

Cultural Orientations of Iranian English Translation Students: Do Gender and Translation Quality Matter?

Fatemeh Salemi¹, Masood Khoshsaligheh², & Mohammad Reza Hashemi³

¹Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, yeganehsalemi@yahoo.com

²Corresponding author, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, khoshsaligheh@um.ac.ir

³Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, hashemi@um.ac.ir

Received: 15/10/2014

Accepted: 05/07/2015

Abstract

The present exploratory study aimed to construct and apply a localized questionnaire to investigate the cultural orientations of Iranian English translation students. It also examined the relationship between cultural orientations of Iranian English translation students, their gender, and translation quality. This mixed-methods study, in the first phase, used focus group interviews to form a pool of cultural orientations to provide for the first draft of the questionnaire items. Initial draft of the questionnaire was subjected to the revision by experts and potential participants to determine the face and content validity of the data to collect. Eventually, a 53-item questionnaire was finalized, and the responses of a cluster sample of 473 Iranian English translations at undergraduate and graduate levels were obtained. In the second phase, the data collected using the revised questionnaire were analyzed through a number of inferential statistical procedures. National identity, cultural heritage, local traditionalism, collectivism, and social attachment were the revealed categories of the cultural orientations of the participants. Findings did not indicate any significant relationship between the Iranian English translation students' cultural orientations, their gender, and translation quality.

Keywords: Cultural Orientations; Iranian English Translation Students; Gender; Translation Quality

1. Introduction

Translation in a broad sense—interlingual rendition, intralingual rendition, revision, and rewriting—provides and facilitates the introduction, transfer, or even reshaping of ideas and knowledge across or within cultures (e.g., Farahzad, 2013). Translation studies as an interdisciplinary field is a thriving domain of research. The field has undergone serious changes during the past years, which roots from the change in the interests of the researchers of the field and that of the scholars of other fields looking into translation from their own perspectives. Recently, more studies are exploring the sociological and psychological phenomena in translation studies.

One of the increasingly developing areas of study within the field relates to the psycho-cultural issues in relation to translation, as intercultural communication.

Katan (1999, p. 169) believed “a cultural orientation is a shared metaprogram: a culture’s tendency towards a particular way of perceiving. The orientation or metaprogram influences how reality is modeled, that is, which aspects are to be generalized, distorted and deleted.” In other words, the orientations are reflections of values that individuals or groups cherish and act accordingly. Kluckhohn (1951) defined a value as an explicit or implicit conception which is distinctive of an individual or a group and can influence the selection from obtainable modes, means, and ends of action.

Just as textbooks across languages can acculturate students into different ideas and subjects (Rashidi & Shahab, 2013), translators with their constant exposure to native and foreign cultural material can change orientations and attachments to and from cultures. Orientation means adjusting oneself according to one’s surroundings. In fact, people try to orient their behavior and the way of doing things over different conditions (Katan, 1999). The current interdisciplinary study was an attempt to bridge translation studies and cross-cultural psychology. Cross-cultural psychology aims at understand the differences between humans from different cultural backgrounds and the similarities between all humans which may be sought variously at physiological, cognitive, personal, social, and cultural levels (Hills, 2002).

The current study aimed at construction, application, and validation of a cultural orientations scale of Iranian English translation students. The study mainly entailed variables which relate to psychological issues by which the study bridges between psychology and translation studies. The main focus of this study was to construct a scale to assess the participants’ cultural orientations. Based on a mixed-methods design (Dörnyei, 2007), this study collected and processed qualitative and quantitative data on the cultural orientations of Iranian prospective translators to address the following questions:

1. What are the main categories of Iranian English translation students’ cultural orientations?
2. What are the strongest cultural orientations of Iranian English translation students?
3. Is there a significant difference between cultural orientations of the Iranian male and female English translation students?
4. Is there a significant relation between Iranian English translation students’ cultural orientations and their translation quality?

