

**Sudan University of Science & Technology
College of Graduate Studies
English Language Department**

**Investigating the Impact of Pragmatic Knowledge
on Arabic - English Translated Texts**

**تقصي أثر المعرفة البراغماتية في ترجمة النصوص من اللغة العربية إلى
اللغة الإنجليزية**

**A Case Study of 4th Year Students, College of Languages at Sudan
University of Science and Technology**

دراسة حالة/ طلاب السنة الرابعة كلية اللغات جامعة السودان للعلوم والتكنولوجيا

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillments for the Requirements
of M.A. Degree in English Language (Applied Linguistics)**

Prepared by:

**Abdulgadir Hassan Abdulgadir
Ahmed**

Supervised by:

Dr. Areig Osman

Oct. 2016

Dedication

To the soul of my father,
To my mother,
To my spouse, and
To my brothers & sisters.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, praise is to Allah; who granted me the strength and ability to carry out this study. I am greatly indebted to Dr. Areig Osman Ahmed Mohammed for her unique scholarly supervision; a debt of gratitude is also due to members of English Department (Graduate College). Collage of languages, Sudan University of Science and Technology.

I am no less grateful to the students of Sudan University of Science and Technology, College of Languages, English Department fourth year, who sat for the research test. I would like to thank all my colleagues, whose suggestions and criticism actually helped a lot in the process of the study.

Finally my thanks extend to everyone who supported me.

Abstract

This study has dealt with the problem that faced some Sudanese University students during translating pragmatic aspects. Specifically; speech acts, structure and real world expressions. The study aims at investigating students' knowledge of pragmatic skills such as how to deal with dimension of pragmatics, account for the differences between English and Arabic languages and tackle translation effectively. The significance of this study arises from the fact that it tries to find out the reasons behind the difficulties that face students during translating pragmatic aspects and suggest some solutions which may help them to understand and translate pragmatic aspects properly.

This study adopted the descriptive method combined with quantitative analysis. The population of the study is 4th year students, semester eight, Collage of Languages, English department, Sudan University of Science and Technology. One tool was used for data collection which was a test for forty students.

The most important result which the study came up with is that: the majority of the students involved in the study were unable to find the correct answers of the test questions. Therefore, the researcher recommends the importance of teaching pragmatics to students at university level in the department of English language.

Abstract (Arabic Version)

المستخلص

تناولت هذه الدراسة المشكلات التي تواجه بعض الطلاب السودانيين في المرحلة الجامعية عند ترجمة نصوص المعرفة البراغمتية؛ تحديداً، تركيب الكلام و الكلام بصورة عامة. تهدف الدراسة إلى التقصي عن مدى معرفة الطلاب للمهارات المتعلقة بالمعرفة البراغمتية مثل كيفية التعامل مع أبعاد المعرفة البراغمتية والتعليل عن الإختلاف بين اللغة العربية والإنجليزية، والترجمة بصورة فعالة.

تتمثل أهمية هذا البحث في كونه محاولة لمعرفة الصعوبات التي تواجه الطلاب أثناء ترجمة عناصر المعرفة البراغمتية وإقتراح بعض الحلول التي يمكن أن تساعد على الفهم والترجمة بصورة جيدة. إستخدم الباحث الإختبار كوسيلة لجمع معلومات البحث حيث جلس للإختبار عدد أربعون طالب وطالبة في جامعة السودان للعلوم والتكنولوجيا، طلاب السنة الرابعة الفصل الدراسي الثامن كلية اللغات قسم اللغة الإنجليزية. كما إنتهجت الدراسة أسلوب التحليل الوصفي الكمي.

من أهم النتائج التي توصلت إليها الدراسة هي أن معظم الطلاب من العينة المحددة لم يتمكنوا من الإجابة على أسئلة الإختبار بطريقة صحيحة، لذلك أوصى الباحث بمراعاة أهمية تدريس مهارات المعرفة البراغمتية لدى الطلاب في المرحلة الجامعية.

Table of Contents

Statement	Page
Dedication	i
Acknowledgement	ii
Abstract (English)	iii
Abstract (Arabic Version)المستخلص	iv
Table of contents	v
List of tables	viii
Chapter One: Introduction	
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 The Statement of the problem	2
1.3 The Objectives of the study	2
1.4 The hypothesis of the Study	2
1.5 The Questions of the study	3
1.6 The significance of the study	3
1.7 The Limits of the study	4
1.8 The Methodology of the study	4
Chapter Two: Literature Review & Previous Studies	
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Pragmatics	5
2.3 Speech acts	6
2.4 Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis	8
2.5 Implicature	10
2.6 Presupposition	12
2.7 Deixis	14
2.8 Reference	15

2.9 Inference	15
2.10.1 Related previous studies – First study	16
2.10.2 The second study	17
2.11 Conclusion	17
Chapter Three: Methodology	
3.1 Introduction	19
3.2 Population	19
3.3 Subjects	19
3.4 Tools of the Study	20
3.5 Procedures	21
3.6 Validity	22
3.7 Reliability	23
3.8 Summary	24
Chapter Four: Data Analysis and Discussion of Results	
4.1 Introduction	25
4.2 General description of result of the subject's performance.	25
4.3 Discussion of the test result – Part one	25
4.3.1 Section one: Speech Acts	25
4.3.2 Section two: Structure	27
4.3.3 Section three: Real World	28
4.4 Part Two	30
4.4.1 Section one: Speech Acts	30
4.4.2 Section two: Structure	32
4.4.3 Section three: Real World	34
4.5 Answers cross tabulation	36
4.6 Testing hypotheses –	36
4.6.1 The first hypothesis	36

4.6.2 The second hypothesis	38
4.6.3 The third hypothesis	39
4.7 Hypotheses discussion	40
4.8 General sum up of the analysis	41
Chapter Five: Conclusion, Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Studies	
5.1 Introduction	43
5.2 Results	43
5.2.1 Question one and hypothesis one	43
5.2.2 Question two and hypothesis two	43
5.2.3 Question three and hypothesis three	44
5.3 Recommendations	44
5.3 Suggestions for further studies	45
References	46
Appendices	48

List of Tables

Chapter Three		
Table 3.6	Chi-square Test the Validity of the Study	22
Table 3.7	Chi-square Test the Reliability of the Study	23
Chapter Four – Part One		
Table 4.1	Shows the results of questions 1, 2, 3 and 4	25
Table 4.2	Shows the results of questions 5, 6, 7 and 8	27
Table 4.3	Shows the results of questions 5, 6, 7 and 8	28
Chapter Four – Part Two		
Table 4.4	Shows the results of questions 1, 2, 3 and 4	30
Table 4.5	Shows the results of questions 5, 6, 7 and 8	32
Table 4.6	Shows the results of questions 5, 6, 7 and 8	33
Table 4.7	Shows the students' answers of the test in percent style.	36
Table 4.8	Descriptive statistics of part one in students' test	36
Table 4.9	Descriptive statistics of part two in students' test.	38
Table 4.10	Descriptive statistics of part three in students' test.	39
Table 4.11	Mean, mode and standard deviation	40
Table 4.12	Chi-square value test	41

Chapter One
Introduction

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Overview

Pragmatics as a subfield of linguistics is concerned with speakers' meanings. It views that their utterances are created in a continuum and not in a vacuum, i.e. a given utterance is embedded within a specific social context which helps a lot in recognizing what is unsaid and still being communicated. It goes beyond the language and does not consider words in isolation, i.e. words by themselves are not enough for the study of pragmatics.

Study pragmatics is a study essentially related to the idea of reference and inference; closeness or distance between the participants for they are considered an important event factors. To make it clear, the essence of pragmatics is that words do not refer; people make them refer, i.e., what matters is not what words might mean but what speakers wanted them to mean.

