i.e. one conjunctive item such as 'and' can convey more than one conjunctive relation. For example, additives, adversatives and causal...etc. (Schiffrin, 2003). Hence, the expression 'and' in 'I called her and we went together' has a temporal function. However, 'I met her and John' reflects an additive relation. So the same conjunction expresses different functions. Moreover, Halliday and Hasan (1976) explained that although 'and' is a conjunctive device that reflects an additive meaning, its meaning again signals the semantic content of text. So, if 'and' expresses a contrast with what has been said before, then it conveys an adversative relation which is similar to 'but' and 'however' (Schiffrin, 2003). This is exemplified by Fareh (1998: 306) as follows: 'John is an extrovert and Mary is an introvert'. Here we

notice that the conjunction ‘and’ reveals an adversative relation between the two clauses; and so, it can be replaced by an adversative conjunction.

Following this view, Schiffrin (2003) claimed that there is a distinction between ‘and’ which plays structurally the role of coordinator between sentences and clauses, and ‘and’ as a cohesive device, when it comes to text cohesion. As a result, the conjunctive’s use is multifunctional. And thanks to this, many simultaneous processes underlying discourse took place and consequently support the creation of coherence.

Moreover, even if these devices do not occur, semantic relations can be expressed especially in the case of time sequence. For this reason, Baker (1992) emphasized that in addition to the use of conjunctions in signalling semantic relations, verbs as well are used to express these relations. To illustrate this, verbs such as ‘follow’ and ‘precede’ express temporal relations; and verbs like ‘cause’ and ‘lead to’ also express causal relations. For example, the verb ‘follow’ in ‘a snowstorm followed the battle’ expresses a temporal relation which is similar to ‘they fought the battle. After that, it snowed.’ (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 228-229).

Another important point is that connective relations express not only external phenomena but also express temporal ones in the text or in communicative situations. For instance, temporal relations are not only limited to the sequence of time in real life but also reflect the stages of texts. The use of enumerative words such as: ‘first’, ‘second’ and ‘to begin with’ are good examples (Baker, 1992).

I.3.1.2. Conjunctions in Arabic

Arabic compound sentences are conjoined by means of conjunctive devices. These devices are usually known as conjunctive particles or the so called .huru:f ʔalqatif . Hence, the explicit expression of coordination is guaranteed through the use of conjunctions like ‘wa’ , ‘fa’ , ‘θumma’ , ‘aw’ , ‘ʔamma’ , ‘bal’ and ‘laki:n’ . These conjunctions cannot stand

alone as separate words. Instead, they must join the words they follow. That is why they are considered as prefixes (Othman, 2004).

The main functions of Arabic conjunctions are additive, causal, adversative and temporal. They are, in fact, similar to the English ones (Alshorafa, 1994).

a. Additives

The most common devices in Arabic are ‘wa’ and ‘fa’. They are used mainly to express additive relations between parts of texts. The conjunctions ‘wa’ and ‘fa’ are rendered into English as ‘and’ and ‘then’. What differentiates between the two is the fact that ‘fa’, in addition to being a coordinating conjunction, it plays the role of linking pieces of information together. Moreover, the prefix ‘aw’ is also an additive conjunction used to express an alternative purpose. For example, in the sentence

’يدافع عن نفسه أو يتقاتل مع غيره .’

judafiçu çan nafsihi aw jataqatlu maça ğajrihi.

‘aw’ is used to alternate between two Arabic sentences ‘defending himself’ or ‘fighting with others’. This means that the person uses self defence or fights with another person.

b. Adversatives

Adversative conjunctions such as ‘bal’ and ‘la:kin’ reflect contrastive relations. They contain both the additive relation, by linking two opposite units of meaning together, and an adversative one which contains the logical meaning of ‘and’ and ‘however’. Consider this example,

’لم أزر لندن في نيسان 1995 بل زرتها في أيار 2001 .’

’lam ʔazur london fi nisan 1995 bal zurtu:ha fi ʔajjar 2001.’

’I did not visit London in April 1995 *but* in May 2001.’

We notice that ‘bal’ bears both the additive meaning of ‘and’ and an adversative meaning of ‘however’.

c. Causal

Relations of this type are expressed through the use of conjunctions such as ‘fla budda ’an’ which is the equivalent of ‘it is a must that’ or ‘therefore’ in English. The prefix ‘li’ i.e. the abbreviation of ‘liḏa’ reflects also a causal relation; they are used in the beginning of a sentence or within sentences. Other kinds of causal conjunctions include ‘Mimma’ and ‘mimma zaḩala’ which are the equivalents of ‘for this reason’ in English.

d. Temporal

The final type of conjunctions in Arabic includes, for example, ‘.hinama’, ‘ḩumma’ and ‘iḏama’; these conjunctions are the equivalents of ‘when’, ‘then’ and ‘and if’ respectively. They ensure a temporal relation between the two events stated in the sentence. ‘ḩumma’, for example reflects a sequence of events in

‘عبرنا الطريق ثم وصلنا إلى كوخ صغير.’

‘ḩabarena ’attariḩa ḩumma wa.salna ’ila kouḩin .saḩi:rin’.

‘We crossed the road, then, we got to a small cottage’.

From the previous examples of conjunctions, it can be concluded that Arabic is highly cohesive within sentence boundaries and across it. Arabic conjunctions of different types have been suggested and revealed their similarity to the English ones.

I.3.2. Some Differences between Arabic and English Conjunctions

Baker (1992) reiterated that languages differ widely in their use of conjunctions. German, for example, prefers the use of subordination and complex structures to express semantic relations. However, Japanese and Chinese have the tendency to use simple and shorter structures. Generally speaking, English favours the use of small chunks in order to express the information in a clear manner, and, hence, cohesive devices signal the semantic relations involved between parts of texts. Moreover, English focuses strongly on the punctuation system in order to signal breaks and relations between chunks of information.

Arabic, however, prefers the use of regrouped and large grammatical chunks. Short sentences are very rare to exist, and this is maybe because punctuation and paragraphing have been developed only recently in Arabic. Few of them tend to have large scale of meanings and this depends on the context in which they occur. Thus, readers are the ones who signal the interpretation of the writer's intended meaning (Baker, 1992).

Mohamed and Majzoub (2000) advocated that cultural differences between Arabic and English reflect the differences at the level of cohesion. Among the dimensions they have investigated, we notice the additive and non-additive characteristics of Arabic and English respectively. That is, Arabic is described as an additive language since the additive conjunctions have higher percentage in written texts, whereas English is a non additive language.

Furthermore, Othman (2004) claimed that conjunctions between textual phenomena are common in Arabic and English, but they are largely dominating in Arabic. That is, Arabic has a tendency for coordination whereas English favors subordination. He explained that English uses both subordination and coordination in writing. However the use of subordination is more favored at the expense of coordination. It is said that the use of subordination makes the written texts more effective and interesting, while the overuse of coordinators make the texts boring and difficult to understand (Oshima,1991, cited in Othman 2004:14) .

Arabic, however, favors coordination rather than subordination. (Ostler, 1987, cited in Othman, 2004:15) for example, found that long sentences conjoined with coordinating conjunctions are specific to Arabic writing. Moreover, Holes (1995:215) suggested that compound sentences in Arabic consist of “more than one simple sentence conjoined by one of a closed set of conjunctive particles.”. Hence, coordination is the main key for coherence in Arabic, just like subordination in English (cited in Othman 2004:15).

I.3.3. Students' Difficulties when Translating Conjunctions

Actually, very few studies tackled the issue of conjunctions cross-linguistically. Fareh (1998) for example, reiterated that the translation of connective devices is of great importance. She stated that connectors play a significant role for ensuring text cohesion and coherence in both written and oral communication. However, one of the great challenges students face during the process of translation is the rendition of these devices.

Some researchers found that the misuse, overuse and underuse of connectors affect text's cohesion and coherence. For example, Crew (1999) pointed out that "the overuse of connectives leads to potential communicative breakdowns." (cited in Thabit and Fareh, 2006). Moreover, researchers at Lund University (Sweden) found that students' difficulties with conjunctions are due to their belief that conjunctions are optional. That is, conjunctions ensure explicit coherence but do not build it. That is why they asserted that the conjunction's appropriate use leads to a communication-ability of texts, whereas their inaccurate use creates confusion. As a result, they claimed that the main reason behind these difficulties is the fact that conjunctions belong to different languages and cultures (cited in Tapper, 1998:117). Similarly, Thabit and Fareh (2006) suggested that the difficulties student's faces while translating are the result of a number of causes. First, the lack of equivalence between languages leads inevitably to breaks of ideas. In other words, the fact that there is no one to one correspondence between conjunctions in different languages, poses several problems. The problem is more aggravated when it comes to two distinct languages, the case of Arabic and English, for instance. Second, conjunctive devices are multifunctional. As we have explained above, conjunctions signal several logical relations between sentences and at the same time these relationships are indicated through the use of more than one connective. Third, more difficulties will erupt particularly when connectives in the source text are rendered into the target one as adverbial conjuncts, no conjunction or the use of punctuations as 'grammatical devices'.

I.3.4. The Discourse Marker ‘fa’

I.3.4.1. Functions of ‘Fa’

‘Fa’ is an Arabic conjunction known as حرف عطف ‘haref çatef’. This conjunction functions as a linker of a succession of items, ideas and events. In fact, it is worth noting that the conjunction ‘fa’ encodes five semantic relations existing at different parts of texts, either at sentential, clausal or phrasal levels. These semantic relations are considered to be functions of sequence, cause, result, contrast and explanations.

In the following discussion, we illustrate these five functions through the examples suggested by Thabit and Fareh (2006).

a. Sequential ‘Fa’

ذهبت الى بغداد فالبصرة .

ðahabtu ila bağdad fa lba.sra.

I went to Baghdad, then to Basra.

We mean by ‘sequence’ the order of time and events. In this view, this semantic relation links two elements in order to make a compound element. As such we can say that ‘fa’ indicates in this example the two events ‘going to Basra’ and ‘going to Baghdad’ are time related, occurring one after another. That is to say, ‘fa’ ensures a consecutive relation between the two events.

b. Resultative ‘Fa’

أحب أحمد المسرح فأبدع فيه .

A.habba a.hmadu almasra.ha fa abdaça fihi.

Ahmad loved theatre and so he excelled in it.

