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1 Introduction

This Master’s Thesis deals with revision and self-revision in translating and partly proofreading as well. It aims to describe the process of revision and its main characteristics, and investigate it in practice, hopefully bringing some valuable results concerning revision in the real conditions. To this end, the Thesis comprises secondary as well as primary research and strives to associate, where possible, the theoretical information with the results to be obtained.

Revision is a means of achieving quality in translation, it is the activity that follows the transfer of a source text to be translated, thus, it means reviewing the translated text a translator has produced. The general principle of revision is very clear and simple: check what you have done to be sure it is good. A good translator should never call a translation finished without checking it, as well as a cook would never serve a meal without tasting it. Revision can be carried out by the translator him/herself; then it is called self-revision, or there may be a reviser checking someone else’s translation. Revision shares a lot of characteristics with translation as such; some facts that can be said about translation generally are naturally true for revision as it is its subordinate process. However, revision also has its own peculiarities. A similar relation exists between revision and proofreading, which usually involves checking a non-translated text; it is also analogical to revision in many ways and definitely is a part of the wind-up phase of the translation process. That is why it is partly treated in the Thesis, too.

Revision (or any aspect of it) has not been a greatly investigated feature of translation so far, neither has revision an established position in translation training. However, it plays a very important role in the process of translation and knowing more about it can help increase the quality of translation. Although the translation product is what most people think of in the context of translation, the Thesis is more process-oriented and looks rather into what the process does than what it produces. Anyways, the quality of the process generally ensures the quality of the product.

This Master’s Thesis is divided into two parts. The theoretical part draws on the available literature and several studies concerning revision and offers different perspectives on different aspects of revision. First, it defines the main concepts (as for example quality in translation, revision, self-revision and proofreading) and it treats the theoretical aspects of revision, i.e. translation and revision models, norms in revision, or its position in Translation Studies. Furthermore, it deals with the profession of reviser, the revision process, the reviser’s role in a translation company, or the strategies and the techniques of revision.
The practical part, on the other hand, involves primary research comprising two component investigations. Firstly, there is a specialised corpus as a means of researching the textual material collected from students of the master’s programme English-language Translation in the Department of English and American Studies. This corpus will be built up and analyzed and the outcome will be discussed. Secondly, revision will be scrutinised via evaluation of a questionnaire on revision given to these students. This questionnaire provides data on self-revision and should compensate for an uneven proportion of the corpus material on revision of translations of others versus self-revision. These two means of investigation are, obviously, different in terms of the primary source. While the corpus analysis is text-based, the questionnaire draws directly on people’s statements about revision. Following the recent trend in Translation Studies, the empirical research applies analytic as well as descriptive approaches.

The data to be obtained will hopefully be of some use to the academics and can be generalised or replicated. The Thesis might be of benefit to translation trainees who wish to learn more (or even only the basics) on revision.
2 Theoretical part

2.1 Quality in translation

Quality in translation, i.e. both quality of the process and the product of translation, is not something that should be taken for granted. Although it seems to be a simple and clear concept, achieving quality in translation is not onefold and stating what features a quality translation should possess is not uncomplicated either.

This is how Newmark views a good translation: “Is a good translation (a) one that satisfies the customer (…), (b) one that fits its purpose (…), (c) typically, accurate – as long as the original is accurate – and elegant (…)? Note that (a) and (b), though they are important and unexceptionable, could apply to any product, and they ignore the original text, whilst (c) humdrum as it is, attempts to be specific to translation. As I see it, customer satisfaction is the proof of a translation’s ‘success’, but it is not a measure of its quality. (Customers, like readers/receptors, can be idiots.)” (Newmark 1998:105) Apparently, Newmark would agree with Mossop in the matter of attributes of a good translation; Mossop also says it is accuracy what makes a perfect translation. He also adds that “quality is always relative to needs”, so “[t]here is no such thing as absolute quality. (Mossop 23)

2.1.1 Quality assessment and quality control

“Quality control and quality assessment\(^1\) are contributions to quality assurance. This is the full set of procedures applied before, during and after the translation production process, by all members of a translating organisation, to ensure that quality objectives important to clients are being met.” (Mossop 118) Quality controls can be carried out by translators, revisers, work providers or other operators. (Gouadec 76)

Assessing quality of a translation means evaluating its strengths and weaknesses and judging its acceptability and appropriateness. As Mossop explains, “[q]uality assessment may take place after delivery. Assessment is not a part of the translation production process. It consists in identifying (but not correcting) problems in one or more randomly selected passages of a text in order to determine the degree to which it meets professional standards and the standards of the translating organization. (…) Whereas quality control (i.e. ‘checking’ or ‘revising’) is text-oriented and client/reader oriented, quality assessment is business-

\(^1\) also termed quality evaluation
oriented. It is a part of the work managing the organisation’s current and future operations.” (Mossop 117-118)

2.1.2 Defining quality control procedures

To err is human and even the best translators make mistakes. Revision, self-revision and proofreading are forms of quality control (Mossop 164) which may improve translated texts mightily, polish them, so that they give a good account of a translation company or translators themselves.

Nevertheless, in the field of Translation Studies, expressions such as revision and checking are far from consistently used and there is a great number of different words denoting concepts more or less similar to revision, self-revision, and proofreading, the three key concepts of this Thesis. Verbs like edit, copyedit, proofread, revise or rewrite are being used in a variety of overlapping or contradictory ways; proof-correction, checking, reviewing, re-reading are also related to the wind-up activities, but employed in an inconsistent way. Some of the experts use the terms rather intuitively, apply their own terminology, or consider some of them virtually synonymous. The following definitions should provide clarification of the meaning of the most basic terms.2,3

Editing “[m]eans finding problems in a text which is not a translation and then correcting or improving it, with particular attention to making the text suitable for its future readers and for the use to which they will put it.” (Mossop 1) Editors work in an editorial office of a newspaper or a magazine or in a publishing house and do not concern themselves with translation.

“Revising, is an aspect of the profession of translator” (Mossop 1); it “is that function of professional translators in which they identify features of the draft translation that falls short

2 For the purposes of this thesis, the terms which are not defined will be used in their elementary meaning or will not be used at all.

3 As far as the Czech terminology is concerned, it seems to be a little bit confusing, too. The Union of Interpreters and Translators provides this definition: “Korektura překladu: tj. porovnání překladu s originálem a oprava překladu. Za korekturu považujeme revizi tehdy, je-li v překladu nutno provést jen drobné úpravy a opravy. Pokud jsou provedeny hlubší zásahy do textu, jedná se o přepracování, nikoli korekturu.“ <http://www.jtpunion.org/spip/article.php3?id_article=15> Let us proceed from the assumption that the generally recognised Czech – English equivalents are korektura – proofreading, revize – revision. It seems that only comparative re-reading of a translation is encompassed under the term korektura (a term which is also used in the field of book publishing for unilingual proofreading.)
of what is acceptable and make appropriate corrections and improvements.” (Mossop 109) Revisers are qualified translators who work in a translation company or as freelancers, usually, they are translators as well. Self-revision is the translator’s own check of the draft translation. (Mossop 116)

Proofreading means looking for and correcting mistakes (most often mistakes in spelling, grammar, text layout, etc.) in a text, be it a translation or not. “Proofreaders can be non-translators; [they] do only those forms of checking and correcting that don’t involve comparing the translation to its source.” (Mossop 109) In the context of this Thesis, proofreading will be considered a sub-process of revision of a translation.

Post-editing means editing machine translation; it is applied in order to achieve higher speed in the translation process, however at the risk of lower quality. As a result, the translator has a mixed translation/revision job to perform. (Mossop 115, Goudec 26) Machine translation output is often unrevisable. (Mossop 24)

From the perspective of a process model of translation, the phase of quality control procedures, i.e. revision, self-revision and proofreading, is near the end of the translation process, and therefore offers an ultimate chance to improve the translation at hand. These activities are effortful, as they require certain skills not everyone possess (to be discussed in chapter 1.2.2 Competence and skills) and involve scrutinising every sentence, phrase, collocation, word, letter, punctuation mark. As far as the time management is concerned, Newmark says that “the last stage of translating, which takes up between a half and two thirds of total translating time, unless the SLT [source-language text] is exceptionally easy and dull.” (Newmark 1991:105)

The main aim of quality control procedures is achieving and maintaining a certain level of quality of translated texts. If draft translations went straight to client and were published or used for the predetermined purpose without any final control at all, the standard of translations would be deep below the current one. Consequently, translations and companies or individual translators responsible for them would do a very unfavourable impression on clients and the public in general.

Every translator is (implicitly or explicitly) expected to check their translations. Sometimes self-revision is enough, some other time, there are two or three revisers checking a translated document, but the need for revision is always relative and depends on the nature of the

---

4 In the context of this Thesis, the terms revision/revising may comprise both, self-revision and revision of a translation done by somebody else.
document to be translated – its features, intended purpose and prospective readers. (Robinson 13) Generally speaking, the more important the translation, the more important its quality control. The revision of a translated legal document will definitely be more detailed than revision of a translated party invitation.

The texts to be revised range from technical documents, novels or short stories, advertising texts, and many others. They may be of high importance or, as Mossop calls them, ‘ephemeral’. Chakhachiro’s and Mossop’s opinions on the need for revising such texts are different: “I believe, however, that Mossop makes general statements that fail to take into account the main purpose of most revisions, namely to assess the accuracy of a translation in terms of meaning and style and to make the emendations required. I disagree with Mossop, who states in his discussion of the revision of ephemeral texts that “[t]here is no point spending five minutes searching for the mot juste if the translation is going to be read quickly and tossed away.” (2001: 100) “Ephemeral translations” range from informational texts on medical, health, and legal issues to news articles, for all of which I hold that it is important to convey the source-language message with all its terminologies and nuances.” (Chakhachiro)

All the three quality control procedures are characterised by several variables: accuracy, speed, effortfulness, and a few more (for instance visual aspects as colour settings, etc.) and the performance of these tasks is affected by the skills and knowledge of the reviser/proofreader and different conditions – stress, general mental state, working preferences and so forth. (Robinson 34; Pilotti, Maxwell, Chodorow) These aspects are interconnected and the way they change and manifest themselves will be discussed in the chapter 1.5.4. Mental processes behind revision, in which results of research on revising and proofreading will be presented.

2.1.3 Revision

In the widest sense of the word, revision can be understood as checking a product of a drafting activity (most often a piece of writing, e.g. a law) in order to make sure it constitutes an acceptable outcome, and possibly changing it. This definition represents a general use of the word including its usage outside Translation Studies. On this general level, we can say that “revision is one of writing processes (as well as for example generating or rewriting a text); one of the processes involved in written verbal production”. (Roussey and Piolat 765) Secondly, in a narrower sense and already within the field of translation, revising generally signifies assuring that a translation is acceptable and of a required quality. We can perceive it as a process which includes finalising, checking, proofreading, and amending a target text.
Thirdly, in its most concrete sense of the word, revision constitutes a particular stage in the wind-up process of translation during which a reviser reads the target text once again, compares the source text against the target text, looks for any possible inaccuracies, mistakes of transfer of meaning, grammatical and stylistic errors and much more. Furthermore, in the context of translation, revision can be viewed either as a tool of quality assurance, a component process in the production of a translation, or a specialist translation assignment to fulfil.

Raymond Chakhachiro states that “[t]he aim of revision is to ensure that a translation is an accurate and acceptable rendition of a source text for the target readership.” (Chakhachiro) It helps minimizing the risk of not fulfilling the translation’s purpose. (Pym 2005:71) In addition to this fundamental and self-explanatory purpose of revision, there are several more. In the article entitled "A Comparison of Translation Quality Assessment Practices", Brunette identifies five methods of used for quality testing, which correspond to particular purposes. It is namely “(a) didactic revision, or formative revision, intended as a careful comparison of source and target texts with the aim of improving translator's skills; (b) translation quality assessment (TQA), related to management techniques and performed over a portion of the translated text with the aim of measuring productivity or quality according to a predefined checklist; (c) quality control, which is also an instrument for management purposes and ensures the compliance of the final translation, i.e. translation as a product, with a set of requirements, norms, and criteria established in advance; (d) pragmatic revision, usually performed by an individual reviser who does not have contact with the translation and whose aim is to improve the final version; and (e) fresh look, which considers the translation as an independent text that has to conform to target readers' expectations.“ (Pérez)

“In a context of translation quality assessment, revision is retrospective and concerned with the accuracy of the product in terms of meaning and style. It uses principles of comparative analysis (Reiss 2000), yet it is not aimed at studying differences between two languages, but rather focuses on equivalence or “matches” and “mismatches” between the source and the target texts.” (House 1977 in Chakhachiro) Indeed, (a) comparative reading is one of the two basic techniques applied during revision. It involves checking the source text against the target text, reveals possible mistranslations, omissions or additions, and tends to have micro-level focus. (Mossop 152) Second, there is (b) unilingual reading, which entails reading the target text without looking at the original document (Newmark 1991:105). This “independent” or “blind” reading, however, cannot be considered the same as proofreading,
since there may still occur discrepancies which are beyond the scope of proofreader’s competence.

The conditions in which revision may occur and the concrete tasks it may involve are divers. “[R]evision often constitutes part of the process of the translation of publications for the market. As such, revision can range from (occasionally) reviewing of source texts to suit target-readers’ culture to stylistic revision in the target language and presentation of the translation in a proofread and formatted lay-out.” (Chakhachiro) Nevertheless, there may be cases when revision is not applicable to a translation. If a translation is extremely poor retranslating should replace revision in order not to waste precious time and money. Furthermore, too many corrections in a text may be confusing and chaotic, therefore, a text to be revised should be of revisable quality. (Gouadec 78) In other cases, when the target text should be significantly adjusted to the target audience, transposing or adapting are more appropriate than revision. In Mossop’s words “Just as editing is not rewriting, revising is not retranslating.” (Mossop 24)

2.1.3.1 Revising the work of others

The main difference between revising someone else’s work and self-revising stems from the number of operators participating in the overall process. Since, in this case, there is (as usual) an author, a translator and a reviser (or two, three of them), sometimes a proofreader, too. There arise a number of interpersonal relationships which may or may not complicate the situation.

The reviser and the revisee are obviously two different persons and the power they have over the text at hand is inferred from the hierarchy existing between them. Whether a suggested change becomes an actual amendment depends on their position. The revisee may be the reviser’s subordinate – a junior translator or a student; in such case, the changes will usually be accepted. The revisee may also be a fellow-colleague; in that situation a discussion about the changes suggested or made can take place. (Mossop 175) It should also be noted, treating the status of the revisee, that even if he or she is an experienced translator and his or her work is usually very good, the reviser must always be attentive and critical and must not rely on the reputation of the revisee.

Aside from this social dimension of revising others, another crucial aspect comes into play. Every translator-reviser has their own image of a good translation solution. Working as a reviser means being open to solutions of others and not imposing one’s own ideas on someone whose work is acceptable and good. Mossop wisely advises that “one thing you must do is...
recognise the validity of approaches to translation other than yours (…) it’s someone else’s
work, and you must respect their approach unless the (…) term they have used could seriously
mislead the reader about the intent of the source text.” Moreover, it is advisable to distinguish
necessary changes from simple suggestions. (Mossop 175-176)

All the changes a reviser makes in a target text must be objectively justifiable. Claiming
that a wording simply does not feel right is not enough. Basing every correction on a reliable
argument is essential, in case the reviser needs to discuss the revised text with the translator,
or the work provider. (Mossop 176)

When revising it is also worth realizing that the translator knows more about the text at
hand then the reviser, the former one worked on it a lot, made research and, hopefully,
checked his or her work. Therefore, one should think hard before changing anything in the
translation, especially if it is a text from a field one is not expert on. Unwarranted or unneeded
changes cost time and money and they can only create unpleasant interpersonal relationships.

2.1.3.2 Self-revision

Self-revision is generally considered a process inherent to every translation process; no
professional translator submits their work unless they read it at least once from the very
beginning till the end, no scanning or spot-checking. (Mossop 167) Robinson calls it
“checking” and presents it as an aspect of the so-called translator’s reliability. (Robinson 13)

However, it has more constraints and limits than revising the work of other translators,
since the whole process includes only one person, and only the knowledge and the set of skills
of the one person can be drawn on. It is therefore necessary to apply different strategies to
change the perspective in order to make self-revision truly efficient. (To be treated in chapter
1.6 Strategies of revision)

When revising one’s own translation, the expectancy effect and familiarity effect manifest
themselves more than in revising somebody else’s translation. These phenomena make it
harder to detect mistakes and may generally hinder accuracy of self-revision.

Unlike when revising a translation of somebody else, when self-revising, one has the feeling
of ownership of the target text, which may, on the one hand, obstruct objectivity and
efficiency of revising, but, on the other hand, also provide stronger motivation.

2.1.4 Proofreading

As mentioned before, proofreading, which ensures that no mistakes are contained in a text,
does not have to be exerted on translations only. Proofreading is a standard procedure in the
process of generating any text, during which a proofreader, whose most essential quality is the
knowledge of the language (usually mother tongue) in which he or she proofreads, searches
for errors – most often grammatical, stylistic, or typographical ones.

Proofreading original texts does not differ from proofreading translated texts in the process
itself, but the two cases may diverge in the type of mistakes that might occur. There are
certain errors peculiar to translated texts (e.g. lack of idiomaticity due to interference). More
on error types in chapter 2.12 Revision parameters an error types. Proofreading original texts
would fall under the field of Czech Studies.

A question arises whether we can in fact claim that a revised text is automatically
proofread, because it should not contain any mistakes at all. If speaking generally, then yes. A
revised translation is one that is ready for print/publication or whatever its pragmatic purpose
is. If speaking technically, maybe, since proofreading can be perceived either as a sub-part of
revision process or as another process that should follow revision in the overall work on a
translation task.
2.2 Being a reviser

In this chapter different aspects of the profession of a reviser and proofreader as well will be dealt with. Revising is not a very prestigious occupation, although it requires a great expertise and responsibility. Reviser stands inconspicuously between the translator and the reader and his goal is to negotiate existing or potential problems in the target text so that all the parties involved are satisfied. As Mossop states, “[R]eviser is (…) a language therapist who improves the text to ensure ease of mental processing and suitability of the text for its future readers”. (Mossop 17)

The principal mission of a reviser is “going back over the text at least once for evaluation purposes, and making changes in the text to correct whatever problems were detected during the evaluation.” (Roussey and Piolat 765) In order to be able to do that a reviser needs to possess certain qualification and skills.

Hansen terms the ensemble of qualities and skills Profile parameters and states that it covers ”(a) the subjects’ individual, cultural, and educational backgrounds, habits, life-stories, and self-evaluation, as well as (b) their experiences and working conditions as professionals” (Hansen 195). They also say that “every translator has his/her individual combination of abilities, skills, and knowledge, an individual pattern, and that this individual competence pattern can be recognised and identified in both (a) his/her translation product and (b) his/her behaviour in the course of the translation process. (Hansen 190) These statements are true for revision and revisers, as well. In revision of others, unlike in self-revision, two (or more) individual patterns and thus potentially different profile parameters come into play, which can enrich the process and product of translation, however, it can also cause troubles if these patterns and parameters are contradictory.