Pragmatics as a study is concerned with all connotative meaning of words and focuses on particular points such as presupposition, deixis, and conversational implicature. It has also to do with the different performed actions when communicating. That is, pragmatics is the study that deals with speech event and speech act.

This study aims at shedding light on some specific aspects of pragmatics (namely speech acts of request and declarations) and its effect on translation. It investigates the overlapping between pragmatics and translation; this will inevitably leads to a discussion of the concepts of cohesion, coherence and the relation with

semantics and pragmatics points of view. The study then highlights the general problems of pragmatic knowledge that faces the targeted learners during translating texts from Arabic language into English language and vice versa.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The problem which the present study attempts to investigate is the impact of pragmatic knowledge on Arabic–English translated texts. This study tries to investigate the students' performance in translating the pragmatic aspects; it tries to see whether those students are aware of these aspects; speech acts, implicatures, presuppositions, reference and deixes. And whether they call upon their pragmatic knowledge during the process of translation as well as how far their pragmatic knowledge does affect the process of translation in both languages; English and Arabic.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

This study tries to realize the following objectives:

1. To evaluate students' ability on the field of pragmatics and translation.
2. To show the importance of pragmatic knowledge and its effect on translations.
3. To promote students to learn a range of pragmatic skills such as how to deal with the dimension of pragmatics, account for the differences between English and Arabic languages and to handle translated texts effectively.

1.4 Questions of the Study

The study should provide answers for the following questions:

1. Do Sudanese EFL students at the University level have sufficient pragmatic knowledge to comprehend and translate speech acts expressions?
2. How far do the differences in language structure of Arabic and English affect translation?
3. In which field of language utterance (speech acts, real world or structure); the subjects involved in the study are performing better?

1.5 Research Hypothesis

As a result of this study, the following will be its hypothesis:

1. The students involved in the study are expected to encounter difficulty in translating speech acts expressions due pragmatic failure.
2. The different language families to which Arabic and English belong to; create a lot of problems in the field of translations.
3. Students are more competent in translating the real world expressions than the other two fields (speech acts & structure).

1.6 Significance of the Study

Differences between English and Arabic at pragmatic level can lead to different errors during translation process, and since most of the errors that learners of English language are likely to make when translating Arabic texts into English texts and vice versa, and since the lack of pragmatic knowledge is one of the main reasons behind such errors, then the significance of this study arises from the fact that most of the Sudanese EFL students at university level are not aware of pragmatic knowledge, especially in the field of translation because most of the time they translate the utterances literally regardless the context in which utterances were occurred. So, the study tries to find out the reasons behind the difficulties that face the

students during translating pragmatic aspects and suggest some solutions which may help them to understand and translate pragmatic aspects properly.

This study may be beneficial for both students and teachers of English language in the field of pragmatics.

1.7 Limits of the Study

The study is confined in a very specific type of learners at Sudan University of Science and Technology, particularly fourth year students'; Collage of Languages, English department.

The scope of this study specified the impact of pragmatic Knowledge on Arabic - English translated texts.

1.8 Research Methodology

The population of the study is 4th year students at Sudan University of science and technology, English department. The researcher will follow the descriptive method in this study.

The researcher will adopt the applied statistical method in order to find out the results.

Chapter Two

Chapter Two

Literature Review and Previous Studies

Chapter Two

Literature Review and Previous Studies

2.6 Introduction

The purpose of this study, which concerned with the impact of pragmatic knowledge on Arabic - English translated texts; is to provide the students with general ideas about pragmatic aspects, which might help them overtake the problems of different structures of the languages as well as translating English texts into Arabic language and vice versa properly. So the study aims at shedding the light on some specific aspects of pragmatics such as speech acts, implicatures, presuppositions, reference and deixes that may help the students in translating texts in both languages; English and Arabic. It investigates the overlapping between pragmatics and translation.

2.7 Pragmatics

According to Yule (1996), Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has, consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. Pragmatics involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. It requires a consideration of how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with who they're talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances.

Pragmatics is a level of linguistic description like phonology, syntax, semantics and discourse analysis. Like the other levels, it has its own theories, methodologies and underlying assumptions. It has its own

foci of interest, which may change over time, come to the fore or fade away completely (for example, at present politeness still commands a disproportionate amount of space in pragmatic journals while no one seems to be much interested in pragmatic presupposition anymore!). As we have seen in this book, pragmatics is concerned with issues not addressed within other areas of linguistics, such as the assignment of meaning in context — utterance meaning and pragmatic force — speech acts, implicature, indirectness and the negotiation of meaning between speaker and hearer. (*Thomas. 2013:184*).

Nowadays it is more fashionable (and probably more accurate) to think that meaning is the result of interpretive processes. We do not assume that all readers will come to share the same view of all aspects of a text's meaning (see Weber 1996: 3–5), though a general consensus is of course likely, and a grossly deviant interpretation may signal problems with the production or reception of the text. We will therefore understand a text differently according to what we bring to it: we cannot assume that it has a single, invariant meaning for all readers. Since Pragmatics is the study of language in use (taking into account elements which are not covered by grammar and semantics), it is understandable that stylistics has become increasingly interested in using the insights it can offer. We are in a world of (relatively) unstable meanings; the role of the reader is that of an interpreter, not a mere passive recipient. (*Black. 2006:2*).

2.8 Speech Act

Speech acts are the acts we perform when, for example, we make a complaint or a request, apologize or pay someone a compliment. The pragmatic analysis of speech acts sees all utterances in terms of the

dual function of "stating" and "doing things", of having a meaning and a force. An utterance in this view has:

- a- A sense or reference to specific events, persons or objects.
- b- A force which may override literal sense and thus really added effects such as those associated with, say, a request or admonition.
- c- An overall effect or consequence which may or may not be of the kind conventionally associated with the linguistic expression or the functional force involved. (*Blum-Kulka 1981:89*).

Speech acts are verbal actions happening in the world. Uttering a speech act, I do something with my words: I perform an activity that (at least intentionally) brings about a change in the existing state of affairs (hence the label, 'performative' utterances', that originally was attached to speech acts). For instance, if I say to a newborn human: "I baptize thee" in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" then this human being is from now on and forever a Christian-provided I took care to let my words be accompanied by the following of water on the infant's head (or some other body parts, in case of necessity). And if I belong to those who believe in the power of baptism, the world as a whole will now have changed as well: there will be one more Christian among the living. This insight, viz., that words can change the world, is not only of importance in a religious context (where such changes may be subject to one's beliefs or may depend, as in the case of miracles, on the strengthen of one's faith); it is an essential part of speech act thinking as well. And as such, it has become an important linguistic discovery. (*Mey. 2004:95*).

In assessing the potential of speech act analysis, translation theorists shared some of the misgivings expressed by critics of speech act theory. The theory was primarily more concerned with combating

alternative philosophical views than with attending to the practical aspects of dealing with language use in natural situations. Naturalness is a key term for the practicing translator or interpreter, and actual use of language can and does throw up different kinds of problems from those that speech act theory would wish us to focus on. For example, there is a huge difference between acts such as "promising" or "threatening" on the one hand, and more diffuse acts such as "stating" or "describing" on the other hand. Yet, both lists are merged under the single heading of illocutionary force. (*Baker.1992:180*).

2.9 Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis

In the field of linguistics there has been a tendency over the years to work gradually upward from smaller units to larger ones. During the period that preceded and immediately followed World War II, much attention was paid to the phoneme, a unit of sound that was regarded as the minimal unit of language. There was also a lively concern for morphology, the structure of words, which were thought to be composed of morphemes, which in turn were composed of phonemes. For example, the word hunted was analyzed as a sequence of two morphemes, hunt and -ed, and each of these morphemes was analyzed as a sequence of phonemes. Around 1960, a great deal of work and effort began to be devoted to syntax, the structure of sentences, which were in turn composed of words. Thus, language at that time was thought to possess a hierarchical structure like this:

Sentences

are composed of words,

are composed of morphemes,

are composed of phonemes.