2. Literature Review

In relation to language and translation, Newmark (1988, p. 94) defined culture as “the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression.” As a controversial issue, he did not believe in language as a cultural component or feature, whereas Vermeer (1989) regarded language as a significant part of a culture. Discussing the problems of correspondence in translation, Nida (1964) believed that culture-related differences are more prone to cause more severe challenges for the translator rather than language structure dissimilarities. “No language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture; and no culture can exist which does not have at its center, the structure of natural language” (Lotman & Uspensky, 1978, p. 211). In the process of interlingual translation, translators might face cultural boundaries. To solve this problem while translating, Kwiecinski (2001) introduced four categories: exoticizing procedures, rich explicatory procedures, recognized exoticization, and assimilative procedures.

In this regard, Katan (2009) believed that an exoticizing procedure “allows the foreign term into the target language”; a rich explicatory procedure aims to “slide an extra term or two which will cue readers to enough of the context, often through a local analogy, to guide them towards a more equivalent cognition; recognized exoticisms are “some well-known geographical and personal names and titles that have accepted translations according to language”; and assimilative procedures “transform text from the original into close functionally equivalent target terms, or it is even deleted if not considered central” (p. 80).

Venuti (1998, p.78) called translation as a cultural practice which leads to the “formation of cultural identities.” Cronin (2006) believes in two dimensions of culture. One level is “singular culture” in which all human beings as cultural beings or language animals are similar. The other level is “pluralized cultures” which leads to various different cultures. He stated that “culture allows us to translate and cultures make us translate” (p. 47). Likewise, Chamberlain (1988) stated that:

The issues relating to gender in the practice of translation are myriad, varying widely according to the type of text being translated, the language involved, cultural practices and countless other factors. Translation of foreign text can lead to both discursive and blessing results. (p. 96)

Venuti (1998, p. 82) believed that “any evaluation of a translation project must include a consideration of discursive strategies, their institutional settings and their social functions and effect.” Sawalha (2011, p. 3) defined cultural orientation as “an individual’s knowledge and outlook on the world and his or her personal

environment. National culture, heritage, upbringing, and socialization all influence an individual's cultural orientation, and in turn, individuals can influence the cultural orientation of others.”

As a main aspect of cultural orientation, Simard and Blight (2011) considered cultural attachment as a philosophy, which summarizes how someone connects to their own culture. Cultural attachment provides the force where the connection of the individual begins, develops, and evolves. Individualism/collectivism is the most researched cultural dimension in cross-cultural psychology. Similarly, Triandis, Chen and Chan (1998) considered individualism/collectivism as one of the major themes in cross-cultural, social, and organizational psychology.

Maznevski, Gomez, DiStefano, Noorderhaven, and Wu (2002) stated that although culture is a phenomenon at a collective level, it can influence perceptions, values and behaviors at an individual level, especially in social interactions. Hofstede (1980) first used the term individualism and collectivism. He referred to individualism in relation to societies in which individuals and individual's interests are more important. By contrast, by collectivism he referred to the societies in which group and group achievements are more important.

3. Method

The present study was an attempt to construct a valid and reliable questionnaire instrument to quantify the cultural orientations of Iranian English translation students in relation to variables of translation quality and gender. As there was no existing instrument for that matter, the study initially constructed a valid and reliable questionnaire instrument. Within a mixed-methods research design (Lunenburg & Irby, 2007), involving qualitative and quantitative phases, through a careful review of the literature, the cultural-orientation-related items, indicated in a number of relevant studies such as Maznevski et al. (2002), Khoury (2006), and Pishghadam, Hashemi, and Bazri (2013), were sought and collected to create a pool of information from which the items of the questionnaire could be selected. To adapt to the pool of items to the Iranian cultural context, in the initial qualitative phase, focus group interviews were used. Focus group interview technique draws on the collective experience of group brain storming and involves participants' thinking out together, inspiring and challenging each other, and reacting to the emerging issues (Dörnyei, 2007). The data were collected from four focus groups of approximately 12 male and female undergraduate and graduate students of English Translation from Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Imam Reza International University, Tabaran Institute of Higher Education, and Khayyam University, all based in Mashhad, Khorasan. Therefore, using the data from focus group interviews, the cultural-orientation-related items which were specific to the Iranian context were

derived. As Dörnyei (2007) suggests, the number of sampled participants in qualitative research should increase (i.e., reiteration) to as many as necessary until adequate data is reached (i.e., saturation), and data from more participants would not contribute after that. The data collection reached saturation with four focus groups of purposively sampled approximately 50 participants overall. Later, a list of 114 relevant items for the first draft of the questionnaire instrument was prepared drawing on the two sources of the items from the related literature and the interview data.