In the same way conjunction ‘fa’ combines two clauses in order to have one sentence. One condition is perceived i.e. the sentence’s clauses are dependent on each other in the sense that the second clause is the result of the previous one. We notice that ‘fa’

functions as a resultative conjunction in this example, because the second clause ‘his excellence in theatre’ is the result of the first one which is ‘Ahmad’s passion for theatre’.

c. Causal ‘Fa’

لا تبك فإن البكاء ضعف.

La tabki fa inna albouka?a .doçfun.

Do not cry because crying is weakness.

In this example, the conjunction ‘fa’ expresses a causal relation. The two clauses ‘do not cry’ and ‘crying is weakness’ are dependent on one another. In this case, ‘fa’ links the two clauses together, making the second the cause of the first one. In other words, it explains that because crying is weakness, he/she should not cry. Hence, ‘fa’ ensures a causal relation between the two ideas.

d. Explanatory ‘Fa’

هناك أخطاء تاريخية كثيرة في مسلسل عمر الخيام فاغتيال الملك كان طعنا و ليس سما .

Hunaka aḫtaʔun tariḫija kaθira fi musalsali çomer al ḫajjam fa
iḡtijał almaliki kan taçanan wa layssa summan.

There are various historical mistakes in the series of Omar AlKhayam that should have been checked. For example, the king was stabbed not poisoned.

Explanatory ‘fa’ reflects that the second sentence is an explanation or an illustration of the first one. Thus, in this example, the second sentence ‘the king was stabbed not poisoned’ expresses one example of the various historical mistakes in the series of Omar Alkhayam which is stated in the first sentence.

e. Adversative ‘Fa’

دعاني صديقي فلم أجب دعوته .

Daçani .sadiki fa lam ʔuzib daçwatahu.

My friend invited me to visit him, but I turned down his invitation.

Adversative 'fa' expresses a contrast between the two clauses. In this example, the two clauses 'my friend invited me' and 'I turned down his invitation' are linked by means of conjunctive 'fa', but which reflects an expected result. That is, the second clause is the result of the first one, yet it was unexpected.

As you can see, the conjunction 'fa' signals five different semantic relations. It expresses a sequence of time, cause, result, explanation and contrast as well. From this wide variety of functions, the authors mentioned above supposed that such a kind of conjunctions would pose great challenges for second language learners when it comes to translation relevance.

I.3.4.2. Possible Equivalents of 'Fa' in English

As far as translation is concerned, many suggestions were put forward depending on the logical relations 'fa' entails.

a. Sequential 'Fa'

ذهبت الى بغداد فالبصرة .

ḏahabtu ila baġdad fa lba.sra.

I went to Baghdad then to Basra.

On the light of this example, the conjunction 'fa' would be rendered into English as 'and'. So the translated version would be as follows: 'I went to Baghdad and Basra'; however, because 'fa' expresses a consecutive relation between the two events, the most appropriate translation is to insert the time conjunction 'then'. Therefore, we come up with the assumption that while translating, we should take into account the semantic precision of these conjunctions.

b. Resultative 'Fa'

أحب أحمد المسرح فأبدع فيه .

A.habba a.hmadu almasra.ha fa abdaça fihi.

Ahmad loved theatre and so he excelled in it.

This example shows that Ahmad's excellence in theatre is the result of his passion for theatre. So, it is acceptable to translate the sentence as follows: 'Ahmad loved theatre and excelled in it'. In fact, such a rendition is correct, but it is not semantically accurate; since the most appropriate equivalent of 'fa' must reflect a consequence. Hence, connectors like 'so', 'therefore' and 'hence' will fulfil the task.

c. Causal 'Fa'

لا تيك فإن البكاء ضعف.

La tabki fa inna albouka'a .doçfun.

Do not cry because crying is weakness.

This sentence can be translated as 'do not cry because crying is weakness. 'Fa' in this case is rendered into 'because', a causal conjunction in English, in order to achieve a semantic accuracy of the sentence meaning. So, causal connectors such as 'because' and 'since' would be appropriate for ensuring the accurate meaning of this sentence. Moreover, we should note that the use of punctuation marks is also favored in these situations. The insertion of a semicolon for example instead of 'because' will maintain its unity. However, the use of other logical connectors such as a 'comma' or a 'full stop' would distort the relation between sentences and violates the cohesion of sentences.

d. Explanatory 'fa'

هناك أخطاء تاريخية كثيرة في مسلسل عمر الخيام فاغتيال الملك كان طعنا و ليس سما .

Hunaka aχta'un tariχija kaθira fi musalsali çomer al χajjam fa îgtijal

almaliki kan taçanan wa layssa summan.

There are various historical mistakes in the series of Omar Al Khayam that should have been checked. For example, the king was stabbed not poisoned.

Explanatory 'fa' can be rendered into English as 'for example' or simply a 'semicolon' in order to ensure the appropriate meaning of the source language. Thus, the sentence would be translated as follows: There are various historical mistakes in the series

of Omar Alkhayam that should have been checked. For example, the king was stabbed not poisoned. So, the use of ‘for example’ reveals that the assassination of the king is merely one example of the various mistakes.

e. Adversative ‘Fa’

دعاني صديقي فلم أحب دعوته.

Daçani .sadiki fa lam ?uzib daçwatahu.

My friend invited me to visit him, but I turned down his invitation.

The final logical relation is of contrast. In this case, ‘fa’ is rendered into an adversative conjunction in English; conjunctions such as ‘but’, ‘though’ or ‘however’ will ensure the adversative relation between the two clauses .Thus, the sentence would be translated appropriately as follows: ‘My friend invited me, but I turned down his invitation.’

All in all, we can say that the five functions of ‘fa’ revealed the possible translations. However, the translator should bear in mind that the semantic precision of conjunctions is of great importance even though there are acceptable translations, they are not very expressive. In other words, sentences do preserve the unity of text but are recognized in their inaccurate sense.

Conclusion

To sum up, conjunctions are items which indicate the logical relations between or within sentences. They contribute in the interpretation of discourse because they bear high semantic properties. However, the misuse of these devices will lead to a total breakdown and misinterpretation of ideas in the translated version, and, hence, it distorts the intended meaning. For this reason and in order to determine the causes of such problems, it is important to make a comparison between the conjunctions of both languages Arabic and English at this level. However, because very few investigations tackled the issue of conjunctions crosslinguistically, there is a need for further studies to be carried out on this particular aspect. That is, the investigation of the differences and similarities between languages should be highlighted in order to solve the difficulties students may encounter.

Chapter II

Description and Analysis of the Test and the Questionnaire

Introduction	41
II.1. Subjects	41
II.2. Research Tools	41
II.2.1. Test	42
II.2.2. Questionnaire	42
II.3. Analysis	43
II.3.1. Test	43
II.3.1.1. Adversative ‘Fa’	43
II.3.1.2. Causal ‘Fa’	46
II.3.1.3. Resultative ‘Fa’	48
II.3.1.4. Explanatory ‘Fa’	50
II.3.1.5. Sequential ‘Fa’	53
II.3.2. Questionnaire	55
II.3.2.1. Section One: Personal Information	55
II.3.2.2. Section Two: Knowledge and Motivation to English	57
II.3.2.3. Section Three: Knowledge and Motivation to Arabic	60
II.3.2.4. Section Four: Knowledge and Motivation to Translation	62
II.3.2.5. Section Five: Attitudes and Opinions about Conjunctions	70
II.4. Summary of the Findings	72
Conclusion	74

Chapter II

Description and Analysis of the Test and the Questionnaire

Introduction

This chapter aims to shed light on the students' recognition of the importance of conjunctive devices when translating. The major interest is to show how the misuse of conjunctions can affect the cohesion of the translated sentences. That is, the inappropriate translation of conjunctions will inevitably distort the meaning and violate the unity of texts. For this reason, the Arabic conjunction 'fa' has been chosen to be an example of such a kind of devices because it bears a multifunctional nature.

We used two main tools for the collection of data. First a test has been oriented for the students, and then we administered a questionnaire in order to support the test findings.

II.1. Subjects

The subjects of this study are third year translation students at the Department of Translation, University of Constantine. The sample of the population was a randomly selected group, and the total population from which this sample is taken is composed of 8 groups. The number of students in this group is normally 40 students, but since there were absences the day the study was undertaken, and some students' answers have been rejected as they have been incomplete, we ended up with a total of 32. The sample consists of 23 females and 9 males. The reason behind such a choice is that students have taken a practical module in Arabic English translation and are, therefore, familiar with such a task.

II.2. Research Tools

This study makes use of two research tools: a test has been given to students in order to identify the possible errors they make in tackling the translation of 'fa', and a questionnaire has been administered for the same subjects in order to support the test.

II.2.1 Test

The test consists of 15 sentences containing the discourse marker 'fa'. The five functions of 'fa' are illustrated through three sentences for each one; that is why we get the overall of 15 sentences. The sentences have been mixed up in order not to let the students guess the translation of the following ones. The sentences have been extracted from a determined context of the literary work of Mostaghanmi (1993) and that of Bakir et al. (1962).

II.2.2. Questionnaire

The questionnaire consists of 16 questions. Most of the questions are of multiple choice, i.e. the students have to choose one or more than one option to answer; this is the case with Q6, Q8, Q9, Q10 and Q12. Other questions are given as scales answers, Q5, Q7 and Q11. Finally, Q13 and Q14 have the nature of comment types, where students are required to provide answers as justifications or explanations of the previous answers to support their responses.

The questionnaire is divided into five sections:

- **First Section:** it contains three questions about age, gender and the year of the Baccalaureate award. Through these questions we aim to gain a description of the subjects under study.
- Second Section:** it contains Q4, Q5, and Q6. These questions are suggested in order to find out about the students' knowledge of English and their motivation to learn it.
- Third Section:** it consists of two questions, Q7 and Q8. They aim at gathering information about the students' knowledge of Arabic and their interest in it.
- Fourth Section:** it is composed of five questions Q9, Q10, Q11, Q12, and Q13. These questions are combining the knowledge of two languages into one skill which is translation. These questions reveal the students' interest in learning translation and how accurate their translation can be.

-Fifth Section: it is concerned with the test's production. We have proposed three questions about the different attitudes students have towards the translation of conjunction 'fa' into English and what difficulties they encounter.

II.3. Analysis

II.3.1. Test

We will advance the analysis of sentences by classifying them into five sections and analyze each section separately. We should note that each section represents one function of 'fa'.

II.3.1.1. Adversative 'Fa'

Examples:

1- إذا كان المتنبّي يرى خير جليس في الأنام كتاب، فان ميخائيل نعيمة يرى الطبيعة خير جليس و أفضل مدرسة.