Beginning around the 1970s, significant attention began to be extended to ways in which sentences combine within still larger stretches of language. Language beyond the sentence has been called discourse, and thus a new level was added to the hierarchy:

Discourse

is composed of sentences,

are composed of words,

are composed of morphemes,

are composed of phonemes. (*Genetti & Adelman 2014:201*).

Pragmatics is concerned with our understanding of meaning in context. Two kinds of contexts are relevant. The first is linguistic context – the discourse that precedes the phrase or sentence to be interpreted; the second is situational context – virtually everything nonlinguistic in the environment of the speaker. Situational context, on the other hand, is the nonlinguistic environment in which a sentence or discourse happens. It is the context that allows speakers to seamlessly, even unknowingly, interpret questions like Can you pass the salt? As request to carry out a certain action and not a simple question. Situational context includes the speaker, hearer, and any third parties present, along with their beliefs and their beliefs about what the others believe. It includes the physical environment, the social milieu, the subject of conversation, the time of day, and so on, ad infinitum. Almost any imaginable extra-linguistic factor may under appropriate circumstances influence the way language is interpreted. (*Fromkin. & et al. 2011: 167*).

2.10 Implicature

In conversation we sometimes infer or conclude based not only on what was said, but also on assumptions about what the speaker is trying to achieve. In the examples: "It's cold in here, Can you please pass the salt, and I have never slept with your wife"; the person spoken to derives a meaning that is not a literal meaning of the sentences. In the first case he assumes that he is being asked to close the window, in the second case he knows he's not being questioned but rather asked to pass the salt; and in the third case he will understand exactly the opposite of what is said, namely that the speaker has slept with his wife.

Such inferences are known as implicatures. Implicatures are deductions that are not made strictly on the basis of the content expressed in the discourse. Rather they are made in accordance with the conversational maxims, taking into account both the linguistic meaning of the utterance as well as the practical circumstances in which the utterance is made. (*Fromkin, et al. 2011: 175*).

Grice makes a distinction between natural and non natural meaning: Natural meaning involves a non-arbitrary relationship that is independent of any purposefulness or intent, as with *Those clouds mean rain*. Non natural meaning is arbitrary and intentional, as with *"masticate" means "chew."* This meaning relationship is arbitrary in that any other word could have come to have this same meaning, and it is intentional in that a person uses the word "masticate" intentionally to mean "chew" (as opposed to clouds, which don't intentionally indicate rain). Within the category of non-natural meaning, Grice distinguishes between what is said and what is implicated. What is said is truth-conditional, and what is implicated is

not. What is implicated, in turn, may be either conversationally or conventionally implicated, and what is conversationally implicated may be due to either a generalized or a particularized conversational implicature. (*Birner. 2013:62*).

Grace suggests that discourse has certain important features: for instance, it has connected (i.e. it does not consist of unrelated sequences); it has a purpose; and it is a co-operative effort. These features give rise to a general principle of communication, the Co-operative Principle, which participants are expected to observe:

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. (*Grice, 1975:45*).

Implied meaning which is not signaled conventionally derives from the Co-operative Principle and a number of maxims associated with it: Quantity, Quality, Relevance (Relation), and Manner:

Quantity: (a) Make your contribution as informative as is required (For the current purposes of the exchange).

(b) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Quality: (a) Do not say what you believe to be false.

(b) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Relevance: Be relevant.

Manner: Be perspicuous, specifically:

(a) Avoid obscurity of expression.

(b) Avoid ambiguity.

(c) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).

(d) Be orderly. (*Baker, 1992:225*).

As a brief account of how the term 'implicature' is used in discourse analysis, we have summarized the important points in Grice's proposal. We would like to emphasize the fact that implicatures are pragmatic aspects of meaning and have certain identifiable characteristics. They are partially derived from the conventional or literal meaning of an utterance, produced in a specific context which is shared by the speaker and the hearer, and depend on recognition by the speaker and the hearer of the Cooperative Principle and its maxims. For the analyst, as well as the hearer, conversational implicatures must be treated as inherently indeterminate since they derive from a supposition that the speaker has the intention of conveying meaning and of obeying the Cooperative Principle. Since the analyst has only limited access to what a speaker intended, or how sincerely he was behaving, in the production of a discourse fragment, any claims regarding the implicatures identified will have the status of interpretations. (*Brown & Yale. 1983: 33*).

2.11 Presupposition

An early discussion of the problem of presupposition appears in Frege (1892): If anything is asserted there is always an obvious presupposition that the simple or compound proper names used have a reference. If one therefore asserts 'Kepler died in misery', there is a presupposition that the name 'Kepler' designates something. (Frege 1892; cited in Levinson 1983: 169).

In short, to utter an assertion about Kepler is to presuppose that the term *Kepler* has a referent that is, to presuppose that Kepler exists (or at least existed, before he died in misery). Nonetheless, this bit of meaning is not conveyed in the same way that "died in misery" is conveyed; at the very least, it's apparent that the primary purpose of

uttering *Kepler died in misery* would not be to convey that the name *Kepler* designates something, whereas it would indeed be to convey that the entity designated by this name died in misery. Frege moreover noted one other crucial property of presuppositions, which is that a presupposition carried by a given sentence will also be carried by its negation. (*Birner. 2013:146*).

Philosophers have been concerned for some time with the status of sentences such as *The King of France is bald*. The question is whether, if there is, in fact, no King of France, such a sentence can be said to be false.

On one view originally suggested by Russell (1905), this sentence asserts both that there is a King of France and that he is bald, and therefore, if there is no King of France, the sentence must be false. There is an alternative solution, associated with Strawson (1964), which says that, in using expressions like *the King of France* (referring expressions), the speaker assumes that the hearer can identify the person or thing being spoken about. He does not, therefore, assert that the person or thing exist, but merely presupposes his or its existence. If the person or thing does not exist there is "presupposition failure" and the sentence is not false; it is neither true nor false, and there is a "truth-value gap", the same judgment, moreover, is made about the negative sentence *The King of France isn't bald*. This, too, has no truth value (but on the first view it would be true, since it would deny the false statement that the King of France exists). (*Palmer. 1981:166*).

2.12 Deixis

There are some very common words in our language that can't be interpreted at all if we don't know the context, especially the physical context of the speaker. These are words such as *here* and *there*, *this* or *that*, *now* and *then*, *yesterday*, *today* or *tomorrow*, as well as pronouns such as *you*, *me*, *she*, *him*, *it*, and *them*. Some sentences of English are virtually impossible to understand if we don't know who is speaking, about whom, where and when. For example: *You'll have to bring it back tomorrow because she isn't here today*. Out of context, this sentence is really vague. It contains a large number of expressions (*you*, *it*, *tomorrow*, *she*, *here*, *today*) that rely on knowledge of the immediate physical context for their interpretation (i.e. that the delivery driver will have to return on February 15th to 660 College Drive with the package labeled 'flowers, handle with care' addressed to Lisa Landry). Expressions such as *tomorrow* and *here* are obvious examples of bits of language that we can only understand in terms of the speaker's intended meaning. They are technically known as deictic expressions, from the Greek word *deixis* (pronounced like 'day-icksis'), which means 'pointing' via language. (Yule, 2006: 115).

There are a number of significant differences between most written and spoken discourse. This applies particularly to deictic expressions. Deictics are 'pointing' words. They include tensed verbs (temporal deixis), personal pronouns, demonstratives (*these*, *this*, *that*), and time and place expressions such as *now*, *then*, *here*, *yesterday*, *today*, and so forth. These words relate our linguistic expression to the current situation. They are bridges between language and the world. They take their basic meaning from the so-

called canonical situation of discourse: face-to-face interaction. (This is clearly the basis of human interaction: one notice, even on the telephone, the need to provide a context for some utterances.) In written texts, particularly in fictional discourse (where the 'world' is created by the text), they have a role that is somewhat different to that found in ordinary language use. (*Black. 2006:15*).

