Process-oriented Translation Studies: A Case Study Based on Lörscher's Model

Sareh Fereydouni

Department of English Language, Marvdasht Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran

Amin Karimnia

Department of English Language, Fasa Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran

Abstract—The present study aimed at investigating Iranian M.A students of translation uses of TAPs strategies while translating a text from English into Persian. The researchers used Lörscher's (2005) model of TAPs as the main framework of the study. The main translated text was in literary genre. The participants of the study were 20 M.A students of Translation Studies. The participants who were selected through accidental sampling were supposed to translate the text into Persian in thirty minutes. Use of dictionaries was also allowed. Before giving the text in question to the participants in order to be translated, the translators were instructed and asked to verbalize what they were thinking about. Having collected the data, each strategy was given its related issue based on Lörscher's (2005) model of TAPs. After counting out the frequency of each TAPs strategy, to find out whether the frequencies of each strategy type were of any statistically significant differences, the researchers conducted the chi-square test. As the results of the study revealed, there were statistically significant differences among the frequencies of the ten TAPs strategies based on Lörscher's (2005) model. The findings also revealed that out of the five ending strategies pointed out in this model, 'negative solution to a translational problem' was the most frequent one.

Index Terms—think-aloud protocols, process-oriented research, translation studies, translation strategies

I. INTRODUCTION

During the history of translation, there have been a lot of theories, models and procedures introduced by several scholars in order to understand the phenomenon of translation better. Although TS has not been treated as an academic field of science (Munday, 2008) and thus has not been studied in isolation within the academic context, the history of translation shows that many attempts have been made without noticing the academic issues in this field of science. Recently, it has been a core topic of discussion to investigate into different aspects in a translation project in order to know what really takes place from the very beginning steps while translating a text. In doing so, a considerable number of scholars have already categorized different aspects of translation. One of the most comprehensive one, was made by Holmes (1988). In his "map" of TS, Holmes (1988) divided TS into two main categories including pure vs. applied TS. The pure branch was further subdivided into theoretical and descriptive TS. The present study relates to the Descriptive Translation Studies (henceforth DTS) (Gandomkar & Karimnia, 2013). The sub-divisions on DTS are introduced briefly as follows:

1. Product-oriented DTS: examines existing translations. In most cases, a comparison is made between a translated text with its original one.

2. Process-oriented DTS: is related to the psychology of translation and seeks to find out what happens in the mind of a translator (Munday, 2008, p.11).

3. Function-oriented DTS: is the study of context rather than the text. It examines which books were translated when and where, and what influences they exerted (Munday, 2008, p.10).

Having an overview on what these sub-branches of DTS would refer to, the researchers tried to narrow down the topic in the realm of process-oriented DTS, which is the main orientation of the present study.

As Venuti (2004) believes, TS research in 1990s is manifested through a diverse mixture of the theories and methodologies which characterize the previous decade. In Venuti's (ibid.) opinion, 1990s is the time for other sub-branches of TS to enter the realm of research, psychology being one of them. In this regard, TAPs were designed. Scholars of both disciplines were interested to become more familiar with the steps taken in the mind of a translator. Chronological issues of translating were one of these considerations. In other words, the scholars were interested to see what stages take place in the mind of a translator. Therefore, some TAPs designs were formulated (e.g., Gerloff 1986, Lörscher1996; Fraser 1996), which mostly have observed translators at various levels, both as trainees and as professionals.

TAPs are faced by a number of theoretical problems which must be tackled. "Verbalization won't register unconscious factors and automatic processes, and it can change a mental activity instead of simply reporting it.

Similarly, subjects are sometimes instructed to provide specific kinds of information: description, for instance, without any justification". (Venuti 2004 as cited in Gandomkar & Karimnia, 2013, p.18).

The main purpose of the present study was studying the translation strategies applied by Iranian M.A students of translation. This was done using Lörscher's (2005) model of think-aloud protocol, which is in fact a revised model of the 1996 one. To figure out the statistical differences among the frequencies of the stages was another purpose of the study. Finally, the reason for such selections was discussed. The present study tried to answer the following research questions:

1. Are there any statistically significant differences among the frequencies of the strategies taken by Iranian M.A students of translation while translating from English to Persian based on Lörscher's (2005) TAP model?