?iða kan ?almutanabbi: jara xajera zalissin fi al ?anami kitabun, *fa*inna mixa?i:l naçi:ma jara ?al.tabiçata xajera zalissin wa ?af.dala madrassatin.

While El Mutannabi considers a book as the best companion, Michael Naeema, *however*, sees that nature is the best companion and the best school.

2- إذ أن طبيب الأسنان أراد أن يضع لضرسه غلافا من الذهب فطلب إليه أن يضعه من الماس.

?ið anna .tabiba ?alasnani arada ?an ja.daça li.dir.sihi ?ilafan mina ?alððahabi *fa*.talaba ?ilajihi ?an ja.daçahu mina ?almasi.

The dentist wanted to cover his tooth with a golden layer, *but* he asked him to cover it with diamond.

3- دعاني صديق لزيارته فلم أجب دعوته.

Daçani .sadiki liziaratihi *fa*lam ?u3b daçwatahu.

My friend invited me to visit him, *but* I turned down his invitation.

Adversative ‘fa’ has been translated in different ways as shown in the table below

Answers	Correct		Inaccurate					
Conjunctions	However/ But	Semi- colon	No Conjunction	Therefore/ So	Full Stop	Comma	Negative Form	Then
Number	35	2	5	10	20	20	2	2
Percentage	36.46	2.08	5.20	10.41	20.83	20.83	2.08	2.08
Total 96 ¹	38.54%		61.45%					

Table 1: Translation of Adversative ‘Fa’

The students’ answers reveal that the majority of responses have been inaccurate i.e. 61.45% of the students’ rendition of ‘fa’ into English have been inappropriate. For example, 20.83% of the students have inserted a full stop between the two clauses. In addition, 20.83% of the students have separated the clauses with simply a comma. Because students have not recognized the function of ‘fa’, they have failed to preserve its intended meaning which entails a contrast. In this case, the students’ use of punctuation marks as a substitute of conjunctions was erroneous. In a similar way, 10.41% of the students have produced a faulty translation when they have inserted ‘so’, a ‘resultative’ conjunction, instead of an adversative one. In this case, we can say that students have not been able to distinguish between the functions of conjunctions in English. That is, even though the relationship between clauses is of contrast, they consider it as a result. Therefore, the main reason behind this inaccuracy is the students’ misunderstanding of the different types of conjunctions.

¹ The total number of responses is 96 because each function is represented through three sentences with the overall of 32 students.

Moreover, 2.08% of the students have translated the sentences absolutely differently. They have used the negative form in order to express a contrast relationship. For example, they have translated sentence 3 as follows: 'I did not go to visit my friend'. They have changed the whole structure in order to maintain the semantic meaning of 'fa', and, at the same time, to avoid the faulty insertion of its equivalent in English. Such a way reveals that these students have been able to recognize the adversative function of 'fa', but unable to render it into English. The main cause of this difficulty is that students do not know the classification of English conjunctions. Added to that, 2.08% of the students' answers have included the temporal conjunction 'then' and 5.20% have inserted no conjunction. Such a kind of suggestions leads inevitably to faulty translation. That is, the students' use of temporal conjunction instead of contrast reveals their failure to comprehend the function of 'fa' in this context, and, thus, cohesion is not ensured because the sentence meaning has been distorted. Moreover, the insertion of no conjunction results in a breakdown of meaning; that is why, we have ended up with sentences structurally disconnected and not cohesive.

On the other hand, 38.54% of the students have responded correctly. 2.08% of them have inserted a semicolon and 36.46% of the students have inserted an adversative conjunction. These students have successfully rendered 'fa' into its appropriate equivalents in English, and, thus, have achieved an adequate translation. It is worth noting that the use of the semicolon in this case reflects the contrast between the clauses that is why, students ended up with accurate translations.

Therefore, we can say that the students' erroneous rendition has been the result of their ignorance that 'fa' functions as an adversative conjunction in this particular context; and even though some students have recognized this function, they failed to insert the appropriate conjunction.

II.3.1.2. Causal 'Fa'

Examples:

1- لا أذكر من قال "يقضي الإنسان سنواته الأولى في تعلم النطق، وتقضي الأنظمة العربية بقية عمره في تعليمه الصمت!" تماما كالنسيان. فالذاكرة في مناسبات كهذه لا تأتي بالتقسيط، وإنما تهجم عليك شللا يجرفك إلى حيث لا تدري.

La ?aðkuru man qal ' jaq.di ?al ?insanu sanawatihi ?al ?u :la fi : taçallumi ?annottki, wa taq.ði ?al?anð.imatu ?alçarabjatu baqjjata çumrihi fi taçlimihi ?al.samta ' tamamen ka?nesjani. *faal*ðakiratu fi munasabatin kahaðihi lata?ti bittaqsiti, wa innama tahzumu çalajka ðallalan jazrufuka ila: .hajðu latadri.

I do not remember who said "Man passes his first years learning how to speak, and Arab regimes teach him for the rest of his life how to be quiet". Exactly like forgetting, *because* memory does not come in such occasions gradually, but it attacks you like a waterfall that drifts you away to the unknown.

2- أنا مغرور لكي لا أكون محقورا فنحن لا نملك الخيار يا صاحبي. إننا ننتمي إلى أمة لا تحترم مبدعيها و إذا افتقدنا غرورنا و كبريائنا، ستدوسنا أقدام الأميين والجهلة.

?ana mîgru:run likaj la ?aku:na ma.hqu:ran *fan*ahnu lanamliku ?alçajara ja .sahibi . ?innana nantami ila: ?umatin la ta.htarimu mubdiçiha wa ?iða ?iftaqadna ?guru:rana wa kibrija?ana, satadu:suna ?aqdamu ?al?ummijjina wa ?alzahalati.

I am arrogant so as not to be oppressed *because* we have no choice dear friend. We belong to a nation that does not respect its creative people. And once we lose our arrogance and pride, illiterate and ignorant people will stamp us.

3- وعندما نعود إليه نعود بحقائب الحنين و حفنة أحلام فقط، نعود بأحلام وردية لا بأكياس وردية، فالحلم لا يبتاع من محلات تاتي الرخيصة.

Wa çindama naçudu ilajhi naçudu bi.haqa'ibi 'al.hanini wa hafnati 'hlamin faqat, naçudu bi'ahlamin wardjatin la bi'kjasin wardjatin, *fa 'al hulumu lajubtaçu min ma.hallati 'tati' 'lraçi.sati.*

When we come back to it, we come back with bags of nostalgia and a handful of dreams; we go back with pink dreams not with pink bags *because* a dream can not be sold in 'Tati' discount stores.

Causal 'fa' has been translated in different ways as shown in the table below

Answers	Correct		Inaccurate			
	Because	Since	And	Therefore/ So	Comma	Full Stop
Number	30	23	09	13	12	09
Percentage	31.25	23.95	9.37	13.54	12.5	9.37
Total 96	55.20%		44.8%			

Table 2: Translation of Causal 'Fa'

The findings reveal that 55.20% of the students have translated 'fa' adequately. 31.25% of the students have rendered 'fa' into 'because', and 23.95% of the students have used 'since'. We suppose that the reason behind the high percentage of correct answers is due to the fact that there is a specific equivalent in Arabic which is a causal 'fa' or what is known as 'fa 'assababijja'. This conjunction preserves a causal relationship between the two sentences and provides the cause or the reason of the events stated in the sentence. The acceptable possibilities can be: 'because', 'since', 'as', and sometimes a colon would be plausible.

The percentage of inaccurate answers, however, is 44.8%. 12.5% of the students have replaced 'fa' by a comma and 9.37% have inserted a full stop. In this case, the use of punctuation marks, like a full stop and a comma, leads to sentences breakdowns, and, as a

result they would not be cohesive. Moreover, 9.37% of the students have used the additive conjunction ‘and’ to express a causal relationship; whereas, 13.54% of the students have inserted resultative conjunctions such as ‘therefore’ and ‘so’. In this case, the translation of ‘fa’ is inaccurate since it has distorted the intended relationship between sentences of the source language, and, hence, it has changed the intended meaning of the source language. Again, such responses have revealed the students’ confusion between the different types of conjunctions.

II.3.1.3. Resultative ‘Fa’

Examples:

1. كان 'سي الطاهر' هكذا أحيانا ، يكون موجزا حتى في فرحته، فكنت موجزا معه في حزنه أيضا. سألني بعدها عن أخبار الأهل، وأخبار (أما) بالتحديد، فأجبت أنه توفيت منذ ثلاثة اشهر.

‘Kan ‘sittahir’ hakaḏa ‘ahjanan, jaku:nu mu:zizan hatta fi far.hatihi, fakuntu muzizan maḥuh fi huznihi ‘aj.dan . sa‘alani baḥdaha ḥan ‘aḫbari ‘al‘ahli, wa ‘aḫbari ‘amma’ bitta.hdidi, fa ‘azabtuhu ‘annaha tuwufijat munḏu ḏalaḏati ‘afhurin.

Si Taher’ was sometimes like that, brief even in his happiness; so, I was as brief with him in his sadness. After that, he asked me about my family, and more precisely about mum, and I answered that she died three months ago.

2. أنقب بعض الشيء في ذاكرتي عن القصيدة التي أخذ منها هذا البيت، وإذا بعنوانها 'الشيخوخة'. فيخيفني اكتشافي فجأة وكأنني أكتشف معه ملامح وجهي الجديدة. فهل تزحف الشيخوخة نحونا بليل طويل واحد.

‘unaqqibu baḥ.da ‘alfaj‘i fi ḏakirati ḥan ‘alqasidati ‘alatti ‘uḫiḏa minha haḏa lbajtu, wa iḏa biḥunwaniha ‘alfajḫu:ḫatu’. fa juḫifuni ‘iktifafi faḏ‘atan wa ka‘annani ‘aktafifu maḥahu malami.ha waḫhi alḏadidati. fahal tazhafu alfajḫuxatu na.hwana bilajlin .tawilin wa.hidin.

I explore in my memory for the poem from which this verse has been chosen; then, I find that its title was “Old Age”. This recall frightens me as if I have undisclosed with that my new face features; *so* will old age creep towards us slowly just like a long night.

