



Problematic Issues Encountering Undergraduate EFL Students at Tobruk University in Distinguishing between Translation and Transliteration

إعداد

الباحثة/ امال حوسين حميد عبدالله

جامعة عمر المختار _ كلية اللغات

hussainannoula@gmail.com

د/ صلاح عبد الحميد فرج آدم

أستاذ مساعد جامعة عمر المختار كلية اللغات

Salah.adam@omu.ed

1. Abstract

This paper aims at exploring the obstacles encountered by undergraduate EFL students at Tobruk University in distinguishing between translation and transliteration processes. In this paper, the researchers examine the ability of undergraduate EFL students in translating general terms as well transliterating proper nouns and brand names to accurately identifying the obstacles. In order to achieve the aforementioned, the researchers used the quantitative method including samples of twenty English sentences should be translated into Arabic and a questionnaire. The samples consist of twenty sentences, each sentence contains one or more general term, a brand name or a proper noun. The second section includes ten questions with yes or no answer; these questions aimed to address the informants' knowledge regarding both processes; translation and transliteration. The third section implies three open-ended questions, and the purpose of these questions is to elicit the participants' perceptions about translating general terms, as well transliterating proper nouns and brand names. The last section contains nine proper Arabic nouns which are required to be transliterated into the English language.

In this research, the researchers focus only on the first section which is the sample containing twenty English sentence that are needed to be translated into the Arabic language. This sample is applied for fifteen undergraduate students in the department of English, Faculty of Arts at Tobruck University. They were chosen randomly and their ages were between twenty and twenty five years old. The informants were given an hour to fill in the sample without using the dictionary. The answers of the informants were tabulated and classified into *accurate translation/transliteration, wrong translation, translation, no answer, literal translation and the percentage of the correct answers* for each sentence.

The results revealed that the majority of informants mistranslated the general terms, and accordingly, they transliterated the terms instead of translating them. Adding to that, approximately two thirds of the respondents cannot differentiate between translation and transliteration. Regarding to the proper nouns and brand names, the informants presented various transliterations. Few percentages could successfully distinguish between translation and transliteration processes.

Keywords:- translation, transliteration, source language (SL), target language (TL), literal translation, general terms, proper nouns, brand names.

1. الملخص

يهدف هذا البحث إلى استكشاف المعوقات التي تواجه طلبة المرحلة الجامعية في جامعة طبرق في التمييز بين عمليتي الترجمة والتعريب. علاوة على ذلك، تبحث هذه الدراسة في قدرة الطلاب الجامعيين على ترجمة المصطلحات العامة وكذلك تعريب أسماء العلم والأسماء التجارية. ولتحقيق أهداف الدراسة المذكورة أعلاه، استخدم الباحث المنهج الكمي باستخدام أربعة أدوات بحثية مختلفة تشمل العينات والاستبيان. يتكون القسم الأول من عشرين جملة، تحتوي كل جملة على واحد أو أكثر من المصطلحات العامة، اسم العلامة التجارية أو اسم العلم المكتوب بخط مائل. أما القسم الثاني فيتضمن عشرة أسئلة تكون الإجابة عليها بنعم أو لا؛ وتهدف هذه الأسئلة إلى معالجة معرفة المشارك بعمليتي الترجمة والتعريب. ويتضمن القسم الثالث ثلاثة أسئلة مفتوحة، الغرض منها هو الحصول على آراء المشاركين حول ترجمة المصطلحات العامة، وكذلك تعريب أسماء العلم وأسماء العلامات التجارية. يحتوي القسم الأخير على تسعة أسماء عربية صحيحة يجب تعريبها إلى اللغة الإنجليزية. يهدف هذا السؤال إلى معرفة كيفية تعامل طلاب المرحلة الجامعية مع أسماء الأعلام في عملية التعريب، خاصة عندما تتضمن الأسماء في اللغة المصدر (اللغة العربية) بعض الأصوات التي ليس لها ما يعادلها في اللغة الهدف (اللغة الإنجليزية). يركز الباحث في هذا البحث فقط على القسم الأول وهو العينة التي تحتوي على عشرين جملة إنجليزية مطلوب ترجمتها إلى اللغة العربية من أجل الإجابة على التساؤلات المطروحة في هذا البحث. تم تطبيق هذه العينة على خمسة عشر طالباً من طلاب مرحلة البكالوريوس في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة طبرق وقد تم اختيارهم بشكل عشوائي وتراوحت أعمارهم بين العشرين والخمسة والعشرين عاماً. تم تحديد ساعة واحدة لملء العينة دون استخدام القاموس. ومن ثم تم جدول إجابات المعلومات وتصنيفها حسب الترجمة الدقيقة/التعريب، والترجمة الخاطئة، والترجمة، وعدم الإجابة، والترجمة الحرفية ونسبة الإجابات الصحيحة لكل جملة.