2.2.1 Qualification and status

In terms of qualification – who the reviser actually is? According to Chakhachiro, he or she “may be a professional translator, a bilingual person, or even a monolingual speaker, depending on social and financial means”. (Chakhachiro) Monolingual speakers in the position of revisers cannot obviously ensure the best outcome of their work, as they are not able to carry out comparative reading of the source and the target text. A bilingual person would certainly do a better reviser, although not everybody speaking two languages possesses the required theoretical knowledge to be able to do the job properly. Obviously, the best option is to have a translator doing the revision tasks, since translation skills contribute greatly
to their successful completion. As far as experience is concerned, it is as valuable as in translation itself and it only comes with time and hard-work. In this respect, Alves and Gonçalves distinguish between novice translators – narrow band – and experienced translators – wide band. The former group (more relevant to this Thesis) is according to them characterised by the “inability to deal with revision as an independent phase” and “erratic cognitive rhythms in this phase”.

Unlike translators who usually were not trained for the job (Robinson 4), “revisers generally come from a linguistic rather than scientific background” (Mossop 133). This is fortunate, since revision should not be left in hands of people without appropriate qualification. (Chakhachiro) It is often the case that senior translators become revisers and check the work of their less experienced colleagues. Such professionals are, however, paid higher and revision thus becomes a pretty expensive article. From the practical point of view, “every minute devoted to revising someone else’s translation is a minute not devoted to preparing a new translation.” (Mossop 140)

The status of revisers may be the same as for translators: in-house employee, contractor or freelancer. Nevertheless, working on one’s own requires self-discipline, i.e. accurate self-revision. A freelancer is not forced to check their work by any company procedure and no colleague will revise or proofread the target text he or she produced. Therefore self-employed translators should devote a substantial amount of time and effort to self-revision. As it is the case with freelance translators, revisers of this status have to tender for (…) contracts. In most cases however, they will be contacted by translators or by work providers or, in a translation service or company, be chosen by the project manager (Gouadec 61). On the other hand, working in a translation company usually provides the assurance of quality control of the translation product. Yet, one should not rely on a colleague’s correcting of the translation and always strive for the best he or she can do.

2.2.2 Competence and skills

As far as the competence and skills needed for revising are concerned, there is a great number of them. Certain are pertinent to the work of translators; others are relative to general working skills. They vary according to whether one proofreads, revises or self-revises.

It is possible to say that a translator has to possess revision competence and that a reviser should possess translation competence. This is obvious in self-revision when translator equals reviser. “Translation competence means, among others, that problems and errors during the reception and formulation phase are recognised by the translator and that he/she has problem
solving and revision strategies available to solve the problems and improve the text.” (Hansen 191) Indeed, revision, as well as translation, consists in identifying problems and sorting them out. Pym describes translation competence as “The ability to generate a series of more than one viable term (…) for a transferred text.” (Mansell 3) This is in fact what happens between recognizing a problem and resolving it. Nevertheless, it is not enough, the ability to select from among the generated options is crucial in revision. (Dimitrova 32) Consequently, translation competence in revision means the ability to find a mistake and deal with it. After all, problem solving and decision making is the essence of revision.

Generally put, revisers and proofreaders have to have a critical eye for detail, stamina, patience and ability to concentrate. They should know how to fight fatigue and stress, if deadlines are tight and they have to work quickly but still accurately. In any case, “revisers are expected to move through the text far more rapidly than the original translator” (Mossop 96). After all, “enhanced speed means enhanced income”. (Robinson 95)

First of all, reviser – and proofreader even more – has to have an excellent knowledge of the target language in terms of grammar, punctuation rules, vocabulary, and stylistics. It means not only knowing how and with what tools the language works but also knowing in what reliable source one can find solutions when in doubt. Sometimes revision reports explaining what was corrected in the draft translation and why are required to be drawn and the responsible person has to be able to explain clearly and using the appropriate terminology of linguistics reasons for the changes made. In revision or proofreading, there should occur no unjustifiable correction. Mastering the source language is than the domain of revisers, as they work with both, the source and the target text when carrying out a comparative analysis and assessing their equivalence. In addition to that, it is necessary for these occupations to keep up with new codifications and educate oneself continuously.

In our times of technology, it is indispensable for revisers and proofreaders to be able to work with computers. It is safe to say that many areas of translation are facing similar demands to keep up with new software and stay proficient in computer skills. (Asadi and Séguinot 535) These involve for example formatting in word processors, using different programs, electronic or online dictionaries and terminology banks, creating back up files, checking files for viruses, searching information on the web, etc.

Thirdly, excellent reading skills are needed. This may seem as an obvious argument, but reading for comprehension – i.e. regular reading – is in its nature different from reading for revision and involves different skills. “When we read, we read for comprehension. Our eye movements are rapid, too rapid to see the details within words – failing to see some words at
all (West 1983, 287). As soon as we grasp the meaning for comprehension, our eyes move ahead. Significantly, “we see what we expect to see. The brain corrects for omissions and oversights” (West 286-87). It is not surprising then, that simple reading is not an effective proofreading strategy.” (Madraso)

Aside from reading skills, interpretive skills come in useful, too. Text-interpreting is a part of revising as well as proofreading and it helps recognizing a problem in the text. Furthermore, Dimitrova mentions an ability translators need to possess – and reviser even more. It is the ability “to evaluate short target language stretches (words, collocations, phrases and clauses) with regard to target language correctness and stylistic and pragmatic appropriateness in relation to the translation purpose. This evaluation is a demanding part of the process, given the fact that these stretches of target language linguistic material are constantly compared to source language stretches in the process, requiring the translator to constantly switch between the two languages.” (Dimitrova 36)

Another skill of a good reviser or proofreader is learning from one’s mistakes – if these are revealed – because reviser or proofreader may often be the last person working on a certain document. One will also enhance one’s knowledge when looking up correct solutions to a particular problem.

Time management is important in any profession as well as in self-revision. It is necessary to plan one’s work carefully, so that there is enough time for translation and self-revision. (Madraso)

Since revision and proofreading lie in decision-making a considerable self-confidence is needed in order for the reviser to be able to overrule translator’s decision. Much like translation, revision and proofreading are solitary occupations and the burden of anxiety may be significant. For this reason, working with somebody else is beneficial, however, it is not always possible. “Only experience can give the considerable self-confidence” (Mossop 9).

These professions also require a certain mental flexibility, so that the reviser/proofreader respects the author’s/translator’s style of writing. Ability to empathise also facilitates cooperation with other operators – translators, clients, another reviser or proofreader, and the like.

2.2.3 Practical aspects

As any other profession, revising has its down-to-earth and day-to-day aspects. These can be viewed as constraints or benefits and are usually common for the work of translator as well.
To begin, revisers “are human beings, with options, attitudes, beliefs, and feelings” (Robinson 31). The enjoyment of what they do as a job is important to them as to anyone else. Maybe the most interesting benefit is the same as for translating – the intellectual enrichment that comes with every new task one is assigned. It can also be the diversity of texts or even of tasks, since stereotypical work usually does not bring inner satisfaction. “It is now often the case that employers are seeking out ‘translator-editors’ – people they can hire, whether as salaried employees or as contractors, to translate, revise, edit and possibly carry out other language-related tasks.” (Mossop 1)

However, there may be tough tasks, uninteresting tasks, or tasks with tight deadlines. A good reviser is expected to handle all of them equally well. As far as the performance is concerned, “[t]he estimate given by some sources is approximately 5,000 words a day, but the number will obviously be higher in case of strict deadlines.” (Kuběna 18) This is, of course, related to the income. It is evident from the pricelists of individual translating agencies which also offer proofreading service that where rewards for proofreading reach the peak, prices for revising come followed by remuneration for translating which is situated on the top of an imaginary financial scale. Proofreading, namely, is often regarded as a supplementary source of income, for proofreading it unfortunately does not offer as satisfying revenue as revising or translating.

“A central issue for all translators, and in particular for revisers, is the trade-off between time and quality.” (Mossop 113-114) Clients want the translation to be reliable, fast and cheap (Robinson 7), but these three attributes do not always go together and it is revisers’ task to balance interests of the parties involved. Even if the deadline is manageable, there are a number of requirements, or rather operators to be satisfied: the author and/or client, translator, possibly the company, and prospective readers. There are numerous variables which may influence reviser’s decision in such matters, but at the end of the day, at least according to Mossop, the target text reader should be the priority factor: “As for balance between source-text author and reader/client, this is of course the central problem of translation (source versus target orientation) (…) Turning to revisers now, in this approach they do not act like a second translator. Instead, the reviser favours future readers of the text. The reviser tries to meet the needs of readers always, and the needs of others, if possible.” (Mossop 112-113)

Another significant factor for the work of a reviser also stems from the participation of more individuals in every translation/revision task. “Translation involves a network of active social agents, who may be individuals or groups, each with certain preconceptions and interests. The translative operation is a matter of transactions between parties that have an
interest in these transactions taking place. (Hermans 26) “The translator is therefore required to foster communicative skills that are necessary for the interaction with the client, the project manager and the proofreader.” (Kubêna 9) In this context, Chakhachiro claims that revisers should be independent of translators, clients, and agencies, since personal bias “can lead to inefficiency and bitter debates”. (Chakhachiro)

2.2.4 Ethics of revising

The ethical rules that apply to translators are applicable to revisers, too. The difference is that the reviser has to consider the person of the translator in addition to other people who are involved in the translation process. In every change the reviser makes, he or she has to take into account the needs and requirements of the author of the translation. This is not the case with self-revision, where one only has moral commitments to oneself and the motivation to ethical behaviour is therefore self-generated.

The reviser should only mark those mistakes that need marking. Not only is it a wasteful exercise to correct appropriate and acceptable renderings of the original text, but “[i]t is unethical to make unwarranted stylistic changes as well as to withhold justified changes in order to discredit or unduly credit the translator.” (Chakhachiro) Still, from the psychological point of view revisers may tend to introduce changes only in order to show they do their job, as it can look like they did not revise a text in which no corrections were made. Reiss (2000:4) and Chakhachiro agree that subjectivity in revision can be remedied, by revisers’ basing intuitive corrections “on the linguistic, stylistic, and pragmatic characteristics of the languages involved”. (Reiss in Chakhachiro) It is widely acknowledged that “[t]here is, for us no such thing as the definitive solution to a translation problem (by definition, translation problems allow for more than one solution)” (Pym 2005:73).

In Newmark’s words “The translator’s first loyalty is neither to the writer nor to the reader but to the truth.” (Newmark 1998;204) “Thus as a reviser you could not let pass a draft translation that reproduces inadvertent nonsense in the source text simply because the client has asked for a very close translation (…) Some might argue that contradictory or otherwise bad writing should be reproduced in some cases in order to make clear to the reader the poor quality of the writing in the source text. But this is not a proper function if translation” (Mossop 113). As a matter of course, reviser should in no case distort the meaning of the text. (Robinson 30)

Further, every professional has to know their limits, be it temporal or intellectual limitations. It is not right to accept a job one cannot do well because he or she has not
sufficient expertise, linguistic competence or time for it. Refusing such a task or facing the consequences (bad reaction from the side of customer, author, or translator, lack of free time) is what a reviser should do. (Chakhachiro) Lastly, the reviser must always admit his/her fault (when he/she realises it), or failure to resolve a problem. (Mossop 160, 177)
2.3 Revision in Translation Studies

Despite the growing interest in revision\(^5\), the literature on revising as such is very scarce; this is a statement on which several experts in the field agree (Mossop, Chakhachiro, Pym). As it is obvious from the most quoted names in the Thesis, the first two are ones of the handful of authors who deal with revision concisely and in detail. While Raymond Chakhachiro focuses on freelance translators and grasps revision as a researcher and a theorist, Brian Mossop tends to write rather about translators/revisers working in a company, treats revision in a more practical way, and offers some very useful advice for students\(^6,7\). Pym’s opinion is that “[r]eviewing becomes an extremely important part of the translation process, meriting its own theorization. (Pym 2010:133)

Speaking of theory, when working on a translation, “one consciously or unconsciously follows a theory of translation”, because to translate is to choose. Choice depends on criteria. Criteria are subordinate to a theory. (Newmark 1998:115) Revision is a part of such a theory. Chakhachiro claims that besides this one, there are two more disciplines pertinent to revision: contrastive analysis, and translation criticism. Contrastive analysis is in fact the technique used in the process of revision, which “require[s] a comprehension of the message of the source text, a fair assessment of the process of translating, and familiarity with the target-language culture, audience, and literature (in the broadest sense of the word).” (Chakhachiro) Thirdly, revision for quality is a subpart of translation criticism – to be found on Holmes’ map of Translation Studies as “a process and function-oriented exercise and translation criticism proper.” (Chakhachiro)

Revision obviously falls under translation as such. It is related to different disciplines and sub-disciplines and can be viewed from different perspectives; it is relative to quality assessment, study of models and processes, cognitive and psychological aspects, research methods, and so forth.

\(^{5}\) Between 20 and 22 October 2011, Mediterranean Editors and Translators Meeting 2011 was organised, the topic of which is Quality in English translation and editing — from research to practice and back. A workshop on revision is on the agenda too.

\(^{6}\) Especially in chapter 12 of his book Editing and Revising for Translators, students can find useful information and advice applicable to their school work.

\(^{7}\) Mossop, of course, states English examples and describes phenomena relative and peculiar to English language; this was taken into account and rethought in respect to Czech.
2.3.1 Revision in translation teaching (studying)

Although this Thesis is not pedagogy-oriented, it is necessary to discuss the matter with respect to translation training, however briefly.

Revision is not mentioned very often in translation seminars and lectures, let alone treated in detail, but it is always (somehow implicitly) required. Every student knows, it is good to revise their work. “Revision should be the final act of translating and proofreading should be the final act of the revision process” (Madraso), nevertheless, the few facts translation trainees learn about revision at university are not enough. Proofreading and revising skill are not innate, and therefore should be taught. (Madraso) Mossop says that “[w]hat students mainly need to do is internalise principles and procedures for editing and translating.” (Mossop 10), i.e. to include revision in their common practice of work and to learn how to make it efficient. Lower efficiency and deficiencies in proofreading skills, according to West and Madraso, lies in “a lack of instruction rather than ‘carelessness, laziness, lack of motivation, dishonesty or even mediocre verbal skills’” (West 286). In other words, general verbal ability is a prerequisite for proofreading, but there are no specific skills that guarantee proofreading ability.” (Madraso and West in Madraso)

Revision in translation instruction can take three forms. A student’s self-revision is (hopefully) the most common one and should be adopted by every translation trainee. Secondly, students can revise their work mutually. It is a fair and very useful method. Fellow students may mark changes in the drafts right away, or write recommendations and commentaries. The problem is that the trainees do not have to have the same amount of knowledge and experience. Such cases are unfortunate, especially when a mediocre student revises a draft of a more advanced student. Thirdly, it can be teachers who revise drafted target texts of students, but it is of course quite time-consuming for them. In the two last options, a lack of commentary or explanation can cause confusion; it is not enough to realise one has made a mistake. A closer clarification of the error should be provided, so that one can learn a lesson from it.

Revising schoolwork is not the same as revising a genuine translation job. “[T]he concrete practice of the many lofty ideals of academe (…) is not observed in professional market.” (Chakhachiro) It is mainly the deadline what makes the difference. (Newmark 1998:52) “According to McAlester, the common practice in universities evaluates translation in vitro (i.e. translation for the sake of translation), which could be remedied by borrowing and employing real-life situations and real-life assessment from the professional practice. He
proposes that one criterion of evaluation in respect to both L1 and L2 translation can be the time it takes the reviser to correct a given target text. This is a fairly simple and straightforward method of assessment.” (McAlester in Šebőková 28)
2.4 Norms in revision

Norms play a significant role in revision, they “are relevant to the entire transfer operation, not just the actual process of translating” (Hermans 27). Revision as a sub-process of the translation operation is guided by numerous norms.

Norms are able to establish firm quality assessment criteria, which are needed. (Chakhachiro). They also guide the reviser and govern and facilitate the decision-making process which is at the core of revision (and of course translation in the first place). “If it were not, translators faced with a source text, however short or simple, would either be unable to opt for one solution rather than another and throw up their hands in despair, or make entirely random decisions, like a computer gone haywire” (Hermans 28). If the key action in translation is decision-making, in revision it is decision re-making or verifying.

It could be said that there are two sorts of norms relevant for revision. First, there are norms explicitly established in writing: grammar books, terminology databases, certification criteria documents, and so forth. Following these norms is more rule-based. Second, norms can naturally arise from the activity of revising; these are rather principle-based. They can be for example social conventions, ethical principles, obligations to the parties involved in a translation job, or norms stemming from a translation brief. Also the source text can be included in this category; as House mentions “qualitative statements presuppose that a target text ‘must be compared with the [source text’s] textual profile which determines a norm against which the appropriateness of the target text is judged’.” (House in Chakhachiro) Of course, every revision task is different, consequently, different norms should be observed. All in all, the individual requirements relative to a certain revision job constitute the norms to be considered.

The above mentioned certification criteria are set out in terms of individual standards. “Translation agencies and organizations that realise the importance of revising translations to ensure quality develop reviewing criteria that stress accuracy of meaning and style” (Mossop 84). Revisers together with other members of a translating agency participate in the process of certification, if need be. (Gouadec 59)

One of the relevant certificates is the ISO 9000 series (revised every five years) which pertains to the quality of management processes. Sadly, it takes a rather general attitude and does not take into consideration the field of activity and other characteristics. Translation as a

very complex task definitely deserves a more tailored approach, if high quality of the process and consequently the translation product is to be achieved.

Norms relevant for revisers and proofreaders are for instance ČSN 01 6910 *Editing Papers Processed by Text Editors*⁹ from 1997, treating punctuation, abbreviations, correct form of numbers, dates, and addresses, text format and layout, correct form of letters, charts and so forth, or ČSN ISO 2384 (010164) *Presentation of Translations*¹⁰.

Last but not least, the European norm (ČSN) EN 15038¹¹ issued in 2006 by the European Committee for Standardization¹² represents a more specialised treatment of quality certification. Besides articles concerning work conditions and the person of translator, the newly added fourth article says that all translations should be at least proofread, if not revised. This norm should provide a higher quality assurance.

---

¹² www.cepres.cz
2.5 Revision as a process

Revision is a multidimensional activity (Roussey and Piolat 788) and as a process, it can be described from different perspectives. When looking into the process of revision, the superordinate process of translation\textsuperscript{13} must be definitely considered. Both these activities are “higher-order cognitive tasks (like reading or writing) with a very significant problem solving component concerned with mediation between languages”. (Angelone 17) Revisers as well as translators work with mental representations of texts in order to be able to process and transfer the information, i.e. the information must be extracted, interpreted and represented in the mind. (Forghan-Parast 14) Nevertheless the very aims of translation and revision processes are not the same.