3. وبينما أسحب نفساً من سيجارة أخيرة، يرتفع صوت المأذن معلناً صلاة الفجر. ومن غرفة بعيدة يأتي بكاء طفل أيقظ صوته أنحاء كل البيت. فأحسد المأذن، وأحسد الأطفال لأنهم يملكون وحدهم حق الصراخ والقدرة عليه.

Wa bajnama ?as.habu nafasan min si:zaratin ?axiratin, jartafi?u .sawtu alma?ađini mu?linan .salata alfa?ri. Wa min ^gurfatin ba?ıdatin ja?ti buka?u .tiflin ?jqađ.a .sawtuhu ?anha.da kulli albajti. **fa** ?a.hsudu al ma?ađina wa al?atfala li?annahum jamlikuna wa.hdahum .haqqa al.sura?ı wa alkudrata ?alajhi.

As I inhale the last smoke of a cigarette, the muezzins’ voices call for the dawn prayer. And from a far away room comes the crying of a little boy breaking the stillness in the entire house. *And, so*, I envy muezzins and children for only they have the right and can scream.

Resultative ‘fa’ has been translated in different ways as shown in the table below

Answers	Correct			Inaccurate			
	Therefore	So	As a Result	Because	That is Why	Because So	No Conjunction
Number	18	32	08	24	10	1	3
Percentage	18.75	33.33	8.33	25	10.41	1.04	3.12
Total 96	60.41%			39.58%			

Table 3: Translation of Resultative ‘Fa’

The results show that resultative ‘fa’ has been somehow easy for students to translate in comparison to other functions. 60.41% of the students have translated ‘fa’ accurately. They have inserted resultative conjunctions such as ‘so’, ‘therefore’ and ‘as result’. These conjunctions came up with 33.33%, 18.75% and 8.33% respectively. 39.58% of the responses have been inaccurate, because students have inserted other types of conjunctions. For example, 35.41% of the responses have included causal conjunctives such as ‘that is why’, ‘because’ and ‘because of’, while 3.12% of the students have inserted no conjunction at all. Such renditions explain the students’ failure to connect the ideas together and their inability to distinguish between the conjunctions of cause and result. What is worth noting is that there has been one odd answer provided by one student who has inserted ‘because so’. He considers that ‘because’ and ‘so’ compose one conjunction which expresses consequence. For this reason, we suppose that students are not only unaware of the multifunctional nature of ‘fa’, but also do not have a clear idea about the different types of conjunctions in English and their appropriate use.

II.3.1.4. Explanatory ‘Fa’

Examples:

1. إن الهواية تحتاج إلى رغبة قوية تقوم بمقاومة كل هؤلاء، فلاعب كرة القدم لو خيرته بين كل ما في الدنيا و بين أن يلعب في ليلة موجعة الأرق لن يتردد في القفز إلى الملعب وراء الكرة.

Inna alhiwajata ta.htazu ila: raġbatin qawijatin taqumu bimuqawamati kulli ha?u:la?i. *fala*çibu kurati alqadami law çajartahu bajna kulli ma fi alddunija wa bajna an jalçaba fi lajlatin muziçati al?araqi lan jataraddada fi alqafzi ila: almalçabi wara?a alkurati.

Hobby is in no need of strong desire that can resist all of them. *For example*, if you give a football player to choose between the whole world and playing in a painfully sleepless night, he will rush with no hesitation to the stadium to run after the ball.

2. وهناك أسماء عندما تتذكرها، تكاد تُصلح من جلستك، و تطفئ سيجارتك، تكاد تتحدث عنها و كأنك تتحدث إليها بنفس تلك الهيبة و ذلك الانبهار الأول، ولذا ظل لاسم 'سي الطاهر' هيبة عندي. فالرموز تعرف دائما كيف تحيط نفسها بذلك الحاجز اللامرئي، الذي يفصل بين العادي و الاستثنائي و الممكن و المستحيل في كل شيء.

Wa hunaka ?asma?un ?indama tata?akkaruha, takadu tu.slihu min?alsatika, wa tu.tfi?u sizaratika, takadu tata.hadda?u ?anha waka?anaka tata.hadu?u ilajha binafsi tilka alhajbati wa ?alika al?inbihari al?awwali, wa li?a ?.alla li?ismi sittahir hajbatan ?indi. *fa*arumuzu ta?rifu da?iman kajfa tu.hitu nafsaha bi?alika alhajizi allamar?i alla?i jaf.silu bajna al?adi wa alisti?na?i wa almumkini wa almusta.hili fi kulli faj?in.

When you remember some names, you straighten up with respect and put off your cigarette. You speak of these names as if you are addressing them with the same feeling of reverence and fascination of a first meeting. That is why the name of 'Si Taher' remains a permanent source of reverence for me. *That is to say*, symbols always know how to confine themselves inside some invisible barriers; those barriers which separates between the ordinary and the alien and between the possible and the impossible in everything.

3. كان في مصادفة وجودي مع 'سي الطاهر' في الزنزانة نفسها شيء أسطوري بحد ذاته ، و تجربة نضالية ظلت تلاحقني لسنوات بكل تفاصيلها، وربما كان لها بعد ذلك أثر في تغير قدرتي. فهناك رجال عندما تلتقي بهم تكون قد التقيت بقدرك.

Kan fi mu.sadafati wuzudi ma?a sittahir fialzanzanati nafsaha faj?un ?us.tu:rijun bi.haddi ?atihi, wa ta?rubatun ni.dalijatun ?.allat tula.hikuni lisanawatin bikulli tafa.siliha, wa rubamma kan laha ba?da ?alika ?a?arun fi ta?jjuri qadari. *fa*hunak ri?alun ?indama taltaki bihim takunu qad ?iltakajta bi qadarika.

To be with ‘Si Taher’ in the same cell was in itself somehow mythical; it was an experience of struggle that persisted in chasing me for years with all its features. Then, it, perhaps, had a hand in changing destiny. *That is*, when you meet with certain men you have met with your destiny.

Explanatory ‘fa’ has been translated in different ways as shown in the table below

Answers	Correct		Inaccurate			
Conjunction	That is	For Example	So	No Conjunction	Because	Sometimes
Number	4	4	28	26	28	6
Percentage	4.16	4.16	29.16	27.08	29.16	6.25
Total 96	8.32%		91.68%			

Table 4: Translation of Explanatory ‘Fa’

The students’ answers reveal that explanatory ‘fa’ has been the most difficult type of conjunctions to translate. Only 8.32% have been able to provide correct responses. This means that 91.68% of the over all responses have been translated inaccurately. The inaccurate answers that students have suggested were ‘because’, ‘so’, ‘sometimes’, and the use of no conjunction. They came up with 29.16%, 29.16%, 6.25% and 27.08% respectively. In fact, the highest percentage has been the insertion of causal and resultative conjunctions (29.16%) for each one. According to these results, the faulty translation indicates that the respondents fail to identify the logical relations between sentences. That is, the use of ‘because’ instead of explanatory conjunctions has changed the meaning of the source language and ,hence, has imposed alternations on the translated version .The main reason behind this failure is that students did not recognize the multifunction of ‘fa’ in the

source language and, hence, they failed to ‘render’ it appropriately. What is really notable is that they have used time indicators and have considered them as linkers between sentences. This is the case with ‘sometimes’ which represents 6.25% of the total answers. That is, the rendition of ‘fa’ in the sentence number three has been translated as follows: ‘Sometimes, when you meet with certain men you have met with your destiny’. Thus, this rendition is inappropriate because the explanatory nature of ‘fa’ is not ensured.

II.3.1.5. Sequential ‘Fa’

Examples:

1- زعموا أن أرضا من أراضي الفيلة قل مأوها فعطشت الفيلة عطشا شديدا، فأرسل ملكهن رواده في طلب الماء في كل ناحية، فرجع إليه بعض الرسل واخبره بأنه عثر على عين كثيرة المياه فتوجه الملك و أصحابه إليها.

Zaçamu: anna ?ara.dan min ?ara.di alfijalti qalla ma?uha façatiftat alfijalatu çatafan çadidan, fa ?arsala malikahuna ruwwadahu fi .talabi ?alma ?i fi kulli na.hitin, **fa** raçaça ilajhi baç.du ?alrusuli wa ?açbarahu bi?annahu çathara çla çajnin kaθirati ?almijahi fa tawa33aha ?almaliku wa ?a.s.habuhu ?ilajha.

Once upon a time, water became scare in a land where elephants lived, and, so, they were about to die of thirst. Their chief sent some of them to search for water. *Then*, some of the messengers returned back and told him that they had found a fountain plentiful of water. So, the king and his followers went to see it.

2- ذهب الحجاج إلى مكة فالمدينة.

ðahaba alhu33u ila: makata **fa** almadinata.

Pilgrims went to Mecca, *then* Medina.

3- خرج الطبيب فالمريض.

çaraça al.tabibu **fa** almari.du.

The doctor went out, *then* the patient.

Sequential 'fa' has been translated in different ways as shown in the table below

Answers	Inaccurate			Correct				
Conjunctions	So/ And so	And	At this moment	Then	After	Followed by	And then	After that
Number	10	28	4	20	10	4	10	10
Percentage	10.41	29.16	4.16	20.83	10.41	4.16	10.41	10.41
Total 96	43.73%			56.23%				

Table 5: Translation of Sequential 'Fa'

The translated sentences revealed that 43.73% of the students have failed to translate temporal 'fa'. However 56.23% of the answers have been accurate. The students' correct responses have included 'then', 'after that', 'followed by', 'following', and 'and then'. The faulty answers, however, have included 'and so', 'and', 'so' and 'at this moment', (conjunctions that do not imply the consecutive nature). For example, students translated the sentence number three as follows 'the doctor went out, so the patient.' Such a rendition is erroneous since there is no consecutive sequence of events; instead, the sentence expresses a cause/ effect relationship. The appropriate rendition of 'fa', however, must entail a consecutive relation between the two events without any delay. Moreover, in sentence number two, the insertion of 'and' in 'pilgrims went to Mecca and Medina' is erroneous, because the additive 'and' implies the occurrence of the two events without being consecutive. Hence, the additive 'and' does not capture correctly the intended meaning of 'fa' in the source language, and so, it has changed the logical relationship holding between the two clauses.

Through the analysis of these data, we conclude that the students' translation of sentences in combination or in isolation has revealed their unawareness about the multifunctional nature of conjunctive 'fa' in Arabic, and so, they failed to preserve the unity of the translated version.