أظهرت نتائج التحليل الإحصائي أن غالبية المشتركين يحدث لهم تشويش في ترجمة المصطلحات العامة؛ ويقومون أحياناً بتعريب المصطلحات بدلاً من ترجمتها. إضافة إلى ذلك، فإن ما يقرب من ثلثي المستجيبين لا يستطيعون التمييز بين الترجمة والتعريب. وفيما يتعلق بالأسماء الصحيحة والأسماء التجارية، أظهرت النتائج ترجمات صوتية مختلفة حيث تمكن أقلية من المشاركين من التمييز بنجاح بين عمليتي الترجمة والتعريب.

2. Introduction

Translation is an act of transferring something from one language (SL) into another language (TL). Translation plays a vital role in our everyday life for it helps diversified societies in communication. Bassnett (1980, p. 21) points out that "Translation involves the transfer of "meaning" contained in one set of language signs through competent use of the dictionary and grammar; the process involves a whole set of extra-linguistic criteria also." The term translation has also been defined by Akan et al., (2019) as an act of interlingual interaction which share the cultural religious, political etc... components of language.

Many people assume that transliteration is similar to translation and they are equivalent, however, there are some significant distinctions. Transliteration is the process of transferring a word written of one language (SL) to another (TL). It helps people pronounce proper names in foreign languages. Unlike a translation, which tells the reader/receiver the meaning of the word that is written in another language.

According to Al-Jarf (2022) transliteration changes the letters (graphemes) from the words original alphabet to similar pronouncing letters (graphemes) in a different language (TL). She also added that the transliteration process helps people to pronounce words and names in the foreign language. It does not give the exact meaning of the word that is written in another language, rather, it explains the readers how the word is pronounced.

Al-Jarf (2022) stated that it has recently become very common to transliterate words and names of people and brand names from one language to another. It is commonly used in passports, airline tickets, insurance policies, medical reports, financial transactions, banking services, business letters, Arabic brand names, street names, landmarks and other. For instance, "Zara" is a brand name in English and when it is transliterated in Arabic became "زارا", it is written with the same pronounced letters.

The current study aims to address some particular questions. Firstly, it aims to investigate the difficulties that face undergraduate students in translating general

terms, as well transliterating proper nouns and brand names. Another purpose is to find out how undergraduate students deal with English sounds that have no equivalents in the Arabic language e.g. /g/, /v/ and /p/. Moreover, this study intends to explore whether the informants have the ability to distinguish between translation and transliteration, as well to investigate the appropriate technique in translating general terms, brand names and proper nouns.

3. Literature Review

Over the past decade, most research in translation has emphasised the use of transliteration between English and Arabic. Hodgson (1974) defined transliteration as the rendering of the spelling of a word from the script of one language into a script in another language. Mostly, students encountered difficulties in differentiating between transliteration and transcription, however, Hodgson added that transcription is only the way of rendering the sound of the word in which it helps readers how to pronounce the word.

The most important aspect of the literature review of this paper does not only focus on similar studies involving the difficulties and problematic issues regarding transliteration process between English and Arabic, but instead, upon how do recent students/translators deal with proper nouns and technical terms in the translation process, especially when the term they deal with do not have an equivalent in the target language, and in case the source language (alphabet) do not exist in the target language. Ultimately, with an adequate but hardly overwhelming quantity of articles related to Arabic transliteration, most of these articles covered the hardness and obstacles elaborated in the language,

A considerable amount of literature has been published on transliteration issues, Al-Masry et al. (2020), Rama (2010) as well Lawson (2008). These studies shed light on the terms that have been transliterated instead of translating them. For instance, (filter) /filtə/ in which many undergraduate students use the process of transliteration " (فلتر) instead of translate it to its equivalent meaning in the TL which is (مصفاة). Transliteration process poses a number of difficulties which encounter undergraduate students at Tobruk University in translating terms from English to Arabic and vice versa.

Recently, much more information has become available on transliteration and translation problems. Mommadzadeh (2018, p.105) claimed that “the ever

expanding bibliographic database necessitate the international settlement of the transliteration issue. Internationally adopted standards have a negative impact on the linguistic tradition of broader language groups". He also added that adopting a standard that is appropriate for all transliteration process is a very complicated issue.

Translation scholars like Catford (1965), Newmark (1988), and Hervey and Higgins (1992) believed that transliteration is a translation technique used to translate proper nouns, brand names, religious terms, etc. According to them, transliteration plays a vital role in our everyday communication.

