

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WRITING WITH TRANSLATION FROM NATIVE TO FOREIGN, AND READING WITH TRANSLATION FROM FOREIGN TO NATIVE LANGUAGES

Hajar Khanmohammad¹, Mahboobeh Kehtari²

¹Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, fer987295kia@yahoo.com

²Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, mahboobeh.kehtari@yahoo.com

Abstract

The present research sought to investigate whether there is any significant relationship between writing and/or reading, in English, with translating from English to Persian (E-P) and/or Persian to English (P-E). To this end, a TOEFL test (including reading and writing parts), an English to Persian translation test, and a Persian to English translation test were administered among 198 MA translation students of the Central Tehran Branch of the Islamic Azad University. Three raters scored translation and the writing tests according to Khanmohamad and Osanloo's (2009) rubric and Jacob et al's (1981) rubric, respectively. The descriptive and inferential statistics confirmed that there is a significant relationship between reading in English with E-P translation, and writing in English with P-E translation. A regression analysis revealed that reading comprehension was a significant predictor of their E-P translation qualities, while writing was not. Moreover, considering the P-E translation as the predicted variable, it was revealed that both reading and writing could significantly predict P-E translation of the students. However, it was observed that writing, rather than reading makes a stronger contribution to P-E translation of the students.

Keywords: Reading Comprehension, Writing, Translation Assessment, Writing Assessment

1. INTRODUCTION

Everything in translation begins with a source language text that has to be read and comprehended, which is an essential and basic requirement for carrying out successful translating. Newmark (1988) states that translators begin the job by reading the original for two purposes: to understand and to analyze it. Accordingly the first step in translation is comprehension of the source language text Newmark (1988). Moreover, As Shreve et al (1993, P. 9) describe "...some translation scholars have made the implicit assumption that reading is a prerequisite for translation because it is the primary mechanism for gaining access to the meaning of a text". Pouya (2012, P. 6497) expresses that "translation as a process is a conscious activity through which a message is reconstructed, represented, recorded, and recreated in the target codes according to the original message in the original text." In support of this, Inaba (2009) states that "Translation therefore takes the form of rewriting that is carried out within the framework of the target language, culture and ideology in the service of a control factor wielded by the patron or the receiving system. In this respect, the translator is a rewriter of the original text." According to these statements, after comprehending the writer's meaning the next step is to transfer and restate the author's meaning in the target language.

Méndez and Vallejo (2003), on the other hand, believe that writing is important for translating, just as important as reading is. For them, the former helps the translator to express the ideas of the source language and the latter to comprehend the whole message. The relationship between two skills of reading and writing, and translation is best manifested in the several researches like those by Abbasi and Shabani (2011) who examined the effect of proficiency in writing on students' translation ability, Akbaripakdaman (2007) who studied the relationship between Writing and translation, and Rahemi, et.al (2013) who studied the relationship between translation and reading comprehension of UNP students, just to name a few. All these studies found positive correlations between translation and two skills of reading and writing.

As Abbasi and Shabani (2011, P. 522) state "the majority of Iranian students in academic institutions and at different levels of language proficiency are poor translators in some texts". Furthermore, Salas (2000) states that reading and comprehension inability in the source language are the first problem of translation process. According to these ideas the researcher assumes that those students who read the SL and do not comprehend the main contents of that text cannot produce an acceptable translation. "In translation classrooms, most of students come across some other errors which are the effect of their poor writing abilities" Akbari Pakdaman (2007, P. 5). Based on all these discussions the researcher wants to examine the relationship between the reading comprehension ability, writing ability, and translation quality of translation students in order to understand whether those students who have high abilities in English writing and reading comprehension can provide a high quality of English into Persian and Persian into English translations or not.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Participants

198 students majoring in English translation answered the tests and made the real subjects of the study. They were all MA students in Central Tehran Branch of Islamic Azad University. Moreover, Three MA translation students, judged by the instructors as qualified as the researchers, functioned as the raters of the study. They participated in rater training sessions to learn how to evaluate the participants' writing and translation tests according to Jacob's et al (1988) model and Khanmohammad and Osanloo's (2009) rubric, respectively.

2.2. Instruments

Three kinds of tests were manipulated: a Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) chosen from "TOEFL Practice Online (TPO)" book (2013) which was administered, after piloting to assure homogeneity of the subjects. The speaking and listening parts were omitted due to limitations in the administration. Two English passages and two Persian texts were administered to the students to translate into Persian and English, respectively. English texts were chosen from Chamberlin and White's (1993) book "Advanced English for Translation" and Persian texts from Pazargadi's book (2006) "The Art of English Translation".