2.5.1 Models of revision

Still referring to translation as a superimposed concept, let us now look at the stages and progress of revision. Generally speaking, there is no consistent overview of process models of translation suggested by different Translation Studies scholars, although all of them work with one. As Forghan-Parast mentions “[w]hile the field of TS has undergone considerable changes over the past 60 years by virtue of its dynamic, interdisciplinary nature, little seems to have changed regarding the theoretical models representing the structure, entities and relationships involved in the act of translation.” (Forghan-Parast 13) The translation process models are quite similar to each other, most often three-phased and transfer-centred. To instantiate, following are some brief examples:

- 1. orientation, 2. drafting and 3. revision – Alves and Gonçalves (Alves and Gonçalves in Šeboková 22);
- 1. pre-drafting phase, 2. drafting phase, 3. post-drafting phase – Mossop (Mossop 167);
- 1. source language comprehension, 2. source-target language transfer of meaning, 3. target language text production. (Angelone 17)
- 1. approach, 2. process, 3. revision – Newmark (Newmark 1998:117);
- 1. understanding languages, cultures, genres, the source text, and the sender’s intentions and individual style, as well as the receiver’s presuppositions and needs in the

\textsuperscript{13} Translation process is defined by Hansen and Gyde as “everything that happens from the moment the translator starts working on the source text until he finishes the target text. It is all encompassing, from every pencil movement and keystroke, to dictionary use, the use of the internet and the entire mental process that is involved in taking a decision, solving a problem, or making a correction”. (Hansen, Gyde 190)
communication situation; 2. making decisions and producing coherent, meaningful, stylistically appropriate and well-functioning texts; 3. revising and evaluating one’s own and sometimes other’s translation products. – Hansen (Hansen 193);

These models (whether primarily meant as such, or just statements of what happens during the translation process) offer an insight into the position of revision in the scheme of translation. However there are also process models which do not mention revision at all (e.g. Bush: “analyzing the original, transferring the concepts to the other culture, and restructuring them to fit the framework of another language”). (Bush) It is probable that for many theorists, revision is an implied subprocess which needs not to be explicitly incorporated in translation models. Nevertheless, such an approach may undesirably degrade its importance. Especially students of translation should realize the significance of concise and thorough revision. According to Pérez, “the wind-up stage of the project should be considered as important as the rest. No translation project is finished before sufficient time has been allocated to revision (consistency and grammar check), detection of any fragments missing and, in the case of localization projects, testing of the applications.“ (Pérez)

2.5.2 Characteristics of the revision process

It is obvious from the models above that revision is the final stage in the translation process and as such constitutes the last opportunity to improve the target text and to minimise the risk of any adverse effects. As explained later, revision itself can be divided into stages.

The conditions of composing a translation and revising it are not identical but there are some interesting and evident analogies and opposites. Knowing that their work will receive a thorough revision, translators can sometimes (consciously or not) rely on revisers and leave a problem unsolved. (Mossop 113) This strategy can be a subject of discussion on ethics and responsibility, but it is definitely something revisers cannot afford to do. The difference also is that translators work from scratch; they compose a completely new text whereas revisers edit an already written draft (this is also the reason why revision may be considered less creative occupation than translation). It is also important to realise that the translator has worked on a text for a much longer time than the reviser will, therefore, the former knows more about the to-be-revised text. This puts revisers in a very difficult position, since they are expected to polish the translation despite being less familiar with it.

The most conspicuous common feature is the problem-solving nature of these two processes. (Mossop 5) As mentioned before, „[r]evising (…) requires going back over the text
at least once for evaluation purposes, and making changes in the text to correct whatever problems were detected during the evaluation. (Roussey and Piolat 765) As they proceed forward, translators encounter tricky as well as uncomplicated passages of a particular text. Revisers work according to the same pattern, usually in linear progression, except that after reconsidering all elements of the text they deal only with the problematic ones. Simply put, revisers intervene only when it is needed.

In the course of their actual drafting work, translators treat the so-called translation units (working unit in the terminology of Asadi and Séguinot) defined as “the portion of source text that a translator deals with cognitively as one chunk, during the formulation of a target-language version: typically, this is a clause, or perhaps a sentence.” (Chesterman 2008:3) These units may not be identical with revision units which would be the portions of drafted target text dealt with by revisers. Fraser 1996; Tirkkonen-Condit 2000 and Angelone 2010 all reached the conclusion that students, in contrast to experienced translators tend to work with smaller translation units, i.e. usually at the word level. The practical part of this thesis will reveal results pertaining to this issue drawing on the corpus of revised texts. However, Mossop suggests that treating too small revision units is not a very wise strategy as they may lose their connection to context (Mossop 154-155). The size of the translation/revision unit depends on the capacity of working memory and ability to sequence or isolate words and phrases (which figures as a dependent variable in some investigations into translation processes). Analogically, translation problems and translation solutions become – in the context of revising a draft translation – revision problems and revision solutions.

Furthermore, according to Bell’s structured model, translation is “a two-way process incorporating analysis and synthesis (…) It shares features with the process of revision by requiring an analysis of the source text and the quasi-synthetic “reconstruction” of it in the target language”. (Chakhachiro) Revision is also characterised by comparative analysis – namely the comparison of the source text and the target text to be finalised – which focuses on establishing equivalence across the texts. Second, revision is based on critical approach that is not so strongly manifested in the transfer phase. In Chakhachiro’s words, [h]owever controversial and elusive the concept of equivalence of meaning and style is, it still hovers over this activity.” (Chakhachiro) Another shared feature is the relation to the translation brief defined by Mossop as a set of specifications that can be explicit (oral or written) or implicit (already known from previous similar jobs, presupposed), or elicited by the translation service or a freelance translator (Mossop 110-111). The specifications expressed in it are to be observed during the revision, too.
Despite the aim of revision being improvement of the translation product, there is always the risk of an erroneous manipulation with the draft translation. Incorrect revising, i.e. replacing a good solution by a wrong one or not correcting a mistake at all may be due to insufficient knowledge of the reviser, imposing of his/her own ideas on the text (in case of revising the work of others), or simple inattentiveness. It can also happen that the reviser amends the text properly, but introduces a minor mistake or inconsistency because he/she did not take all the relevant elements into account.

Searching for information which is not supplied in the text or by the context may take place in the phase of revision. However, “[r]evisers do not have the time to carry out (…) lengthy searches.” (Mossop 99-100)

Revision does not take place only after the transfer phase of the translation process; it is distributed in the transfer phase too. Even in the course of generation of the translation, the translator(-reviser) often makes deletions, additions, or any other modifications. This phenomenon is called online revision (Asadi and Séguinot 531) and the changes made in this phase are referred to as edits. (Asadi and Séguinot 524, 526). Online revision occurs in every translation process. Nevertheless, investigation of this type of revision, requires consistent recording of the act of translating, using methods such as eye-tracking, think-aloud protocols, or screen logging tools. In addition, there is a form of revision Hansen identified in terms of control pauses. It is an immediate revision of the sentence or clause one has just translated which can also be considered a part of the revision process. (Hansen 195)

2.5.3 Stages of revision

The multi-stage sequential nature of problem solving (Angelone 32) can be observed in the process of revision. Similarly to models of translation, models of revision are often triadic with a phase of reflection on the solution in their centre.

Hayes et al. defines the main three stages as:

1. Critical reading,
2. Solution searching,
3. Text transforming. (Hayes et al. 1987 in Roussey and Piolat 776)

Erik Angelone, who does not deal explicitly with revision, but with uncertainty in translation problems solving, proposes the following phases which are applicable to revision:

1. Problem recognition,
2. Solution proposal,
3. Solution evaluation. (Angelone 17)
The stages marked by number one, i.e. the key moment of recognizing there is something wrong with the drafted translation in the first place, launch a bundle of the three subprocesses, which should follow one after another. Disrupting the sequence usually causes dysfunction of the whole treatment of a revision instance. After the third phase, reviser should reach a so-called *tipping point* and move forward to another revision case. As Shreve points out “Exit from a bundle may be by successful resolution of the problem, but also by recognition of failure or even postponement of solution” (Shreve 2006 in Angelone 22-23).

In terms of *problem recognition*, all problematic elements must be identified and all elements potentially affected by a change must be located. Getting to the very reason for which a concrete rendering of the source text is not appropriate is the aim of this stage.

*Solution proposal* “consists of strategy planning and/or application, with immediate objective of generating and, as Tirkkonen-Condit has suggested, ‘trying out’ potential solutions for the encountered problem.” (Angelone 20)

In the last stage, *solution evaluation*, the reviser “decides on an appropriate equivalent from a series of candidate translation variants retrieved during the solution proposal stage and then evaluates it”. A control check of the selected revision solution should follow.

In relation to what Hansen calls a *felicitous translation process*, it can be said that a *felicitous revision process* is one in which the reviser has “cognitive awareness and control over their actions, so that they realise if they have found an in-context and communication-situation appropriate formulation, i.e. a formulation that fits in relation to source text, theme, text type, and register, and in relation to the presuppositions, expectations, and needs of the target text receiver(s) – and what is important – where translators [revisers] are attentive and also realise if they have not yet found an appropriate solution and they still will have to work on the task.” (Hansen 191)

Nonetheless, there are more tasks to be carried out, as for example identifying prospective readers and the use they will make of the translation, familiarizing oneself with the translation brief, deciding on revision strategy, the degree of revision, identifying a type of mistakes to focus on, etc. (Mossop 151) In the course of the revision process, it is important to keep the critical approach on and even if a passage of a text conveys the meaning of the original well and reads smoothly, the reviser should be ready to get back to it in case a different change is related to elements contained in that passage. All in all, revisers must keep consistency in mind.
2.5.4 Mental processes behind revision

In this chapter, some deeper aspects underlying the process of revision will be presented. Information relevant to the topic has been gained mainly via empirical research carried out by scholars working in fields related to Translation Studies.\(^\text{14}\)

According to Robinson “[t]ranslation [and revision as its part] is always intelligent behavior – even when it seems least conscious or analytical. (Robinson 50) Indeed, when revising one draws on knowledge in the first place, employs metacognition, uses different strategies and strives consciously to avoid any possible negative effects. It may thus seem that revision within the frame of translation is a purely controlled processing. Nevertheless, Kiraly argues that some translation processes (including revision) are driven by intuitive behaviour, consequently, some “problems are handled by a relatively uncontrolled processing center, leading to more intuitive decisions”. (Kiraly 1995 in Mansell 4). Obviously, there are different opinions on activation of the revision process. While Hayes postulates that the process of revision is activated either intentionally “during deliberate evaluation of the text“, or automatically “at the same time as other text-production processes are being carried out” (Hayes 1996 in Roussey and Piolat 766), Roussey and Piolat are convinced that revision is a purely intentional exercise which requires “deliberate implementation of more complex processes” and as such it is triggered on purpose. (Roussey and Piolat 769)

Psycholinguistically, reviser assumes certain roles. According to Forghan-Parast’s cybernetic model of translation the roles translators assume are: Translator/Author, a position which is “responsible for creating the target text and primarily associated with instantiating that information”, and Translator/Reader who is “involved with interpreting information from the text. These two roles are quite different from their counterparts in “normal” author-reader relationship, for they occur in a single mental space”. (Forghan-Parast 16) Turning back to revisers, their threefold position would analogically be: Reviser/Author, Reviser/Reader, and finally Reviser/Translator. In terms of the last role, reviser would try to establish a sort of

\(^{14}\) Not all the studies deal directly with revising translations, however the data obtained are applicable to the theme of this Thesis. The relevant papers are:
- Erik Angelon,: Uncertainty, uncertainty management and metacognitive problem solving in translation task,
- Brigitta Englung Dimitrova: Literal Translation in the Translation of Professional Translators,
- Paula Asadi, Candace Séguinot: Shortcuts, Strategies and general Patterns in a Process study of Nine Professionals,
- Meredyth Daneman, Murray Stainton: The Generation Effect in Reading and Proofreading,
- Maura Pilotti, Kimberly Maxwell, Martin Chodorow: Does the Effect of Familiarity on Proofreading Change With Encoding Task and Time?,
- Jean-Yves Roussey, Annie Piolat: Critical effort during text revision.
connection to the translator, realising his or her motives to render the translation in the way it was rendered.

In connection to online revision (discussed in chapter 2.5.2 Characteristics of the revision process), there is a phenomenon called monitoring. This term “refers to an awareness of the correctness that accompanies the drafting phase of translation. It is well-documented that most editing takes place as the text segment is produced, as Jensen (2002:111) and Séguinot (1989:34) observed. The monitoring component that scans previously translated segments seems to be running in the background.” Translator proceeds in a linear fashion, but suddenly goes back and corrects something in the preceding text. However, monitoring activity seems to result in correcting spelling rather than more serious changes. (Asadi and Séguinot 530-531)

2.5.4.1 Reading for revision and effortfulness

Reading for revision (also termed critical reading) is a basic procedure used in the process of revision. Its aim is “not only to build a representation of the text’s meaning, but also, and more importantly, to find problems” which may in any way disturb the reader, and – in case of translation – the meaning of the text. “This problem-detection process requires a critical reading of the text at various linguistic levels. (...) the reader/reviser must aim for a larger and more complex set of goals than those involved in simple reading in view of understanding” (Butterfield, Hacker & Albertson, 1996 in Roussey and Piolat 767). Roussey and Piolat confirmed that critical reading is more effortful and resource-demanding than reading for comprehension. What is more, this is true even if the to-be-revised text does not include any mistakes. This finding confirms the proposition that revision is activated intentionally; revisers consciously look for mistakes and devote certain effort to the task regardless of the actual occurrence of errors.

Effortfulness, i.e. the hardship of cognitive work, can be influenced by different variables. One of them (besides experience, familiarity, or medium for example) is the type of mistakes occurring in the text. Pilotti, Maxwell, and Chodorow found out that it is easier to detect letter additions than letter substitutions, since “a word looks ‘different’ from its earlier form” when it contains one or more letters than it should. (Pilotti, Maxwell, Chodorow). Further, mistakes in function words are harder to find, because words of this type occur frequently and are processed as one unit. They also serve as cues early in the text processing and recede to the background, as revision or proofreading becomes more content oriented. (Koriat &

15 This type of reading is in process during the source text interpretation.
Greenberg, 1996 in Pilotti, Maxwell, Chodorow) Other types of error which require more effort are syntactic and inter-sentence errors, because a higher number of units has to be processed at a time when dealing with such an error.

The number of units one is able to treat at once depends on the capacity of working memory; experts agree that it is seven (plus or minus two) items at a time. (Madraso) Logically, the better working memory revisers have, the easier it is for them to disclose a more demanding type of mistakes. In the investigation of Roussey and Piolat, “participants with lower capacity of short-term memory allocated more attentional resources to critical reading when they revised the syntax-error text than when they revised the other two versions” [i.e. texts containing spelling errors and no errors]. (Roussey and Piolat 785) It is necessary to note, that their research focused on text-reviewing in mother language, therefore it can be assumed that working in second language is even more effortful.

2.5.4.2 Decision making, uncertainty and metacognition

As already mentioned before, decision-making in revision is as important as it is in translation itself. Newmark wrote that translation might be “[t]he only occupation where the search for the truth is pursued by way of never ending changes of mind”. (Newmark 1998:113) However difficult a decision may be, it is reviser’s mission to select a final option.

Reviser has to decide whether there is or is not a fault in the draft which is being revised and if there is one he or she has to opt for a solution. Moreover, “[d]ecision making in revision involves interpretation of source-text messages, determination of the style and the audiences of the source and target texts, the identification of the semantic and stylistic problems in target texts, a description of problems when there is a need for a reviser’s report, and suggestions for alternatives.” (Chakhachiro)

In context of decision-making, Mansell operates with optimality theory (Prince and Smolensky, 2002 in Mansell 5) which is a theory of Universal Grammar offering “a cognitive basis for the explanation of the decision-making process”. It says that more than one output is possible to an input. The input is the text to be translated and the outputs are candidate translation solutions. “Optimality Theory proposes that grammar has two parts: a generating component, which generates a series of candidate outputs on the base of an input, and an evaluating component which evaluates input-output pairs to ascertain an optimal candidate

---

16 Short-term (recent) memory is defined as “a system for temporarily storing and managing the information required to carry out complex cognitive tasks such as learning, reasoning, and comprehension. Working memory is involved in the selection, initiation, and termination of information-processing functions such as encoding, storing, and retrieving data.” http://www.medterms.com/script/main/art.asp?articlekey=7143 [retrieved 2011-10-01]
out of the set.” Part of the theory are also constraints on the hierarchy of which decision is based; “faithfulness constraints which demand fidelity to the input and markedness constraints, which demand unmarked outputs […] faith constraints demand that things stay as they are, and markedness constraints demand change.” These constraints are violable and their system creates a base for potential source text-target text pairs. (Mansell 5-6)

Indecision represents one of the very basic issues of translating and revising. Especially in revision, there may be cases of doubt about how to solve a problem, since reviser’s opinion on a problem he or she is dealing with always conflicts with the solution of the translator of the draft (as unproblematic passages are those translator and reviser have the same opinion on). Angelone’s uncertainty management based on metacognition offers a valuable insight into this matter. He defines it as “the application of conscious, deliberate strategies for overcoming comprehension, transfer, or production indecision.” (Angelone 19) There are three processes in which uncertainty may occur: (1) source language comprehension, (2) source-target language transfer of meaning, and (3) target language text production. Behind each of the processes, there are three phases: problem recognition, solution proposal and solution evaluation. Applied to revision, during the first and key phase, reviser identifies the problem, thinks about what it stems from and locates all the relevant elements. In solution proposal, reviser comes up with one or more candidate solutions the appropriateness of which is assessed in solution evaluation phase. Such bundles containing these three phases theoretically follow one after another as translator/reviser works on a text. In practice, Angelone observed different tendencies of professional and novice translators; experienced translators spend more time on problem recognition and tend to hold on to all the three phases in successive order when dealing with a difficult place in a text. Conversely, translation students devote more time to solution evaluation and “jump around” the three phases, i.e. they do not stick to the problem-recognition, solution-proposal, solution-evaluation pattern. “Bundles are disrupted and left apparently incomplete, there is a jumping back and forth between problems sequences because solution evaluation was not successfully completed, and, most tellingly, problem recognition appears to be weak.” (Angelone 33-34) These findings among others confirm what is claimed by Alves and Gonçalves about novice translators’ behaviour (mentioned before). It follows that “[t]he effective determination of the nature and scope of problems sets the stage for more efficacious subsequent proposal and solution evaluation.” (Angelone 32)

It was thereby confirmed that professionals as well as students use metacognition, which facilitates problem solving by using metacognitive knowledge (awareness of what one does
and does not know) and metacognitive regulation (exerting active control over planning and evaluation processes). (Angelone 25) However, there is a “significant difference in how that [metacognitive] activity occurs. For the non-professionals, it is more refracted and unpredictable.” (Angelone 34)

2.5.4.3 Tendency towards literal translation

Literal translation is one of the translation strategies, which can be defined as “structural identity or near-identity on the syntagmatic and syntactic level between the source segment and its corresponding target text segment.” (Wills 1996:128 in Dimitrova 29) It is often frowned upon and considered inappropriate, for it can sometimes reflect the source text structure in an exaggerated and unwanted way. (Dimitrova 29) Nonetheless, it is important to distinguish literal translation from translationese and interference which both truly are undesirable. One of the proponents of literal translation is Peter Newmark: “literal translation is often acceptable (…) and [I] even recommend it: My thesis is, however, that literal translation is correct and must not be avoided, if it secures referential and pragmatic equivalence to the original.” (Newmark 1988:68-69 in Dimitrova 30)

Brigitta Englung Dimitrova researched the tendency of translators to revise more literal renditions by less literal ones. She posits that the reason for such a strategy is that it eases the memory load. Already Wills suggested that literal translation is less cognitively demanding than non-literary procedures, since what has been written down does not have to be kept in one’s working memory. (Wills 1996:128 in Dimitrova 30) Dimitrova confirmed this psycholinguistic minimax-strategy observing that “professional translators in [her] study frequently made revisions which distanced the structure of the emerging target text from that of the ST. They work stepwise, writing down a literal translation as the first step, then changing in into another structure, less similar. Most of them do this revision immediately, during the writing phase, mostly before they continue to write down the rest of the sentence”. (Dimitrova 36)

2.5.4.4 Familiarity and expectancy effect

Familiarity, i.e. enhanced memory of the text to be scanned for errors (Pilotti, Maxwell, Chodorow), can hinder or improve the process of revision and is interconnected with several variables as for example speed, accuracy, or delay.