3.1 Translation and Transliteration

Almost every paper that has been written on transliteration process includes a selection relationship between translation and transliteration process. Messaoudi (2013) noted that the translation process, as a part of translation, is almost complicated and achieving a perfect transliteration is complex. He added that the identification of the parallel other language words for each of the spelling is not difficult for a few languages but complicated for some languages like English.

To determine the difference between translation and transliteration system, Catford (1965) argued that graphological translation is totally different from transliteration. In his point of view, in the process of actual transliterating, the transliterator substitutes each source language letter or other graphological unit by a target language letter, or other unit, based upon in a conventional manner established set of rules. Furthermore, he added that transliteration rules assign transliteration equivalents which vary from translation equivalents in two ways. He described the first way as it is not necessarily being connected to the same graphic item as the source language letters, while the second way is being (in good transliteration) in one-to-one identification with SL letters or other units. Catford (1965, p.66) sees the process of transliteration as "SL graphological units are replaced by TL graphological units; but these are not translation equivalents, since they are not selected on basis of relationship to the same graphic substance."

The widely use of translation process especially in different fields regarding to daily basis may lead to a confusion to the readers in understanding the intended meaning. In case of the variable use of many acronyms and abbreviations in many subjects and areas that include technical terms, the reason that is considered to be

complicated to introduce Arabic equivalents. Translators are expected to transliterate product names in Arabic characters (Al-abjadiyah) regardless of they are acronyms or an abbreviation. As well as, all other acronyms (e.g. HTML, HTTP) should be transcribed in their Latin form (using English characters), but their translated antonyms could be added between parenthesis (Messauodi, 2013). He also added that there is an urgent need for automatic and effective translation activities between these two languages, since Arabic language is being spoken and used by a large number of people and countries these days, as well the huge increase of communicative relationship between both languages.

Fragopoulos (2014, p.148) asserted that “transliteration enacts a simultaneous existence between cultures, languages, and geographies. It fractures any notion of pure national identity or singular national language.”

Transliteration is a major area of interest within the field of translation between two different languages and cultures. Almahameed et al. (2017) demonstrated that transliteration technique can be considered as a textual journey that a traveller may proceed to inform foreign words and phrases into the target language and culture, consequently assumed them as a way of finding a cross-cultural contact between the two cultures, two traditions, and two languages.

A survey conducted by Halai (2007) has proposed another strategy for both processes, translation and transliteration. According to him, the researchers should detect whether the source language words have any equivalent in standard English words; if this is the case, they should adopt English words or phrases, using quotes when it is difficult to translate or interpret the source words or phrases or do not have a direct equivalent. For instance, the term (radio) is translated by many translators/speakers as (راديو) whereas its appropriate translation is (مذياع), a different example is (google) could be subject to the transliteration process as (جوجل), because it does not have a direct equivalent in the target language (Arabic language).

In the same vein, Onwuemene (1999, p.1058) defines transliteration as “the act of thinking and conceiving in one’s first language but expressing the substance thought or conceived in one’s second language such that second-language expressions used contain some salient linguistic and rhetorical implants from the first language”.

Recently, a primary concern of transliteration process held by Guessoum et al. (2022) claimed that the task of transliteration is transforming the words that are written in one language alphabet while still preserving the phonetics of the transliterated words. The researchers pay attention in transliterating names between English and Arabic. In their point of view, many difficulties are found in transliteration process; one of the main difficulties from a given source language to another is the lack of some phonetic character correspondences. To illuminate, in translating between Arabic and English, several Arabic sounds such as /ث/ and /ط/ do not have a direct single letter correspondences in the English language alphabet.

Guessoum et al. (2022) demonstrated that although a great deal of attention has been devoted this task for different languages such as English, only few studies have paid attention to Arabic mainly in consequence of the lack of transliteration datasets.

On one hand, both researchers, Ali and Ijaz (2009) investigated that the process of transliteration is successful in translating names of people, places, companies, etc. because the translation of any dictionary can never be comprehensive and is ineffective for translation of proper nouns. According to Ali and Ijaz (2009), transliteration process is not an easy task especially between two different languages. In their study, they also compared transliteration between Urdu and English; they reported that transliteration is a method of transcribing one script to another by using same phonetically equivalent words in the Target Language. Moreover, they added that transliteration rules supply mapping for the letters of the source script alphabet to the target script alphabet letter on the basis of phonetic similarity.