2.3. PROCEDURE

To pilot the TOEFL test, it was, first, administered to 20 translation students. It took them about 90 minutes to answer. The reading and writing parts were scored separately. The scores of reading part were considered as an evaluation for the subjects' reading comprehension. Moreover, to score the writing part, two raters were assigned to score them according to Jacob's et al. (1981) descriptor and the mean of the raters' scores were regarded as an evaluation for the students' writing abilities. After making sure of the tests reliabilities, they were administered to the real participants of the study. The translation tests were, also, scored by three raters using Khanmohammad and Osanloo's (2009) rubric, then the inter-rater reliability was computed. The translation tests were, then, administered to 198 students. Descriptive and inferential statistics were run to reject or verify the hypotheses of this study

RESULTS

Piloting the TOEFL test

Descriptive statistics of the scores of Proficiency indicated the total mean of 86 for the proficiency total test and 18.91 for the reading part and 85.56 for the writing section. In order to calculate the reliability of reading scores KR-21 formula was used and it equaled 0.80.

Table 1 shows all correlations of three raters assigned to the writing section. As indicated they were significant because the amount of sig values (0.000) were less than 0.01 level.

Table1. Correlations of the scores by the three raters

		Writing Rater3	Writing Rater2	Writing Rater1
Writing Rater3	Pearson Correlation	1	.919**	.838**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	20	20	20
Writing Rater2	Pearson Correlation	.919**	1	.873**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	20	20	20
Writing Rater1	Pearson Correlation	.838**	.873**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	20	20	20

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

Reliability of scores of writing was, also, calculated using Cronbach's Alpha. **(0.96)** was the reliability index, much close to +1, and indicating constancy among the scores given by three raters.

Translation tests were, also, piloted. They were rated by three scorers. Score of each student was decided to be the mean of the three scores. Totally, the mean of the E-P test turned out to be 76.72 and that of P-E to be 73.56. To make sure about the reliability of the scores, correlation among three ratings and between any two ratings were calculated.

According to Tables 2 and 3, correlation between any two raters scoring was significant since the amount of all sig (0.00) values were less than 0.01. They, however, confirm the reliability of the translation tests at the piloting phase.

Table2. Correlations of the scores of the three raters of E-P translation

		English Translation rater1	English Translation rater2	English Translation rater3
English Translation rater1	Pearson Correlation	1	.862**	.932**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	20	20	20
English Translation rater2	Pearson Correlation	.862**	1	.952**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	20	20	20
English Translation rater3	Pearson Correlation	.932**	.952**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	20	20	20

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

Table3. Correlations of the scores of three raters of P- E translation

		PersianTranslation rater1	PersianTranslation rater2	PersianTranslation rater3
Persian-Translation rater1	Pearson Correlation	1	.861**	.909**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	20	20	20
Persian-Translation rater2	Pearson Correlation	.861**	1	.949**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	20	20	20
Persian-Translation rater3	Pearson Correlation	.909**	.949**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	20	20	20

Table2. Correlations of the scores of the three raters of E-P translation

		English Translation rater1	English Translation rater2	English Translation rater3
English Translation rater1	Pearson Correlation	1	.862**	.932**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	20	20	20
English Translation rater2	Pearson Correlation	.862**	1	.952**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	20	20	20
English Translation rater3	Pearson Correlation	.932**	.952**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	20	20	20

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

To validate the tests, their reliabilities were, also, measured using Cronbach's Alpha which turned to be **0.97 and 0.96**, respectively. Since these values are close to +1 it can be concluded that there are positive relationships among the scores given by 3 raters in above Tests.

4.3. Main Phase of the Study

4.3.1. Proficiency Test

For the purpose of this study combination of reading and writing tests were regarded as an indication of the proficiency of students. As mentioned before, the proficiency test was administered among 198 participants. The descriptive statistics of this test appears below in Table 4.

Table4. Descriptive Statistics of the scores of the Proficiency Test

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Proficiency	198	45.17	92.17	71.947	8.79306	77.318	-.536	.173	-.065	.344
Valid N (listwise)	198									

Table 5. Test of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Proficiency	.088	198	.001	.975	198	.001

The parametric correlation should be run on the participants' scores obtained from the proficiency test. As an assumption of parametric correlation, test of normality was run (Table 7). For the sake of proficiency test the distribution of data was not normal, i.e. skewness did not fall within the range of +1.96 and -1.96 for this distribution (Table 5). Thus, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was run.

4.3.2. Reading Test

As described before, the reading part of the proficiency test was scored separate from writing. The scores of reading part were considered as an evaluation for subjects' reading comprehension. The descriptive statistics of the test is shown in Table 6:

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics of the scores of the Reading Test

Std. Deviation	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
Reading	198	38	95	68.74	12.720	161.799	-.404	.173
Valid N (listwise)	198							

Table 7 Test of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Reading	.148	198	.000	.958	198	.000

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The parametric correlation had to be run on the participants' scores obtained from reading test. Tests of normality was run to meet the assumption of the correlation. Since the distribution of reading scores came out not to be normal, (Table 7) Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was run.