The level of familiarity primarily depends on the encoding operation involved. First, it can be surface encoding, which refers to prior reading, proofreading, or retyping for instance.
These encoding operations which technically lie in an orthographic and lexical analysis result in a moderate level of familiarity and are said to yield more accurate and faster proofreading. The other encoding operation is called deep encoding under which we can understand generating or translating a text, i.e. semantic and syntactic processing of a text. Consequence of deep encoding is a high level of familiarity. (Pilotti, Maxwell, Chodorow) A research conducted by Daneman and Stainton proved that people are less able to find errors in self-generated than in other-generated texts. This is because of the presence or absence of the so-called expectancy effect which occurs as a consequence of deep encoding and leads to a less thorough analysis of the text. “The problem is that your mind already knows what your writing is supposed to say and will automatically compensate for mistakes.” (Ash) Expectancy effect makes revision or proofreading faster but less accurate. Further, the more one goes on repeating an unfamiliar collocation, the more natural and familiar it will sound. (Newmark 1998:159-160)

Familiarity does not concern only text as such, but also the subject-matter of the text. In terms of this issue, there are two different attitudes: On the one hand, “the participant’s [reviser’s] familiarity with the topic of the text may hinder their ability to concentrate on the proofreading task” and hence is undesirable. On the other hand, if the reviser is personally affected by the topic of the text and thus experience a sort of attachment to the text, he or she may take the task more seriously. Unfamiliarity then forces the revisers to read more attentively “and will therefore enable them to detect more errors under right conditions.” (Wharton-Michael) Daneman and Stainton’s experiment showed that as far as other-generated texts are concerned, people are more able to find mistakes in the texts the topic of which they are familiar with.

Leaving a delay between translating a text is considered a very efficient strategy of revising, since it provides a fresh look on the text to be revised. “The longer writers [translators-revisers] remain away from their work, the less they remember the specific wording; therefore, they anticipate less and focus more on the actual text proofreading strategy”. (Bean and Bouffler 70 in Madraso) It was discovered that the negative familiarity effect described above is reversed to beneficial after a certain delay. An experiment on immediacy in proofreading operated with a ten- to forty-minute break, which turned out as too little. However, another study used a two-week pause (Daneman and Stainton in Pilotti, Maxwell, Chodorow), which, in reality, is too long to be inserted between translation and revision. To conclude, the ideal time break to be allowed between composing and revising a translation lies somewhere in the time span of forty minutes to two weeks.
Regarding the speed of revision/proofreading (because “faster is generally better in the professional world”) (Robinson 2), it is not dependent on the type of encoding operation; familiarity has always positive effects on speed (Pilotti, Maxwell, Chodorow), but it seems it can be at the expense of accuracy. Robinson comments on this problem explaining that “[o]ne commonsensical assumption says that the faster you do something, the more likely you are to make mistakes; the more slowly you work, the more likely it is to be reliable. (...) But increased speed (...) really only damages reliability when you are doing something new or unfamiliar, something, that requires concentration, which always takes time.” (Robinson 49)

The crucial variable here is the type of error, obviously, it takes more time to find and correct a syntax error than a spelling error. (Roussey and Piolat 781) Furthermore, there have been contradictory result concerning whether experience can help proofreaders and revisers increase accuracy. (Wharton-Michael)

Familiarity effect is different in self-revision and revision by someone else. In the first case, the reviser composes the text to be revised, therefore, the negative familiarity effect can only be minimised by leaving as much time as possible between the translation and the revision. Daneman and Stainton claim that “the disadvantage for proofreading self-generated text is likely a by-product of extreme familiarity rather than any special quality of self-generated knowledge per se.” (Daneman and Stainton) On the other hand, in revising somebody else’s translation, the reviser has the advantage of a fresh view and can be completely unfamiliar with the text (and its topic) at hand. For these and other different conditions of self-revising and revising, some may consider the latter method more efficient.
2.6 Strategies and techniques of revision

There are revision strategies and techniques (similarly to translation techniques and strategies) which offer different approaches to revision. Mossop explains their function as follows: “You need to know not only what to look for, but how to look for it (…) You need to have a procedure that increases the likelihood that you will find the errors in a translation (…) you also need some principles to help you decide whether in fact to make a change”. (Mossop 151)

There are more approaches to revision, but none of them is generally acknowledged as the right one. (Mossop 167) It has been also confirmed by different studies that people revise in their own way according to their personal preferences and needs. Asadi and Séguinot remind that “[i]t is important to note that strategies are not necessarily linked to the translator, but rather to the task”. (Asadi and Séguinot 537) What is reflected in the strategy applied to a revision is also the particular translation receiving the revision (the above mentioned relative assessment), consequently the degree of revision (full or less-than-full revision). Moreover, it may be possible to determine one or more error types that are likely to occur in a text at hand and apply a respective revision technique.

A tool that can increase efficiency of revision is self-diagnosis (it concerns mainly self-revision). It serves to “discover one’s weaknesses and realise the strategy of self-revision process, so that it can be improved”. (Mossop 170-171) Self-reflection requires identification of one’s revising pattern and of the mistakes (their type) a reviser is likely to make. Knowing this, self-revisers can adjust the order of the component tasks to be performed and thus minimise the risk of missing an error or introducing it, e.g. if one tends to introduce language errors during Transfer check\footnote{i.e. checking for accuracy and completeness of transfer. See also Mossop’s revision parameters in the Appendices.}, then language errors last should be checked for last. (Mossop 153) Indeed, according to Madraso, the failure to see errors may result from a problem with the revising system rather than a problem with the reviser’s abilities. (Madraso)

The techniques of revising are procedures applicable to day-to-day translation practice, increasing effectiveness of work routine. The two types of reading (unilingual and bilingual) were already presented in chapter 2.1.3 Revision. Chesterman and Wagner listed several techniques, relating them actually to translation, and not to revision. Nevertheless, most of them aim at polishing and finalising the drafted translation. Below are some of them.
(compiled from different sources) that should bring fresher look at the translation and thus enable identification of problematic places.\textsuperscript{18}

a. \textit{Leaving the translation overnight or longer} – allowing at least a part of a day between composition and revision. (Chesterman and Wagner 69) This is generally the most common and very helpful technique which, however, requires good time-management. In case of self-revision the delay is inserted as mentioned above, in case of revising others, it can put between the individual revision scans.

b. \textit{Changing the medium} – revising on paper instead of on screen, recording the translation on a Dictaphone and than listening to it, reading it aloud, or listening to the translation being read by somebody else. (Chesterman and Wagner 71-72)

c. \textit{Starting reading at some point in the middle of the document} – new insight is provided by breaking up the logic of the text and its sequential argument. (Chesterman and Wagner 71-72) This way expectancy effect can be decreased. \textit{Reading backwards} can generate the same beneficial outcome (Ash), nevertheless, seeing words and phrases out of the actual context – which happens in this case – may be risky.

d. \textit{Letting somebody else read the translation} (or imagining to be someone else when self-revising it). Consulting another person reduces subjectivity but also the feeling of anxiety. (Madraso)

e. \textit{Changing mental state} – for example by changing a pen, a chair, a place one works in. It is mainly useful in self-revision when switching from the role of translator to the one of reviser.

f. \textit{Duplicate the final reader’s experience} by starting with the unilingual reading, reading from beginning to the end (Mossop 153) and trying to forget everything one knows about the target text.

g. \textit{Using different modes of reading} – Newmark presents three modes of reading which can be employed during revision. It is namely “(1) reading aloud; (2) ‘phonic’ reading\textsuperscript{19}, where, as in thinking, the sounds of what is read remain in the mind, and (3) normal ‘efficient’ rapid reading, where the sense ‘eliminates’ the sound. Especially during reading aloud, reviser/proofreader can note “the sections that give the reader difficulty (…) often they signal problems with the text: sentence-structure problems,

\textsuperscript{18} Generally speaking, strategies for distancing will be used more by self-revisers, since they lack a “naive”, first-time reader look more than revisers of others’ translations.

\textsuperscript{19} also termed subvocalisation
spelling problems, mechanical problems”, occasionally content problems (Madraso). Reviser should be able to switch between them if needed (e.g. dealing with a very difficult passage or when treating direct speech in a text, revising a text which is to be read out loud). (Newmark 1998:1)

h. Reading larger units of text during comparative reading, as reading too small units read may cause lack of context. (Mossop 154-155)

i. Inserting short breaks from time to time – hard intellectual work is tiring and usually does not generate quality results if done without some amount of rest.

j. Thinking negatively – Pym claims that some problems in translation (and thus revision) can be solved by inverting the positive mode of thinking. “This means trying to define not the ideal function of the translation, but the probable ‘failure conditions’, the ways in which the translation would obviously not do its job”. (Pym 2005:75)

k. Separating the checks – in most cases there are more features to look for in a translated text (spelling, commas, numbers, accurate transfer, capitalizations, collocations, etc.) (Chesterman and Wagner 71-72), (Newmark 1998:67, 161). These checks can be carried out separately in order for the reviser to concentrate better on the particular error type.

Separate checks are efficient since detecting one type of error can get in the way of detecting another type. It may be hard to focus on problems on the micro level as one is checking for macro-level problems. (Mossop 152) However time-consuming and rather dull it is to proceed this way, separate scans for individual kinds of mistakes are very helpful. When applying this strategy, the reviser has to decide on the sequence of readings, for example “[p]roblems with style can necessitate major, sentence-level revision; consequently, proofreading for style early in the proofreading process makes sense because these changes may create new difficulties that can be detected by later proofreading strategies.” (Madraso) Another point is that “[c]hecking certain features of Presentation” is especially important if your revision falls at the end of the production process.” (Mossop 163) In terms of the separate checks, Mossop divides parameters to check for into a. CLP parameters (Content, Language and style, and physical Presentation), and b. Transfer parameters. (Mossop 151) While a. requires only unilingual reading, when checking for b. both source and target text must be read. In comparative reading, it is also important whether one reads the source text or the target text
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20 i.e. layout, text in italics or bold text, division of paragraphs, formal arrangement of the text, etc.

21 problems of logic and facts
first. Reading the source text first can hinder unbiased view on the target text and produce the expectancy effect. It “may influence your judgement about the language quality of the translation. In particular, you may fail to notice that the translation is unidiomatic. (...) [it] will put in your mind the meaning which the translation is supposed to have. (...) You will not see the text from the user’s point of view. Also in time pressure reading the target text before the source text is recommended.” (Mossop 152, 154). “The sequence of the check also depends on priorities relative to the text at hand, sometimes remedying Transfer mistakes is more important than remedying Language and style mistakes (...) the more important comes last.” (Mossop 153)
2.7 Principles of revision

One of the shared characteristics of revision and translation is the application of principles; in both one does not always achieve success by following firmly stated rules, but has to observe certain guidelines and deal with problems intelligently.

Below are some basic principles of revision adopted from Brian Mossop, since he is the only expert explaining them in detail.

- *Minimise corrections* – changes need to be made only if there is a sufficient reason for them and if they can be objectively justified. Mossop advises to “change the text if you cannot understand the TT without consulting the ST,” or “if you have to read a sentence twice”. (Mossop 156)

- *Avoid duplication effort* – in case there are more revisers or proofreaders working on a text or if the self-reviser is prone to forgetting what he/she has already checked, “it is advisable to mark places and terms one has already checked and signal difficult passages” (Mossop 170) and unsolved problems. Also, if a proofreader will check the revised text, parameters he/she will be looking for can be ignored. (Mossop 164)

- *Avoid perfectionism* – since one could go on endlessly improving a text, there is no point in trying to make a target text literally perfect. Instead, acceptable text should be revisers’ goal. (Mossop 156)

- *Don’t retranslate* – “Work with the wording that is already there, don’t restart the drafting process by working from the source text and inventing a whole new translation of a sentence.” (Mossop 156)

- *Beware of introducing errors* – it is important to observe all the elements participating in a change, so that they are all adjusted accordingly. When changing one mistake of a certain type, a mistake of another type can easily be introduced. (Mossop 157)

- *Minimise amending errors you are not currently checking for* – when performing separate checks, it is better to pay attention to the chosen feature and not to correct the other parameters, as errors can be missed or corrected inappropriately. (Mossop 158)
2.8 Production profiles

Everybody has an inner, more or less concise revision management. Asadi and Séguinot discovered two production profiles which differ in terms of online revision\textsuperscript{22}. \textit{prospective thinking} and \textit{on-screen translation}. The first one is „reminiscent of the style used in pre-computer translation. Historically, professionals using a typewriter or Dictaphone were forced to translate first mentally or orally, taking in large chunks of text and reading ahead for comprehension before beginning to type.” (Asadi and Séguinot 526) These translators think ahead and consequently make fewer changes – usually only minor ones – in the drafting phase; they correct spelling or change one translation variant for another. The second production style, on-screen translation, lies in less planning, tackling shorter text segments, and taking advantage of the word processing environment. Onscreen translators make extensive use of online revision: immediate changes in lexical choices and syntax, rereading and backtracking the text produced, moving text segments. (Asadi and Séguinot 530) In addition to these two profiles, the authors propose a threefold continuum of translation/revision strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIM OF THE PRODUCTION</th>
<th>Translation Drafting Strategy</th>
<th>Drafting &amp; Checking Strategy</th>
<th>Revision Strategy\textsuperscript{23}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRAFTING/REVISION RATIO</td>
<td>To produce a first draft and revise it later.</td>
<td>To produce a text and check references.</td>
<td>To complete a revised text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost no immediate revision (revising spelling or translation variant change), revision deliberately postponed to after-draft phase.</td>
<td>Moderate immediate revision, treating a few errors, but some of the changes in meaning left to the revision stage. Mixing composition and checking.</td>
<td>Extended immediate revision, translating a text segment and then verifying translation with an authoritative source before moving on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 1 – \textit{Production profiles} (Asadi and Séguinot 537-538)

\textsuperscript{22} immediate revision in drafting phase of the translation process mentioned in the chapter 2.5.2 Characteristics of the revision process

\textsuperscript{23} In the study of Asadi and Séguinot, the subjects who used the revision strategy were all professional revisers unlike the rest of the research participants.
It cannot be directly deduced that the more revision occurs in the drafting phase the less of it there will be in the post-drafting phase since there are other factors as for instance the expertise of the translator or quality, respectively difficulty of the text. However, this scheme is also related to Dimitrova’s research on revising literal translation solutions. She also found a pattern in revising; she was looking into when more or less literal renditions are amended. Some of the literal translations are removed in the writing phase, but most of them in post-writing phase. It means that some of the translators are “aware of the impossibility or inappropriateness of some of the translation solution which” they write down, but they “consciously and deliberately postpone deciding about them to a later stage”. (Dimitrova 37) Regarding the literal vs. free translation technique, Asadi and Séguinot also claim that prospective translators tend to translate more freely than onscreen translators as a result of the size of translation units these two groups operate with. (Asadi and Séguinot 527)

Mossop also writes about revision in the drafting phase and adds that “there is some evidence that as translators gain experience, they become able to do most of the needed self-revisions during the drafting phase, whereas less experienced translators tend to rely more on the post-drafting phase.” (Mossop 205)
2.9 The process of revision in a translation company

The process of revision can be described also in the context of translation companies, i.e. the sequence of individual operations the reviser carries out when working on a revision job. It is of course different in different companies. Revision can be carried out as a standard procedure (full length revision or revision of only a certain proportion of texts), or on a special request. (Mossop 109) Most importantly, there has to be a firmly established system with clear-cut responsibilities for everyone participating on a translation job. (Mossop 162) Translation agencies usually apply their own evaluation criteria for revision to which reviser refer when justifying the changes made. A sample of such evaluation system classification is a part of the Appendices. As to freelance translators and revisers, they need to make up and stick to a procedure on their own.

There are several models of the process of translation in a translation company by several scholars (of course, here the attention will be drawn to the stage of revision in it). They do not differ only in the number and nature of the individual stages, but also in the revision parameters which they recommend to focus on when revising24. In her article Translation and Project Management, Celia Rico Pérez describes the process of translation in a translation agency as follows: “commissioning, planning, groundwork, translation and wind-up phase.” (Pérez in Kuběna 15) Thus for her, revision is the very final phase in the process. Douglas Robinson drew up a little more detailed description of the process: “receiving and handling requests to do specific translations, doing research, networking, translating words, phrases, and registers, editing the translation, delivering the finished text to the employer or client, billing the client for work completed, getting paid.” (Robinson 7) In comparison to Pérez’s model, Robinson adds a few more steps after the phase of revision.

Daniel Gouadec was also looking into the way translation is processed in the business environment, however, his interpretation is much more thorough (maybe even too much). In his 157-step scheme, he describes translation process from the very beginning till the very end. It is obvious from his explanation that revisers do not participate only in the revision as such, but come into play much before the revision phase commences (e.g. the reviser receives a request for translation/revision, opens a job account, accepts or refuses the job, draws up an offer or estimate, participates in agreeing on conditions of the work – schedule, procedures,

24 To be discussed in chapter 2.12 Revision parameters and error types.
payment, etc.). He also states that a reviser can act on behalf of a work provider. According to Gouadec these are the basic stages of the translation process (comprising many subphases):

1. Finding the job (freelancers as well as employees);
2. Getting the translation;
3. Preparing, planning and organizing the job;
4. Preparing the translation;
5. Transfering/Translating the material;
6. Performing quality controls;
7. Closing the job file;
8. Creating the archive/Consolidating the instruments;
9. Follow-up.
   (Gouadec 59-85)

The stage no. 6 is, generally said, the stage of revision. It is obvious that for Gouadec this is not the final step in the overall process.

Furthermore, the quality checks pertaining to a translation job can be carried out by a. translator, b. reviser, or c. work provider. However, the translator is always expected to check his work, at least to do a unilingual reading. The translator checks the translated text, makes the necessary changes and delivers a “ready for revision” translation to the reviser together with a revision kit (the ST, drafted TT, specification for revision, job specifications, resources and raw materials; and anything else necessary or potentionally useful) (Gouadec 77-78). Revision by the work provider is considered an additional and optional activity, in terms of which the work provider can ask the translator or the reviser to to carry out any supplementary changes, the former deems necessary. (Gouadec 79)

This is then the sequence of operations from the point of view of the reviser.
1. Receiving the revision kit, reassembling and processing the material to be revised.
2. Carrying out quality control. If the draft is not of revisable quality, the reviser asks the translator to improve it. (Gouadec 79)
3. Making necessary changes. In case the revision is carried out on paper, these changes may be input into the electronic form – usually by a student trainee or a new employee – and then checked by the reviser. (Mossop 162)
4. Drawing reviser’s report to justify translations or amendments if required. (Chakhachiro)
5. Getting the revised translation ready for delivery, handling the finished job.
6. Filling a quality control record form.
7. Possibly making additional changes if requested by the work provider. (Gouadec 79)

As a matter of course, the document must be saved during all the operations, backed up, and the changes made must always be back-traceable.
2.10 Visual aspects of revision

As in other fields, the use of computers has become increasingly common in translation. Therefore, revisers and translators now use the computer interface in their work, which, among others, saves a lot of time. However, translating and revising on screen has certain disadvantages.