To achieve content validity, the first draft of the questionnaire items was subjected to the revision and comments of a selection of scholars in translation and intercultural studies. According to their comments and recommendations, nearly half of the items were excluded on grounds of redundancy, overlap, repetition, and matters of priority within a small enough number of items. Some of the remaining 53 items were accordingly rewritten and revised to be unambiguous and unidimensional. To achieve face validity, nine potential participants were asked to review the items and their understanding of each item was sought and discussed to ascertain that appropriate readability and clarity of items. Few of the items were revised for language. Next, the final draft of the questionnaire was ready and a five-point Likert scale was added. Options were associated with a percentage [1 (0%, *Completely Disagree*), 2 (25%, *Disagree*), 3 (50%, *No Idea*), 4 (75%, *Agree*), 5 (100%, *Completely Agree*)] in order to emphasize the equality of the distance of the options and therefore the interval nature of the data collected.

In the quantitative phase of the study, using the designed questionnaire, quantitative data were collected and analyzed. To select the sample for the quantitative phase, cluster sampling technique was used which is recommended when the target population is widely dispersed (Dörnyei, 2007). In the end, a selection of nearly 400 English translation students from several Iranian universities (i.e., Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Imam Reza International University, Tabaran Institute of Higher Education, Khayyam University, Islamic Azad University, Quchan Branch, and Binalood Institute of Higher Education) were invited to participate in the study. Eventually, 473 male and female Iranian English translation students at undergraduate and graduate levels completely responded to the questionnaire.

To establish the psychometric features of the findings, including construct validity and reliability, and to analyze the data to address the first research question, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and scale reliability analysis were used. After the due EFA process, 20 more items were excluded from the instrument, as they did not load high enough on any of the five underlying constructs determined. Finally, the rotated version of the questionnaire included 33 items which were eventually used

for the later analyses. To address the second research question, descriptive statistics were employed. To answer the third research question independent samples *t* test was used. Finally, Pearson product-moment correlation was used to answer the fourth question of the study.

4. Results

4.1. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

An EFA was run on the data from the questionnaire both to psychometrically evaluate the data and to investigate how the 53 variables could be summarized into a smaller set of underlying constructs. Initially, the results of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test which is the measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity were reviewed (see Table 4.1). KMO statistic value of 0.81 was obtained which is completely optimal (Kaiser, 1974). Bartlett's measure tests the null hypothesis that the variables do not correlate with other variables. Because in factor analysis, relationships between the variables are pivotal, it is essential that the test be significant and result in rejecting the null hypothesis. In this research, the Bartlett's test was highly significant ($p < 0.001$) and accordingly the data could be used for an EFA:

Table 1. *KMO Test and Bartlett's Test*

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.81
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	6302.18
	<i>df</i>	1378
	<i>Sig.</i>	.00

One of the criteria which is widely considered in factor extraction is the scree plot test. The necessary graph in this test is devised by plotting the latent roots against the number of factors in their order of extraction. The shape of the resultant curve is used to evaluate the cutoff point of factoring. Cattell (1966) explains the point for selecting factors should where the plot begins to straighten out first time on the curve:

Table 2. *Total Variance Explained by the Five Factors*

Components	Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.71	11.26	11.26
2	3.34	10.14	21.41
3	2.66	8.08	29.50
4	2.64	8.00	37.50
5	2.15	6.52	44.02

Our screen plot, as indicated, considers five factors for extraction, and, according to Stevens (1992), the screen plot test with a sample of 200 subjects or more can provide a reliable criterion for factoring. In addition, even though the fewer factors extracted are always preferable, the criterion of the cumulative percentage of total variance explained by successive factors, approaching 50% should be observed, and as such five factors were retained for the solution.

Table 2 shows that by extracting five factors, the solution could explain over 44% of the cumulative percentage of the total variance. This amount of the total variance is perfectly acceptable by consideration of the challenging nature of this exploratory analysis.