2. What are the most frequent strategies taken by Iranian M.A students of translation while translating from English to Persian based on Lörscher's (2005) TAP model?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Empirical studies of the translation process have used think-aloud protocols to provide a window into the mental activity which is not directly observable. In this regard, Séguinot's (1996) paper reported on a protocol study in a natural discourse situation involving two professional translators and discussed the relevance of the data to the debate on the use of verbalization as a methodology. The protocol provided evidence of translation strategies and pointed to the need for a dynamic model of the translation process that takes into account activation, suppression, and attending mechanisms.

According to Eftekhary and Aminizadeh (2012. P. 1039), constructs and mental processes in general and translation processes in particular have been the focus of much research in the past three decades. Among the techniques applied in studying such strategies and cognitive processes, the use of TAP has extensively been proposed. Though much has been written on the use of TAPs in recognizing the mental processes translators experience, very little can be found to address the mental processes and mechanisms they undergo while translating a piece of literary text. The aim of their study was to investigate the strategies senior translation students of Islamic Azad University of Bandar Abbas applied while translating literary texts using TAPs. In doing so, 12 senior translation students of Islamic Azad University, Bandar Abbas Branch participated in the study. Participants were chosen according to the convenience sampling method. The subjects then were asked to translate four literary texts and while translating verbalize whatever goes on in their mind within a TAP framework. The "think aloud protocols" were categorized based on the frequency table and the translations were analyzed qualitatively. The data were analyzed to show the strategies applied by the respondents. In the analysis of the strategies, just the types of strategies were of importance to the researchers, though the frequency of each strategy was also collected and reported. Based on the findings, fourteen strategies were detected with Look-up was as the most frequent strategy applied by the participants in the study .Using imagery and paraphrasing were the second and third most frequent strategies used by the participants respectively. Switching to L1 while translation was found the lowest strategy as reported in TAPs by the subjects. Deductive reasoning strategies were the second lowest strategy reported. Such strategies as evaluating and monitoring, Resourcing and referencing, co-text recourse and problem solving stood in between.

According to Hansen (2005, 511), "in empirical process-oriented translation research with different kinds of introspection, two important questions are raised repeatedly: 1. does concurrent verbalization, likeThink-aloud, have an influence on the translation process and 2. What do we actuallylearn from introspective methods like think-aloud and retrospection? Based on ideasfrom modern psychology and brain research, Hansen (ibid.) argued that think-aloud must have animpact on the translation process. Furthermore, it was suggested that it was not only spontaneous, unmodified thoughts about the actual task that were verbalized, but also memories, reflections, justifications, explanations, emotions and experiences."

TAPs have often been used to study the cognitive aspect of translation. On a paper, Künzli (2009,) revealed the usefulness of TAPs for scrutinizing the linguistic aspect oftranslation. Examples are drawn from material collected in forty think-aloud sessions over several years. The subjects were trainee translators or professional translators. The language pairs were French-German and French-Swedish. The problems discussed fell into four categories: a) sociolinguistic), b) textual, c) functional, and d) grammatical.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

Twenty Iranian M.A students acted as the participants of the study. As in the data analysis procedure, each and every word was important, this procedure was very time consuming. Therefore, the number of participants was limited. These students were selected from M.A students studying at Islamic Azad University, Fars Science and Research Branch. The participants of the study were chosen through accidental sampling. These students were further divided into groups of four. Therefore, five groups of students were available to be studied, each group containing four students. The reason to this selection is elaborated under data collection procedure section.

B. Materials of the Study

The selected material was in literary genre. The poem "To His Coy Mistress" by Andrew Marvell (as cited in Perrine, 1970) was given to the students as the material of the study. Participants were supposed to translate the text into Persian in around thirty minutes. It is important to mention that the use of dictionaries was also allowed.