2.13 Reference

In discussing deixis, we assumed that the use of words to refer to people, places and times was a simple matter. However, words themselves don't refer to anything. People refer. We have to define reference as an act by which a speaker (or writer) uses language to enable a listener (or reader) to identify something. To perform an act of reference, we can use proper nouns (*Chomsky, Jennifer, Whiskas*), other nouns in phrases (*a writer, my friend, the cat*) or pronouns (*he, she, it*). We sometimes assume that these words identify someone or something uniquely, but it is more accurate to say that, for each word or phrase, there is a 'range of reference'. The words *Jennifer* or *friend* or *she* can be used to refer to many entities in the world. As we observed earlier, an expression such as *the war* doesn't directly identify anything by itself, because its reference depends on who is using it. (*Yule, 2006: 116*).

2.14 Inference

As in the 'Mr. Kawasaki' example, a successful act of reference depends more on the listener's ability to recognize what we mean than on the listener's 'dictionary' knowledge of a word we use. For example, in a restaurant, one waiter can ask another: *Where's the*

spinach salad sitting? And receive the reply; *He's sitting by the door.* If you're studying linguistics, you might ask someone, *Can I look at your Chomsky?* And get the response; *Sure, it's on the shelf over there.* These examples make it clear that we can use names associated with things (*salad*) to refer to people, and use names of people (*Chomsky*) to refer to things. The key process here is called inference. An inference is additional information used by the listener to create a connection between what is said and what must be meant. In the last example, the listener has to operate with the inference: 'if X is the name of the writer of a book, then X can be used to identify a copy of a book by that writer'. Similar types of inferences are necessary to understand someone who says that "Picasso is in the museum or we saw Shakespeare in London or Jennifer is wearing Calvin Klein". (Yule, 2006: 117).

2.15 Related Previous Studies

2.15.1 The First Study

This study was conducted in 2014 by Muawia Mohammad Elhusien Gaily; under the title of: The Impact of Planned Classroom Teaching on Developing EFL Learners Pragmatic Competence. This study carried out at Sudan University of Science and Technology of the requirement for the degree of PhD in English language teaching. The objectives of the study is to examine the pragmatic competence of the subjects as well as the effect of planned pedagogical on subjects' pragmatic production and comprehension of the four forms of English speech acts of apology, request, complaint and refusal, he came up with the results that all the subject involved in the study were pragmatically incompetent; "in spite of their relatively long period of learning English, they didn't show sufficient pragma-

linguistic and socio-pragmatic knowledge that would enable them to produce and realize the four target speech acts of apology, request, refusal and complaint".

This study is similar to the present study in two aspects; both of them, concentrated on speech acts expressions and used test for data collection. However, the present study differs from this study in that it has more two different aspects in addition to speech acts i.e. real world and structure to compare with speech acts..

2.15.2 The Second Study

(Triki, M. 2013) in his study A Pragmatic Approach to the Study of English/Arabic Translation Errors; which carried out at Constantine University 1, Algeria 2013, attempts to explore the interface between pragmatics and translation with a specific reference to English - Arabic/ Arabic - English real translations, its objectives is to account for the pragmatic errors made by translation students and to show the importance of pragmatic knowledge and competence in translation, and came out with the result that "translation students, most of the time does not give any importance to the pragmatic aspects in a certain text when translating it from English into Arabic or vice versa, they translated the original utterances literally regardless the context in which utterances occurred".

2.16 Conclusion

The above literature shows the different ideas of different researchers and writers about the reasons behind missing translation in the field of pragmatics which are encountered learners of English language as a foreign language. The researcher is in complete agreement with (Gaily. 2014) when he came up with the

result that the subject involved in his study were pragmatically incompetent. Also the researcher agreed with Triki (2013) when he said "translation students, most of the time does not give any importance to pragmatic aspects in a certain text when translating it from English into Arabic or vice versa, they translated the original utterances literally regardless the context in which they were occurred.

However, the current study is an attempt to shed more light on students' pragmatic competence and the reasons behind mistakes committed by some Sudanese Universities students while translating from English to Arabic and vice versa.

Chapter Three
Chapter Three
Research Methodology and Procedures

Chapter Three

Research Methodology and Procedures

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an account of how the research has been conducted in order to achieve its aims, and tests the hypotheses of the study. Since the study attempts to investigate the impact of pragmatic knowledge on Arabic-English translated texts, this chapter gives a description of method adopted by the researcher to find out the problems that facing Sudanese University students in using pragmatic knowledge during the translation process.

3.2 Population

The population of the study is Sudan University of Science and Technology, Collage of Languages, department of English, fourth year (semester eight) students. The total number of students is about eighty students.

3.3 Subjects

To collect data of the study, the researcher faced difficulty to convince the target students to sit for the test; the majority of them were avoided sitting for the test, complaining that they are busy with other things. Finally after a great effort, some of them agreed to sit for the test.

The total number of the students who sat for the test was forty students from Sudan University of Science and Technology, Collage of Languages, Department of English, fourth year eighth semester (male and female) during the academic year (2015 – 2016).

The sample above shares some important characteristics, which are:

Age: The majority of the students' ages are ranging between (20 and 25).

Background: All subjects have the same education background, but they have different Linguistic competences.

3.4 Tools of the Study

One tool is used in the study for the purpose of data collection, which is a test.

The test has two versions, English and Arabic. The respondents were presented with the items to which they were required to translate the questions in both languages (English and Arabic). Each version has divided into three sections; speech acts, structure and real world respectively.

3.4.1 Section One

This section focused on the problems that face student in translating speech acts of request, and declarations from English to Arabic and vice versa. It has four items in each version.

3.4.2 Section Two

This section focused on the problems that encounter students while translating the expressions that have some kind of structural problems in both languages. It also has four items in both versions.

3.4.3 Section Three

This section focused on the problems that encounter students while translating real world expressions from English to Arabic and vice versa. It has four items in both versions too.

3.4.4 The test was developed through the following stages:

It was design by the researcher in consultation with some colleagues.

It was then presented to the supervisor for approval.

Then it was refereed to six expert scholars from different collages who agreed that the test items were appropriate to measure the purpose they were designed for, except for some modifications and advices which were taken into consideration in the present version of the test.

After that it was piloted in small scale group of students. The pilot sample was seven students chosen randomly to do the test, their performance was as expected i.e. most of them were translating literally, ignoring the context where the items were occurred.

The reliability of the test was calculated by SPSS program.

3.5 Procedures

As shown in (3.4) the data of this study was collected from the answers of the subjects for the test distributed to them. The test has two sections, English and Arabic, each one includes twelve questions divided into three groups; speech act, structure and real world respectively. It was designed to measure the students' performance, and identifying their ability in these three fields.

Data collection took one day .The test was offered to the subjects on Wednesday 27 of July 2016 at 11:30 am after a piloted sample which conducted on Monday 25 of July 2016 at Sudan University. The nature of the test and aims of the study were explained to the subjects.

The pilot sample performed as expected, i.e. they were translated the expressions literally regardless the context in which they were occurred. The condition where the test held was somehow good, the weather was moderate in the class, the light was also good and the place is wide enough to accommodate the students and they were

given sufficient time to do the test. The students' competence and performance were evaluated according to their answers to the test papers. So, they were given scores according to their answers only.