The findings from two empirical studies drawn on in this chapter concern primarily proofreading. Yet since the procedures of revising (mainly unilingual re-reading) are similar to those of proofreading, these results are related to revision as well. Of course, rather minor mistakes are concerned here, not errors of transfer for instance. The variables which may intervene with visual aspects (e.g. familiarity, speed) are mentioned in the chapter 2.5.4 Mental processes behind revision. Some of the facts stated in this chapter will be investigated later, in the practical part of the Thesis – in the questionnaire for students, possibly in the corpus.

First of all, let us point out that “the perceptual process of detecting errors may be affected by the way a user sees visual images or words.” (Woodland and Szul) “West (1983) concluded that proofreading errors occurred because proofreaders did not see the errors rather than because they did not know the correct spelling of words or correct grammar rules. Consequently, the visual perception of words when proofreading affected the error detection process.” (West 1983 in Woodland and Szul)

The variables that come into play are visualization ability, medium, screen layout and design, speed, fatigue, annotation method (i.e. the way changes are being marked), and other minor factors, e.g. text orientation, font, reading distance, or display quality and contrast. As to the very first one, visualization ability is the ability of a person to process two-dimensional and three-dimensional figures. It was discovered that the ability to detect typographical errors in keyboard copy is related to this ability. (Woodland and Szul) The better the visualization ability, the more successful the proofreading.

As regards the medium, there are two options: computer screen and hard copy. Errors are more likely to be misread on screen, probably because “there is some type of disruption in cognitive processing among these media”. (Mossop 101; Creed et al. in Wharton-Michael) Moreover, reading on the screen results in greater fatigue due to higher eye strain, which also contributes to lower error detection (Wilkinson and Robinshaw in Wharton-Michael). Wharton-Michael says that working on paper is quicker (but probably only in terms of reading). Yet Mossop claims that working with a paper copy is generally slower, since the
text is being changed in handwriting and there is also higher risk of introducing mistakes when inputting the changes into an electronic copy. (Mossop 101) As far as undoing changes one has made is concerned, it is clearer what the original wording was on the paper than on the computer screen. (Mossop 103) It was also found out that sex has no impact of the choice between or success in screen versus paper form proofreading/revising. As to experience in proofreading on paper or on screen, Oliver claims that “previous experience in computer-based proofreading may help individuals overcome a possible medium difference in proofreading.” (Wharton-Michael)

Screen layout and design concerns, among others, colours. Researchers found out that not all colours are equally legible. Revisers and proofreaders are more successful when working with dark text on light background. Therefore, revising or proofreading texts in such configuration may increase accuracy. Furthermore, it is geometry that matters, mainly in comparative reading. Mossop advises to carry out the parallel reading either on wide screen or looking at a screen and a hard copy attached next to it, otherwise the horizontal view of lines is problematic. (Mossop 102) Of course comparative reading can be done using two hard copies, yet this choice is not exactly ecological and cost-efficient.

When investigating fatigue, Wharton-Michael found out that “participants detected more errors at the beginning of the story than at the end of the story, regardless of medium.” (Wharton-Michael)

To sum up, the conditions in which revising or proofreading occurs should not be played down. Personal preferences or limitations as well as setting of the work environment should be considered in order to achieve good results.
2.11 Revisers' aids

As already mentioned, computers have become an indispensable aid for translators and revisers. Thanks to them, translation and revision are very flexible processes; they enable more and easier recasting, deleting, changing one’s mind, correcting… (Newmark 1998:141) With the computer technology available today, “translators can make changes without any fear of their process appearing in their final draft. It is possible that this may encourage more changes than we might have seen previous to the computer era.” (Asadi and Séguinot 539) The great advantages stemming from use of ICT exceed the risks that may attend it.

Revisers use different aids the same way translators do, they search facts, terminology, collocations, exact meanings of expressions, verify grammar or spelling, and so forth. Since revisers are usually the last agents to modify a translated text, it is necessary that they are 100% sure that the changes they introduced are correct.

First, the Internet can be considered revisers’ aid; in fact the most popular one and enormously useful. Mossop reminds of the danger which accompanies using this tool – “The internet sometimes seems to encourage overly hasty decisions. (…) The main problem with the Internet (…) is that most of the material is unedited.” (Mossop 97) – the risk of drawing on a wrong source can be minimised by always considering its reliability. In terms of this kind of revisers’ aid, Google is a very widespread searching tool gaining information from the gigantic corpus of text, which the Internet surely is. Of course, the results obtained when searching have to be interpreted carefully. “Google can tell you whether an expression exists, it cannot tell you how readers will understand it“ (Mossop 94) and what is more, “mere occurrence of a structure (in Google) does not by itself create ‘correctness’”. (Mossop 95)

There are other engines and other online aids for revisers, for example actual electronic corpora (ČNK). One can also gain translation variants by comparing English and Czech version of a website, if there is such a pair. Searching within individual web sites is also helpful, however much more limited than Google or other engine search. Many translators and revisers also use Google (or other) images for subject-matter search. (Mossop 97).

Second, there are certain editing programs which “help writers perfect their work. Like other computer-assisted strategies, editing programs simply highlight possible problems; they do not correct for the writer.” (Madraso) These programmes are usually not available for the Czech language. In fact, the only and widely used software tool of this type is the MS Word

Spell check, since MS Word is the most popular text-editing programme. This programme function checks typography and spelling and suggests a list of solutions (if these are available in the system), furthermore, it points out instances of incorrect grammar, offering one or more solutions. However, “[i]t cannot choose the correct word from a list of possible choices; therefore, the writer must still rely on personal knowledge” (Madraso) (the right solution does not even have to be on the list, or there can be wrong solutions suggested). It cannot be relied on entirely, as it is not able to indicate whether a word is used correctly. (Ash) Revisers should be aware of the possible introduction of errors in case the programme automatically corrects an unknown word; it can for instance change a proper name to a similar common name. Although it is advisable to follow what the spellcheck marks, there seems to be a certain “spellcheck blindness” phenomenon, i.e. the reviser/proofreader “does not check underlined words for errors based on the assumption that a particular word is underlined because given word processor does not have it in its vocabulary” (Šeböková 65).

Another useful function of MS Word is the command Find and Replace which can be used when checking consistency, typography, or changing more occurrences of an expression. Nevertheless, one must be careful and check every occurrence the function finds and not to replace them all automatically.

The program also includes Tracking Changes function which is used by revisers a lot. It enables them to see concrete changes and their author, or to add commentaries – suggestions for changes. Moreover, the changes can be displayed in a different way and one can reject or accept them by a single click. Some, however, can be overlooked, since they are not marked conspicuously enough (e.g. minor deletions), or one can get lost in a tangle of lines and comments, if there is too many of them.

Revising and proofreading can be done in pdf files as well, using PDF-X Change Viewer. This programme is able to add commentaries into pdf documents, but the user cannot edit the content directly in the file.

Recently, there appeared a few online translation and proofreading services (e.g. www.chinglish.com, ErrNET(TM)), however they are not available for the English-Czech language pair.
2.12 Revision parameters and error types

This chapter will present the features of a translated text revisers focus on. They have in mind the requirements imposed on a translation by the author of the source text and the prospective readers of the target text. Revisers observe these parameters and look for mistakes. So, the requirements define the parameters on the base of which the classification of mistakes is established.

**REQUIREMENT → PARAMETER → MISTAKE**

E.g.: the translation should include the right terminology, thus the parameter is “correct terminology”, and thus the mistake can potentially lie in incorrect usage of terms. It would be pointless to enumerate possible text requirements as they are numerous and change with individual revision tasks.

To contrast the above mentioned proposition, this is how Hansen defines translation product parameters: they are “(a) results of an evaluation of the final target text, which means primarily errors and good solutions; (b) categorizations of types of errors in the final product, and (c) the results of an evaluation of the subjects’ revisions during the translation process.” (Hansen 195) While for her parameters arise from evaluation or represent directly error types, the primary proposition respects a certain time line of the process: Requirements are stated prior to translation or revision, parameters are being observed during the act of translation or revision, and finally, the mistakes are (or are not) revealed after it.

Before looking at individual taxonomies of revision changes and error types²⁶, let us note that mistakes in a text are not distributed proportionally. Their occurrence is rather uneven; therefore reviser must be ready to encounter five errors in one sentence or no error in five successive sentences.

2.12.1 Classifying revision changes, parameters and errors

This chapter should scrutinise the nature of revision parameters, changes, and errors. The different classifications provide more thorough and systematic theoretical approach to revision.

First, it is important to note that not all changes made in terms of revision are corrections. *The quality of change* can be summarised as:

²⁶ The classification of errors pertinent to the corpus analysis will be presented in the practical part of the Thesis.
a. Improvement, i.e. correcting a mistake. In such case it is meaningful to identify the error type.

b. Unnecessary change, i.e. an amendment for which there is no sufficient reason. The revised text segment is of the same quality as it was before the change. In such cases, revision is a wasteful exercise.

c. Deterioration, i.e. change of the drafted text segment which represents a worse solution.

Secondly, the changes can be classified with respect to the reviser’s motivation. The intentions of revisers can be observed in experiments using talk-aloud protocols. The reason underlying a change can be:

a. to achieve maximal faithfulness to the original (accurate meaning transfer, equivalent adjusting, stress, style),

b. to make the target text conform with generally applied and officially established rules and principles (grammar, spelling, punctuation, idiomaticity),

c. to ease reading and comprehension for the intended receivers (tailoring the language, smoothing, adjusting terminology).

Revision changes can also be assessed according to their scope, i.e. the size of a proportion of text which is affected. (Mossop 152) The basic division is twofold:

a. microlevel changes,

b. macrolevel changes.

If a mistake occurs on the micro level, it is, generally speaking, easier to spot it since the mistake is manifested in a smaller text unit. Macrolevel errors, on the other hand may “involve issues of cohesion, coherence, genre conventions and so on.” Angelone says that revision does not usually occur on this level. (Angelone 17-18) There are further classifications of the level on which a change occurs; for example Dimitrova works with this classification in her study:

a. syntactic,

b. morphological,

c. lexical,

d. content,

e. orthography and

f. other

(Dimitrova 33)
Four, Fraigley and Witte based their revision changes classification on “whether new information is brought to the text or whether old information is removed in such a way that it cannot be recovered through drawing inferences”. They term such changes meaning changes (Text-Base Changes in the scheme below) and divide them further according to the text level affected. The other category is called surface changes, it involves formal modifications which “do not bring new information to a text or remove old information.” (Fraigley and Witte 402)

![Chart no. 2 - Fraigley and Witte’s system of revision changes (Fraigley and Witte 403)](chart.png)

Newmark states that “categorization of translation errors is firstly subject to one’s personal theory of translation, and secondly to whether the errors occur in literary or non-literary texts.” (Newmark 1998:189) Disregarding the literariness of texts due to the focus of this Thesis, it is true that the categorizations can be subjective. There are a lot of possible points of view on error types. The following paragraphs should give an overview of them.

When dealing with mistakes in translated texts, the particular language has to be considered. English is certainly prone to other kinds of mistakes than Czech. In the context of revision (or proofreading) spelling is mentioned very often, but it is mostly in connection to English. The Czech language is different as far as phonetics and orthography are concerned and spelling mistakes are not such a big issue. On the level of grammar, the errors peculiar to the Czech language concern subject-predicate accord in the past tense (y/i), exception words and other cases of “i/y”, capitalization, consonant groups, “spřežky”, the prefix s-/z-, etc. In terms of punctuation, it is definitely the use of comma. As to stylistics, there are also mistakes which are more frequent than others: false syntactic pair, position of the reflexive pronoun
“se”, noun chains, and so forth. Moreover, a different sort of mistakes is to be found in original texts and in translations. “The errors which are peculiar to translational writing [are]: mistranslations, omissions, and the strange unidiomatic language interference (odd word combinations or sentence structures calqued from the source text)”. (Mossop 21)

House developed her own classification in which she divides errors to:

a. covertly erroneous errors which “result from differences between the socio-cultural values and the two language systems.” They are more difficult to uncover “since they demand a much more subtle, qualitative-descriptive assessment.” (House 2001:56 in Chakhachiro) and

b. overtly erroneous errors – these are mismatches (mistranslations, additions, and omissions) and faults of the target language. They are further subdivided to
   i. Not Translated;
   ii. Slight Change in Meaning;
   iii. Significant Change in Meaning;
   iv. Distortion of Meaning; and
   v. Breaches of the TL system (cases of ungrammaticality – clear breaches of the TL system; and cases of dubious acceptability - breaches of the norm of usage) (House in Yamini)

Another example of classification of mistakes treating explicitly translation is Geoffrey Kingscott’s system in his article “An Approach to Translation Quality Assessment”:

a. Wrong Term,
b. Syntactic Error,
c. Omission,
d. Word structure or agreement error,
e. Misspelling,
f. Punctuation Error,
g. Miscellaneous Error.

(Kingscott in Kuběna 48)

There are no two identical systems of error classification since it is usually accommodated to the particular text conditions. The appropriateness of some of the above mentioned classifications will be discussed in the practical part of the Thesis.
Let us now consider the revision parameters. These are the criteria observed during the process of revision which define the potential error types. The parameters by Mossop are the following:

1. MEANING TRANSFER
   a) Accuracy
   b) Completeness
2. CONTENT
   a) Logic
   b) Facts
3. LANGUAGE AND STYLE
   a) Smoothness
   b) Tailoring
   c) Sub-language
   d) Idiom
   e) Mechanics
4. PHYSICAL PRESENTATION
   a) Layout
   b) Typography
   c) Organization

(Mossop 125)

The Transfer parameters (1.) which can only be checked in comparative reading are opposed to the CLP parameters (2-4.) that can be revised by means of unilingual reading.

To compare, there is Gouadec’s system of revision parameters below. He states these features should be observed in “standard quality control”.

I. MATERIAL QUALITY – completeness, compliance with specifications, layout;
II. LANGUAGE (spelling, grammar, syntax, terminology, phraseology), style, register – correctness, homogeneity, compliance with applicable specifications;
III. TECHNICAL-FACTUAL-SEMANTIC QUALITY CHECK – information, data, logical or other sequences – adequacy and compliance with applicable specifications;
IV. TRANSFER – completeness, compliance with professional standards, specifications, readers’ possible constraints;

27 The complete chart of Mossop’s revision parameters is to be found in the Appendices.
28 This parameter does not have to be checked by the reviser if the translator has checked it.
v. HOMOGENEITY AND CONSISTENCY (harmonization) of style, terminology, phraseology and register.

(Gouadec 77)

The two systems are similar in treating transfer and language (and style) as an independent category. While Mossop calls the formal aspect of a translated text Physical presentation, Gouadec terms it Material quality. Moreover, Gouadec adds a feature called Homogeneity and Consistency; Mossop presupposes such parameter implicitly for all his categories. Finally, Mossop’s parameter of Content can be compared to Gouadec’s Technical-factual-semantic quality check. To sum up, these two models have a lot in common, however, they are not completely suitable to the corpus analysis to be carried out.
3 Practical part

The practical part of this Thesis involves two key elements: a specialised corpus and a questionnaire. Both are first introduced and duly described, then analyzed and conclusions from the data obtained are drawn. The results of both practical subparts will be merged, if possible, in order to get a complex notion of what revision involves in the practical sense of the word.

The basic limitation of the practical part of the Thesis is its focus on students of translation and the direction of translation from English to Czech.

3.1 The corpus

The main objective of the corpus research is to reveal what changes and how many of them occur in student translations. The approach is mainly descriptive, although there is a category judging the quality of the changes. In Newmark’s words “texts can’t be measured, words can.” (Newmark 1991:111) In accordance with this statement, analytic approach is applied to investigation of individual texts in the corpus.

Since there was not any existing corpus which would fit the needs of this project, a new specialised corpus had to be created. It is a unidirectional parallel corpus which is, however, not focused on the transfer between source text and target text, but on the revision phase which is monitored by analyzing the changes made between the drafted and the final target text versions. The design of the corpus was guided by several general research questions, these will be presented in the chapter 3.1.4.

The texts creating the corpus were obtained from fellow students, they are typical seminar tasks, part of a department translation project, and two of them are trail translations carried out in terms of a job application. In numbers, the corpus consists of ten translated and revised texts; five texts are examples of revision, another five of self-revision. The total size of the collection is 53,369 characters²⁹ (10,638 words), the length of the individual texts ranges from 1,600 to 19,000 characters¹. In the whole corpus, 461 instances of revision were identified. Subjects who translated or revised the texts are eleven, nine of them are advanced translation trainees, two are professionals. The reason why not all the translators and revisers are students is the lack of research material available. The language pair and the direction of the

²⁹ The numbers given are counted without spaces. The length of draft translations was counted.
translations is English into Czech. Detailed information about the corpus texts is represented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Name</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Reviser</th>
<th>Draft Length</th>
<th>Final Length</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT1_Rules</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6624</td>
<td>6733</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2_Software</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>pA</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2238</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT3_Obama</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>pB</td>
<td>12270</td>
<td>12515</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT4_Reactor</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>18698</td>
<td>18678</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT5_Polysystem_II</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>40617</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Name</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Draft Length</th>
<th>Final Length</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT6_Dickens_I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>3467</td>
<td>3537</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT7_Origami_I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>2949</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT8_Origami_II</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>2762</td>
<td>2806</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT9_Polysystem_I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT10_Dickens_II</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2603</td>
<td>3102</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>12752</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 3 – Review of the texts in the corpus

The individual texts were named and numbered; “RT” stands for “revised text”, a number follows (1-5 are revisions by somebody else, 6-10 are self-revisions), lastly every text is assigned a name reflecting its topic. Two of the texts occur twice, namely Origami and Dickens, these are identical source texts, however rendered by different translators-revisers. RT5 and RT9 are different parts of one text. In the view of anonymisation, the initials of translators and revisers were chosen randomly, pA and pB are professional translators-revisers, rest of the subjects are students of the MA programme English-language Translation.

As far as the texts’ characteristics are concerned, they represent typical assignments students usually get. They are mostly non-literary texts, largely non-technical. The following table gives a brief characteristics of the texts. They are available in full length in the Electronic Appendices.
The representativeness of the corpus is a complex issue. As to the nature of the texts comprised in the corpus, they represent a day-to-day school practice in different seminars attended by mature students of translation; they are as divers as translation tasks are in university courses. Nevertheless, representativeness is also linked to the size and proportion. (O’Keeffe and McCarthy 31) Since the material for this type of research is hard to obtain, the corpus is of medium size and the proportion of revision and self-revision is not exactly even. Nevertheless, as a general, basic research into the matter of revision, these features of the corpus are satisfying.

3.1.1 Methodology

The recent years have witnessed a small boom in corpus investigation in the field of Translation Studies; it is so thanks to new software available which makes the researched data more flexible and easier to scrutinise. There has also been a tendency “to make methods and findings more ‘scientific’, i.e. more valid, exact, and eventually, replicable.” (Hansen 204) To this end, different advanced and multiparadigm research methods have been used.

The peculiarities of translated texts can be investigated either via the process, or via the product. Although the process of revision is traceable in the corpus in terms of the state of the texts before and after revision, this Thesis represents the second option, using a collection of texts and describing their features. This project neither focuses on translators; the material obtained does not suit such an aim.