After retaining the five factors for analysis, using principal component analysis, a factor solution which most of the variables had high loadings on the first factor was achieved. To improve the factor solution, it was necessary to rotate the structure (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). As can be seen in Table 3, the results of the factor solution, rotated using Varimax method and with loading values lower than 0.40 suppressed, gives a clearer structure for interpretation.

After the initial rotation, the final factor solution was achieved after three more respecifications. In other words, after the initial rotation, the factor loadings and variable communalities were examined, but 16 variables either did not have a significant loading value or loaded a factor which could not be justified (Field, 2009). The final factor solution comprised five factors and thirty three variables.

To label the achieved factors, the theme in common with the corresponding variables (especially those with the highest loadings) under each factor was considered. Eventually, the first factor, explaining a total variance of 11.26%, was labeled “national identity.” The second factor, explaining a total variance of 10.14% was labeled “cultural heritage.” The third, the fourth, and the fifth factors, respectively, explained a total variance of 8.08%, 8.00%, 6.52%, and were labeled “local traditionalism,” “collectivism,” and “social attachment” (see Tables 2 & 3):

Table 3. *Rotated Factor Solution, Factor Loadings, and Reliability Values*

Cronbach's	Variables/Factors	Loadings
0.73	Factor 1: National Identity	
	47. Iranian movies are informative.	.70
	35. I prefer watching Iranian movies.	.62
	29. Iranian movies are better than western ones.	.62
	25. I prefer religious travels.	.62
	48. I do not put on western style dress.	.61
	27. Religious ceremonies are important.	.61
	46. I like praying in mosque.	.53

	24. Religion is a private matter.	.53
	45. I do not buy western brands.	.52
0.67	Factor 2: Cultural Heritage	
	49. Ferdowsi is a valuable poet.	.66
	50. Iranian culture and civilization has been the biggest.	.65
	43. Iranian culture is richer than Western culture.	.61
	53. Iranian proverbs are the best.	.59
	51. Iranian classic poetry is the best.	.55
	28. Takht-e Jamshid is a most important site.	.51
	38. I prefer Iranian names.	.49
	39. I enjoy Iranian themes parties.	.41
0.82	Factor 3: Local Traditionalism	
	34. I enjoy Iranian local accents.	.65
	33. Traditional restaurants are better.	.62
	44. I like Iranian local dress.	.58
	31. Iranian music is the best.	.53
	32. Iranian architecture is the best.	.41
0.67	Factor 4: Collectivism	
	16. I tend to be a group member.	.69
	15. I prefer group works.	.67
	01. I put family first when making decisions.	.64
	03. I adhere to family values.	.64
	17. All should be responsible for the society.	.48
0.70	Factor 5: Social Attachment	
	11. I put others first when taking decisions.	.68
	09. I do what the society approves.	.63
	10. I do what others expect me.	.61
	06. One's group makes one's identity.	.52
	02. I put my friends' needs first.	.47
	19. People with same political attitudes feel closer.	.41

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation Method: Equamax With Kaiser Normalization

4.2. Scale Reliability Analysis

Scale reliability analysis on SPSS was used to establish the reliability of each of the subsets of the questionnaire. The review of the results shows that all the subsets enjoy an acceptable level of internal consistency reliability, that is near or over a threshold of 0.7 (Field, 2009). The Cronbach's alpha values for subset 1 to 5 were 0.73, 0.67, 0.82, 0.67, and 0.70, respectively. Further results also suggested retaining all the variables under each subset as excluding any of the variables would not improve the subsets' alpha value. In other words, both conceptually and

empirically, it was justified to retain all the variables associated with their corresponding factors.

4.3. Categories of Cultural Orientations

After the EFA revealed the five underlying constructs which the variables manifested and the reliability analysis results supported the internal consistency of the variables and their retention under each factor, the categories of the cultural orientations of the Iranian English translation students were identified and hence the answer to the first research question:

Table 4. *Factors' Mean Ratings*

Rank	Factors	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Factor 4: Collectivism	473	3.80	.67
2	Factor 2: Cultural Heritage	473	3.66	.66
3	Factor 3: Local Traditionalism	473	3.33	.82
4	Factor 5: Social Attachment	473	3.03	.70
5	Factor 1: National Identity	473	2.84	.73

Table 4 shows the mean ratings of each factor. The categories of the cultural orientations in order of important from the participants' perspective are collectivism ($M = 3.80$), cultural heritage ($M = 3.66$), local traditionalism ($M = 3.33$), social attachment ($M = 3.03$), and national identity ($M = 2.84$).