C. Data Collection Procedures

The English poem was given to the participants in order to be translated into Persian. The translators were then asked to verbalize what they were thinking about. As a simple word could have an impact on the results of the study, all the conversations were tape-recorded and further analyzed. During data collection procedure, each strategy was given its related issue based on Lörscher's (2005) model of TAPs. What is important to be mentioned is that in order to avoid any interfering issues during the process of data collection e.g., the interviewer's confirmations, approvals or disapprovals, the data were drawn out from the dialogue between pairs of four students, rather than monologues.

Table 1.describes the strategies pointed out by Lörscher (2005) as related to think-aloud protocol investigations:

TABLE1.
LÖRSCHER'S (2005) MODEL OF TAP

Strategy	Definition
RR	Realizing a translational problem
VP	Verbalizing a translational problem
SP1	Search for a (possible preliminary) solution to a translational problem
SP2	Solution to a translational problem
SP a. b. c…	Parts of a solution to a translational problem
SP Ø	A solution to a translational problem is still to be found (Ø)
SP = Ø	Negative (Ø) solution to a translational problem
PSL	Problem in the reception of the SL text

In addition to these original elements of translation strategies, Lörscher (2005, p.28) proposes other potential elements which consist of three issues presented in the following table:

TABLE 2.
OTHER POTENTIAL ELEMENTS INTRODUCED BY LÖRSCHER (2005)

Strategy	Definition
MSL/MTL	Monitoring (verbatim repetition) of SL- & TL- text segments
REPHR SL/TL	Rephrasing (paraphrasing) of SL- & TL- text segments and other potential elements of checking solutions and mental organization of SL- TL- text segments

D. Data Analysis

In order to find out whether the differences among the strategies introduced by Lörscher (2005) would hold any statistically significant differences or not, the chi-square procedure was used. This was done through SPSS software. In addition, all other related issues were discussed, concluding remarks were dealt with and suggestions for further studies were made by the researchers.

IV. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

After giving the text to each group at different time frames, the acts of each participant were analyzed. The exact frequency of each strategy used by every one of the participants is presented in Appendix A. In addition, sample of data collected from the participants of all five groups is presented in Appendix B. In this regard, Table 3. presents the total frequencies of each strategy used by all twenty participants of the study:

TABLE 3.
TOTAL FREQUENCIES OF EACH STRATEGY USED BY ALL TWENTY PARTICIPANTS OF THE STUDY

Code	Strategy Abbreviation	Strategy Definition	Total Frequency of Usage
1	RR	Realizing a translational problem	37
2	VP	Verbalizing a translational problem	37
3	SP1	Search for a (possible preliminary) solution to a translational problem	6
4	SP2	Solution to a translational problem	5
5	SP a. b. c…	Parts of a solution to a translational problem	9
6	SP Ø	A solution to a translational problem is still to be found (Ø)	4
7	SP = Ø	Negative (Ø) solution to a translational problem	12
8	PSL	Problem in the reception of the SL text	7
9	MSL/MTL	Monitoring (verbatim repetition) of SL- & TL- text segments	6
10	REPHR SL/TL	Rephrasing (paraphrasing) of SL- & TL- text segments and other potential elements of checking solutions and mental organization of SL- TL- text segments	2

In Table 3., columns 4 to 8 have been colored with specific intention of the researchers. The reason for this isolation is that According to Lörscher (2005), these are the final products of stage 1 in this model (i.e., realizing a translational problem). In other words, an individual participant of the study would first realize a translational problem (i.e., stage 1). Then, the translator may or may not verbalize that translation problem (i.e., stage 2). A search for a (possible preliminary) solution to a translational problem (i.e., stage 3) would be optional, too. However, the final results of this translational problem realization, according to Lörscher (2005) would be one of the following stages (i.e., stages 4 to 8):

a. The translator finds the final solution to the translational problem;
b. The translator will partly find the final solution to the translational problem;
c. The translator has not yet found the final solution to the translational problem;
d. The translator could not find the solution to the translational problem; and
e. The translator faces a problem in the reception of the SL text.