In terms of methodology, I draw on Gyde Hansen’s integrative description, which is “a method which combines approaches from both empirical science and the liberal arts.”
In practice it means working with both qualitative and quantitative data and the respective methods and approaches. The qualitative data are categorised and counted and the qualitative results obtained are interpreted and explained. Hansen herself says that these two types of information will be present in any translation research. (Hansen 196) From the theoretical point of view, the process of research investigation has two components: analytic and synthetic description, i.e. examination of the input data in isolation and “investigating the relations of the phenomenon under investigation to connected phenomena in its surroundings, and to the whole study.” (Hansen 206)

3.1.1.1 Limitations of the research

As mentioned above, the analytic procedures of the research process entail isolating the component data of the material in question. Unfortunately, a certain degree of distortion of the information cannot be avoided due to the fact that any subject of translation investigation does not fit to or allow complete isolation from the complex reality of the translation phenomenon. (Hansen 202)

Secondly, the observer effect is to be considered. Pym claims that every observation is affected by the position of the observer, therefore, “[w]e can never trust any one observation absolutely.” (Pym 2010:93-94) Indeed, subjectivity is an issue in every research project, however, it cannot be entirely eliminated especially in a field like Translation Studies. In this Thesis, subjectivity can mainly be present in the judgements of quality of a revision change. On the other hand, the data entering the investigation are not influenced by the subject knowing they will be a part of a research paper.

Thirdly, there is a limitation in terms of the variables that are included in the research. Since this one is only text-based research and also due to the length of the corpus, the aspects like time elapsed between translation and revision, speed, exact motivation underlying a change, translator-reviser’s habits, and the like could not be part of the analysis. As a case of subjectivity and limited resources available, a small amount of guesswork had to be done in extreme cases.

For example deciding whether a mistake like “při snaze čelit sporů” stems from the lack of knowledge of grammar, or whether it is a simple typo (revision instance no. 24 in RT_3_Obama). There were more difficult cases, where the dilemma was most often about the underlying motivation of the change in question.
3.1.2 The corpus design

The corpus was created for a special purpose and thus is tailored for the examination of revision. Its design involved a lot of planning, but new tasks and changes emerged also as the creation process was evolving.

The method used for gaining the material is “non-probability sampling”, as O’Keeffe and McCarthy term it. It lies in “taking samples from where it is possible to get them; it is often termed ‘convenience’ or ‘opportunistic’ sampling”. (O’Keeffe and McCarthy 58) However some of the texts obtained had to be eliminated because of the system of mark-up; certain documents contained recommendations rather than straightforward changes. This method of amendment did not suit the corpus analysis.

All the input data were in electronic format, namely in Microsoft Word 2003 or 2007 version of the text editor. Two of the source texts had to be rewritten into an MS Word document, so that the changes could be traced and the exact length of the texts could be determined (RT_7 and RT_8 _Origami – originally a picture, and RT_3 _Obama – originally in pdf format). This fact already shows that the revisers worked on screen. The texts were duly adjusted, named, the numbers of characters were counted and then the portions of texts were manually lined up into MS Excel worksheets. The alignment was usually carried out by sentences, nevertheless, the context was always taken into consideration and in certain cases the text stretches were longer or shorter, according to the respective needs for context and good orientation. Anyway, the context can always be checked in the full-length documents in the Electronic Appendices of the Thesis.

Every Excel sheet includes a header giving information on the type of revision (self-revision or revising others), length of source text, draft translation and revised translation, differences between them, and also the number of revision instances. Furthermore, the main data are embodied in the table below the header. The revision instances are numbered and the aligned segments may repeat since in one text segment there can naturally be different revision instances. The main activity in analysing the corpus data lied in comparing the draft segments to the final version segments. The changes are marked as follows:

- blue – elements to be considered,
- red – removed elements,
- purple – added elements

The format of the tabled data is consistent across all worksheets. The following picture is an example of a table of corpus analysis.
3.1.3 The analysis procedure

The comparative analysis of the drafted target text and the final target text version was done via the Compare tool of MS Word. A sample thumbnail of the compared document is to be found in the Appendices. No other special programme was used during the whole research work. MS Word marks every difference between the two documents chosen, this was very helpful in terms of recognizing the changes made. To every instance a source text segment was aligned, which provides the context of translation phase and eventual comparative reading for revision. If an identical change occurred twice or more in a text (in view of consistency), only the first occurrence was tabled and included in the analyses. Only the changes made were marked up, the changes which could have been done to improve the text were disregarded. The last column called “notes” may contain comments on individual revision instances, however the text inserted there is only taken into consideration if written in black.

After alignment of the textual material, the individual revision instances were classified. The four fundamental categories were: change type, scope of change, literalness, and quality of change. In addition, a few additional features were observed, namely resulting changes, mistakes introduced in the phase of revision (in terms of quality of change), and deliberate postponements of revision solution.

3.1.3.1 Change type

After a superficial examination of the corpus, the system for classifying the revision changes of four types and fourteen sub-types was drawn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. TRANSFER</th>
<th>2. STYLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. significant change of meaning</td>
<td>7. register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. slight change of meaning</td>
<td>8. smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. equivalent change</td>
<td>9. reducing reiteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. adding information</td>
<td>10. introducing reiteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. reducing information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was not possible to adopt an already existing taxonomy, since none suited the analysis well enough. Instead, the types of change are partly original and partly borrowed from Brian Mossop, Juliane House, or Lester Fraigley and Stephen Witte. One of the reasons why Mossop’s revision parameters (presented in the Appendices and in the chapter 2.12.1) did not suit the corpus analysis is the modest division within the Transfer type; Mossop only considers Accuracy and Completeness of Transfer. The applied system comprises six sub-types of Transfer change; two categories were borrowed from House, namely significant and slight change of meaning (of course the borderline between these two degrees is not easy to draw). These two categories are self-explanatory; they are assigned to instances of minor or major shift of meaning. Further, there is a change subtype of equivalent change which was created on the basis of the prototype theory. This theory of cognitive science proposes that “although sets of words, phrases, and sentence structures have closely matched meanings and are acceptable in the target language, there are some of them that are better than others.” (Chakhachiro) Equivalent change means replacement of an acceptable solution by another one; the change can lie in reformulation, change of point of view, it may involve addition or deletion of certain elements, but only those which were implicitly present in the drafted version. The next two subtypes are originally by Fraigley and Witte. Adding or reducing information concern facts that were not implicitly present in the draft version. The last subtype of transfer is adjusting stress. It concerns mainly functional sentence perspective and it is based on the fact that emphasis of the source texts should be equivalent with emphasis of the target text.

Table no. 6 - Revision changes classification
**Transfer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Type</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>significant change</strong></td>
<td>Ask to have your desk removed.</td>
<td>Požádejte o jiné pracovní místo.</td>
<td>Požádejte o přestěhování vašeho stolu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RT_4/64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>slight change</strong></td>
<td>I have to look at my flexibility and willingness to learn a new approach.</td>
<td>Musíme se obrátit na svou pružnost a ochotu naučit se nový přístup.</td>
<td>Musíme se zaměřit na svou flexibilitu a ochotu naučit se novému přístupu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RT_4/67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>equivalent change</strong></td>
<td>The market is tight, and you are having a hard time convincing yourself to leave.</td>
<td>Na trhu je docela těsno a vám se nedaří se přemluvit k odchodu.</td>
<td>Na trhu je docela těsno a vám se nedaří se donutit k odchodu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RT_4/57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>adding</strong></td>
<td>5 Fold one triangular flap backwards and forwards, so that it stands up.</td>
<td>5. Přehněte jeden trojúhelníkovitý roh tam a zpět tak, aby stál.</td>
<td>5. Jeden z trojúhelníkových rohů jemně přehněte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RT_7/32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>reducing</strong></td>
<td>How many people working in this industry even understood the cycle and planned for it?</td>
<td>Kolik lidí z tohoto oboru vůbec chápal cyklickou povahu ekonomiky a počítalo s ní?</td>
<td>Kolik lidí vůbec chápal cyklickou povahu ekonomiky a počítalo s ní?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RT_4/40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>adjusting stress</strong></td>
<td>Once you have become sufficiently sensitized to these distinctions, the Importance of Not Being Earnest rule is really quite simple.</td>
<td>Jak už jednou budete schopní vycítit tyto rozdíly, pravidlo „Jak je důležité nebýt přehnaně upřímný“ bude vypadat velmi jednoduše.</td>
<td>Jakmile budete schopni tyto rozdíly vycítit, pravidlo „Jak je důležité nebýt přehnaně upřímný“ bude vypadat velmi jednoduše.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RT_1/34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 7 – *Examples of individual change types – Transfer*

Mossop’s category called Content proved to be unnecessary in this corpus analysis, there was only one case of breaching the logic. Therefore, there is not any similar category in the applied classification system.

Another reason for creating a new classification of changes was the inappropriateness of Mossop’s or House’s categories reflecting language and style (also presented in chapter 2.12.1). While House condenses them in one single subcategory, Mossop treats them more thoroughly, however, some of the classes seem obscure or overlap and might fit a different type of research. For instance, in the present conditions, it was not possible to decide whether a change was made in terms of Smoothing or Tailoring when it comes to such a dilemma. The motivation of the reviser can sometimes be guessed, but can never be known precisely if only the textual material is available. Instead, there is *Style* as an independent category, which includes *register, smoothing* (which lies in reorganising target text units, enhancing coherence and reader’s comprehension and ease of reading), and *reducing* or *introducing reiteration*. The category called *other* covers the rest of the stylistic amendments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>register  (RT_7/6)</th>
<th>Mezi další věci ze skládaného papíru, které se dají nosit, patří teplé papuče z novin, pásy složené z papíru a nejrůznější druhy šperků.</th>
<th>Mezi další věci ze skládaného papíru, které se dají nosit, patří teplé pantofle z novin, pásy a nejrůznější druhy šperků.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>smoothing (RT_1/49)</td>
<td>Někdy tito herci dokonce vypadají, jako by se ocitli pro ně v trapné a nepříjemné situaci.</td>
<td>A i přesto téměř vždy vypadají, jako by se ocitli v pro ně trapné a nepříjemné situaci.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reducing repetition (RT_5/1)</td>
<td>It felt as if I were meeting a character from one of the great novels of the late nineteenth century—Our Mutual Friend, Sister Carrie, or something by George Gissing or Thomas Hardy.</td>
<td>Připadalo mi, jako bych bych potkal nějakou postavu z románu z konce 19. století – Náš vzájemný přítel, Sestřička Carrie nebo něco od George Gissinga nebo Thomase Hardyho.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>introducing repetition (RT_1/24)</td>
<td>For the English, the rules of humour are the cultural equivalent of natural laws – we obey them automatically, rather in the way that we obey the law of gravity.</td>
<td>Pro Angličany jsou pravidla humoru kulturním ekvivalentem přírodních zákonů – řídíme se jim automaticky, skoro stejně jako zákony gravitace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 8 – Examples of individual change types - Style

The third change type is called **Target language system** and it includes three subcategories: **grammar, idiom, and typography**. The grammar category concerns changes related to rule-based issues such as spelling, accord, declination, orthography etc. Furthermore, the subtype called **idiom** refers to changes that stem from rhetorical preferences of the target language, i.e. reducing interference, adjusting terminology in technical texts, enhancing idiomaticity and natural sounding. Typography involves punctuation marks and correct usage of dashes, hyphens, quotation marks, and so forth.
(...) how can these politicians bring themselves to utter such shamefully earnest platitudes, in such ludicrously solemn tones?

Jak vůbec mohou politikové vyslovit takové ostudné fráze, navíc vyřčené s vysokou závažností?

Adobe will provide a Version Cue compatibility component that will allow CS5 users to interact with assets stored in Version Cue CS4.

Společnost Adobe poskytne komponentu k zachování kompatibility, která umožní uživatelům CS5 pracovat s položkami uloženými v aplikaci Version Cue CS4.

I find that usually this is the best choice, because I can rely on the skills I have or can polish them to move forward in a very positive fashion.

Zjistila jsem, že je to většinou ta nejlepší volba, protože se můžu spoléhat na své dovednosti nebo je vypilovat a tak se posunout vpřed velice pozitivním způsobem.

Table no. 9 – Examples of individual change types – Target language matters

Last but not least, there is a change type of Mechanics (which is not identical with Mossop’s Mechanics). This category is not further divided. Changes of mechanics are mechanical slips, typos, over-deletions, doubled words, in short, mistakes caused by the computer keyboard/mouse interface. The aspect of formatting was not taken into consideration, since it was not possible to trace the format changes in certain texts and since in some of the revision tasks it obviously was not a part of the translator’s/reviser’s task to put the translation in a respective layout.

Table no. 10 – Examples of individual change types – Mechanics

A category relating to respecting a translation brief, or any instructions given for a translation or revision task was not created either, as such guidelines were not part of the tasks or were not available.
In addition to all the above enumerated change types, a case of revision could be marked as “unclassified”, which means it was not possible to assign any available change type to it. The number of unclassified instances (within any of the set categories) will show the efficiency of the classification system established.

### 3.1.3.2 Scope of change

The scope of change proved to be a surprisingly difficult facet of the examined textual material. This criterion should reflect the text level on which a change occurred. In practice, it can be considered from two perspectives; the thing to be identified and classified is either the size of an element which participated in the change, or the size of an element that had to be considered by the reviser. Since this research is text-based and therefore there is no information available on what was going on in the revisers’ minds, the former possibility had to be opted for. Unfortunately, findings from this part of the investigation are not of great interest. They cannot reveal the size of revision units as such, but only size of the formal elements that were edited. Moreover, there arises another problem – the dilemma between considering only the size of the draft text element or final text element because the size of these two elements is not the same (e.g. one can be a word and the other a phrase). For these reasons the criterion of scope of change was excluded from the analysis.

### 3.1.3.3 Literalness

The idea of looking into literalness in revision was inspired by the research paper by Brigitta Enlung Dimitrova (mentioned in the chapter 2.5.4.3 Tendency towards literal translation). She came to the conclusion that in many cases translators revise more literal rendition of the source text by less literal ones. However, her research concerned exclusively self-revision and mostly revision in the writing phase. Here, the tendency toward literalness in revision will be investigated in revising work of others and self-revision, both of course in the revision/wind-up phase.

For this category there are three possible evaluations: more literal, less literal or unclassified. In terms of literalness, unclassifiable cases can either indicate that the degree of literalness of the final solution was the same as of the draft solution, or that there was no point in deciding on this category, e.g. in case of a typo.

### 3.1.3.4 Quality of changes

A classification category called quality of change was established in order to discover how much is actually changed for the better. This category is most prone to subjective evaluation,
nevertheless, the decision on whether a final version solution is better or worse than a draft solution was always supported by rational argument.

A revision instance can be identified as improvement, deterioration, or unnecessary (already stated in the chapter 2.12.1). First, improvement does not always mean a perfect solution to a revision problem; it can only be a partial correction of a mistake. Deterioration is clearly an instance which came out worse after revision. Thirdly, a case marked as unnecessary may indicate that there was no amendment needed at all, or that it was, but the change was not successful. Since it is the aim of revision to improve the target text, any change that does not improve it is deemed unnecessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unnecessary (RT_1/82)</th>
<th>There have certainly been brave individuals who have campaigned for the rights and freedoms we now enjoy, but most ordinary English people now rather take these for granted, (...)</th>
<th>Samozřejmě, že se objevili stateční jednotlivci, kteří chtěli bojovat za práva a svobodu, čehož teď rádi využíváme, ale co většina obyčejných Angličanů bere jako samozřejmost.</th>
<th>Samozřejmě, že se objevili stateční jednotlivci, kteří chtěli bojovat za svobodu a práva, kterých teď rádi požíváme, avšak které také většina obyčejných Angličanů považuje za samozřejmost.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement (RT_8/7)</td>
<td>Turned upside down, many boxes make excellent hats.</td>
<td>Otočené hlavou vzhůru můžou výborně posloužit jako klobouky.</td>
<td>Otočené dnem vzhůru mohou posloužit jako klobouky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterioration (RT_9/25)</td>
<td>As it evolves, polysystem theory is entering a new phase in which extraliterary factors such as patronage, social conditions, economics, and institutional manipulation are being correlated to the way translations are chosen and function in a literary system.</td>
<td>Teorie polysystémů se vyvíjí a vstupuje do nové fáze. Mimoliterární faktory, mezi které patří například sponzorství, sociální podmínky, ekonomika a institucionální manipulace, nyní vzájemné souvisí se způsobem výběru překladů a jejich funkcí v literárním systému.</td>
<td>Teorie polysystémů se vyvíjí a vstupuje do nové fáze, ve které jsou mimoliterární faktory, mezi které například patří sponzorství, sociální podmínky, ekonomika a institucionální manipulace, korelované stejným způsobem, jakým se vybírají překlady a jak v literárním systému fungují.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 11 – Examples of classifying the quality of changes

The quality of changes is linked to an additional variable – mistakes introduced during revision. These are all considered deterioration and their percentage will be counted in the corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mistake introduced (RT_4/62)</th>
<th>You get your turn in Figure 1.2</th>
<th>Dostane se na vás v diagramu 1.2.</th>
<th>Dostane se na i vás (Obr. 1.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table no. 12 – Example of an introduced mistake
3.1.3.5 Resulting changes

One of the additional features observed in the corpus texts are resulting changes. These are secondary revisions that occur as a consequence of a primary change, e.g. adjusting letter case when dividing or merging sentences, changing endings of depending parts of sentence as a consequence of a change of a verb or a noun with different gender, and the like. It will be found out how many changes bring about resulting changes. They are likely to be missed if the reviser does not pay enough attention to the whole segment which is affected by the change made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resulting change (RT_2/39)</th>
<th>Adobe will provide a Version Cue compatibility component that will allow CS5 users to interact with assets stored in Version Cue CS4.</th>
<th>Adobe poskytne komponent pro zachování kompatibility, který umožní uživatelům CS5 pracovat s položkami uloženými v CS4 Version Cue.</th>
<th>Společnost Adobe poskytne komponentu k zachování kompatibility, která umožní uživatelům sady CS5 pracovat se zdroji uloženými v aplikaci Version Cue CS4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resulting change – a mistake introduced (RT_10/27)</td>
<td>They are painfully conscious of the contours of their society, the dominance of money, the price of transgression, the place on the scale of rank and clout of everyone they encounter.</td>
<td>Jsou si až moc dobře vědomi toho, jaká je společnost, v níž žijí, moci peněz, ceny za porušení pravidel, svého místa na žebříčku postavení a vlivu každého, s kým se setkají.</td>
<td>Bolestně si uvědomují hranice sociální vrstvy, v níž žijí, rozhodující vliv peněz, cenu za porušení pravidel, své místo na žebříčku postavení a vlivu každého, s kým se setkají.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 13 – Examples of resulting change

3.1.4 Research questions

Since this Thesis should give a basic view of revision and its aspects and does not investigate a single particular facet of revision, open research questions were formulated in place of concrete hypotheses. They will concern general issues which can be further investigated via more specialised research.

The following research questions\(^{31}\) were set for the corpus analysis (results for revising texts of others and self-revision will be compared within the appropriate research questions):

1. **How much revision actually occurs in student translations?**
2. **How does the target text length change after revision?**

\(^{31}\) Research questions concerning text level on which changes occur were dropped due to the impossibility to classify the scope of change in the corpus material.
3. What is the proportion of revision change types and subtypes in students’ revised translations?

4. What is the quality of student revisions?

5. Is there a tendency towards literal translation (viz. Dimitrova’s research) in students’ revised translations?

Answers to these research questions will be presented in the following chapter, the possible underlying reasons will be treated in the chapter 3.1.6 Discussion.

3.1.5 Results

The results presented in this chapter were obtained by means of integrative approach, i.e. first classifying the isolated revision cases and then quantifying these data. The results are illustrated by a number of tables and charts; the most crucial ones are placed either in this chapter or in the Appendices, the others are to be found on the CD-ROM Appendices.