Transliteration is an important component in the translation system and plays a key role in helping learners understanding how to pronounce new terms especially if the terms are used in daily basis, even if the words are borrowed to the language. To illustrate, English technical terms which sometimes lack to find their equivalents in the TL (Arabic language); for instance, English-Arabic example include the English technical term 'radar' which is phonetically transferred into (رادار) in Arabic through a process called transliteration because it lacks the Arabic equivalent. Some sounds in English have no equivalents in Arabic language such as /g/ sound; some translators use the letter /ج/, both sounds are not the same in pronunciation but they try to give, if not the same, a similar sound to sound. Similarly, the Arabic language has some sounds which are not existed in English, for instance /x/ or /خ/ sound in Arabic does not have a similar sound in English, thus translators sometimes are

required to use two letters /kh/ to make the Arabic sound /خ/ which is pronounced nearly similar in the English language.

Al Onaizan and knight (2002) found that there are two types of transliteration exist 'forward transliteration' and 'backward transliteration'. Al Masry et al. (2020) described forward transliteration as the transliteration of a foreign name (in the case of our system Arabic) into English. Typically, it could be diversified transliterations with acceptable candidates. To illustrate, the Arabic proper name (محمد) might be correctly transliterated into Mohamed, Mohammed, Mohammad, etc. Truthfully many types of name variation commonly found in databases can be expected. The second type is backward transliteration which is a process used to adopt the original form of English name that has already been transliterated into the foreign language, for instance in any Arabic text, the term (جوجل) in which its origin is not an Arabic term, thus in this case only one transliteration is retained to be 'google' in English language.

Catford (1965) distinguished three steps in order to set up a transliteration system. The first step is substituting the SL letters by SL phonological units; this is the ordinary and common literal process of converting from the written to the spoken medium, for instance the term (radar) in English language should be replaced from written letters to the spoken sounds in the SL to be /reɪdɑː/. The second step transferring the SL phonological units into TL phonological units, whereas the third step includes transforming the TL phonological units into TL letters, or other graphological units to be (رادار) in the TL (Arabic Language).

3.2 Translating General Terms

General terms are terms that used to describe specific idea or concept. General terms can be diversified according to different fields, for instance, technical terms, business terms, religious terms etc. In this paper, it will be focused only on technical terms. Technical terms are terms that conveyed a specific meaning, it could be a word, phrase or acronym. They are an essential part of all technical and scientific writing. A survey conducted by Kesbi (2012) demonstrated that the main aim of Arabization is to adopt and adapt western sciences through the process of coining new Arabic terminologies. He claimed that Arab translators face obstacles reflected in one of their important tools, namely dictionaries. Truthfully, Arabic dictionaries

reveal the inability and weakness such as the lack of indications of the etymology, neologism, references and contexts of the translated terms. According to him, all of these problems have a great impression on the transmission of the language, hence of knowledge.

In his study on the effect of transliteration, Abo Al-ma'ati (2012) analyzed the negative impact of transliteration process on the basis of the Arabic language. His focus was on technical terms and terms which are used on daily basis. According to him, transliteration is seen as foreign term that added or reduced from it to enter the dictionary of Arabic language. Unfortunately, he stated that the most serious issue in translation process is how most people deal with terms that have their equivalent ones in Arabic language, but they still use their English pronunciation. To illustrate the term (Mobile) which means in Arabic (الهاتف الجوال) whereas most of translators translate it as (موبايل) even it has another four translations in the Arabic language which are (الجوال، النقال، المحمول، والخلوي). As well, he added that we are in a globalisation era in which no place for the weak, adding to this the challenges we face in transliterating terms that have their equivalents in Arabic may distort the basis of the Arabic language.

Similarly, Pinchuck showed that languages may suffer from gaps at the lexical level, and most likely, "one language will have no words for a concept expressed in the second language" (1977, p.35). English and Arabic example includes the English term (radar)/reɪdɑː/ into (رادار), which is phonetically pronounced into Arabic through a process called (transliteration) or (transcription). Here the phonetic of the source language term are directly transferred with or without modification into the target language. Therefore, Arabization in its narrowest sense, entails mere transliteration of a foreign term according to Arabic sounds and characters Khulusi (1982).

Kesbi (2012) argued that any scientific or technical term is unintentionally accompanied with the creation of new terms. Similarly, he added that while facing this multilingual knowledge, each language should be equipped with an acceptable and sufficient terminology if it aspires to achieve its fundamental function of a means of knowledge.

3.3 English and Arabic Orthographies

Messaoudi (2013) compared between English and Arabic scripts. According to him, Arabic transliteration suggests an option for converting Roman characters to Arabic characters. This can help you type Arabic words phonetically in English script and still have them represented in Arabic. He, furthermore, highlighted that transliteration is not identical to translation, while transliteration focuses on the sounds of the words that are converted from one alphabet to the other; translation is concerned with the meaning of the terms. To illustrate, because of the nature of the system of Arabic language, there is no single correct way to write an Arabic alphabet (ج) in English which might be transliterated as (j) or (g), which is known in Arabic as “Ta’reeb” (Messaoudi 2013, p.8). Normally, some Arabic letters are performed by a letter (or a combination of letters) that may have equivalent phonetic sounds (or nearly equivalent) for instance, the letter (خ) might be written with a combination of letters like (kh/x) in English.