4.4. Highest Rated Cultural Orientations

To answer the second question, descriptive statistics including the mean rating of each of the questionnaire items was computed. The descriptive results identified the top ten cultural orientations of the Iranian English translation students.

Table 5. *Descriptive Statistics of the 10 Highest Rated Cultural Orientations*

Rank	Item	<i>N</i>	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	01	473	4.28	.86
2	14	469	4.27	1.96
3	19	473	4.18	1.22
4	08	473	4.16	.99
5	03	472	4.11	.95
6	50	467	3.93	1.03
7	39	472	3.89	.98
8	52	471	3.86	1.03
9	41	471	3.81	1.08
10	38	470	3.74	1.14

As Table 5 illustrates, the top 10 cultural orientations include 01. "I put my family first when making decisions" ($M = 4.28$), 14. "I prefer being with my family" ($M = 4.27$), 19. "People with same political attitudes feel closer" ($M = 4.18$), 08. "I

am proud of my cultural identity” ($M = 4.16$), 03. *“I adhere to my family values”* ($M = 4.11$), 50. *“Iranian culture and civilization is the biggest”* ($M = 3.93$), 39. *“I enjoy Iranian themed parties”* ($M = 3.89$), 52. *“I prefer to be with friends”* ($M = 3.86$), 41. *“Iranian traditional food is the most delicious”* ($M = 3.81$), and 38. *“I prefer Iranian names”* ($M = 3.74$).

4.5. Cultural Orientations and Gender

In response to the third research question, independent samples t test was used. The results of the test demonstrate that the variable of gender did not result in a significant difference between the choices of the male and female participants. In other words, the larger significance values than the criterion value of 0.05 for each of the dependent variables failed to reject the null hypotheses that there is no significant difference between the cultural orientations of male and female Iranian English translation students, at 95% confidence level at any other categories. The details are reported in the following:

In terms of Factor 1, national identity, between the rating scores by the male ($M = 2.82$, $SD = 0.71$) and the female ($M = 2.90$, $SD = 0.81$), there was not a significant difference $t_{(473)} = -0.99$, $p > 0.05$.

In terms of Factor 2, nultural heritage, between the rating scores by the male ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 0.65$) and the female ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 0.70$), there was not a significant difference $t_{(473)} = -1.89$, $p > 0.05$.

In terms of Factor 3, local traditionalism, between the rating scores by the male ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 0.82$) and the female ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.84$), there was not a significant difference $t_{(473)} = -0.98$, $p > 0.05$.

In terms of Factor 4, collectivism, between the rating scores by the male ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.67$) and the female ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.68$), there was not a significant difference $t_{(473)} = 0.40$, $p > 0.05$.

In terms of Factor 5, social attachment, between the rating scores by the male ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 0.72$) and the female ($M = 3.02$, $SD = 0.67$), there was not a significant difference $t_{(473)} = 0.30$, $p > 0.05$.

4.6. Cultural Orientations and Translation Quality

In order to respond to the fourth question, Pearson product-moment correlation statistics was employed. In this part, for evaluating the translation quality of a subset of the participating Iranian English translation students, a translation production test was assigned to 100 participants, 58 of whom eventually completed translating an English news passage of 150 words into Persian. In order to objectify the natural subjectivity in assessing translation, the translations were evaluated by

two raters, applying a holistic method of evaluating students' translations validated by Waddington (2001).