As the findings of the study revealed, the following stages were the most frequent ones among all other types:

a) Stage 1 (RR): Realizing a translational problem (f=37).
b) Stage 2 (VP): verbalizing a translational problem (f=37).
c) Stage 7 (SP = Ø): Negative (Ø) solution to a translational problem (f=12).

However, in order to find out whether the frequencies of each strategy type were of any statistically significant differences, the researchers conducted the chi-square test. In this regard, Table 4. represents some descriptive statistics on the input of the data:

TABLE 4.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON THE FREQUENCY OF EACH TAPs STRATEGY BASED ON LÖRSCHER'S (2005) MODEL

Code	Strategy Abbreviation	Observed Frequency	Expected Frequency	Residual
1	RR	37	12.5	24.5
2	VP	37	12.5	24.5
3	SP1	6	12.5	-6.5
4	SP2	5	12.5	-7.5
5	SP a. b. c…	9	12.5	-3.5
6	SP Ø	4	12.5	-8.5
7	SP = Ø	12	12.5	-0.5
8	PSL	7	12.5	-5.5
9	MSL/MTL	6	12.5	-6.5
10	REPHR SL/TL	2	12.5	-10.5
Total		**125**		

Following the previous table, Table 5.presents the results of the chi-square test:

TABLE 5.
THE RESULTS OF THE CHI-SQUARE TEST

Chi-Square	125.320
df	9
Asymp. Sig.	0.0001

As the results of the study revealed, there were statistically significant differences among the frequencies of the ten TAPs strategies based on Lörscher's (2005) model. This was due to the fact that the Asymp. Sig. was observed to be more than 0.05 (i.e., 0.6140). However, as mentioned at the beginning of this section, stages 4 to 8 would be one of the ending strategies applied by each and every participant of the study. Likewise, none of these strategies could be achieved together simultaneously (Lörscher, 2005). Therefore, the researchers conducted another chi-square test in order to see whether the frequencies among these five stages (codes 4 to 8) would hold any statistically significant differences or not. In this regard, while Table 6. presents the basic descriptive statistics on this issue, Table 7. represents the results of the chi-square test applied:

TABLE 6.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON THE FREQUENCY OF TAPs STRATEGY BASED ON LÖRSCHER'S (2005) MODEL:
THE QUESTION OF STRATEGY CODES 4 TO 8

Code	Strategy Abbreviation	Observed Frequency	Expected Frequency	Residual
4	SP2	5	7.4	-2.4
5	SP a. b. c…	9	7.4	1.6
6	SP Ø	4	7.4	-3.4
7	SP = Ø	12	7.4	4.6
8	PSL	7	7.4	0.4
Total		**37**		

TABLE 7.
THE RESULTS OF THE CHI-SQUARE TEST: THE QUESTION OF STRATEGY CODES 4 TO 8

Chi-Square	5.568
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	0. 6140

As the findings of the study related to these five strategies (codes 4 to 8) revealed, there were no statistically significant differences observed (Asymp. Sig. was observed to be less than 0.05). All in all, it could be stated that based on the findings of the present study, there were significant differences observed among the ten TAPs strategies developed by Lörscher (2005). However, these differences were not observed to be significant within the main five strategies which were supposed to be the final outcome of stage 1 of the model (i.e., realization of a translational problem).

V. DISCUSSION

In this section, some related discussions are provided. First of all, the researchers would like to re-present the research questions and hypotheses of the study once more. The first research question of the study was posed as follows:

• Are there any statistically significant differences among the frequencies of the strategies taken by Iranian M.A students of translation while translating from English to Persian based on Lörscher's (2005) TAP model?

As the findings of the study revealed, there were significant differences observed among the ten TAPs strategies developed by Lörscher (2005). Therefore, it could be stated that the first research hypothesis claiming that "there are statistically significant differences between the frequencies of the strategies taken by Iranian undergraduate students of translation while translating from English to Persian based on Lörscher's (2005) TAP model" was supported. However, this fact must not be neglected that these differences were not observed to be significant within the main five strategies which were supposed to be the final outcome of stage 1 of the model (i.e., realization of a translational problem). These strategies included the ones with the codes of 4 to 8.