II.3.2. Questionnaire

The questionnaire consists of five sections:

II.3.2.1. Section One: Personal Information

Question 1- Gender a- Male b-Female

Gender	Number of Students	Percentage %
Male	9	28
Female	23	72
Total	32	100

Table 6: Gender

This question gives us an idea about the population under study. We observe that the majority of subjects are females. Out of a total number of 32 students, 23 are females (72%) and 9 students are males (28%).

Question 2 – Age

Age	Number of students	Percentage %
20-22	26	81
23-25	6	19
Total	32	100

Table 7: Age Range

The reason behind the choice of this question is to describe the sample of our study. We suppose that age may contribute to the students' level and experience. That is, we expect that older students who have more experience will be more intelligent and creative than younger ones. As you can see, the students are almost of the same age, i.e. they are between 20 and 25 years old. 26 students (81%) are between 20 and 22 years old. However, the students beyond 23 years old are 6 students and represent 19% of the population. A brief interview with the students of this category has revealed that they have had other academic training before or while learning translation such as law, computer science and physics.

Question 3 – Year of the Baccalaureate Award and the Speciality

Year	Speciality...	
Year	Number of Students	Percentage %
2006	6	19
2007	26	81
Total	32	100

Table 8: Year of Baccalaureate Award

Speciality	Number of Students	Percentage %
Letters	11	34
Letters and Languages	13	41
Science	8	25
Total	32	100

Table 9: Baccalaureate Speciality

This question aims to know the number of years the students have spent in learning Translation. The speciality reveals the students' linguistic background. That is to say, the students who have obtained their Baccalaureate in letters and foreign languages are supposed to be more competent than those who have had of scientific background. The reason is that the quality of the syllabi in the field of letters is different from that of science and, hence, it gives more insights on the students' level. As you can see, 6 students (19%) have obtained their Baccalaureate in 2007, and 26 students (81%) have been awarded their Baccalaureate in 2007. The highest percentage reveals that the students who have succeeded in their three academic years are more competent in translation. Thus, they have a good level and face no difficulties in learning languages.

Concerning the speciality, the results show that 13 students (41%) are of letters and foreign languages, 11 students (34%) are of letters and 8 students (25%) are of sciences. Hence, as we have mentioned above, the students of letters' background are of higher percentages than those of sciences.

II.3.2.2. Section Two: Knowledge and Motivation to English

Question 4 -Do you think it is important to learn English?

a- Yes

b- No

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
Yes	32	100
No	0	0
Total	32	100

Table 10: Importance of English

All the students (100%) answered ‘Yes’ for the importance of learning English. This confirms that students are aware of the importance of English and, thus, this helps them for a better translation and for developing a competence in translation.

-If it is yes, is it because English is:

- a- An international language for communication
- b- The language of science and technology
- c- It is easy for us to gain information

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
a	26	81
b	12	37
c	2	6
Total	32	100

Table11: Justifying the Importance of English

Concerning the justifications they selected for the importance of English, 26 students (81%) consider English as an international language for communication. 12 students (37%) believe that English is the language of science and technology. This percentage reveals that students are learning translation in parallel with other disciplines or they have already had scientific training. 6 students (19%) consider English important because of the wide range of academic materials available in English.

To sum up, we can say that students are motivated towards learning English and are aware of its importance. For this reason we suggest that the students’ view of the importance of English is not merely the result of the wide belief that English is an international language; they seem to be quite convinced of this fact.

Question 5- How often do you read in English?

- a- Very often b- Often c- Sometimes d- Rarely e- Never

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
Very Often	3	9
Often	6	19
Sometimes	17	53
Rarely	6	19
Never	0	0
Total	32	100

Table 12: Reading in English

It is well known that reading affects the competence in languages and as a result affects the translation competence. For this reason we suppose that students who have good reading habits will inevitably have appropriate linguistic knowledge in English and, hence, their performance of translation will be accurate.

The students' answers for this question reveal that 17 students (53%) read sometimes, 6 students (19%) read often, and 6 students (19%) read rarely. Only 3 students (9%) reported that they read very often. However, the percentage of students shows that all of them read in English.

As we can see the highest percentage represents the students who read sometimes. This result does not really confirm their good habits of reading. That is why we aim to see what kind of materials they do read.

Question 6- What kind of materials do you read in English?

- a- Materials related to your field c- Magazines and newspapers
b- Literature d- Others

Option	Number of Students	Percentage % ¹
a	15	47
b	9	28
c	13	41
d	7	22

Table 13: Materials Students Read in English

As you can see, this question reveals that the majority of students i.e. 15 students (47%) read materials related to their field of study. In the second position, 13 students (41%) prefer to read literature. 9 students (28%) read newspapers and magazines and the remaining students i.e. 7 students (22%) have suggested other kinds of materials. For example, they read books of religion and computer sciences. Only one student has suggested TV programmes, but his answer has been erroneous since we are interested with written materials and not with oral ones.

II.3.2.3. Section Three: Knowledge and Motivation to Arabic

Question 7-How often do you read in Arabic?

a- Very often b- Often c- Sometimes d - Rarely e- Never

¹ Note: The discrepancies in the percentages are the result of the multiple choices students were allowed to indicate. This explanation is valid for all the tables representing multiple choice questions.

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
Very Often	10	31
Often	4	13
Sometimes	16	50
Rarely	1	3
Never	1	3
Total	32	100

Table 14: Reading in Arabic

As you can see students' reading in Arabic are almost similar to their reading in English. 16 students (50%) read sometimes in Arabic. 10 students (31%) have reported that they read very often and 4 students (13%) read often in Arabic. Only 1 student (3%) reads rarely in Arabic, whereas, 1 student (3%) has reported that she never reads in Arabic.

In a similar way, the competence in Arabic is as important as the competence in English. That is to say, students need to be knowledgeable of their mother tongue, in order to produce successful translation in the target language.

Question 8- What kind of materials do you read in Arabic?

- a- Materials related to your field d- Translated material
b- Literature e- Others
c- Magazines and newspapers

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
a	11	34
b	18	56
c	19	59
d	6	19
e	2	6
No answer	1	3

Table 15: Materials Students Read in Arabic

The students' results show that 19 students (59%) read newspapers and magazines, 18 students (56%) read literature, 11 students (34%) read materials related to their studies and 6 students (19%) read translated materials. 2 students (6%) have suggested other kind of materials, for example, they read books of religion and philosophy. However, 1 student (3%) has not answered this question as she did not read in Arabic.

In brief, we can say that the materials students read have not reflected their excellent level in reading while regularity in reading is a key factor of successful translation. Because the students are not good readers, we assert that the poor translation of the sentences is rather the result of such deficiency.

II.3.2.4. Section Four: Knowledge and Motivation to Translation

Question 9- Are you learning translation because?

- a- You like translation
- b- To get a degree
- c- To get a job
- d- You did not have the choice to study other subjects
- e- Others

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
a	20	62
b	6	19
c	26	50
d	2	6
e	1	3
Total	32	100

Table16: Reasons for Learning Translation

This question aims to show whether the students' claim that their motivation towards translation is similar to that towards languages, or they are just pretending. That is, we aim to know the reasons behind their choice of learning translation.

The students' answers show that for the majority of students, translation was their own choice. 20 students (62%) have reported that they are learning translation because they like it. 26 students (50%) have reported that they are doing it in order to get a job and 6 students (19%) in order to get a degree. 2 students (6%) have reported that they have not had the choice to study something else. So, because it was not their choice to learn translation, they lack the motivation required and, thus, they are more likely to produce erroneous translation. Only 1 student (3%) has reported that translation helps him in his academic training which is law.

All in all, the answers reveal that students are motivated towards learning translation and do really feel its importance. Because they linked translation with other fields such as law, computer science and physics, they have proved that they are interested in it.

Question10- When you read a translated material are you able to recognize it as Translation?

a- Yes

b- No

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
Yes	22	69
No	10	31
Total	32	100

Table 17: Recognition of Translated Materials

Through this question we aim to assess the students' ability to recognize a translated version from the original one. That is to say, the students' ability to distinguish between a good and a bad translation helps them to gain competence in translation.

Thus, in this table we can see that 22 students (69%) can recognize a material as a translation or not, whereas, 10 students (31%) can not do so. It is worth noting that these percentages are not sufficient measures to decide that students are truly competent in translation. To decide whether a translated material is a translation or not should not be based on the students' intuitions, but there is a need to know what makes them respond so. For this reason we have suggested the following question:

-If yes, what leads you to recognize it?

- a- The sentences are not connected accurately
- b- The translated material is different in matters of culture
- c- It is difficult to understand its language
- d- There are lot of loan words and footnotes

Justifications:

- a- The sentences are not connected accurately.

This option has been suggested in order to reveal the ability of students to recognize the importance of sentences in combination. That is, to see if students can recognize the unity of texts through the use of cohesive devices or not.

- b- The translated material is different in matters of culture.

That is, the cultural peculiarities which characterize every subject matter help us to shed light on the differences between cultures and, hence, readers will easily recognize them.

- c- It is difficult to understand its language.

Generally speaking, students feel that a given text is difficult to understand and claim that there is something inaccurate with the language of translation, but they are incapable to detect the problem.

- d- There are lot of loan words and footnotes.

The recognition of vocabulary is said to be one of the major keys that guide students for such decisions. The occurrence of loan words and footnotes in the translated version show that the original version is different in culture. So, the insertion of such a kind of features aims to ensure a better comprehension of a text.

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
a	8	25
b	15	47
c	3	9
d	6	19
Total	32	100

Table 18: Criteria for Recognizing Translated Materials

The students' answers show that 15 students (47%) consider the cultural differences between languages a prominent feature of the translated material. In the second position, 8 students (25%) have reported that their recognition is based on the connectivity of written discourse. 6 students (19%) have related the translation to the occurrence of loan words and footnotes. Only 3 students (9%) have reported that the difficulty of language reveals its unnaturalness. Hence, these considerations do not really preserve the naturalness of the original version.

To sum up, most of the students are able to recognize translation criteria. Therefore, they are aware of the difficulties they may encounter and try to overcome them in order to produce appropriate translation. That is why we suppose that students will answer appropriately questions Q14, Q15, and Q16.

Question 11- How often do you translate?

- a- Very often b- Often c- Sometimes d- Rarely

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
Very Often	7	22
Often	16	50
Sometimes	8	25
Rarely	1	3
Total	32	100

Table19: Experience in Translation

We have suggested this question in order to assess the students experience with translation. It is well known that the translation skill is developed through the constant practice of this activity.