Later, the correlation between the scores of the two raters was measured using Pearson correlation, and the results showed an acceptable level of interrater reliability ($r = .67, p < 0.05$). Eventually, the mean score provided by the two raters on a scale of 0 to 20 was used in the correlation analysis. The results indicated no significant correlation between the translation quality of the participants and the categories of cultural orientations (see Table 6):

Table 6. *Relation Between Cultural Orientations and Translation Quality*

Factors/Categories		Translation Quality
Factor 1: National Identity	Pearson Correlation	-.167
	<i>Sig.</i> (2-tailed)	.211
	<i>N</i>	58
Factor 2: Cultural Heritage	Pearson Correlation	-.091
	<i>Sig.</i> (2-tailed)	.495
	<i>N</i>	58
Factor 3: Local Traditionalism	Pearson Correlation	-.085
	<i>Sig.</i> (2-tailed)	.527
	<i>N</i>	58
Factor 4: Collectivism	Pearson Correlation	.090
	<i>Sig.</i> (2-tailed)	.500
	<i>N</i>	58
Factor 5: Social Attachment	Pearson Correlation	-.159
	<i>Sig.</i> (2-tailed)	.234
	<i>N</i>	58

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

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

As Table 6 shows, there was not a significant relationship between Iranian English translation students' categories of their cultural orientations and their translation quality: Factor 1: national identity $r = -.17$, Factor 2: cultural heritage $r = -.09$, Factor 3: local traditionalism $r = -.08$, Factor 4: collectivism $r = .09$, Factor 5: social attachment $r = .16$ with p value greater than 0.05 in case of all the categories. It is, then, concluded that the students' translation quality is not significantly related to their cultural orientations.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The goal of this study was twofold: First, it aimed to construct and validate a cultural orientation scale, localized to the context of Iran, to identify Iranian students' cultural orientations. Second, the study was an attempt to address the

relation between Iranian English translation students' cultural orientations and their age, gender, and translation quality. The results of the EFA revealed the five main underlying constructs representing the cultural orientations of the sample of Iranian prospective English translators. The underlying constructs included national identity, cultural heritage, local traditionalism, collectivism, and social attachment. These results despite certain general similarities, however, essentially differed from the results of earlier studies carried out in other different contexts such as Triandis, Chen and Chan (1998), Konig, Steinmetz, Frese, Rauch, and Wang (2006), and Khoury (2006), among others, as in most of these studies the constructs underlying the cultural orientations were dissimilar. For example, Khoury's (2006) scale was manifested by factors such as responsibility, affiliation, social welfare, religion, and achievement. Konig, Steinmetz, Frese, Rauch, and Wang (2006) indicated seven cultural orientations of business owners, namely uncertainty avoidance, power distance, in-group collectivism, assertiveness, future orientation, humane orientation, and performance orientation.

Such results further support the idea that cultural orientation is context-specific, and a universal pattern cannot be sought. The basic factors of people in various contexts like teachers, business owners and translator trainees in this case differ considerably despite certain similarities. Hofstede (1980) and Triandis, Chen, and Chan (1998) state that individualism/collectivism is the most researched cultural dimension in cross-cultural studies, and most research on cultural orientations arrives at individualism/collectivism as one of the dimensions manifested in their studies. In the current study, too, collectivism was revealed as one of the Iranian English translation students' dimensions of their cultural orientations which was incidentally the highest rated and most important factor to the participants. So, it shows that Iranian English translation students are collectivist for whom group and group achievements are more important.

Based on the results of the factors manifested, first and foremost, the Iranian English prospective translators value collectivism. That is, they tend to belong to a group and prefer to work collaboratively. They adhere to the family's values and feel responsible for the society. Secondly, they value their cultural heritage. Namely, they find the Iranian culture, civilization, and literature, and heroes most prominent and unparalleled. They also cherish local traditions of Iranian culture, meaning that they enjoy the Iranian local accents, clothing, food, and architecture. Fourth, they find social attachment very important. That is, it is a value to put others and the society first when taking decisions and do what the society approves and expects. The final dimension of the cultural orientation of the participants was national identity. In other words, the participants find the Iranian

movies, the Iranian dressing style, the Iranian religion and rituals more valuable and of higher essence.

As for the results on the relationship between cultural orientation and other variables, unlike Sawalha (2011) who found evidence to support a relationship between an individual's cultural orientation and their attitude toward certain job positions, the findings of this study revealed no correlation between Iranian English translation students' cultural orientations and their translation quality. That is, translation competence does not entail the cultural orientations of the translator. The results also supported that cultural orientations are not gender specific and there is no difference between the orientations of the male and female participants at any of the five levels.