The second research question of the study was also posed as follows:

• What are the most frequent strategies taken by Iranian M.A students of translation while translating from English to Persian based on Lörscher's (2005) TAP model?

As the results of the study showed, strategy codes 1, 2, and 7 were observed to be the most frequent ones used by the participants. While the frequencies of usage for the first two strategies were observed to be 37 simultaneously, this frequency was revealed to be 12 for the seventh one. Therefore, it could be stated that the second research hypothesis claiming that "'negative (Ø) solution to a translational problem' and 'problem in the reception of the SL text' are the most frequent strategies taken by Iranian M.A students of translation while translating from English to Persian based on Lörscher's (2005) TAP model" was partly supported.

The findings of the study supported those obtained by Barani and Karimnia (2014, p. 26257), who aimed at investigating different reading comprehension strategies, using a TAPs framework. In that study, "the TAPs strategies applied by Iranian B.A students of translation while translating a text from English into Persian were investigated. In doing so, thirty-two students (sixteen sophomores and sixteen seniors) were given a text with a nearly high level of difficulty to be translated. This level of difficulty was double-checked with two of the professors in advance. Each and every step taken during the process of translation was then tape-recorded and further placed in the classes of 'general' vs. 'local' reading comprehension strategies pointed out by Block (1992), which is based on think-aloud protocols. The results of the chi-square procedure indicated that there were statistically significant differences in terms of the frequencies of local strategies among the 'higher' vs. the 'lower' level of students. The findings also revealed that there were no statistically significant differences in using the general strategies among the students."

Likewise, the results of the present study supported the findings of the study conducted by Gandomkar and Karimnia (2013) who investigated different strategies used by Iranian B.A students of translation. In that study, the researchers applied Gerloff's (1986) model of TAPs to review the procedures used by such students during the process of translating a text from English into Persian with special reference to literacy genre. The model they applied to collect the data was similar to the framework used in the present research. First, each recorded action done by the translators were categorized under their possible classifications. Then, using the chi-square test, the differences between the frequencies of such students were investigated. The results revealed that there were significant differences between the frequencies of the TAP strategies used by the participants while translating literary genre from English into Persian. The findings also showed that 'extra-textual' or 'language use and task monitoring' (LUTM), 'Editing' (ED), and 'text contextualization' (TC) were the most frequently used strategies among the seven main strategies introduced by Gerloff (1986).

The procedures and objectives of the present study were also in agreement with those obtained by Bernardini (2002). Similar to the present work, Bernardini (2002) tended to survey the breakthroughs as well as the limits of the growing body of literature on TAPs in TS, and showed the necessity to take issues of environmental, experimental, theoretical validity more seriously. Bernardini (2002) also aimed at addressing some of these issues, at the levels of experimental design/administration, data analysis and report. It was reported that the risks involved in the adoption of a lax experimental methodology in TAPs studies had been somehow underestimated in the past few decades, and that the

generalized lack of concern with it can invalidate not only the results obtained in the single projects, but the validity of the approach itself.

The Objectives of the study were in accordance with Hubscher (2004), who investigated the influence of personalities on translator behavior and discovered links between attitudes, performance and creativity in the target text. In fact, as the results of the present study revealed, there could be a link between a translator's personality type on the one hand, and one's choice of a translation strategy on the other. This issue could possibly be investigated with special reference to the TAPs strategies (Gerloff, 1986). The fieldwork of her study consisted of a translation test from French into English which was administered to twenty postgraduate translation students, and in which they verbalized their thought processes and explained their choices, thereby expressing certain revealing attitudes and behaviors. The experiments were analyzed with different methods, and correlations were made between results found which gave credence to the idea that translators' personality characteristics, which were reflected in their attitude towards their work influenced, and were apparent in their performances. The students' different qualities (resourcefulness, originality, creativity…) were also displayed in varying degrees in the experiment and helped create patterns in the target texts.