Due to the differences between English and Arabic scripts, transliteration could not be an adequate for describing this process. Izwaini (2009, p.105) argued that “Because one-to-one correspondences are not always present between the Arabic and Latin alphabet, and because converting Arabic to Latin script involves encoding additional vowelisation information which is not visible in the Arabic script, the term transliteration would not be accurate for describing the Latinisation of Arabic.”

Beyond the obvious difference in script direction between Arabic and English, there are more distinct differences relating to the type of script and the nature of the writing system. Scheer (1986) identifies two mapping relations in the scripts of modern languages: logography and phonography; the latter being divided into syllabary and alphabet. There is also a distinction between writing systems employing a consonant-based alphabet (e.g. Arabic script), and those employing ‘complete’ alphabet (e.g. Latin script).

Al-Jarf (2022) used a survey to assess the difference between English and Arabic languages. Accordingly to her, there is a considerable difference between the two languages. Arabic has only 25 consonants and 3 long vowel sounds (see table 1 below), in addition to 14 diacritical marks that include three short vowels (see table 2). Diacritical marks are replaced above or underneath a consonant sounds.

Table1: The Arabic Alphabet in Arabic Script and Phonetic Alphabet

ا	ب	ت	ث	ج	ح	خ	د	ذ	ر	ز	س	ش	ص	ض	ط	ظ	ع	غ	ف	ق	ك	ل	م	ن	ه	و	ي	ء
'	b	T	Th	j	h	xKh	d	dh	R	Z	s	Sh	ṣ	ḍ	ṭ	ẓ	ʿ	Gh	f	Qq	k	l	M	N	H	w	y	'

Table 2: Arabic Diacritics with Examples

Methodology

4.1 Method

التشكيل Diacritical Marks				
Tamween with Shaddah	Tamween تنوين	Short vowels with Shaddah شدة	Short vowels	
ـَـ	ـَـ	ـَـ	ـَـ	fatHah فَتْحَة
ـِـ	ـِـ	ـِـ	ـِـ	kasrah كَسْرَة
ـُـ	ـُـ	ـُـ	ـُـ	DHammah ضَمَة
		ـْـ	ـْـ	sukun سُكُون

The sample of this study consists of fifteen participants, they are representing third and fourth year students at Tobruck University, Department of English Language. Based on the information drawn from the pilot study, the researchers could develop survey questions that were appropriate to help the researcher adding more questions and finding clear results.

The data of the current study is analysed quantitatively. Firstly, the data obtained from the students' test was analysing using excel software in order to determine the percentage for correct answers of each sentence and then the percentages of correct answers are calculated and tabulated. Each sentence has its own table, divided into correct *translation/transliteration*, *no answer*, and *wrong translation/transliteration*.

Participants The questionnaire examines fifteen undergraduate students at Tobruk University. The participants are randomly selected from third and fourth years at faculty of Arts.

Participants were asked to fill in the questionnaire and translate the sentences in one hour, as well as they were not allowed to use dictionary, since the terms included are general and used on a daily basis. The respondents are between twenty and twenty five years old and the majority was female students; there was only one male participants who was subjected to answer the questionnaire.

5. Results and Discussion

5.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the analysis of students' questionnaire are classified and presented in the form shown in appendix (1). The questionnaire is used in order to elicit students' translations and their perceptions towards transliterating general terms, proper nouns as well brand names between English and Arabic and vice versa.

5.2 Analysing Question One

The aim of this question is to explore how participants translate general terms, brand names and proper nouns i.e. how do participants translate and transliterate them. This question contains twenty sentences, each sentence includes one or more technical terms and a proper noun which needed to be translated and transliterated by third and fourth year students. In this paper, only the first ten sentences will be presented and analysed.

To begin with, students in the first question were asked to translate the first sentence which contains two technical terms (technique and filter), these terms were needed to be translated by undergraduate students. Table 1 shows the summary statistics of the participants' answers. The results obtained from the preliminary analysis of translating these technical terms showed that only eight participants could translate these terms accurately. On one hand, concerning the term (technique), only eight participants could translate it with its intended meaning. They successfully could translate this term as (تقنية/خاصية). Thus, the total percentage for correct answers is 50%, whereas three of the participants presented wrong translation which is (معمل). Two of the participants used transliteration process for this term and transliterated the term (technique) as it is pronounced (تكنيك). This case supports the opinion of Fathi (2009) who reported that insight into the linguistic landscape in which the younger generation lives, in particular, reveals a crisis of Arabic linguistic identity, whether on the level of structure or composition. As it can be seen from the data in table 1 that two of the participants could not give any answer for this term.