It goes without saying that the findings of this study are limited with the nonprobability sample used, and it is possible that different results are obtained if a larger and random sample is used in later studies. The results of the study are specially limited in terms of the correlation of translation quality of the participants with the fact that only a small subset of the sample could complete the translation task. Further, the relation between the cultural orientations of professional or prospective translators could be different than what was found in this study if a bigger subset or all of the participants of the sample took part in a translation product test which may also have controlled for more intervening variables.

Because it has evidently been supported that "there is a relationship between an individual's cultural orientation and his or her attitudes toward potential job positions in an employment search context" (Sawalha, 2011, p. 4), the achieved instrument can also be useful for the prospective employers of English and Persian translators. Employers, by using this instrument, can employ a translator with cultural orientations appropriate for a certain intended task.

Because the study of the Iranian English translators' cultural orientations is fairly inconclusive, more research in this area including larger and probability samples of participants, other relevant variables, as well as a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection and analysis is highly recommended.

References

- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1(2), 245-276.
- Chamberlain, L. (1988). Gender and the metaphors of translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *Rethinking translation: Discourse, subjectivity, ideology* (pp. 57-74). London: Routledge.
- Cronin, M. (2006). *Translation and identity*. London: Routledge.

- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farahzad, F. (2013). Editing (virayesh) as a movement of resistance during the Iran-Iraq war. *Research in Applied Linguistic Studies*, 4(1), 123-141.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hills, M. D. (2002). Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's values orientation theory. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 4(4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1040>
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. London: Sage.
- Katan, D. (1999). *Translating cultures: An introduction for translators, interpreters and mediators*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Katan, D. (2009). Translation as an intercultural communication. In J. Munday (Ed.), *The Routledge companion to translation studies* (pp. 74-92). London: Routledge.
- Kluckhohn, C. K. (1951). Values and value orientations in the theory of action. In T. Parsons & E. A. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action* (pp. 21-34) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Khoury, H. A. (2006). *Measuring culture: The development of a multidimensional culture scale*. Retrieved January 1, 2014, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3583&context>
- Kwiecinski, P. (2001). *Disturbing strangeness: Foreignisation and domestication in translation procedures in the context of cultural asymmetry*. Toruń [Poland]: Wydawnictwo Edytor.
- Lotman, J., & Uspensky, B. (1978). On the semiotic mechanism of culture. *New Literary History*, 9(2), 211-232.
- Lunenburg F. C., & Irby B. J. (2007). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Maznevski, M. L., Gomez, C. B., DiStefano, J. J., Noorderhaven, N. G., & Wu, P.-C. (2002). *Cultural dimensions at the individual level of analysis: The cultural orientations framework*. Retrieved March 2, 2014, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.imd.org/research/projects/upload/CPQ%20CulturalDimensions.pdf>
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: E. H. Brill.

- Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS survival manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Pishghadam, R., Hashemi, M. R., & Bazri, E. (2013). Specifying the underlying constructs of the home culture attachment scale. *Iranian Journal of Society, Culture & Language, 1*(1), 37-51.
- Rashidi, N., & Shahab, S. (2013). Disciplinary acculturation: A comparative study of intradiscourse cycles of English and Persian introductory textbooks of sociology and linguistics. *Research in Applied Linguistic Studies, 4*(2), 33-50.
- Sawalha, R. G. (2011). Understanding the interrelationships among cultural orientation. *Psychological Contract and Job Attitudes*. Retrieved February 2, 2014, from the World Wide Web: www.csulb.edu/colleges/cba/honors/thesis/.../RawanSawahlaThesis.pdf
- Simard, E., & Blight, S. (2011). *What is cultural attachment theory?* Retrieved From April 5, 2014, from the World Wide Web: www.culturallyrestorativepractices.ca/icrp-cultural-attachment-theory.html
- Stevens, J. (1992). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Triandis, H. C., Chen, X. P., & Chan, D. K-S. (1998). Scenarios for the measurement of collectivism and individualism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*, 275-289.
- Venuti, L. (1998). *The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of translation*. London: Routledge.
- Vermeer, H. (1989). Skopos and commission in translation activity. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (2nd ed., pp. 227-238). London: Routledge.
- Waddington, C. (2001). Different methods of evaluating student translations: The question of validity. *Erudit, 46*(2), 311-325.