3.6 Validity

Table (3.6): Chi-square Test the Validity of the Study

	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
First question	.400	1	.527
Second question	10.000	1	.002
Third question	6.400	1	.011
Fourth question	.900	1	.343
5th question	.100	1	.752
6th question	2.500	1	.114
7thquestion	.900	1	.343
8th question	32.400	1	.000
9th question	28.900	1	.000
10th question	12.100	1	.001
11th question	.900	1	.343
12th question	.900	1	.343

The Chi-square value test done to test the validity of the research hypotheses. The table (3.6) above shows the values of Chi-square as follows: (.400, 10.000, 6.400, .900, .100, 2.500, .900, 32.400, 28.900, 12.100, .900 and .900) while the second column represents the values of degree of freedom (N-1) which are as follows: (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) which means students either answered correctly or incorrectly. The values of the Sig. which is shown the last column are

as follows (.527, .002, .011, .343, .752, .114, .343, .000, .000, .001, .343 and .343), when compared to the value of the standard significance value, it can be noticed that most of the values are less than (.05), and it means that the hypotheses were accepted.

3.7 Reliability

Table (3.7): Chi-square Test the Reliability of the Study

	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
First question	6.400	1	.011
2nd question	10.000	1	.002
3rd question	25.600	1	.000
4th question	22.500	1	.000
5th question	10.000	1	.002
6th question	10.000	1	.002
7th question	.400	1	.527
8th question	4.900	1	.027
9th question	16.900	1	.000
10th question	8.100	1	.004
11th question	.400	1	.527
12th question	1.600	1	.206

The Chi-square value test done to test the reliability of the hypotheses. The values of Chi-square are as follows: (6.400, 10.000, 25.600, 22.500, 10.000, 10.0000, .400, 4.900, 16.900, 8.100, .400 and 1.600) while the second column represents the values of degree of freedom (N-1) which are as follows: (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) which means students either answered correctly or incorrectly. The values of the Sig. which is shown the last column is as follows (.011,

.002, .000, .000, .002, .002, .527, .027, .000, .004, .527 and .206). When compared to the value of the standard significance value, it can be noticed that all values except (7th, 11th and 12th) are less than (.05), and it means that the hypotheses were accepted.

3.8 Summary

This chapter has been concerned with the methodology of the study. So far, the data that collected through the test will be tabulated and treated statistically by SPSS program. The results in percentile form will be used to answer the relevant study question.

Chapter Four
Chapter Four
Data Analysis and Discussions of Results

Chapter Four

Data Analysis and Discussions of Results

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is intended to provide analysis on obtained data from students' test. The chapter gives a descriptive analysis along with brief comments on every table result. Every table includes four questions which represent one of the three sections, i.e. speech acts, structure and real world respectively. Forty students are asked to undergo the test with the paper divided into two parts with each part containing (12) questions to be solved.

4.2 General Description of the Result of Subject Performance

The data of the study aims at investigating the problem encountered (ELF) students. As it has been shown in section (3.4); the statistical analysis of data was carried out using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) program. Below are the descriptive statistics of the test results.

4.3 Discussion of Test Results - Part one (English Version)

4.3.1 Section One: Speech Acts

Table (4.1): Shows the results of questions 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Valid	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4
Correct	02	23	08	14
Incorrect	38	17	32	26
Total	40	40	40	40

The question number one in the table (4.1) above witnesses the lowest percentage ever so far for participants' correct answer; only (5%) of them succeed in guessing the correct answer, while the other (95%) fail to give the correct translation of the expression "*Have you got any cash on you?*". The high percentage of incorrect answers is an indication of students' weakness in the field of pragmatics because they were translated the expression as questioning the addressee whether he have money or not.

In the second question where participants were asked to give equivalent translation for the expression "*I sentence you to be hanged by the neck until you be dead*", (57.5%) of them got the correct answer, while (42.5%) missed to guess the correct translation. Such expression is believed to be familiar for most of the participants because they might come across it as the percentages prove.

In the third statement, as the case in the previous one, participants who get the correct answer get lower frequency and hence lower percentage (20%) as they give an equivalent translation for the expression "*The princess broke the bottle on the ship and names it Titanic*". This result indicates that this expression is difficult to understand by most of the students because they didn't come across such expressions before.

The fourth question in table (4.1) above shows (35%) of the participants gets the correct answer, while the rest (65%) were unable to guess the correct equivalent translation of the expression "*Can you please pass the salt?*" Participants' answers vary differently, for some; the participants translate 'salt' as 'Salad'. This result

indicates that there is lack of vocabulary as well as pragmatic knowledge among the participants.

Summary: According to the result above, it can be said that students make more mistakes when answering the questions of the first section of part one (speech acts) due pragmatic failure. This result supports the first hypothesis positively.

4.3.2 Section Two: Structure

Table (4.2): Shows the results of questions 5, 6, 7 and 8.

Valid	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Question 8
Correct	05	09	23	17
Incorrect	35	31	17	23
Total	40	40	40	40

In the table (4.2) above, the result of question five; only (12.5%) of participants make successful translation of the expression *"Are you still asking such critical questions?"* The maximum percentage (87.5%) hints on a serious problem about pragmatics in this question. The answers of the students in this question vary differently because of vocabulary lack as well as pragmatic failure.

Again in question six in the table (4.2) above where participants were asked to give an equivalent translation of the expression *"The candidate went out to his carriage and the others followed in twos and threes"*. As seen in the table, (22.5%) of the participants get the correct answer while (77.5%) flop to give the right answer because of the differences between the participants' native language and the

target language in counting system especially in dual numbers because the later one contains only singular and plural.

In question seven, participants get the correct equivalent translation with percentage (57.5%), while (42.5%) get the wrong answers. Apparently, participants easily get the general meaning of the expression *"I had been driving along very slowly in the terrible weather when suddenly a large dog had appeared in front of me"* because the participants have a considerable knowledge about perfect tense. This result proved the claim of concentrating on teaching grammar.

In the last column of table (4.2) question eight, (42.5%) of the participants succeed in guessing the correct equivalent translation of the expression *"I had been waiting for over an hour when he finally turned up and explained that he had been held up by a fallen tree in the road"* while (57.5%) fail to get the correct translation. This example similar the previous one; it indicates the same result.

Summary: In the second section of part one (structure); the average of the correct answers is less than the other two sections. This result indicates that structure is also a challenge for the students. So it can be said that this result supports the second hypothesis positively.

4.3.3 Section Three: Real World

Table (4.3): Shows the results of questions 9, 10, 11 and 12.

Valid	Question 9	Question 10	Question 11	Question 12
Correct	19	02	20	20
Incorrect	21	38	20	20
Total	40	40	40	40

In the table (4.3) above; the ninth question, participants who get the correct answer get the lower frequency and hence lower percentage (47.5%) than others as they give an equivalent translation for the expression "*Please rescue me! I've been here since last month, and my food will run out tomorrow*". Because the intended meaning of this expression is the same as its literal one, then the result proves no much difficulty for most of the students.

The second column of the above table shows the statistical result of question ten in (part one) where (5%) of participants gets the correct answer as they translate the expression "*Can you give me a lift?*" While most of the participants with high percentage (95%) were missed in getting the correct equivalent translation. This result proves that most of the participants pragmatically lack the knowledge that helps them give the proper translation of this expression. So they missed because of difficulty.

In the eleventh question; as the case in the first question, a half of the participants succeed in finding the correct equivalent translation with percentage (50%) while the other half were unable to guess the correct answer. This result indicates facility for students as they know how pragmatically give the correct translation of the expression "*get the picture*" in the sentence "*I've explained it hundred times, but she just doesn't get the picture*". Because of the context situation.

As shown in the above table (4.3), the twelfth question shows that a half of the participants succeed in picking the right answer with percentage of (50%), while the other half were unable to pick the correct answer. This result indicates that the expression "*Babies for*

Selling" is quite easy to be understood as *children's materials for sailing* since there are no babies for sailing according to the participants' culture.