From the results obtained we can say that students are quite familiar with this task since it is their field of study. 16 students (50%) have reported that they translate often. 7 students (22 %) translate very often and 8 students (25%) translate sometimes. Only 1 student (3%) of the whole population translates rarely. We have not suggested the ‘never’ scale, because it would be illogical that students learn translation and never translate. Therefore, we can say that the majority of students 23 students (72%) translate often and very often. Despite these answers, very few acceptable responses have been found in the translation of the sentences. Thus, their claims are going to be questioned; how is it possible to translate regularly but fail to translate accurately?

Hence, in order to check their experience with translation we have suggested the following question.

Question 12- What kind of materials do you translate?

- a- Scientific articles c- Songs
b- Newspaper articles d- Others

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
a	16	50
b	19	59
c	6	19
d	8	25

Table 20: Materials Students Translate

Through this question we aim to reiterate that the more students get familiar with different types of discourse, the more they get used to translate.

The findings reveal that the practice of translation is focused on academic and non academic domains. The main concern of students is the translation of academic materials. That is, 19 students (59%) translate newspaper articles and 16 students (50%) translate scientific articles. Their persistence in the translation of academic materials reveals their awareness that translation is based on practice, and, hence, they will achieve successful translation. However, only 6 students (19%) tend to translate non academic materials such as songs. Moreover, 8 students (25%) have suggested other kind of materials. For example, one student has reported that he translates articles of politics and economy, and these are included in the academic materials. So, we suppose that his answer is a paraphrasing of ‘scientific articles’. Other students have reported that they translate their own courses into Arabic in order to achieve a better understanding; this is the case of computer sciences and physics’ students.

Question 13-Do you think it is enough to have a good language to translate well?

a- Yes

b- No

-If 'no', explain what else you need to have?

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
Yes	13	41
No	19	59
Total	32	100

Table21: Translation and the Mastery of Languages

Through this question we aim to assess the students' assumptions about the translation product. In other words, its aim is to see whether students believe that translation is simply guaranteed through the mastering of two languages, or there are other considerations.

The answers of this question show that 19 students (59%) consider that the mastery of languages is not sufficient for the translation, whereas 13 students (41%) believe that the mastery of languages is enough to achieve an accurate translation. In fact, these findings reveal that students are aware of the requirements of translation, and mastering languages is merely part of these requirements. So we can say that thanks to their experience, students are knowledgeable about the criteria involved in translation.

To confirm these answers, we have asked students about the possible requirements they need to know, and their responses have been stated as follows:

- Students must have a mastery of the subject matter. That is, they should have good information and must be updated about all the domains.
- Students must be knowledgeable about the culture of both languages.

- Students need practice. That is, consistent practice helps them produce successful translations.
- Students must be able to ensure the connections between ideas of texts. This has to do with translation principles.

To put it briefly, students have tried to summarize the important features contributing to translation. Therefore, they seem to be aware of the different requirements of successful translations. They are particularly aware of the connections existing between parts of texts. However, in comparison to the test's results, students seem to lack the appropriate application in this aspect. That is, although they are aware of the connections between ideas, they are still unable to ensure this connectivity by means of cohesive conjunctions.

II.3.2.5. Section Five: Attitudes and Opinions about Conjunctions

Question 14- Was it difficult for you to render 'fa' into English?

a- Yes

b- No

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
Yes	18	56
No	14	44
Total	32	100

Table 22: Difficulties in Translating Arabic 'Fa' into English

The aim of this question is to assess the students' thoughts about the translation of sentences into English. That is, we want to see if students have found difficulties when translating. 18 students (56%) have reported that they have found difficulties when translating 'fa', whereas 14 students (44%) have found no difficulties. We suppose that the reason behind this deficiency is the fact that students have not dealt during their courses

with text organization and have not studied conjunctions as linking devices. Moreover, their answers have really confirmed the inadequate translation of conjunctive ‘fa’ into English.

Question 15- Have you noticed the multiplicity of functions that characterizes ‘fa’?

a- Yes

b- No

-If yes, what lead you to say so?

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
Yes	7	22
No	25	78
Total	32	100

Table 23: Recognition of the Multiplicity of Arabic ‘Fa’

The reason behind suggesting this question is to see whether students are aware of the multifunctional nature of ‘fa’ or not. 25 students (78%) have reported that they do not know this multiplicity, whereas 7 students (22%) have claimed that they are aware of it. These students have justified their answers by writing that the conjunction ‘fa’ is rendered into English as ‘then’, ‘afterwards’ and ‘after’. But this is not accurate, since these conjunctions express only temporal relation while the multiplicity of functions must include adversative, explanatory, causal, and sequential relations as well. Therefore, such a justification confirms the students’ poor production in translating the previous sentences.

Question16- Do you think that connectors play a major role in signalling the logical relations between parts of sentences?

a- Yes

b- No

-Explain why?

Option	Number of Students	Percentage %
Yes	7	22
No	25	78
Total	32	100

Table24: Importance of Conjunctions when Translating

Only 7 students (22%) consider that conjunctions are important to reflect the logical relations between sentences. However, the majority of responses i.e. 25 of the answers (78%) reveal that students do not take into account the use of conjunctive devices when translating. They have explained that conjunctions are merely extra items used for stylistic purposes, and, hence, they are not significantly important for translation. Therefore, this question has proved that the main cause behind the students' inability to translate accurately the conjunctive 'fa', is their belief that conjunctions are not of great importance in translation.

II.4. Summary of the Findings

To sum up, the findings resulting from the test analysis may stir up the following observations:

First, students have failed to recognize the semantic relations ensured through the use of conjunctions. That is, they have failed to distinguish between resultative and causal conjunctions; and that is what explains the insertion of 'so' instead of 'because'.

Second, the translation of 'fa' has been to a great extent difficult. We have noticed that resultative 'fa' has been the easiest conjunction to translate, in comparison to the other functions; whereas, explanatory 'fa' has been the most difficult to render.

Third, the use of punctuation marks such as the comma and the full stop has been inappropriate, and very few students have been able to use the semicolon as a linking device between clauses.

Fourth, students have avoided the translation of this conjunction using a different strategy; they have changed the whole structure of the sentence in order to preserve the sentence meaning. Thus, such a strategy explains the source of errors students make when translating.

Fifth, on the whole, the misuse of this particular conjunction has resulted in a significant confusion in the target language i.e. English. That is, the misinterpretation of the functions of 'fa' has made students unable to ensure the appropriate cohesion on the one hand, and has distorted the intended meaning on the other one.

Sixth, we suppose that because of the limited number of Arabic conjunctions, students have not been able to render them into English. That is, because there is no one to one correspondence between Arabic and English conjunctives, students have produced unnatural translations.

All in all, we can say that the analysis of the data has shown that the majority of the students' rendition of 'fa' into English has been erroneous. The main cause behind this deficiency is that students ignore the multifunctional nature of the Arabic 'fa', and, as a result, their translation has not been successful since it has lacked the necessary cohesion.

Therefore, our hypothesis that the students' unawareness that 'fa' is a multifunctional conjunction leads them to produce inaccurate translations in terms of both cohesion and coherence has been confirmed.

As far as the questionnaire is concerned, we can say that the students concern with cohesion is overshadowed by their concern with coherence. That is, the students' main concern when translating is to preserve the sentences meaning; whereas, textual features such as conjunctive devices are of less importance. This is revealed in their answers to

question16. Similarly, this point has been confirmed in the translation of adversative 'fa', when students have changed the whole structure of the sentence, but maintained its intended meaning.

Moreover, it is worth explaining that the students' poor reading habit is the main cause of their poor translation. Despite their reading frequency and the types of materials they read, they still lack the required competence in translation. This is shown in answers to Q11, Q12 and Q13.

Furthermore, even though translation is the students' major field, where they are thought to be competent in both languages Arabic and English, they, however, seem to have non-adequate linguistic background in both languages.

Conclusion

Through this chapter we have tried to shed light on how well students of translation at the University of Constantine recognize the multifunctional nature of Arabic 'fa', and how its translation affects the cohesion and coherence of the surrounding sentences. By means of a test and a questionnaire we have administered to the subjects, we have concluded that because of the students' poor reading habits, poor translations have been created. Therefore, for the mastery of this task reading is required since it is considered to be the building blocks of translation, and nothing else is expected to ensure competency in this skill.

General Conclusion

There are several problems taking place at the different levels of language when translating. The discourse level, for example, reveals a wide range of difficulties students meet during this process. Among these difficulties is the students' inability to preserve the unity of the target texts, since they lack the necessary cohesive devices and, more particularly, lack the conjunctive devices.

This study aims at describing the performance of a group of third year students of translation, at the department of Translation (University of Constantine), and examining the way they tackle the translation of conjunctive 'fa' into English. More particularly, the study investigates the multifunctional nature of 'fa' and its possible rendition into English in order to overcome the difficulties students may encounter when doing so. In this way, we have examined several points related to the importance of cohesion and its impact on the way sentences are interpreted through a comparison between Arabic and English conjunctions and a description of their categories, functions and cohesive role in both languages.

The findings of this research have revealed that the majority of students have failed to render the conjunctive 'fa' accurately into English. And the reason behind this deficiency is that students seem to be unaware of the multiplicity of functions that characterizes 'fa'. Moreover, the test and the questionnaire have indicated that there are many factors that contribute to the students' translation and attitudes towards the importance of conjunctions. Their poor reading habit, for example, has revealed their poor translation product. That is, even though students have pretended reading frequently, the results show that they lack the necessary knowledge about conjunctive devices which could be ensured through consistent reading. Furthermore, the students' misinterpretation

of conjunctions is due to their ignorance of the various categories of these devices in both languages.

Therefore, students are unaware of the various functions of 'fa', and, hence, their production is erroneous in terms of both coherence and cohesion.

In the light of the results obtained, it is worth suggesting a number of implications to foreign language learners and novice translators as well:

First, the awareness of the multifunctional nature of conjunctions can be said to be an important factor to focus on in teaching translation. That is, through the explicit teaching of these devices, students will be able to recognize their various functions, and, hence, will render an accurate translation.

Second, the misinterpretation of the conjunctive devices is mainly the result of the students' poor translation experience and knowledge of both the SL and TL. Therefore, they should understand the meaning of the source language, first, and then translate this particular meaning. This would be achieved through a regular practice.

Third, because there is a wide belief that reading can be seen as an efficient exercise to develop the translation skill, it would be possible to design syllabus for teaching reading strategies in addition teaching translation.