VI. Conclusion

The present researchers used Lörscher's (2005) model of TAPs as the main framework of the study. This was a comprehensive and a detailed model of TAPs which was developed by Lörscher (2005). During the stage of data collection, the researchers, more or less, observed some frequencies related to each strategy code (i.e., codes 1 to 10). Even strategy codes 9 and 10 which were presented as other potential elements present in the TAPs model (Lörscher, 2005) happened to hold some frequencies. Therefore, it could be concluded that this model of TAPs is applicable within the English-Persian context.

Based on the findings of the present study, there were significant differences observed among the ten TAPs strategies developed by Lörscher (2005). This was observed when comparing the ten TAPs strategies in question. Therefore, it could be concluded that Iranian M.A students of translation mostly make use of certain strategies when translating a literary text from English into Persian. In addition, it could be stated that when comparing the five ending strategies (codes 4 to 8) together, the seventh one would hold a higher frequency than the other ones.

As the findings of the study related to the five ending strategies (i.e., codes 4 to 8) showed, these differences were not observed to be significant. It is important to mention that these strategies were supposed to be the final outcome of stage 1 of the model (i.e., realization of a translational problem). After this stage, the translator would a) find the final solution to the translational problem, b) partly find the final solution to the translational problem, c) not yet find the final solution to the translational problem, d) not find the solution to the translational problem, and e) face a problem in the reception of the SL text. Therefore, it could be concluded that Iranian M.A students of translation make use of these five strategies similarly. This is with special reference to English-Persian literary text translation.

APPENDIX A. THE EXACT FREQUENCY OF EACH STRATEGY USED BY EVERY ONE OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Groups		Group 1				Group 2				Group 3				Group 4				Group 5				
Subjects		#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	#9	#10	#11	#12	#13	#14	#15	#16	#17	#18	#19	#20	
Frequency of Each Strategy Used by each Subject																						
Code	Strategies																					Total
1	RR	1	3	1	1	1	3	0	3	1	0	1	4	1	2	3	2	2	4	3	1	37
2	VP	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	4	2	2	2	5	2	1	37
3	SP1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	6
4	SP2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	5
5	SP a. b. c…	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	9
6	SP Ø	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
7	SP = Ø	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	12
8	PSL	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	7
9	MSL/MTL	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6
10	REPHR SL/TL	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

APPENDIX B. SAMPLE OF DATA COLLECTED FROM THE PARTICIPANTS OF ALL FIVE GROUPS

Strategy Code	Strategy Abbreviation	Strategy Definition	Sample of the Use of Each Strategy
1	RR	Realizing a translational problem	Ye bare digebexoun!
			One time more read!
			Read it one more time!
			Chi?
			What?
			What?
			Akharesh chi bud?
			Its last what was?
			What was the last part again?
Strategy Code	**Strategy Abbreviation**	**Strategy Definition**	**Sample of the Use of Each Strategy**
2	VP	Verbalizing a translational problem	In qesmateshyani chi?
			This its part means what?
			What does this part mean?
			Alan shouldstdaqiqanchemaa'nieemide?
			Now shouldst exactly what meaning gives?
			Now, what does shouldst exactly mean here?
			In till the conversion of the Jews yaa'ni chi?
			This till the conversion of the Jews Means what?
			What does it mean: till the conversion of the Jews?
Strategy Code	**Strategy Abbreviation**	**Strategy Definition**	**Sample of the Use of Each Strategy**
3	SP1	Search for a (possible preliminary) solution to a translational problem	Dicshenary o biar.
			Dictionary bring.
			Open the dictionary.
			Cheratudicshenery search nemikoni?
			Why in dictionary search don't you?
			Why don't you look it up in a dictionary?
			Bezarnegahkonambebinamchizirajebeheshtudicshenaryneveshte!
			Let look to see anything about it in dictionary written!
			Let me check if there's anything about this in the dictionary!
Strategy Code	**Strategy Abbreviation**	**Strategy Definition**	**Sample of the Use of Each Strategy**
4	SP2	Solution to a translational problem	Aqapeida shod!
			Man find did!
			Man! I got it!
			Aha! Pas darasltalmih be enjilbude.
			Aha! So in fact allusion to Bible it was.
			Aha! So, in fact this was an allusion to the Bible.
			Injamaa'niekaraneyerudmide, motmae'nnam!
			Here means Bank River it, Sure am I!
			Here it means the river bank, I' sure about it!
Strategy Code	**Strategy Abbreviation**	**Strategy Definition**	**Sample of the Use of Each Strategy**
5	SP a. b. c…	Parts of a solution to a translational problem	Rate injayaa'ninerkh, maa'nierotbe ham mide.
			Rate here means fee, means rank also it.
			Rate here means the fee of something, it also could mean rank.
			Marble ye no'esange. Benevis sang.
			Marble one type of stone. Write stone.
			Marble is a kind of stone. You could write stone.
			Him injabarmigarde be ye chizemozakkar.
			Him here referes to one thing male.
			Here, him would probably refer to a male-being.
Strategy Code	**Strategy Abbreviation**	**Strategy Definition**	**Sample of the Use of Each Strategy**
6	SP Ø	A solution to a translational problem is still to be found (Ø)	Inoyadetbasheakharsar check mikonim.
			This remember you last turn we check.
			Remember this part! We'll take care of it at the end.
			Bezarhala… Baa'dan.
			Let now… After.
			Wait for now… Later we'll do this.
			Jeloshbenevisehtemalantalmih be ye chizibude.
			In front of it write probably allusion to one thing it was.
			Write in front of it that it might have been an allusion to something.
Strategy Code	**Strategy Abbreviation**	**Strategy Definition**	**Sample of the Use of Each Strategy**