Summary: The third section of part one (real world) seems a bit easy than the previous two sections, it can also be said that students make mistakes when answering the questions of the third part then the third hypothesis is also positively supported.

4.4 Part Two (Arabic Version)

4.4.1 Section One: Speech Acts

Table (4.4): Shows the results of questions 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Valid	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4
Correct	11	09	03	02
Incorrect	29	31	37	38
Total	40	40	40	40

The table (4.4) represents the result of the first four questions in the second part of the test where participants were asked to give an equivalent English translation of different Arabic expressions.

As seen in the table, only (27.5%) of the participants get the correct answer of question one in part two, while (72.5%) of them fail to get the correct answer of the expression " (فضحك علي في نشوة طفل وهو يفكر في طلب يد " /*fədāhikā ʔli:jn fi: nəfwæti tɪflin wəhʊwə jʊfəkɪrʊ fi: təlɒbi jəd seɪdə min wæli:dəhæ θʊmæ qæla bindɪfɑ; jæ muʔlim ʔli:jn jətluβʊ əlqʊrbɔ minkʔ*).

Most of the participants translate the expression literally due to their pragmatic weakness.

In the second question of (part two), participants are asked to give equivalent translation of the expression " ما شاء الله ... إن ضغطك أفضل من " ضغطي. كما أن التحليلات الأولية تبشر بأن قلبك كقلب الأسد. (*/mæfæ allæhu...innæ dæxtukæ əfdəlu min dæxti:, kəmæ annæ əltəhli:ləti ələwəlæ tʊbæfrʊ biənnæ qəlbukæ kəqəlbʊ əlɒsædi/*). As seen in the table, only (22.5%) of participants were give correct equivalent translation and the rest (77.5%) failed to give the correct answer. Here also the students were unable to find out the intending meaning of the similarity between a lion's heart and the fitness of the patient which means good healthy, because of their ignorance of pragmatics.

Looking at result of question three in the table (4.4) above; an indication of pragmatic problem can be seen from the minimum number of the participants with correct answer of percentage (7.5%), and the researcher notices that giving an equivalent translation of Arabic expressions into English makes it more difficult for the participants. The expression "سبحان مغير الأحوال لقد تغير ذلك الشقي كثيرا، ولو لا تلك اللكمة أعلى جبهته لقلت إنه ليس على فرج" (*/subhænə muxəjirʊ ələhwæl fəqəd təxəjərə zælikæ əlfəqi:ʊ kəθi:rən, wə ləʊ lə tɪlkə əlləkmatʊ fi: lələ zəbhətʰi: ləqultʊ innəhu leisə əli: fəɾəʒ/*). proved that pragmatically hard to translate and the percentage (92.5%) of the incorrect answer is a clear proof.

In question four, like the case in the previous question, participants still get lower correct answers in translating the expression:

فترة إنتظار ثملة بالدفء تحت الغطاء الثقيل. (*/fətrəʊ intiðærin θəmilətʊn biddɪfi təhtə ælxitəʊ æθəqi:l/*).

Only (5%) succeed in guessing the correct translation, while the rest fail to get the correct answer with high percentage (95%). This result indicates a serious problem of failure because of vocabulary lack.

Summary: As seen, the participant performance in the second part of the test is below the expectation especially in section one (speech acts), it seems difficult to translate the intended meaning correctly; they were always translated the texts literally. This result supports hypothesis one positively.

4.4.2 Section Two: Structure

Table (4.5): Shows the results of questions 5, 6, 7 and 8.

Valid	Question 5	Question 6	Question 7	Question 8
Correct	06	09	19	17
Incorrect	34	31	21	23
Total	40	40	40	40

The table (4.5) above represents the results of questions 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the second part of students' test.

In the first column of table (4.5) above; question five, participants get lower correct answers' percentage as only (15%) of them succeed in guessing the correct answer while (85%) unable to get the correct answer as they asked to give an equivalent English translation of the expression: "لم تقع عين رجل إحدى إبنتيّ...مبارك... مبارك يا ست أمينة". (/læm tʌdʒu eɪnəjʊ rəzʊlʊn əlæ ihdə ibnətɛɪə ... mʊbærəkʊn mʊbærəkʊn jæ sit əmi:nəh/).

This result indicates that the participants have a problem in dealing with pragmatics even in their native language because they were weak in pragmatics.

In question six, (22.5%) of the students get the correct answer as they translate the expression "إنها مجموعة نادرة فقد شملت كل الفئات المطلوبة من المجتمع: معلمتان و معلمان ، طبيبان و طبيبتان ، شرطيان و شرطيتان، تلميذان و تلميذاتان، ..الخ. (/innəhæ məzmuʊɒtin nədɪrətɪn fəqəd ʃəmɒlt kʊlʊ əlfɪæti əlmətlu:bəti; muəllimæni wə muəllimətæni, tilmi:ðæni wə tilmi:ðætæni, tæbi:bæni wə tæbi:bətæni, ʃʊrtijæni wə ʃʊrtiɪrətæni ... ilæx/). While (77.5%) get the incorrect answer because of the differences between the participants' native language and the target language in the dual system of gender as mentioned before there is no duality in English language.

The above table (4.5) which also represents the result of question seventh of (part two), shows that (47.5%) of participants pass in guessing the correct answer which means the difference is slight, while (52.5%) of the them fail to get the correct answer in translating the expression "لقد قلت لك عدة مرات إن هذا الأمر ليس من شأنك." (/ləqd qʊltʊ ləkɒ əddəti mərætɪn innə hæðə ælɒmrə leɪsə min ʃə'nʊkə/).

This result indicates that a considerable number of students can deal with affirmation sentences easily and that is the reason behind this result.

The last column of table (4.5) which represents the statistical result of the last question in part two, shows that (42.5%) of the participants get the correct equivalent translation of the expression:

لم تخبرني. بلى إني قد أخبرتك من قبل. (/lə'm tʊxbɪrni: bələ inni: qəd əxbərtʊkə min qəblʊ/).

While (57.5%) fail to guess the correct translation. This is the same case like the previous one.

Summary: In part two, section two; the result was similar to the previous one. From the students' answers of the test, structure can be considered one of the main problematic area of translation.

4.4.3 Section Three: Real World

Table (4.6): Shows the results of questions 9, 10, 11 and 12.

Valid	Question 9	Question 10	Question 11	Question 12
Correct	16	13	18	10
Incorrect	24	27	22	30
Total	40	40	40	40

The table (4.6) above represents the results of questions 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the second part of students' test.

Again in the ninth question of the second part of students' test. As it is shown in the table (4.6) above, (40%) of the students get the correct answer, while (60%) get the incorrect answer of the expression:

لم أفكر آنذاك بالزواج. ناقشت الفكرة بهدوء مع والدتي فإنتهينا إلي نتيجة مرحة ومشرفة هي: أن القطار لم يفت
 بعدعلي/ (lɒm ʊfəkɪrʊ æniðækə bilðəwæzi. næqəftʊ əlfɪkrətʊ bihʊdʊɪn

mɒæ wælid fəntəheɪnə ilæ nəti:zətɪn mərihətɪn wə mʊfriqətɪn hɪə ənnə əlqɪtær lɒm jəfʊt bɒdʊ ɒleɪə/).

Because they were deal literally with it. This result indicates that most of the participants have no knowledge about pragmatics.

In question tenth, the table shows that only (32.5%) of the students succeed in giving the correct translation of the expression "أسرع وإلا فاتك "

القطار. and in spite of the similarity of the intended and literally meanings of this expression, most of the participants fail to guess the right translation. This result and the previous one strengthen the claim that EFL students face obstacles in field of pragmatics in on hand, and in another hand, there is great relationship between pragmatic knowledge and giving correct translated text. In the above table which also shows the percentages of question eleventh in part two, (45%) of the students get the correct answer as they translate the expression:

هل تعلم أن الكرة الأرضية تدور حول نفسها وحول الشمس في ذات الوقت
 (/həl tə'ləmə ənnə əlkurtəi ələrdi:ətʊ tədu:rʊ həwlə əffəmsi wə həwlə nəfsihə fi: ðæti əlwɔqti/).