On the other hand, the second technical term (filter) was got the same answers by informants as the first technical term (technique). Only eight participants could

translate it correctly. To illustrate, a number of students were succeeded in translating this term as (تنقية/تصفية), in which the total percentage for correct answers is 50%. Two of participants failed to translate it, they translated it as (يُسْرَب) which is a wrong translation. However, some other students used transliteration process for this term as (فلتر). Two of the participants left this sentence without any answer.

Table 1: This *technique* can *filter* the water easily.

	Accurate Translation	Wrong Translation	Transliteration	No Answer	percentage
Technique	8	3	2	2	50%
Filter	8	2	3	2	50%

When respondents were asked about translating sentence number two which contains two proper nouns (Happy Chicken and Chicken Hut), ten students used accurate transliteration for the first one (Happy Chicken) (هابي تشكن) see table 2. One of the students transliterated it between quotation marks “ ”, it could be put between quotation marks because he/she want to make sure that this proper noun should not be translated by its literal meaning; thus the total percentage of transliterating this proper noun is 67%. Some students used literal translation as (الدجاج السعيد) which is not acceptable in this case, because proper nouns and brand names should be transliterated. As it has been argued by Al-Jarf (2022) that transliteration of words and names from one language into Romanised script is very common and, in some cases, is very necessary.

As for the second proper name (Chicken Hut), nine of the participants could deal with it as a proper name and they used the transliteration process accurately. Ten of the students transliterated it as (تشكن هت), in the same vein, student number 6 put the the transliterated name between quotation marks “ ”, it could be happened to emphasise that he/she did not use literal translation for this proper name. Thus the total percentage for correct answers is 60%. The table below illustrates that four of the students used literal translation which does not convenient in such case. Four of the participants translated it as (الدجاج السعيد), while two of the students did not answer it.

Table 2: My friends prefer eating from *Happy Chicken* rather than *Chicken Hut*.

	Accurate Transliteration	Literal Translation	No Answer	Percentage

Happy Chicken	10	4	1	67%
Chicken Hut	9	4	2	60%

The aim of sentence number three is to find out how participants deal with daily terms whether technical terms, brand names and proper nouns. This sentence contains the brand name (iPhone 12 Pro Max). Ten out of fifteen students succeed to use the transliteration process (آيفون 12 بروماكس), because this is a brand name. In order to keep the importance of the effect of the product name, we should use the transliteration process. Three students out of fifteen translated it literally as (هاتف), whereas students number 5,6 left it without any answer as it has been shown in table 3 below.

Table 3: iPhone 12 Pro Max has more advantages than the one before it.

	Accurate Transliteration	Literal Transliteration	No Answer	Percentage
iPhone 12 Pro Max	10	3	2	67%

Interestingly, the fourth sentence contains the term (google). The purpose of this sentence is to shed light on how participants could transliterate it, because it does not have an Arabic equivalent. Regarding the English sound /g/ which does not have an Arabic equivalent sound; it could be transliterated to the Arabic sounds /ق/ and /ج/. Ten out of fifteen students could transliterate this term with the same sound /ق/ to be (قوقل), thus the total percentage for the correct transliterations is 67% as it has been shown in table 4 below. Two of the participants transliterated it wrongly, both of them used the definite article (ال) to be (القوقل). Al-Jarf (2022) asserts that the definite article in Arabic is used in formal purposes. While three of the participants left it without any answer.

Table 4: If you want to get information easily, you can use google.

	Accurate Transliteration	Wrong Transliteration	No Answer	Percentage
Google	10	2	3	67%

In response to question 5, surprisingly, few participants answered it correctly. Sentence number five contains the term (mall) in which only four students translated it as (مجمع تجاري), whereas nine out of fifteen students transliterated this term as they pronounced it. Thus, ten participants out of fifteen transliterated it as (المول). Another problem for translating this term is that students did not only transliterate it but also entered the Arabic definite article (ال). On one hand, it is apparent from table 5 that very few students could deal with this term as an English term that has its Arabic equivalent. As it can be seen from table 5 below that only 26% from respondents could translate the term accurately. On the other hand, the majority of students used the transliteration process for this term. One of the students used a wrong translation. This result supported what Fathi (2009) has claimed that we are not here in the context of calling for retreat and lock in Arabic, or not interacting with the other, but rather in the context of calling for organising our relationship with the other, we lend and borrow without tyranny to the foreign expatriate, until we are totally removed or deleted.