Fourth, conjunctions should compose a major constituent in the syllabus of translation courses. That is, students should be taught to recognize the role of conjunctions in signalling the logical relations between clauses and sentences in discourse.

In addition to the practical courses, the theoretical ones should be included in the students' programs. An explicit teaching of discourse analysis and the organizations of texts will inevitably help students to sense the importance of conjunctions.

Further research in this area would have to:

- 1- Translate a text as a whole instead of translating merely one sentence or two sentences in combination. That is to say, the text as a whole containing the five functions of 'fa'

would reveal accurately the various difficulties students may encounter. This would help them to understand clearly the aspects of cohesion and coherence since cohesion between sentences is of great importance than within sentences.

- 2- Suggest a large token of sentences containing the conjunction 'fa' to translate with a large group of students.
- 3- Extend this investigation to fourth year students and to graduate students to see if they are much more experienced than the undergraduates.
- 4- Undertake a similar study on two separate groups one of which would serve as a control group in order to confirm our hypothesis.

Bibliography

- Aarts, F. (1980). The contrastive analysis debate: Problems and solutions. The Eleventh Triennial Conference of the International Association of University Professors of English. Aberdeen: Netherlands.
- Al-Amri, K. H. (2008). The Seven standards of textuality: Text-linguistics for students of translation: The English program .Hand out N°2. King Saud University. *College of Languages and Translation*. Retrieved February13, 2010 from <http://www.faculty.ksu.edu.sa/kamri/Text-linguistics.aspx>.
- Al-Qahtani,D.M. (2004). *Semantic Valence of Arabic Verbs*. Beirut, Lebanon : Libraire du Liban Publishers.
- Alshorafa, N.S.D. (1994). Text linguistics and cohesion in written Arabic. *JKAU' Arts and Humanities*, 17, pp17-30. Retrieved May 6, 2010 from http://www.kau.edu.sa/centers/spc/jkau/.../Review_Artical.aspx?No.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation*. London, England: Routledge.
- Bakir, A., Almhiri, A. &Altuhami,N. (1962). *ʿA.ssarf ʿAlqarabi*: Lissanawat ʿalʿula wa aḥanija wa ḥaliḥa mina ʿattacli:mi ʿaḥanawi. Tunis,Tunisia: Dar ʿarrasem li.ttibaça
- Biber, D., Conard, S.& Leech,G.(2002). *Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Edinburgh: Longman.
- Blum-kulka, S. (1986). 'Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation'. In House, J and Blum-kulka, S. (eds.). *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication: Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies*. Gunter Narr Verlag Tubingen.

- Bouchair, Z. (2003). Transfer from French: The case of the passive voice. Unpublished Magistère Thesis. University of Constantine.
- Carstens, W. (1999). Text-linguistics: Relevant linguistics? *School of Languages and Arts, Potchefstroom University for CHE* p588-592. Retrieved February 12, 2010 from <http://www.pala.ac.uk/resources/proceedings/1999/pdf/carstens.pdf>
- Celce-Murcia, M & Larsen-Freeman, D.(1999). *The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishing Company.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Fareh, S. (1998). The function of and and wa in English and Arabic written discourse. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 34, 303-312. Retrieved January 13, 2010 from <http://www.ifa.amu.edu.pl/psicl/files/34/18Fareh.pdf>
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hinkel, E. (2001). Matters of cohesion in L2 academic texts. *Applied language learning*, 12(2), 111-132, Retrieved February 13, 2010 from <http://www.elhinkel.org/downloads.htm>
- Madoui, S. (2004). Student's approach to text cohesion and coherence while translating. Unpublished Magistère Thesis. University of Constantine.
- Martin, J.R. (2007). 'Cohesion and Texture'. In Schiffrin, D, D. Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton (eds). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing, Blackwell Reference Online. Retrieved March 18, 2010 from <http://www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/book>.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Mohamed, A & Majzoub, O. (2000). Texts, texture and culture: Cohesive markers' rhetorical organization in Arabic and English narrative texts. Retrieved

January13, 2010 from <http://www.rele.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/31/2/45>.

- Mostaghanmi, A. (1993). *ḍakirartu ḥalgased*. Beirut, Lebanon: Dar ḥlʿadab ḥlʿarabi.
- Müller, S. (2005). *Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native English Discourse*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Onodera, N.O. (2005). *Japanese Discourse Markers. Synchronic and Diachronic Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Othman, W. (2004). Subordination and coordination in English and Arabic Texts. *AlBasaer*.8.2, 12-33. Retrieved May1, 2010 from <http://wwwfaculty.ksu.edu.sa/ahmad/Pages/aticl2.aspx>.
- Schiffrin, D. (2003). 'Discourse Markers: Language, Meaning and Context'. In Schiffrin, D, D. Tannen and Heidi, E. Hamilton (eds). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing, Blackwell Reference Online.03March2007 <http://www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/book?> Retrieved March 18, 2010.
- Tanskanen, S.K. (2006). *Collaborating towards Coherence: Lexical Cohesion in English Discourse*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Tapper, M.(1998). Connectives in advanced Swedish EFL learners' written English. 116-117. Retrieved January13, 2010.<http://www.sol.lu.se/engelska/dokument/wp/.../Tapper-wp-05.pdf>
- Thabit, A. & Fareh, S. (2006). Difficulties encountered by bilingual Arab learners in translating Arabic 'fa' into English. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9 (1), Retrieved January13, 2010 from <http://www.citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/downloaddoi=10.1>
- Widdowson, H.G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H.G. (2004) *.Text, Context, Pretext*. Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishing.

Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Yeh, C. (2004).The Relationship of cohesion and coherence: a contrastive study of English and Chinese. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(2), 243-249

Retrieved January 23, 2010.

<http://www.corpus4u.org/upload/forum/2006041415470439.pdf>

Yowell, Y. and Muftah, S. L. (1995). *Principles of Translation*. Benghazi, Libya: Dar 'annahda 'al'arabija.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Students' Test

Dear students,

You are kindly requested to translate the following sentences into English. Your answers are very important for the validity of the research we are undertaking. That is why we are expecting you to be honest and sincere in answering the test. The test is anonymous, so you are not supposed to write your name on the paper.

1. كان في مصادفة وجودي مع 'سي الطاهر' في الزنزانة نفسها شيء أسطوري بحد ذاته ، و تجربة نضالية ظلت تلاحقني لسنوات بكل تفاصيلها، وربما كان لها بعد ذلك أثر في تغير قدري .فهناك رجال عندما تلتقي بهم تكون قد التقيت بقدرك.

2. كان 'سي الطاهر' هكذا أحيانا ، يكون موجزا حتى في فرحته، فكنت موجزا معه في حزنه أيضا. سألني بعدها عن أخبار الأهل، وأخبار (اما) بالتحديد، فأجبتة أنها توفيت منذ ثلاثة اشهر.

3. إن الهواية تحتاج إلى رغبة قوية تقوم بمقاومة كل هؤلاء، فلاعب كرة القدم لو خيرته بين كل ما في الدنيا و بين أن يلعب في ليلة موجعة الأرق لن يتردد في القفز إلى الملعب وراء الكرة.

4. إذا كان المتنبي يرى خير جليس في الأنام كتاب، فان ميخائيل نعيمة يرى الطبيعة خير جليس و أفضل مدرسة.

5. زعموا أن أرضا من أراضي الفيلة قل ماؤها فعطشت الفيلة عطشا شديدا، فأرسل ملكهن رواده في طلب الماء في كل ناحية، فرجع إليه بعض الرسل واخبره بأنه عثر على عين كثيرة المياه فتوجه الملك و أصحابه إليها.

6. أنا مغرور لكي لا أكون محقورا فنحن لا نملك الخيار يا صاحبي. إننا ننتمي إلى أمة لا تحترم مبدعيها و إذا افتقدنا غرورنا و كبرياءنا، ستدوسنا أقدام الأमीين والجهلة.

7. أنقب بعض الشيء في ذاكرتي عن القصيدة التي أخذ منها هذا البيت، وإذا بعنوانها 'الشيخوخة'. فيخيفني اكتشافي فجأة وكأنني أكتشف معه ملامح وجهي الجديدة. فهل تزحف الشيخوخة نحونا بليل طويل واحد.

8. و هناك أسماء عندما تتذكرها، تكاد تُصلح من جلستك، و تطفئ سيجارتك، تكاد تتحدث عنها و كأنك تتحدث إليها بنفس تلك الهيبة و ذلك الانبهار الأول، ولذا ظل لاسم 'سي الطاهر' هيبة عندي. فالرموز تعرف دائما كيف تحيط نفسها بذلك الحاجز اللامرئي، الذي يفصل بين العادي و الاستثنائي و الممكن و المستحيل في كل شيء.

9. إذ أن طبيب الأسنان أراد أن يضع لضرسه غلافا من الذهب فطلب إليه أن يضعه من الماس.

10. ذهب الحجاج إلى مكة فالمدينة.

11. و عندما نعود إليه نعود بحقائب الحنين و حفنة أحلام فقط، نعود بأحلام وردية لا بأكياس وردية، فالحلم لا يبتاع من محلات تاتي الرخيصة.

12. وبينما أسحب نفسا من سيجارة أخيرة، يرتفع صوت المآذن معلنا صلاة الفجر. ومن غرفة بعيدة يأتي بكاء طفل أيقظ صوته أنحاء كل البيت. فأحسد المآذن، وأحسد الأطفال لأنهم يملكون وحدهم حق الصراخ و القدرة عليه.

13. لا أذكر من قال "يقضي الإنسان سنواته الأولى في تعلم النطق، وتقضي الأنظمة العربية بقية عمره في تعليمه الصمت!" تماما كالنسيان. فالذاكرة في مناسبات كهذه لا تأتي بالتقسيط، وإنما تهجم عليك شلالا يجرفك إلى حيث لا تدري.

14. دعاني صديق لزيارته فلم أجب دعوته.

15. خرج الطبيب فالمريض.

Thank you.

Appendix 2

The Model Translation of the Test

Adversative 'Fa'¹

1. إذا كان المتنبي يرى خير جليس في الأنام كتاب، فإن ميخائيل نعيمة يرى الطبيعة خير جليس و أفضل مدرسة.

While El Mutanabi considers a book as the best companion, Michael Naema, however, sees that nature is the best companion and the best school.

2. إذ أن طبيب الأسنان أراد أن يضع لضرسه غلافا من الذهب فطلب إليه أن يضعه من الماس .