Strategy Code	Strategy Abbreviation	Strategy Definition	Sample of the Use of Each Strategy
7	SP = Ø	Negative (Ø) solution to a translational problem	Marble yani almas!
			Marble Means diamond!
			Marble means diamond!
			Manzouraz echoing sound hamunsedaye rasa hast.
			Intention form echoing sound that voice strong is.
			Echoing sound here means a loud voice.
			Ball hamunmaa'nietoupe football mide.
			Ball that meaning soccer ball has.
			Ball here means a soccer ball.
Strategy Code	**Strategy Abbreviation**	**Strategy Definition**	**Sample of the Use of Each Strategy**
8	PSL	Problem in the reception of the SL text	Maakenafahmidim In yaa'ni chi!
			We that don't understand this means what!
			We didn't get this part!
			Engarfaqat ye beiteshmundketarjomenashod.
			Seems just one stanza that translated not.
			Seems we were not able to translate only one stanza.
			Nanevisibehtare age motmaa'ennisti.
			Don't write better if sure not you are.
			Don't jog it down if you're not sure about it.
Strategy Code	**Strategy Abbreviation**	**Strategy Definition**	**Sample of the Use of Each Strategy**
9	MSL/MTL	Monitoring (verbatim repetition) of SL- & TL- text segments	Now let us sport us while we may, Now let us sport us while we may
			Now let us sport us while we may, Now let us sport us while we may
			Now let us sport us while we may, Now let us sport us while we may
			amorous birds of prey, amorous birds of prey, amorous birds of prey
			amorous birds of prey, amorous birds of prey, amorous birds of prey
			amorous birds of prey, amorous birds of prey, amorous birds of prey
			slow-chapped power, slow-chapped power
			slow-chapped power, slow-chapped power
			slow-chapped power, slow-chapped power
Strategy Code	**Strategy Abbreviation**	**Strategy Definition**	**Sample of the Use of Each Strategy**
10	REPHR SL/TL	Rephrasing (paraphrasing) of SL- & TL- text segments and other potential elements of checking solutions and mental organization of SL- TL- text segments	TuenjilumadekeYahudiaruzeqiamatmasihimishan, yaa'nitaqire din midanbemasihiat.
			In Bible comes that Jews day judgment Christian become, means change religion give to Christianity.
			According to The Bible, the Jews change their religions to Christianity right after the Judgment Day happens.
			Chun rude Gang ba rude Humber az ham kheiliduran. YekishtuHende, yekishtuEnglis.
			Because river Ganges with river Humber from each other very far are. One in India is, one in England is.
			Because the Ganges River and the Humber river are so far away from one another. In fact, one is in India, while the other one is in England.