Table 5: My family went to the *mall* last night.

	Accurate Translation	Wrong Translation	Transliteration	Percentage
Mall	4	1	9	26%

It is apparent from table 6 that only three participants could get the appropriate meaning for the technical terms (bank & cash). Even these terms are known and they are used in our daily basis, but most of undergraduate students used the transliteration method instead of translating both terms into their equivalent Arabic meaning. To begin with the first term (bank), the total percentage for the accurate translation is only 20% in which its accurate translation is (مصرف). Whereas the majority of participants transliterated it (بنك). The majority of respondents used transliteration process which is not acceptable in such case. As it has been mentioned in the literature review by Halai (2007) that it should be detected whether the source language words have any equivalents in Standard English words; if this is the case, they should adopt English words or phrases, using quotes when it is difficult to translate or interpret the source words or phrases or do not have direct equivalent in the target language.

In the same vein, the second term in this sentence is (cash), it has been translated correctly by only three participants. Despite the simplicity of vocabulary; nevertheless the majority of students transliterated this term as (كاش)

instead of translating to its Arabic equivalent meaning (نقداً). Thus as it has been shown in table 6 below that the total percentage for the correct answer is only 20%. Adding to that, three of participants left it without any answer.

Table 6: The *bank* paid 2000 dollars in *cash*.

	Accurate Translation	Transliteration	No Answer	Percentage
bank	3	12	0	20%
cash	3	9	3	20%

The results obtained from the preliminary analysis of translating the seventh sentence are summarised in table 7. This sentence contains the technical term (computing). Even though this term is very easy and known but only six students could get the appropriate translation. Some students could translate it as (حوسبة), while four of students gave a wrong translation. Moreover, four of the participants left it without any translation. Thus as it has been shown in table 7 below that the percentage for translating this term correctly is 40%.

Table 7: We are in *computing* era.

	Accurate Translation	Wrong Translation	No Answer	Percentage
Computing	6	5	4	40%

From the data in table 8 below, we can see that nine out of fifteen students could get the appropriate meaning for the term (goal). The generality respondents translated it into (هدف), while six informants could not translate this term, they left it without any answer. The most surprising aspect of the data for translating this term is that only 60% could translate it correctly, whereas the rest of participants could not. This indicates the weakness of students in translating even the simple terms that are used on our daily basis.

Table 8: The player was very clever and scored the *goal* in the appropriate time.

	Accurate Translation	Wrong Translation	Percentage
Goal	9	6	60%

With regard to the ninth sentence, it contains two technical terms that are written in italics (montage & clips). Surprisingly, no one of undergraduate students could translate the term

(montage) appropriately. Ten informants left it without any answer. Two of the participants translated it wrongly, whereas four students used the process of transliteration (مونتاچ). It can be realised from these results that undergraduate students face difficulties in translating the easiest vocabulary that are used in everyday life. Thus, the percentage for translating the term (montage) is 0% as it has been shown in table 9 below. Translating such terms is sometimes tricky, because they sometimes transliterate them instead of translating these terms. As it has been stated previously by Catford (1965) that translation is totally different from transliteration. He added that the transliterator should substitute each source language letter or other graphological unit by a target language letter or other graphological unit, based upon in a conventional manner established set of rules. We can estimate from Catford's point of view that transliteration process should undergo certain rules. Thus, we cannot use transliteration method for any word.

As we can see in table 9 below, the second term in the ninth sentence is (clips). Only a small number of those asked to translate this sentence could get the translation properly. Two of respondents translated it as (مقطع/مشهد), while the majority of the participants left it without answering. Student number 4 translated it as (النوادي) which is totally wrong. The rest of students used the process of transliteration; they transliterated it as (الكليب) in which it could be estimated that not any word can be transliterated, especially if there is an equivalent meaning in the target language. The term (clip) has many meanings (مقطع/مشهد/قصاصة) instead of transliterating it or left it blank. As it has been drawn in table 9 below that only 13% of undergraduate participants could get the translation properly.

Table 9: A montage of clips will be shown to inspire the players tomorrow.

	Accurate Translation	Wrong Translation	Transliteration	No Answer	Percentage
Montage	0	2	4	9	0%
clip	2	1	3	9	13%

When the participants were asked to translate sentences number ten, the overall translation for this sentence is very negative. Eight out of fifteen students did not give an accurate translation for the technical term (satellite). They translated it as (قمرين صناعيين/قمران صناعيان). Whereas seven of participants left this term without any translation. Thus the overall percentage for translating this sentence is 0%. However, it could be translated appropriately as (اثنين من الأقمار الصناعية). No one of the participants who translated this sentence took into consideration the difference between English and Arabic languages. As it has been mentioned in

the literature review that beyond the obvious difference in script direction between Arabic and English, there are more distinct differences relating to the type of script and the nature of the writing system. Diab (2014) describes the Arabic scientific language, in this modern era, is a challenge.