As to the first research question, there were 461 revisions in the whole corpus made up of 10,638 words (53,369 characters without spaces). It means that 4.33% words were changed in terms of revision. Furthermore, a quite conspicuous difference between such a percentage in revision and self-revision was observed. While in texts revised by somebody else the percentage of changes amounts to 3.11%, for self-revision it is 8.93%.

3.1.5.1 Change in the length of texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text name</th>
<th>diff. draft - final</th>
<th>% difference in characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT1_Rules</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2_Software</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT4_Reactor</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT3_Obama</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT6_Polysystem II</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
<td>-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text name</th>
<th>diff. draft - final</th>
<th>% difference in characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT6_Dickens I</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT7_Origami I</td>
<td>27.06</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT8_Origami II</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT9_Polysystem I</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT10_Dickens II</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 14 – Change of text length

---

32 This figure is a result of weighted average of percentages of revision changes in the component texts. It was used in place of arithmetical average because the latter does not reflect the different length of texts in relation to the number of revision instances. The result of an arithmetical average could be used as a piece of information characterising the corpus per se, but such a number cannot be generalised. Weighted average was therefore applied in all related calculations.

33 The proportion of revision is expressed in words since during the research analysis most of the changes occurred at word level.
It is clear from the corpus data that revision influences the length of the target text. Again, the numbers are higher for self-revision even after accounting for the individual text lengths. In two cases the final version of a translation was even shorter than its draft, but these are obviously exceptions. In vast majority, the revised texts were longer than the drafted texts.

3.1.5.2 Types of changes

As far as the types of changes made in student revisions are concerned, their subtypes were counted individually and then added up. As visualised in the chart above, more than half of the revision cases are changes in transfer (changing the translation variant, adding or reducing the information). The second most often field of change is style followed by changes in the target language system (grammar, idiomaticity, typography). Only 4% of the changes were issues of mechanics. In the category of change type, only 7 cases were unclassified.

Furthermore, the results for the change type of transfer as such show that revisers most often operate with equivalents. Out of the 240 instances identified as changes in transfer, one...
half lied in altering a translation equivalent which did not change the meaning. The second and the third position (with similar scores) belongs to slight changes of meaning and adding information into the drafted texts. The least frequent changes concern stress adjustment, crucial changes of meaning and reduction of the information in the drafted text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer subtypes</th>
<th>Significant change of meaning</th>
<th>Slight change</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
<th>Adding info</th>
<th>Reducing info</th>
<th>Adjusting stress</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>revising others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-revision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 17 – *Comparison of Transfer subtypes in revision and self-revision*

Comparing results concerning *transfer subtypes in revision and self-revision*, one can notice the double values for slight and significant change of meaning in revision of others and a quite big difference between the figures for reducing information (greater in self-revision) and adjusting stress (greater in revising texts of other translators).

The subtypes of style – adjusting register, smoothing, introducing or reducing reiteration were spread out within the category as follows: smoothing – 60%, register 18%, reducing reiteration – 12%, introducing it – 5%, and other stylistic changes – 5% as well. The percentages for revision and self-revision more or less correspond, only adjustments in terms of reiteration are more frequent in self-revision. The difference of 9% in smoothing (more in revising others) is not of a great importance.

In terms of *changes in target language system*, half of them were adjustments of idiomaticity, secondly changes in typography (26.32%) and grammar (22.68%). These percentages are similar across self-revision and revision – again the percentages are higher for the latter – except of changes in typography; these represent 23% in texts revised by somebody else in comparison to 40% in self-revised texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TL system subtypes</th>
<th>Idiom</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Typography</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>revising others</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-revision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 18 – *Comparing changes in TL system for revision and self-revision*
Since the **changes of mechanics** were not further divided, they can be only compared with respect to their occurrence in text revised by the translator/reviser and another reviser. As mentioned in the first point of this chapter, changes in mechanics represent 4.34% out of the total number of changes (20 revision instances); 60% of them were made in self-revised texts and 40% in translations revised by somebody else.

**3.1.5.3 Quality of changes**

The fourth aspect to be presented is the **quality of revision changes**. Out of the three options established, improvement is the most frequent one (62%)\(^\text{34}\), followed by unnecessary changes (25%). Only 36 cases (which make up 8%) were amended in an inappropriate way.

![Chart no. 19 – General proportion of quality of change](chart.png)

**Quality of change**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of change</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterioration</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

The **proportion of quality for revision and self-revision** is summed up in the following table. The data show very similar tendencies for both kinds of revision. Still, revision carried out on somebody else’s text shows greater improvement, less unnecessary changes and also less deterioration.

---

\(^{34}\) The partial numbers do not always have to make up 100% or 461 revision instances due to the unclassified cases and cases where one instance was classified as more than one option within a respective category.
In addition to cases of deterioration, there is another facet of revision which degrades the quality of a final version of a translation – mistakes that are introduced in the course of revision. These mistakes were recorded in 4% of the revision instances (out of which 40% occurred in revising others and 60% in self-revision).

From the data retrieved, it was also possible to see the quality in relation to the change types. The instances of the same subtype of change and of the same quality were counted. Improvement occurred most often at the level of equivalent change, smoothing and grammar. Unnecessary changes concerned most frequently equivalent changes and deterioration was the most repeated in the subtypes of smoothing, adjusting stress, equivalent change and significant change of meaning.

This matter could be further analysed by looking at relation between quality and change type separately in revision and self-revision, however, the data may be misleading because of the size of the corpus generally and because of small number of respective instances (mainly scarce cases of deterioration). Charts for all combined results are to be found in the Appendices.

### 3.1.5.4 Literalness

As far as the tendency towards literal translation is concerned, the number of changes was quite balanced in this matter. Out of the total number of revision solutions classified in terms of literalness, 26.40% were more literal and 33.56% were less literal. The general difference of 7.16% is not very crucial. This category contained the most unclassified instances of all.
However, literalness can be correlated to quality (viz. table below). It was discovered that for both kinds of revision together, less literal renditions changed the translation for the better in almost 44% of the cases and made the translations worse in about 12% of the cases. The instances classified as “improvement” and whatever degree of literalness were the most often since cases of improvement as such prevailed, as well. In comparison to that, the instances marked as “deterioration“ and more/less literal at the same time did not represent even a half of the cases of improvement. Deterioration occurred mostly in self-revised texts where the renderings were less literal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literalness and quality</th>
<th>Less literal ~ improvement</th>
<th>More literal ~ improvement</th>
<th>Less literal ~ deterioration</th>
<th>More literal ~ deterioration</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>revising others</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-revision</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 22 – Correlating literalness to quality of change

Final revision solutions that were more literal were considered improvements in almost 38% and the proportion of deterioration for such renditions was approximately 6%. These results are not tremendously distinct in revising others and self-revision, the maximum difference does not exceed 10.8%.

On top of the findings which answer the research questions set out for the corpus, it was find out that there are certain changes which bring about additional minor change/changes.
These were called resulting changes. Their proportion is not great (7%, i.e. 34 revision cases), however, they represent a certain risk in revision. In the corpus they were distributed equally among the self-revised translations and the translations revised by someone else.

3.1.6 Discussion

The results presented above let themselves to various explanations and imply different facts. These will be discussed in this chapter. The potential reasons underlying the results obtained may be assumptions and presuppositions which could be confirmed via a research oriented on translators and revisers as human beings.

First of all let us consider the total percentage of revision in the corpus. Although 4.33% may not seem a high number at first sight, if considering that every 25th word (approximately) was amended in the texts where normally one line comprises around 13 words (as in this paragraph for example), revision proves to concern a quite large proportion of target texts. On top of that, there are instances that the revisers could have wanted to change, but did not in the end. Furthermore, the discovered difference in the volume of changes between revision and self-revision (3.11% vs. 8.93% respectively) prove to be quite sizeable. One of the possible explanations is the greater comfort revisers feel when amending their own translations. On the other hand, intervening a translation of another translator requires more self-assurance which is generally based on experience usually lacked by students\textsuperscript{35}. The changes one makes in one’s own translation do not in fact have to be all supported by an explanation, in such cases revisers needn’t justify the amendments and can simply say to themselves that a translation solution simply “does not sound right” and edit it. Finally, the borderline between the transfer and the revision phase is harder to draw in self-revision than in revision of others’ translations. A “self-reviser” may perceive the revision stage as not exactly separated from the transfer stage and therefore edits the target text more intensively viewing all the text modification natural. Also, knowing that the target text one generated will be read by someone else (let us assume that translators do usually know this) makes the translator check it more thoroughly, which, theoretically, leaves less things to be changed during the revision.

The results concerning the change of target text length before and after revision are analogical to the proportion of revision as such. It is crucial, however, to note that the output is influenced by omissions in transfer in two of the self-revised texts (RT_7 and RT_10). In

\textsuperscript{35} Although the whole research concerns student translations, two of the revisers were professionals. However, their performance did not show any important divergence from the performance of the translation trainees.
these texts, the translators/revisers realised they forgot to translate one paragraph of the source text and completed the translation during the revision. This does not mean the percentage for self-revised translations is distorted or biased, since such amendments are natural and occurred under natural circumstances. If these two texts were disqualified the percentages for revision and self-revision would be similar. Anyway, the final versions of translated texts were almost always longer than their drafts, but the difference was never very significant. The numbers thus show that most of the amendments are – formally – additions. However, in the academic conditions the length of translations does not really matter, since the students are not limited in terms of space.

As to the overall proportion of types of change, about half of the revision cases fall under transfer (53%), which can only be checked via comparative reading, and the other half is spread among style (26%), target language system (17%) and mechanics (4%), which usually require just unilingual re-reading. It follows that a quality revision technique should include both these kinds of reading.

The aspects of transfer were more edited in self-revision than in revision (60% and 48%). This fact may support the proposition saying that self-revision lacks a clear cut separation from the writing (transfer) phase; self-revisers may indeed change the target text in terms of meaning while still being mentally in the stage of proper translation. On the other hand, changes in target language system occurred more in the text revised by someone else (8% vs. 23%). This can be caused again by the inability of a translator (whose priority is, generally speaking, rendition of the meaning) to transform internally into a reviser (who should care, among others, for grammar, collocations, etc).

In terms of subtypes, the most often changes were equivalent alterations (27%) Such a percentage can support the prototype theory. Revisers indeed replace a word or phrase by another one which they deem better. Second most frequent changes were adjustments of smoothness (15%) which proves that revisers care a lot about reader-friendliness of the target texts and that adjustments of this aspect of target texts are needed. The last more significant percentages are slight change of meaning (9%), idiom (8%), and adding information (8%). These are thus the subtypes revisers deal with quite often. To mention a peculiarity from among the transfer subtypes, the values for slight change of meaning and adjusting stress were doubled in revising others in comparison to self-revision. It can simply be due to the familiarity effect, i.e. the self-revisers’ inability to see their own mistakes of this sort. The stress issue also agrees with Newmark’s complaint about how little attention translators devote to the right emphasis (Newmark 1998:70).
One quarter of the revision activity concerned stylistics and style really deserves such an amount of revisers’ attention. The change type of style is more complex than the others (the concept of style is difficult enough as it is) and the results within it are not very significant, therefore will not be discussed in detail. The values for the subtype changes of style were quite equally distributed.

Within the target language system changes, there arose an interesting difference of the proportion of changes in idiomaticity, grammar and typography. There were more changes in idiom, but less instances of typography edits in revising others. Adjusting idiomaticity can be easier for revisers working on texts of others, since they have the advantage of fresh view. The explanation for typography being tackled more by self-revisers can be that it is something translators manage to solve themselves and revisers do not have to amend the target text in terms of typography. It is the same case with mechanics, the mistakes in which can also be signalled by the spellchecker.

Correlating the categories of change type and quality of change, we obtain results showing what kinds of changes were actually corrections, how much unnecessary revision there was, and in which cases the revision harmed the target texts. Within all the three quality degrees, the biggest proportion belonged to the transfer changes (especially to equivalent changes which were the most numerous generally as well). More unnecessary changes in terms of transfer usually occurred in self-revised texts than in revisions of others. It follows that one sometimes wastes one’s time trying to improve the target text. Correcting mistranslations (which corresponds to cases classified as “significant/slight change of meaning + improvement) were recorded in only 35 cases out of the total 461 cases. It does not have to necessarily mean there are no mistranslations, but it may also be a prove of revisers not being able to find and correct them (which applies to all change subtypes). The results for stylistic matters were rather variable. A mediocre number of unnecessary changes was discovered in all the three quality degrees. On the level of target language system changes, there occurred very few unnecessary modifications; great majority of them were improvements, and only 5 cases were classified as deteriorations. As far as mechanics is concerned, the changes made in it are hardly ever unnecessary or deteriorations.

To discuss the quality of revision changes as such, despite the pretty high percentage of changes for the better, there are indeed unnecessary instances which only make the process of translation longer and revision renditions which are worse than draft translation solutions. As presupposed, better quality outcome was recorded in the texts revised by someone else. Besides deciding on the degree of quality of a revision change, mistakes introduced were counted. They may occur in revision as probably as in self-revision. These mistakes together
the fact that “improvement” does not automatically mean that a revised portion of a target text was absolutely successful (it only means the final solution is better than the draft one) imply that student revisions are not of perfect quality.

From the proportion of literalness in the corpus texts it seems that the tendency towards freer final translation solutions is only slight. Dimitrova’s research on literalness in revision concerned only self-revision of professional translators. The tendency she revealed through her investigation was stronger than the one observed in this corpus. Although less literal renditions prevail, the difference between them and more literal revision changes is only about 12%. Furthermore, the tendency towards more dissimilar revision solution is a little stronger in revising others. The significant proportion of changes towards more literal translation solutions proves that students are aware of this translation strategy being perfectly acceptable. Merging the results from this category with the category of quality again, it is obvious that the tendency towards literalness can be harmful, since 12% of the less literal revision instances were classified as deteriorations. It is possible that in such cases the revisers wanted the translation to sound less verbatim but worsened its quality at that expense.

In addition to the categories of variables set out prior to the corpus analysis, there arose some findings in the course of the categorisation. First, there were a couple of intentional postponements (e.g. in RT_6), i.e. for some reason the self-reviser could not cope with a piece of the source text (which were evidently not omitted by mistake) and either just wrote down a suggestion or left a blank space in the draft translation. This proves that students rely on revision stage when dealing with a difficult translation problem and use it deliberately even for finishing a translation. Moreover, it is evidence for the blurriness of the boundary between transfer and revision phases. Second, the “resulting changes” were counted. Their percentage is not high, but the mere occurrence of such changes implies that it also necessary to control the changes one has made carefully, i.e. revise the changes in fact.

All in all, the classification system established for the corpus analysis proved to be appropriate. The number of unclassified cases is negligible (maximally 2.2%) – except for the category of literalness (39%). The high percentage, though, was not due to inappropriateness of the classification taxonomy, but it stems from the nature of the aspect of literalness as such. Generally speaking, the unclassified instances (despite consulting the particular full length text) or revision changes classified as more than one type or category document the connection of any text to the context in which it exists as suggested by Dusi but also the fact that in research investigation of translation, no feature can be completely isolated and strictly categorised.
3.2 The questionnaire

The main objective of the questionnaire included in the practical part of this Thesis is to reveal actual day-to-day revision practice of translation trainees. Moreover, since the proportion of revising others versus self-revision in the corpus was not even, the questionnaire should also compensate for the smaller amount of data from self-revising. It also investigates facets of revision that could not be researched via corpus analysis, e.g. revision technique or delay allowed between translation and revision.

3.2.1 Description and design of the questionnaire

The questionnaire comprises 16 questions. The respondents were asked to answer those questions honestly and were assured of a complete anonymity. All the 36 subjects that filled in the questionnaires were first or second year students of English-language Translation study programme at the Department of English and American Studies. A blank questionnaire is to be found in the Appendix, the filled questionnaires were scanned and uploaded onto the CD-ROM appendices.

Some of the questions were open; others were answered by multiple choice answers. The questionnaires were distributed to two groups of students and collected after the students filled them in. Afterwards the information was transcribed into a MS Excel sheet. The questionnaires were numbered by nos. 1-36.

If certain questions were unanswered (in that case, a dash was put down in the Excel table cells) they could not be integrated into the result tables. However, sometimes the answers were logically derived from other answers, for example in the questionnaire no. 12, a student mentioned a spellchecker use, but did not write it as an answer to the question asking about revision aids use. So, it was assumed that the student uses it, although he or she did not indicate it explicitly. Contrarily, information could not be deduced in the queries about revision strategy: in the questionnaire no. 11, a subject ticked the possibility saying he or she leaves a time span between finishing translating and revision, but did not state the amount of time. Since the chosen answer says “leave it overnight or more” no particular number could have been inferred from the previous answer.

The questions posed to the students can be classed into two groups: queries about students’ attitude to revision or the strategy and technique they use. These two types of questions were mixed together.
### 3.2.2 Research questions

The research questions set out for the student questionnaire are analogical to the queries included in it. They concern only self-revision.

1. **What strategy students use for revision?**
2. **What techniques do they apply when revising?**
3. **What is the students’ attitude towards revision?**

### 3.2.3 Results

The results presented in this chapter were obtained by adding up answers to the individual questions and relating them to each other. Later, this information will possibly be connected to the implications of the corpus. The tabled results are presented in the text that follows, or they are uploaded onto the CD-ROM Appendices.

Let us look at the students’ attitude to revision in general. All of the students who filled the questionnaire claim they revise their translations and almost all of them (except for one) also think that revision is indispensable in translation, even if the translator has put a maximum effort in the translation. As to their view of revision as a possible future job, none of the

### Tables

#### Table no. 23 – Questions concerning the students’ attitude to revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>application of revision</td>
<td>work vs. study tasks care</td>
<td>general task preference:</td>
<td>future profession preference</td>
<td>equal attention to all parts of text</td>
<td>necessity of revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table no. 24 – Questions concerning the students’ strategy and technique of revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of readings</td>
<td>revision in translation process and length of delay</td>
<td>unilingual vs. bilingual reading</td>
<td>simple reading vs. another technique</td>
<td>screen vs. paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>separate reading for different types of mistakes</td>
<td>special focus</td>
<td>separate readings for transfer and the other issues</td>
<td>using tools</td>
<td>information search</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students intends to become a reviser, but one third of them would except revision or would like to revise as a part of their future job activities. Another third would prefer to work only as a translator and the last one wishes to do a job different from revising or translating. The activity of revising is not a very popular one; 83% of the students prefer translating. It was found out that 67% of students (24 of them) already translate for money. Eight of them admit that they put more effort into the translations they get paid for than to translation assignments from school seminars. Fourteen students claim they treat them with equal care and only 2 students wrote they pay more attention to schoolwork translations and revisions.

Most of the questions, however, concerned the strategy and technique of revision. In the question no. 3, more than a half of the respondents ticked the option saying their strategy of revision is to translate a text, check it immediately, then leave it aside for at least a night and finally check it again. 31% of the students use similar strategy, only without the immediate revision and 22% of the students indicated they simply translate a text and revise it right away (it means they do not allow any time span between translation and revision). The average delay between finished translation draft and revision is 1.57 day (ranging from one hour to two a fortnight). Furthermore, the average number of readings of a translation indicated by the respondents is 3.26 (ranging from 1 to 10 scans of the target text/source and the target text). Almost 40% of translation trainees apply different revision technique when revising, namely cooperation with another person or reading out loud in addition to simple reading.