REFERENCES

[1] Barani, M., &Karimnia, A. (2014). An investigation into translation students' English reading comprehension skills and strategies: A cross-sectional study. *Elixir Ling. & Trans.73*, pp. 26257-26262.

[2] Bernardini, S. (2002). Think-aloud protocols in translation research: Achievements, limits, future prospects, *Target13* (2), pp. 241-263.

[3] Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007).Research methods in education (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.

[4] Eftekhary, A. A. &Aminizadeh, S. (2012). Investigating the use of thinking aloud protocols in translation of literary texts.*Theory and Practice in Language Studies2* (5), pp. 1039-1047.

[5] Fraser, J. (1996). The translator investigated: Learning from translation process analysis. *The Translator*, *2*(1), 65-79. Retrieved May 21, 2014, from https://www.stjerome.co.uk/tsa/journal/1/.

[6] Gandomkar, M., &Karimnia, A. (2013).An investigation into Iranian students' translation strategies based on Gerloff's model of think-aloud protocol. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, *3* (4), pp. 17-33.

[7] Gerloff, P. (1986). Second Language Learners' Reports on the Interpretive Process: Talk-aloud Protocols of Translation. In J. House and S. Blum-Kulka (eds.) *Interlingual and InterculturalCommunication*, pp. 274-262, Gunter NarrVerlag: Tübingen.

[8] Hansen, G. (2005). Experience and emotion in empirical translation research with think-aloud and retrospection, *Meta50* (2), pp.511-522.

[9] Holmes, J. S. (1988). The name and nature of translation studies, In L. Venuti (Ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. (pp.172-185). New York: Routledge.

[10] Hubscher, S. (2004). Translator behavior: Personality features as an integral part of the translation process, *Choice and Difference in Translation 18*, pp.43-60.

[11] Königs, F. G. (1987). What happens during translation: Theoretical aspects, empirical manifestations observed and practical consequences, *Die NeuerenSprachen*, (2), pp. 182-185.

[12] Krings, H. P. (1986), Translation problems and translation strategies of advanced German learners of French (L2). In J. House

and S. Blum-Kulka (eds.) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*, pp. 262-276.

[13] Künzli, A. (2009). Think-aloud protocols: A useful tool for investigating the linguistic aspect of translation, *Meta 54* (2), pp. 326-341.

[14] Kussmaul, P., &Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (1995).Think-aloud protocol analysis in translation studies, *Meta8* (1), pp. 177-199.

[15] Larson, M. L. (1998). Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence (2nd ed.). Lanham, New York and London: University Press of America.

[16] Lörscher, W. (1986). Linguistic aspects of translation processes: toward an analysis of translation performance. In Juliane House &Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds.). *Interlingual andIntercultural Communication*.Tübingen, Narr, pp. 277-292.

[17] Lörscher, W. (1996). Psychological analysis of translation processes, *Meta 41*(1), pp. 26-32.

[18] Lörscher, W. (2005). The translation process: Methods and problems of its investigation. *Meta 50*(2), pp. 597-608.

[19] Moradi, F., & Karimnia, A. (2013). An investigation into the translation methods applied by Iranian translators with special reference to English lyrics translating based on Newmark's (1988) flattened V diagram. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, *3* (4), pp. 51-60.

[20] Munday, J. (2008). Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

[21] Newmark, P. (1988). A textbook of translation.New York: Prentice Hall International.

[22] Séguinot, C. (1996). Some thoughts about think-aloud protocols, *Target8* (1), pp. 75-95.

[23] Venuti, L. (2004). The Translation studies reader. New York: Routledge.

Sareh Fereidouni has an M.A. in Translation Studies. She has been teaching English for 5 years.

Amin Karimnia is an assistant professor in Applied Linguistics in the Department of English, Fasa Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran. His research interests are in the area of Discourse Analysis, Sociolinguistics, Pragmatics, and Translation Studies.