This question differs little bit from the previous ones since it reflects a scientific truth; and must be translated as it's, but a considerable number of students were missed because of vocabulary weakness.

In the twelfth question in the second part of the test where participants are asked to give equivalent English translation of the Arabic expression "كنت أفكر، وأنا أرى الشاطئ يضيق في مكان ويتسع في مكان، أن ذلك شأن الحياة، تعطي بيد وتأخذ باليد الأخرى".
 (/kuntʊ ʊfəkɪrʊ wə ənə əræ əlfætɪrʊ jədi:qu fi: məkænin wə jətɔsi fi: məkænin, ənnə ðælikə ʃəlɪnʊ əlhjæti tuti: bijədin wə təxuðʊ biljədi əlɪxræ/).

As seen in the table above, (25%) of the participants get the correct answer while (75%) of participants fail to get the correct answer. Because of vocabulary lack.

Summary: In part two, section three (real world); the students' performance is a bit better than the other two sections, but it is also

below the desirable result. In general it can be said that the students' performance in part one is a bit better than part two.

4.5 Answers Cross Tabulation

Table (4.7) shows the students' answers of the test in percent style.

			Answers		Total
			Correct	Incorrect	
English	Speech Acts	Count	44	116	160
		% of Total	09.2 %	24.2 %	33.3%
	Structure	Count	53	107	160
		% of Total	11.0 %	22.3 %	33.3%
	Real World	Count	67	93	160
		% of Total	14.0 %	19.4%	33.3%
Total		Count	164	316	160
		% of Total	34.2 %	65.8 %	33.3%
Arabic	Speech Acts	Count	28	132	160
		% of Total	5.8%	27.5%	33.3%
	Structure	Count	56	104	160
		% of Total	11.7%	21.7%	33.3%
	Real World	Count	53	107	160
		% of Total	11.0%	22.3%	33.3%
Total		Count	137	343	480
		% of Total	28.5%	71.5%	100%

4.6 Testing Hypotheses

4.6.1 The First Hypothesis

Table (4.8) Descriptive Statistics of Part One in Students' Test.

	Mean	Mode	Std. Deviation
First question	1.5500	2.00	.50383
Second question	1.2500	1.00	.43853
Third question	1.3000	1.00	.46410
Fourth question	1.4250	1.00	.50064
5th question	1.5250	2.00	.50574

6th question	1.6250	2.00	.49029
7th question	1.5750	2.00	.50064
8th question	1.0500	1.00	.22072
9th question	1.0750	1.00	.26675
10th question	1.2250	1.00	.42290
11th question	1.5750	2.00	.50064
12th question	1.4250	1.00	.50064

The table above shows the descriptive statistics of the first part in students' test. Looking at table (4.8) which consists of the mean values (average) of the first hypothesis "*The subject involved in the study are expected to encounter difficulties in translating speech acts expressions due pragmatic failure*", the researcher can notice that the value of mean in total is (1) which means students' number of incorrect answers is more than their number of correct answers.

The column of mode (the most frequent value) shows that the mode is (1). This result strengthens the claim in the average column.

The last column shows the standard variation value which is homogenous with value not more than (.523).

In general, according to the values of the mean (1), it can be said that students make more mistakes when answering the questions of the first part which in turn means that the first hypothesis is accepted.

4.6.3 The Second Hypothesis

Table (4.9): Descriptive Statistics of Part Two in Students' Test.

	Mean	Mode	Std. Deviation
First question	1.3000	1.00	.46410
2nd question	1.2500	1.00	.43853
3rd question	1.1000	1.00	.30382
4th question	1.1250	1.00	.33493
5th question	1.2500	1.00	.43853
6th question	1.2500	1.00	.43853
7th question	1.5500	2.00	.50383
8th question	1.3250	1.00	.47434
9th question	1.1750	1.00	.38481
10th question	1.2750	1.00	.45220
11th question	1.5500	2.00	.50383
12th question	1.4000	1.00	.49614

The table (4.9) above shows the descriptive statistics of the second part in students' test where students are required to give equivalent English translated text from Arabic expression.

As noticed in the table which consists of the mean values (average) of the second hypothesis "*The different language families to which Arabic and English belong to; create a lot of problems in the field of translations*", the value of mean in total is (1) which means students' number of incorrect answers is more than their number of correct

answers.

The column of mode (the most frequent value) shows that the mode is (1). This result strengthens the claim in the average column.

The last column shows the standard variation value which is homogenous with value not more than (.423).

In general, according to the values of the mean (1), it can be said that students make more mistake when answering the questions of the second part which in turn means that the second hypothesis is accepted.

4.6.4 The Third Hypothesis

Table (4.10): Descriptive Statistics of Part Three in Students' Test.

	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
First question	6.400	1	.011
2nd question	10.000	1	.002
3rd question	25.600	1	.000
4th question	22.500	1	.000
5th question	10.000	1	.002
6th question	10.000	1	.002
7th question	.400	1	.527
8th question	4.900	1	.027
9th question	16.900	1	.000
10th question	8.100	1	.004
11th question	.400	1	.527
12th question	1.600	1	.206

The Chi-square value test done to test the validity of the hypotheses. As noticed in the table (4.10) above which consists of the mean values (average) of the third hypothesis *"The students are more competent in translating the real world expressions than the other two fields"* The values of Chi-square are as follows: (6.400, 10.000, 25.600, 22.500, 10.000, 10.0000, .400, 4.900, 16.900, 8.100, .400 and 1.600) while the second column represents the values of degree of freedom (N-1) which are as follows: (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) which means students either answered the test correctly or incorrectly. The values of the Sig. which is shown the last column is as follows (.011, .002, .000, .000, .002, .002, .527, .027, .000, .004, .527 and .206). When compared to the value of the standard significance value, it can be noticed that all values except (7th, 11th and 12th) are less than (.05), and it means that the third hypothesis is accepted.

4.7 Hypotheses Discussion

Table (4.11): Mean, Mode and Standard Deviation

	Mean	Mode	Std. Deviation
Speech acts	1.2750	1.00	.45220
Real world	1.2750	1.00	.45220
Structure	1.2750	1.00	.45220

The table (4.11) above shows the descriptive analysis (mean, mode and standard deviation) of speech acts, real world and structure. As shown in the table, in speech acts the total mean was not more than (1) and the mode is (1) while the standard deviation is homogenous with value not more than (.452) and the same value can be applied to the real world and structure.

4.8 Chi-square Value Test

Table (4.12): the total variable analysis on the three hypotheses

	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Speech acts	8.100	1	.004
Real world	8.100	1	.004
Structure	8.100	1	.004

The table (4.12) above shows the total variable analysis on the three hypotheses. The first hypothesis "*The subject involved in the study are expected to encounter difficulties in translating speech acts expressions due pragmatic failure*" is accepted in general statistics as it is value of significance (.004), and the same statistics can be applied on the two other hypotheses: "*The different language families to which Arabic and English belong to; create a lot of problems in the field of translations*" for the significance value (.04) and "*The students are more competent in translating the real world expressions than the other two fields*" for the same significance value (.04).

4.9 General Sum up of the Analysis

Looking at the tables of frequencies and percentages of the first part of the test, the researcher notices that students' percentages of correct answers tend to be lower than their percentages of incorrect answers which indicate the existence of pragmatic failure when it comes to translating English expressions into Arabic ones. This claim is in total agreement with the hypothesis that states "*The subjects*

involved in the study are expected to encounter difficulties in translating speech acts expressions due to pragmatic failure".