Table 10: Astronomers say the new planet has twosatellites.

	Not Accurate Translation	No Answer	Percentage of Correct Answers
Two Satellites	8	7	0%

6. Conclusion

This study discussed the problematic issues that encountered undergraduate students at Tobruck University in distinguishing between translation and transliteration. Moreover, it revealed the obstacles in translating general terms, as well transliterating proper nouns and brand names.

References

- 1 - Abo Al-ma'ati, K. (2012). *Comprehensive Arabization is a Way of Creativity and Renaissance*. Jeddah: King Abdulaziz University.
- 2 - Akan, F., et al. (2019). *An Analysis of Arabic-English Translation: Problems and Prospects*. Saudi Arabia: King Khalid University.
- 3- Ali, A. & Ijaz, M. (2009). *English to Urdu Transliteration*. Pakistan: National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences.
- 4- Al-Jarf, R. (2022). *Gemination Errors in Arabic-English Transliteration of Personal Names on Facebook*. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*. Saudi Arabia. ISSN: 2754-2599.
- 5 - Almahameed, A., et al. (2017). *Between Languages and Cultures: Arabic into English Transliteration in English Travel Literature*. Australia: Australian International Centre.
- 6 - Al Masry, E., Al Sharqawy, M. & Mubarak, H. (2020). *Diacritization and Transliteration of Proper Nouns from Arabic to English*. Cairo: Free Zone.
- 7 - Al-Onaizan, Y. & Knight, K. (2002). *Machine Transliteration of Names in Arabic*. Philadelphia: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 8 - Bassnette, S. (1980). *Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Catford, J. (1965). *A linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 9 - Diab, M. (2014). *Scientific Language in between Arabization and Writing*. Jordan: Balqa Applied University.
- Fathi, S. (2009). *The Problem of Arabization in Light the Identity of Arabic Language*. Jordan: Languages Centre.

-
- 10 - Fragopoulos, G. (2014). *The Politics and Poetics of Transliteration in the Works of Olga Broumas and George Economou*. MELUS. Volume 39, Number 4, pp. 140-161.
- 11 - Guessoum, A., Hadj, M. & Meziane, F. (2022). *ANETAC: Arabic National Entity Transliteration and Classification Dataset*. Algeria: USTHB.
- 12 - Halai, N. (2007). *Making Use of Bilingual Interview Data: Some Expressions from the Field*. *Qualitative Research Report*, 12(3)344-355.
- 12 - Hervey, S. & Higgings, I. (1992). *Thinking Translation: A Course in Translation Method French-English*. London: Routledge.
- 13 - Hodgson, M. (1974). *The Venture of Islam*. United States: University of Chicago Press.
- 14 - Izwaini, S. (2009). *Romanization of Arabic Names*. Abu Dhabi: Ministry of Culture, Youth and Community Development.
- 15 - Kesbi, A. (2012). *Arabization and Translation: Focus on Lexical Issues*. Morocco: University Hassan II Mohammedia.
- 16 - Khulusi, S. (1982). *Fann Attarjama fi Daw'a Diraasaat al Muqarana*. **Baghdad: Daar al Shu'uun al Thaqaafiyya.**
- 17 - Lawson, D. (2008). *An Evaluation in Arabic Transliteration Methods*. North Carolina: Ronald Bergquist.
- 18- Mesoudi, M. (2013). *Developing the Transliteration Interface for Arabic Text*. *International Journal of Computer Applications* (0975-8887). Volume 62-No.17.
- 19 - Mommadzadeh, S. (2018). *Transliteration and Translation in Data Processing*. Azerbaijan: Institute of Information Technology of ANAS.
- 20 - Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall International.
- 21 - Onwuemene, M. (1999). *Limits of Transliteration: Nigerian Writer's Endeavor Toward a National Literary Language*. PMLA 114.5.pp.1055-66.
- 22- Pinchuck, I. (1977). *Scientific and Technical Translation*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- 23 - Rama, T., Singh, A. & Subramaniam, S. (2010). *Transliteration as Alignment vs. Information Retrieval*. India: Language Technologies Research Centre.
- 24 - Scheerer, E. (1986). *Orthography and Lexical Access*. *New Trends in Graphemics and Orthography*. New York: W.DeGruyter. 262-286.