Only 9 students said they use the hard copy as well as the computer screen for revision of their translations (another 3 students stated they revise on paper only exceptionally); 58% of them revise only in the electronic interface then. One student indicated s/he uses the paper form only.

Form the responses to questions no. 4 and 14 it was found out that approximately half of the students (17 of them) carry out both unilingual and bilingual reading, 10 of them read only the target text and 8 students read only the source text against the target text. However, in the latter question, 23 respondents said they read the translation separately for issues of transfer and target language matters. Finally, 12 students wrote they do not check for the accuracy and completeness of transfer separately from stylistics, grammar, idiomaticity, or mechanics.

As illustrated in the table\textsuperscript{36} below, most\textsuperscript{37} respondents do not focus on any aspect of translation when revising their own work. If there is any special focus, it concerns mainly

\textsuperscript{36} The rest of the tables presenting results of the investigation via the questionnaire are a part of the Appendices.
idiomaticity, grammar, spelling or style. One third of the total 36 students claim they check such particular parameters individually (question no. 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Special focus</th>
<th>out of 36 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>logic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohesion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accurate transfer, difficult spots in transfer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammar</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smoothness, readability</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idioms and collocations, naturalness, interference</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spelling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double spaces (format/typography)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unanswered/no special focus</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 25 – Special focus in self-revisions of translation students

The question no. 15 concerned tools used by students. Half of them responded they do not use any tools for revision whatsoever. 39% (14 students) use the Microsoft Word spellcheck function. Other aids were not mentioned more than twice, viz. the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Using tools</th>
<th>out of 36 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Word spellcheck</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other spellcheck programmes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>česká (internetová) jazyková příručka</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pravidla českého pravopisu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corpora (CZ, EN)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>various internet sources on the Czech language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 26 – Using tools in self-revisions of translation students

The students were also asked whether they pay the same attention and care to revision in all parts of a text (whether they do not neglect the final paragraph/s for example). 56% answered they do and 42% admitted they do not pay equal attention to all parts of the text to be revised.

If the respondents did not answer this question, it was assumed they do not focus on any potentially problematic aspect of the target text.
Finally, the question no. 16 concerned the search for information a translator has to carry out to transfer the source text into the target text appropriately. Only one student indicated s/he looks up the necessary information solely in the revision phase, another one ticked s/he does most of the research in that phase. 61% of the respondents search it in the translation phase and 28% of them use the revision phase for the search exceptionally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. Information search</th>
<th>out of 36 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all in translation phase</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most in revision phase</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equally in tr. and rev. phase</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>search in revision phase only exceptionally</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other: half before translation, half during translation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 27 – *Information search in self-revisions of translation students*

### 3.2.4 Discussion

Students proved to recognise the importance of revision, however, it seems it is not preferred to translating and neither the profession of reviser is appealing for the translation trainees. The most common preference is translating and working as a translator or a translator and a reviser at the same time. As regards the care students devote to schoolwork and paid translations, it is logical that, at the end of the day, students pay more attention to the job assignments (besides those who treat these two with equal effort). As mentioned in the theoretical part of the Thesis, the conditions of university seminar translations and work translations are not the same and it makes sense that the students care more for the activity through which they make a living. Revision of these two types of assignments can therefore be of a different quality.

In terms of revision strategy and technique, several interesting findings arose. A vast majority of translation trainees leave a time span between finishing the draft target text and revising it, which is definitely wise. Of course, the longer the delay is, the better. For example one or two hours, as indicated in two of the questionnaires, might not be long enough, however the most frequent answer to this question was one or two days. Such a delay can provide for a fresh perspective and thus reduce the expectancy effect. Furthermore, the number of revision readings was surprisingly high. Students most frequently replied they carry out three readings; the other answers were usually even slightly more than that. All in all, it is obvious that they give the revision phase a lot of attention.
After merging the information from the questions concerning revision technique (nos. 4 and 14), it is obvious that some students use an inappropriate revision technique. In a few cases it was found out that they only read the target text while looking for mistakes of transfer, or they read the source text and the target text parallelly when checking for mistakes in the target language system, style and mechanics. The problem is that while comparing the two texts one easily overlooks an error which is not a matter of transfer. Secondly – in the context of unilingual reading - the translation can make sense, but not the sense intended by the author of the source text. These unreasonable strategies concerns about 20% of the respondents. The research for information one needs to carry out render the translation successfully occurs mostly in the transfer phase, which is good since revision is not the proper stage for information searching.

Moreover, the items indicated as focused on during revision were compared to the subtypes which represented the most frequent changes in the self-revision part of the corpus. These (idiomaticity, grammar, and spelling) scored only 2% to 3% in the corpus analysis. Such results are thus contrary to each other, which can be caused by the modest pool of the participants of the investigation.

The additional revision techniques the students use are not many. Only two of them were mentioned in the questionnaire, namely reading out loud and working with someone else. The students do not apply methods like recording the text on a tape or changing their surroundings or mental state. It is more possible they have never tried to do so than that they found these techniques inefficient. Nevertheless, the percentage of the respondents using an additional revision technique is not exactly low. As far the medium is concerned, it stands similarly to the revision techniques. There is a certain percentage of the respondents who use printouts when revising either as a regular method or in translations that are more demanding. Since both media have their advantages and shortcomings, it is good that all of them do not rely on the computer interface only.

As far as the tools of revision are concerned, students use some, but probably fewer in comparison to the transfer phase. Considering the common practice of working on translation assignments using the computer and with respect to the percentage of the students who use hard copy to revise, it is improbable that the students would use the MS Word spellchecker only in 39% of the cases. Rather they got used to it to such extent that they do not consider it a tool for revision. It is also surprising that no one of the students mentioned Google as a tool for revision.
In addition to the desired answers to the research questions, the results of the questionnaire revealed that there is in fact a certain amount of self-diagnosis among the students of translation. Four respondents wrote (in the question concerning special focus) that they concentrate on a particular aspect of translation because they know they are prone to err in them. Self-diagnosis surely is a very effective approach to self-revision.
4 Conclusion

This Master’s Thesis set the objective to describe and analyse revision in the process of translation. This was done through the available literature, findings from different research papers and practical research. The choice of this particular topic proved to be good; despite the scarce literature and research on the subject of revising, it was possible to treat revision from different points of view (theoretical, practical, the perspective of a reviser, a student, etc.) and make up a consistent overview of the basic facts as well as present more concrete issues. The Thesis should treat the topic in a logical and consistent manner and should be understandable also to amateur translators. It might serve translation trainees to get a complete idea of what revision involves and how to deal with it.

As explained in the theoretical part, revision as a part of translation is a complex process with its own theoretical basis, ethics, models and principles. As a tool of quality assurance and assessment, revision is an indispensable element in the overall translation process. This proposition is in accordance to the findings of the primary research presented here. Despite the mediocre size of the textual material and the commonsensical fact that, “any generalization about translation is relative” (Newmark 1991:101), the corpus research conducted in terms of the practical part of the Thesis brought some interesting results. Its external validity internal validity is based on descriptive, analytic and objective approach. Both primary sources of the research conducted are free for further investigation. Although quality of revision was only a partial focus of the investigation, it is obvious that revision can substantially improve the quality of translation. Moreover, the difference in some of the variables between revision and self-revision were described.

The student questionnaire, which also constitutes a part of the practical approach to revision in this Thesis, investigated the facets that could not have been investigated via the corpus. It also treated a few common variables, which were later compared. In addition the questionnaire counterbalanced the smaller proportion of self-revised texts in the specialised corpora.

The overall results obtained can be summarized as follows: revision concerns relatively small portion of target texts, its share is higher in self-revision. The revised versions of translations are usually a little longer than their drafts. About half of the revision occurs in the matters of transfer, one quarter of them concerns style. More specifically, changes most often lie in altering translation equivalents. Also, there is a slight tendency towards revision changes which lead to less literal rendition of translations. Students apply quite good revision strategy;
most of them leave some time before revising their translations. As to the revision technique, they are rather conservative. They consider revision important, however not very enjoyable. The results from the research conducted through the corpus and the questionnaire will hopefully be of some use for the academics.

Furthermore, this Thesis showed that there is much more to be studied about revision, especially via more sophisticated means. Further research could treat for example the difference between revision strategy and technique of professional translators and translation trainees, translation universals in revision, online revision, or it could focus solely on quality in revision.

To conclude, revision should be a part of every translator’s work habits (especially when they work alone). Quality is what we all want to have in translation and revision is the most powerful tool to achieve it. Indeed “quality is the journey, not the destination”. (Bush)
5 Abstrakt

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá revizemi překladů a klade si za cíl popsat nejrůznější aspekty této součásti překladového procesu a zároveň jej prozkoumat empiricky. Oblast revizí překladů není dosud zcela prozkoumána, přestože v posledním desetiletí se v oblasti teorie i praktického výzkumu objevilo mnoho nových metod a studií. I z tohoto důvodu bylo zvoleno právě toto téma.

Celá práce je rozdělena na dvě hlavní součásti, a to teoretickou a praktickou část. V teoretické části jsou popsány hlavní charakteristiky revizí překladů vlastních a cizích textů, okrajově i korektur, které se většinou týkají pouze originálních (nepřeložených) textů. Vyloženy jsou jak aspekty čistě teoretické (místo revizí v teorii překladu, normy nebo proces revizí), tak aspekty praktičtější (nástroje používané při kontrole přeložených textů, revize jako povolání a podobně). Dále jsou zde uvedeny poznatky ze souvisejících oblastí a oborů, například kognitivní náročnost čtení při revizi, otázka rozhodování v překládání atd.

Praktická část potom obsahuje dvě dílčí složky. Zaprvé je to korpus studentských textů, vždy verze před závěrečnou opravou, po ní a samozřejmě i zdrojový text. Tento korpus byl sestaven speciálně pro potřeby výzkumu této diplomové práce a poznatky z něj by mohly být k užitku studentům překladu a snad i jejich vyučujícím. V rámci analýzy tohoto materiálu bylo položeno několik výzkumných otázek, která byly zodpovězeny prostřednictvím analýzy a následné interpretace zjištěných dat. Zadruhé praktická část této diplomové práce obsahuje dotazník, který vyplňovali studenti překladatelství na místní Katedře anglistiky a amerikanistiky. Informace získané z těchto dotazníků byly, pokud možno, dány do souvislostí s ostatními výsledky výzkumu.
6 Abstract

This Master’s Thesis deals with revisions of translated texts and aims to characterise this particular aspect of the process of translation from the theoretical perspective but also via empirical research. Although this type research in the field of Translation Studied has advanced a lot during the recent years, the findings concerning translation revision are still scarce. This fact was also one of the reasons for choosing this topic as a subject of investigation.

The Thesis comprises two main parts: theoretical and practical part. The former describes characteristics of self-revision, revision of someone else’s translation and partially proofreading, too (which generally concerns non-translated texts). It deals with purely theoretical aspects, e.g. the place of revision in translation theory, norms or models of revision, as well as more down-to-earth matters as tools for revision, revision as a profession, etc. Furthermore, various findings from related fields and different research papers are presented.

The practical part includes a corpus research and a questionnaire. The corpus was built up directly for the needs of the Thesis and consists of source texts, draft translations and their final versions after revision. The results form analysis of the corpus might be of some use to translation trainees and, hopefully the teachers as well. Second, the questionnaire given to the master students at the Department of English and American Studies should equally generate valuable information which, were possible, are correlated to the output of the corpus analysis.
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8 Appendices

8.1 A sample of evaluation criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW/EDB adherence</td>
<td>The translation of SW items does not comply with the translation in the actual SW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factual correctness</td>
<td>Translation does not comply with the actual function of the program. The translation of the word is OK as such but incorrect in the context. Correct cross-references (e.g. web links, software references, where available).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omissions</td>
<td>Words, part of sentences, sentences, paragraphs are missing. Deletions and additions are allowed only due to differences in localized products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translated/Untranslated</td>
<td>Parts that were supposed to be translated were not translated or parts that should not be translated were translated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country standards</td>
<td>Adaptation of country standards (date and time formats, units of measurement, currency, number formats, sorting order, capitalization, units of measurements etc.). Examples (of names, streets etc.) are not localised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terminology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary adherence</td>
<td>Translation does not adhere to the term in glossary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Inconsistent usage of translation for one term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Grammar rules are broken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Spelling errors that can be found by the spell-checker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP/Word order</td>
<td>Functional sentence perspective, word order, word for word translation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Archaisms, jargon, colloquial words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard style</td>
<td>Anglicisms, offensive or ironic translation, passive/active mode incorrectly used, standard phrases not used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-overs</td>
<td>Redundant words resulting from sentence change, wrong declinations resulting from correcting one word only but not the rest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style guide</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style Guide and other reference material</td>
<td>Adherence to Translation Style Guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/file guidelines</td>
<td>Not keeping specific project/file guidelines and instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential</td>
<td>Changes which you think would improve the translation, but are not actual errors and are not necessary to correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Errors that will be noticeable but will not confuse or mislead the user.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Errors that will confuse or mislead the user. Grammar or syntax errors that are major violations of generally accepted language conventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Mistranslations that may have legal, safety, health and financial consequences. Complete misunderstanding of the style of the whole text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 28 – A sample of evaluation criteria applied by a translation agency

8.2 The revision parameters by Brian Mossop

**Group A – Problems of meaning transfer (Transfer)**
1. Does the translation reflect the message of the source text? (Accuracy)
2. Have any elements of the message been left out? (Completeness)

**Group B – Problems of content (Content)**
3. Does the sequence of ideas make sense? Is there any nonsense or contradiction? (Logic)
4. Are there any factual, conceptual or mathematical errors? (Facts)

**Group C – Problems of language and style (Language)**
5. Does the text flow? Are the connections between sentences clear? Are the relationships among the parts of speech of each sentence clear? Are there any awkward, hard-to-read sentences? (Smoothness)
6. Is the language suited to the users of the translation and the use they will make of it? (Tailoring)
7. Is the style suited to the genre? Has correct terminology been used? Does the phraseology match that used in the original target-language texts on the same subject? (Sub-language)
8. Are all the word combinations idiomatic? Does the translation observe the rhetorical preferences of the target language? (Idiom)
9. Have the rules of grammar, spelling, punctuation, house-style and correct usage been observed? (Mechanics)

**Group D – Problems of physical presentation (Presentation)**
10. Are there any problems in the way the text is arranged on the page: spacing, indentation, margins, etc.? (Layout)
11. Are there any problems of text formatting: bolding, underlining, font type, font size, etc.? (Typography)
12. Are there any problems in the way the document as a whole is organized: page numbering, headers, footnotes, table of contents, etc.? (Organization)

(Mossop:125)

38 The source of this material is anonymous
8.3 Comparison of texts - corpus design

Picture no. 29 – Comparing the draft version and the final version of the translation using the “Compare” tool in MS Word
### 8.4 Tables and charts of corpus results

#### Table no. 30 – Basic proportion of revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change types</th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>TL matters</th>
<th>Mechanics</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>revising others</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-revision</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table no. 31 – Change types proportion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change types</th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>TL matters</th>
<th>Mechanics</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>revising others</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-revision</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Subtype</td>
<td>Total Number of Revision Instances</td>
<td>Percentage of Occurrence of All Change Subtypes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table shows the percentage distribution of different change subtypes across the total number of revision instances.
Chart no. 33 – Proportion of stylistic changes in the corpus

Table no. 34 – Proportions of style subtypes in revision and self-revision

Chart no. 35 – Proportion of target language system changes in the corpus
Table no. 36 – Changes in mechanics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanics</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>revising others</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-revision</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 37 – Proportion of mistakes introduced in during the revision phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised text</th>
<th>mistakes introduced</th>
<th>subtotal</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| %            |                     |          | 4% |
Table no. 38 – Improvement in change types (out of 287 revision cases classified as “improvement”)

Table no. 39 – Unnecessary changes in change types (out of 116 revision cases classified as “unnecessary”)
Table no. 40 - Deterioration in change types (out of 34 revision cases classified as “deterioration”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised text</th>
<th>resulting changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 41 – Proportion of resulting changes (counted from total number of revision instances)
Table no. 42 – Quality of revision changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Unnecessary</th>
<th>Deterioration</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>revising others</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-revision</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>435</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 43 – Literalness of revision changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literalness</th>
<th>More literal</th>
<th>Less literal</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>revising others</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-revision</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>268</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 44 – Correlating literalness and quality of revision changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literalness and quality</th>
<th>Less literal ~ improvement</th>
<th>More literal ~ improvement</th>
<th>Less literal ~ deterioration</th>
<th>More literal ~ deterioration</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>revising others</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-revision</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>197</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| %                        | 43.7%                      | 38.1%                      | 12.2%                      | 6.1%                        | 100%  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised text</th>
<th>Change type</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Literarness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>179</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,52%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,17%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,83%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 45 – Unclassified revision instances (counted from the total of 461 instances)
8.5 Student questionnaire

Dear fellow-students,
following are a few questions concerning revision in the process of translating. Feel free to comment on any of the questions in any space available and be honest, please.
This questionnaire is anonymous and the data obtained will be used solely for my Diploma Thesis research.

Would you say, that it is a part of your translation strategy to revise your translations?
☐ YES  ☐ NO

How many times do you (usually) read a document you translate before you declare it finished and errorless?

What is your strategy when working on a text? (A text you are about to submit in a school seminar)
☐ You translate it.
☐ You translate it and check it immediately.
☐ You translate it, leave it overnight or longer, and then check it.
☐ You translate it, check it immediately, leave it overnight or more, and check it again.
☐ Other strategy: (please describe it)

If you leave a time span between translation draft and its revision, how much time do you allow between finishing the first version of your translation and its final version (after revising it)?

When revising, …
☐ you simply read the text from the beginning till the end,
☐ or you use another technique? (reading out loud, working with somebody else, recording the target text on a tape or a different gadget, back translation, etc.) (explain)

When revising, …
☐ you read the target text only  ☐ you compare the source and the target text  ☐ both

Either you…
☐ revise the text on computer screen  ☐ revise the text on paper  ☐ both
In case you already work as a translator, do you devote the same amount of time, effort and care to the documents you translate in terms of your job as to the texts you submit in school?

☐ YES,
☐ NO, I pay more attention to “work” translations,
☐ NO, I pay more attention to “study” translations.

Do you prefer…

☐ translating or ☐ revising?

As to your future job, you would like to become…

☐ reviser ☐ translator ☐ both ☐ a different profession

Do you (honestly) pay the same attention to the first and to the last paragraph of a text you revise?

☐ YES ☐ NO

You think that…

☐ revision is not necessary if one worked hard during the transfer phase and paid a lot of attention to it,
or
☐ even if one worked hard on and paid a lot of attention to the translation itself, revision is still necessary.

Either you…

☐ perform more readings/scans through the text and search for individual type of errors (spelling, numbers, proper names, grammar, terminology, punctuation, etc.),
or
☐ go through the text once and search for all types of mistakes at once.

Is there something you primarily focus on when revising? If there is, why?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Do you perform separate readings for mistranslations and for incorrect spelling, grammar, punctuation, etc.? In other words, do you first check the texts by comparing ST and TT and then check the TT alone?

☐ YES ☐ NO
Do you use any tools or aids for revision?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

If yes, specify them.

When translating, one needs to search information outside the source text (internet search, dictionary look ups, etc.). Do you…

☐ do all the searching during the translation phase,
☐ do most of the searching during the revision,
☐ divide the searching half and half between these two phases,
☐ do searching in the revision phase only exceptionally?

Thank you very much for your time, I appreciate your help!