The second part of the test even shows the difficulties in more clear shape as the percentages of students' incorrect answer are higher than their equivalent correct percentages. The second hypothesis "*The students are more competent in translating the real world expressions than the other two fields (speech acts and structure)*" is in total agreement with what is obtained as a result in this section.

Chapter Five

Conclusion, Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Studies

Chapter Five

Conclusion, Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Studies

5.1 Conclusion

The study was conducted to investigate the impact of pragmatic knowledge on Arabic – English translated texts.

The findings of the study show that the participants under the study most of the time translated the expressions literary regard less the context where they were occurred, because of their pragmatic failure as well as vocabulary lacking. For example, in the field of structure there are differences between Arabic and English in counting system and gender which caused a lot of problems for the students during translation process.

5.2 Results

1. The first result of the study shows that (85%) of the students involved in the study make mistakes when answering the questions of the first section of the students' test (speech acts).
2. The second result of the study shows that (77.3%) of the students make mistakes when answering the questions of the second section of the students' test (structure).
3. The third result of the study shows that (75%) of the students make mistakes when answering the questions of the third section of the students' test (real world expressions).

5.3 Recommendations

To sum up, the results indicate that students most of the time, do not give any importance to the pragmatic aspects in a certain text when translating it from English into Arabic or vice versa. In other words,

most of the students, fourth year – English Department at Sudan University College of Languages, are not aware of the importance of pragmatics in translation. Most of the time, they were translate the original utterances literally regardless the context in which the utterances occurred. Therefore, the researcher recommends the followings:

1. The importance of teaching pragmatics to students in the department of English language at Sudan University of Science and Technology.
2. English departments at Sudanese Universities were not focus on pragmatics. Yet, students in English departments should know about pragmatics, in order to be more competent to make a clear link between the text and its pragmatic features before starting translate it.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies

Throughout this study, the researcher has noticed that the following may need to be research:

1. To investigate deeply about pragmatics in general and its effect on translation process.
2. To investigate in depth the importance of pragmatic knowledge and the satisfactory strategies that suit University level.

References

References

- Brown, Gillian & Yule, George. 1983, *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Mona. & Malmkjer, Kirsten. 2011, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London and New York.
- Betty J. Birner. (2013) *Introduction to Pragmatics*, United Kingdom.
- Blum-Kulka, S. 1981, *The Study of Translation in View of New Developments in Discourse Analysis*. London & New York. Longman.
- Carol Genetti. & Allison Adelman. 2014, *How Languages Work, An Introduction to Language and Linguistics*, United States of America. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Elizabeth Black, (2006). *Pragmatic Stylistics*, Edinburgh University Press Ltd. Great Britain.
- F. R. Palmer, 1981. *Semantics – 2nd ed.* United Kingdom. University Press. Cambridge.
- Fromkin, V. Rodman, R. & Hyams, N. *An Introduction to Language 9*. Canada 2011.
- Gaily, M. (2014), *The Impact of Planned Classroom Teaching on Developing ELF Learners Pragmatic Competence. A study of Sudanese Universities*. Unpublished PHD Thesis of Sudan University of Science and Technology.
- Grice, H. P. (1975), 'Logic and conversation' in (eds.) P. Cole & J. Morgan *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts* New York: Academic Press.
- Mey, Jacob L. (2004), *Pragmatics: An Introduction – 2nd ed.* United Kingdom.
- Mona Baker, 1992, *In Other Words. A course book on translation*, 2 Park Square. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN.

Thomas, Jenny. 2013. *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*, New York, NY 10017, USA.

Triki, M. (2013), *A Pragmatic Approach to the Study of English/ Arabic Translation Errors*, Faculty of Letters and Languages, Department of Foreign Languages University Constantine 1 (Algeria). Online edition www.journalacademica.org © 2013 Journal Academia Foundation.

Yale, George. 2006. *The Study of Language Third Edition*, Cambridge University Press. New York.

Yale, George. 1996, *Pragmatics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Appendices

Appendices

1- Covering Letter:

Date: /07/2016

Dear Doctor,

I am doing an M.A. thesis at Sudan University of Science and Technology under the title "Investigating the Impact of Pragmatic Knowledge on Arabic-English Translated Texts", bellow are some expressions which are used to collect the data of the study and supposed to answer the question: How far does pragmatic knowledge affect the process of translation?

Therefore, cold you please devote some time to referee the test which is going to be conducted on the University students – English department fourth year, translating from English to Arabic and vice versa.

Your cooperation is highly appreciated.

Best regards
Abdulgadir Hassan Abdulgadir

2- Students' Test:

Name:

Date: Jul.2016

Age:

Male:

Female:

Dear students, the following are some expressions that are used to carry out an M.A. research concerning the proficiency of (EFL) students in the field of pragmatics and its effect on translation. The study under title of: Investigating the Impact of Pragmatic Knowledge on Arabic - English Translated Texts. The researcher would be highly appreciative if you do the test appropriately and honestly. Be assuring that the information of this test will be treated as confidential for research purpose only.

Translate the underlined expressions in the following sentences:

Part One:

1. Have you got any cash on you?

.....
.....

2. I sentence you to be hanged by the neck until you be dead.

.....
.....

3. The princess broke the bottle on the ship and names it Titanic.

.....
.....

4. During meal: Can you please pass the salt?

.....
.....

5. Are you still asking such critical questions?

.....
.....

6. The candidate went out to his carriage, and the others followed in twos and threes.

.....
.....

7. I had been driving along very slowly in the terrible weather when suddenly a large dog had appeared in front of me.

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

8. I had been waiting for over an hour when he finally turned up and explained that he had been held up by a fallen tree in the road.

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

9. If you have found a message in a bottle lying on a beach. The message says:

"Please rescue me! I've been here since last month, and my food will run out tomorrow!"

.....
.....

10. Can you give me a lift?

.....
.....

11. I've explained it hundred times, but she just doesn't get the picture.

.....
.....

12. In a shop signboard, "Babies for selling".

.....
.....

Part Two:

1- فضحك علي في نشوة طفل (وهو يفكر في طلب يد سيدة من والدها) ثم قال بإندفاع:
يا معلم علي يطلب القرب منك.

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

2- "ما شاء الله ... إن ضغطك أفضل من ضغطي. كما أن التحليلات الأولية، تبشر بأن قلبك كقلب الأسد".

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

3- "سبحان مغير الأحوال فلقد تغير ذلك الشقي كثيراً، ولولا تلك اللكمة في أعلى جبهته لقلت إنه ليس علي فرج".

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

4- فترة إنتظار ثملة بالدفء تحت الغطاء الثقيل.

.....
.....

5- "لم تقع عين رجل علي إحدى ابنتي ... "مبارك ... مبارك يا ست أمينه.

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

6- إنها مجموعة نادرة فقد شملت كل الفئات المطلوبة من المجتمع: معلمتان , معلمان , طبيبان و طبيبتان , شرطيان و شرطيتان , تلميذان و تلميذتان , الخ.

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

7- لقد قلت لك عدة مرات إن هذا الأمر ليس من شأنك.

.....
.....
8- لم تخبرني بلى إنى قد أخبرتك من قبل.

.....
.....
9- لم أفكر آنذاك بالزواج. ناقشت الفكرة، بهدوء، مع والدتي فانتبهينا إلى نتيجة مرحة ومشرقة هي أن القطار لم يفت بعدعلى.

.....
.....
10- أسرع وإلا فاتك القطار.

.....
.....
11- هل تعلم أن الكرة الأرضية تدور حول نفسها و حول الشمس في ذات الوقت.

.....
.....
12- كنت أفكر . وأنا أرى الشاطئ يضيق في مكان ويتسع في مكان . أن ذلك شأن الحياة تعطي بيد وتأخذ باليد الأخرى.