The dentist wanted to cover his tooth with a golden layer, but he asked him to cover it with diamond.

3. دعاني صديق لزيارته فلم أجب دعوته.

My friend invited me to visit him, but I turned down his invitation.

Causal 'Fa'²

1. لا أذكر من قال "يقضي الإنسان سنواته الأولى في تعلم النطق، وتقضي الأنظمة العربية بقية عمره في تعليمه الصمت!" تماما كالنسيان. فالذاكرة في مناسبات كهذه لا تأتي بالتقسيط، و إنما تهجم عليك شللا لا يجرفك إلى حيث لا تدري.

I do not remember who said "Man passes his first years learning how to speak, and Arab regimes teach him for the rest of his life how to be quiet". Exactly like forgetting, because memory does not come in such occasions gradually, but it attacks you like a waterfall that drifts you away to the unknown.

¹ The sentences have been extracted from Bakir et al. (1962, p.98)

² The sentences have been extracted from Mostaghanemi (1993)

2. أنا مغرور لكي لا أكون محقورا فنحن لا نملك الخيار يا صاحبي. إننا ننتمي إلى أمة لا تحترم مبدعيها و إذا
افتقدنا غرورنا و كبريانا، ستدوسنا أقدام الأميين والجهلة.

I am arrogant so as not to be oppressed because we have no choice dear friend. We belong to a nation that does not respect its creative people. And once we lose our arrogance and pride, illiterate and ignorant people will stamp us.

3. وعندما نعود إليه نعود بحقائب الحنين و حفنة أحلام فقط، نعود بأحلام وردية لا بأكياس وردية، فالحلم لا
يبتاع من محلات 'تاتي' الرخيصة.

When we come back to it, we come back with bags of nostalgia and a handful of dreams; we go back with pink dreams not with pink bags because a dream can not be sold in 'Tati' discount stores.

Resultative 'Fa'¹

1. كان 'سي الطاهر' هكذا أحيانا ، يكون موجزا حتى في فرحته، فكنت موجزا معه في حزنه أيضا. سألني
بعدها عن أخبار الأهل، وأخبار (اما) بالتحديد، فأجبتة أنها توفيت منذ ثلاثة اشهر.

'Si Taher' was sometimes like that, brief even in his happiness; so, I was as brief with him in his sadness. After that, he asked me about my family, and more precisely about mum, and I answered that she died three months ago.

2. أنقب بعض الشيء في ذاكرتي عن القصيدة التي أخذ منها هذا البيت، وإذا بعنوانها 'الشيخوخة'. فيخيفني
اكتشافي فجأة وكأنني أكتشف معه ملامح وجهي الجديدة. فهل تزحف الشيخوخة نحونا بليل طويل واحد.

I explore in my memory for the poem from which this verse has been chosen; then, I find that its title was "Old Age". This recall frightens me as if I have undisclosed with that my new face features; so will old age creep towards us slowly just like a long night.

¹ The sentences have been extracted from Mostaghanemi (1993)

3. وبينما أسحب نفساً من سيجارة أخيرة، يرتفع صوت المآذن معلناً صلاة الفجر. ومن غرفة بعيدة يأتي بكاء طفل أيقظ صوته أنحاء كل البيت. فأحسد المآذن، وأحسد الأطفال لأنهم يملكون وحدهم حق الصراخ والقدرة عليه.

As I inhale the last smoke of a cigarette, the muezzins' voices call for the dawn prayer. And from a far away room comes the crying of a little boy breaking the stillness in the entire house. And, so, I envy muezzins and children for only they have the right and can scream.

Explanatory 'Fa'¹

1. إن الهواية تحتاج إلى رغبة قوية تقوم بمقاومة كل هؤلاء، فلاعب كرة القدم لو خيرته بين كل ما في الدنيا وبين أن يلعب في ليلة موجعة الأرق لن يتردد في القفز إلى الملعب وراء الكرة.

Hobby is in no need of strong desire that can resist all of them. For example, if you give a football player to choose between the whole world and playing in a painfully sleepless night, he will rush with no hesitation to the stadium to run after the ball.

2. وهناك أسماء عندما تتذكرها، تكاد تُصلح من جلستك، و تطفئ سيجارتك، تكاد تتحدث عنها و كأنك تتحدث إليها بنفس تلك الهيبة و ذلك الانبهار الأول، ولذا ظل لاسم 'سي الطاهر' هيبة عندي. فالرموز تعرف دائماً كيف تحيط نفسها بذلك الحاجز اللامرئي، الذي يفصل بين العادي و الاستثنائي و الممكن و المستحيل في كل شيء.

When you remember some names, you straighten up with respect and put off your cigarette. You speak of these names as if you are addressing them with the same feeling of reverence and fascination of a first meeting. That is why the name of 'Si Taher' remains a permanent source of reverence for me. That is, symbols always know how to confine themselves inside some invisible barriers; those barriers which separates between the ordinary and the alien and between the possible and the impossible in everything.

¹ The sentences have been extracted from Mostaghanemi (1993)

3. كان في مصادفة وجودي مع 'سي الطاهر' في الزنزانة نفسها شيء أسطوري بحد ذاته ، و تجربة نضالية ظلت تلاحقني لسنوات بكل تفاصيلها، وربما كان لها بعد ذلك أثر في تغير قدرتي. فهناك رجال عندما تلتقي بهم تكون قد التقيت بقدرك.

To be with 'Si Taher' in the same cell was in itself somehow mythical; it was an experience of struggle that persisted in chasing me for years with all its features. Then, it, perhaps, had a hand in changing destiny. That is, when you meet with certain men you have met with your.

Sequential 'Fa'¹

1. زعموا أن أرضا من أراضي الفيلة قل مأوها فعطشت الفيلة عطشا شديدا، فأرسل ملكهن رواده في طلب الماء في كل ناحية، فرجع إليه بعض الرسل واخبره بأنه عثر على عين كثيرة المياه فتوجه الملك و أصحابه إليها.

Once upon a time, water became scare in a land where elephants lived, and, so, they were about to die of thirst. Their chief sent some of them to search for water. Some of the messengers returned back and told him that they had found a fountain plentiful of water. So, the king and his followers went to see it.

2. ذهب الحجاج إلى مكة فالمدينة.

Pilgrims went to Mecca, then Medina.

3. خرج الطبيب فالمريض.

The doctor went out, then the patient.

¹ The sentences have been extracted from Bakir et al (1962).

Appendix 3

Students' Questionnaire

Dear students,

This is a questionnaire that is needed for research purposes. You are requested to fill it and to express your thoughts about your translation of the previous sentences.

Thank you in advance.

1-Gender a- Male b-Female

2- Age:

3-The year you were awarded your Baccalaureate

Year ----- Speciality -----

4-Do you think it is important to learn English?

b- Yes b- No

If it is yes, is it because English is:

d- An international language for communication

e- The language of science and technology

f- It is easy for us to gain information

5- How often do you read in English?

a- Very often b- Often c- Sometimes d- Rarely e- Never

6- What kind of materials do you read in English?

c- Materials related to your field c- Magazines and newspapers

d- Literature d- Others (specify)

7- How often do you read in Arabic?

a- Very often b- Often c- Sometimes d- Rarely

8- What kind of materials do you read in Arabic?

- d- Materials related to your field c- Magazines and newspapers
e- Literature d- Translated materials
Others (specify) -----

9- Are you learning translation because:

- f- You like Translation
g- To get a degree
h- To get a job
i- You did not have the choice to study other subjects

10- When you read a translated material are you able to recognize it as translation?

- a- Yes b- No

-If yes, what leads you to recognize it?

- a- The sentences are not connected accurately
b- The translated material is different in matters of culture
f- It is difficult to understand its language
g- There are lot of loan words and footnotes

11- How often do you translate?

- a- Very often b- Often c- Sometimes d- Rarely

12- What kind of materials do you translate?

- c- Scientific articles c- Songs
d- Newspaper articles d- Others (specify)

13- Do you think it is enough to have a good language to translate well?

- a- Yes b- No

-If no, explain what else you need to have?

14- Was it difficult for you to render the Arabic conjunction 'fa' into English?

a- Yes

b- No

15- Have you noticed the multiplicity of functions that characterizes 'fa'?

a- Yes

b- No

-If yes, what leads you to say so?

16- Do you think that connectors play a major role in signaling the logical relations between sentences?

a- Yes

b- No

-Explain why?

ملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى وصف تأثير وعي طلاب اللغة الانجليزية كلغة أجنبية بأدوات الربط النصي على ترجمتهم إلى اللغة الإنجليزية وبصفة خاصة ترجمة حرف العطف 'ف'. يبدو أن ترجمة هذا الحرف يخلق عدة صعوبات باعتباره حرفا متعدد الوظائف والخصائص الدلالية. ولتحقيق هذا الهدف تم جمع بعض المعطيات من خلال استبيان قدم لمجموعة من طلاب السنة الثالثة اختصاص ترجمة بجامعة قسنطينة. وكشفت النتائج أن عدم إدراك الطلاب لطبيعة ووظائف حرف العطف يؤدي إلى ترجمة تفتقر إلى كثير من الانسجام النصي. وبناء على هذه النتائج، توصي هذه الدراسة بتدريس مفصل وواضح لثنى الروابط التي تساهم في التماسك النصي ووظائف كل منها من خلال تحليل مقارن بين اللغتين العربية والإنجليزية من أجل مساعدة الطلاب على التغلب على هذه الصعوبات.

Résumé

L'objectif de cette étude est d'examiner l'effet de la conscience des étudiants algériens des conjonctions sur leur traduction vers l'anglais comme langue étrangère, et, plus particulièrement, la traduction de la conjonction arabe «fa». L'interprétation de cette conjonction en anglais semble poser beaucoup de difficultés à cause de sa nature multifonctionnelle et de ses propriétés sémantiques. A cette fin, des données ont été collectées à travers l'administration d'un test et d'un questionnaire pour un groupe d'étudiants de troisième année traduction à l'Université de Constantine. Les résultats montrent que les étudiants produisent un texte traduit sans grande cohésion à cause de leur manque de connaissance de la conjonction 'fa' et de son caractère multifonctionnel. Pour aider les apprenants à surmonter les difficultés d'apprentissage et de traduction, cette étude recommande un enseignement explicite de divers types de conjonctions et de leurs fonctions respectives à travers une étude contrastive entre l'anglais et l'arabe.