4.3.3. Writing Test

Similar to the RT, writing part of Proficiency test was also scored separately and the scores were considered as an evaluation for participants' writing abilities. The descriptive statistics of the Writing Test (WT) appears in Table 8.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of the scores of the Writing Test

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
Total Writing Scores	198	48.67	92.67	75.1582	8.87544	78.773	-.581	.173
Valid N (listwise)	198							

Table 9. Test of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Total Writing Scores	.074	198	.010	.972	198	.001

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The parametric correlation had to be run on the participants' scores obtained from the writing test. Applying test of normality (Table 9), the distribution came out not to be normal, i.e. skewness did not

fall within the range of +1.96 and -1.96 for this distribution (Table 10). As substitute Kolmogorov-Smirnov was run.

Table10. Correlations between the scores of three raters on the Writing test

			Writing Rater1	Writing Rater2	Writing Rater3
Spearman's rho	Writing Rater1	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.911**	.848**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	198	198	198
	Writing Rater2	Correlation Coefficient	.911**	1.000	.873**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	198	198	198
	Writing Rater3	Correlation Coefficient	.848**	.873**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	198	198	198

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

As shown in Table 12 the values of Spearman correlations among three raters' scores were significant because the sig values (0.000) are less than the significant level of 0.01.

The reliability of scores was, also, calculated using Cronbach's Alpha. Since this value (**0.96**) was close to +1, it can be concluded that there was constancy among the scores given by three raters.

4.3.4. English-Persian Translation Test

English-Persian (E-P) test included two English paragraphs administered to 198 translation students. Students were allowed to use Dictionaries while translating. Then, the researcher and two other raters scored them based on Khanmohamad and Osanloo's (2009) rubric. Table 11 shows the descriptive statistics of this test.

Table11. Descriptive Statistics of the scores on the E-P Test

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
Total English-Persian Scores	198	31.17	92.33	74.1928	9.31538	86.776	-.929	.173
Valid N (listwise)	198							

Table12. Test of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Total English-Persian Scores	.086	198	.001	.958	198	.000

Table12. Test of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Total English-Persian Scores	.086	198	.001	.958	198	.000

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The parametric correlation had to be run on the participants' scores obtained from English to Persian translation test. Normality assumption (Table 12) was not met, i.e. the distribution of data for E- P translation test came out not to be normal and skewness did not fall within the range of +1.96 and - 1.96 (Table 13). Therefore, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was run.

Scoring of the E- P translation test also, followed the same procedure of P- E test.

Table 13, below, indicates the significance of the correlation between the scores of rater1 and rater2 (0.94), between the scores of rater1 and rater 3 (0.96), and between the scores by raters 2 and 3(0.96) at 0.01 level.

Table13. Correlations of the scores of the E-P test

			English-Persian scores rater 1	English-Persian scores rater 2	English-Persian scores rater 3
Spearman's rho	English-Persian scores rater 1	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.947**	.967**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	198	198	198
	English-Persian scores rater 2	Correlation Coefficient	.947**	1.000	.967**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	198	198	198
	English-Persian scores rater 3	Correlation Coefficient	.967**	.967**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	198	198	198

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

The reliability value of the scores calculated by Cronbach's Alpha was **0.98** which is a high rate of reliability.

4.3.5. Persian-English Translation Test

Persian-English (P-E) translation test, including two paragraphs, was also administered to the subjects of study It took them 40 minutes to translate it into English. Three raters scored the tests based on Khanmohammad and Osanloo's (2009) rubric. Table 14 shows the descriptive statistics of the obtained scores on the test.

Table14. Descriptive Statistics of the scores of the E-P Test

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic		Statistic	Std. Error
Total Persian-English Scores	198	43.83	92.67	75.1726	9.07491	82.354	-1.026	.173
Valid N (listwise)	198							

Table 15. Test of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Total Persian-English Scores	.108	198	.000	.934	198	.000

a. Lilliefors Significance Correlation

The parametric correlation had to be run on the participants' scores obtained from three raters' corrections. Since the distribution of data for the P- E translation test came out not to be normal, i.e., skewness did not fall within the range of +1.96 and -1.96 (Table 16), test of normality had to be run (Table 15). Since the first assumption for this correlation was rejected, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was run.

Table16. Correlations of the scores of the P- E test

			Persian-English scores rater 1	Persian-English scores rater 2	Persian-English scores rater 3
Spearman's rho	Persian-English scores rater 1	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.948**	.951**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	198	198	198
	Persian-English scores rater 2	Correlation Coefficient	.948**	1.000	.947**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	198	198	198
	Persian-English scores rater 3	Correlation Coefficient	.951**	.947**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	198	198	198

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

According to Table 16 the values of correlation (0.000) among three raters' scores were significant at 0.01 level. The reliability value of the scores calculated by Cronbach's Alpha was **0.99** which is close to +1, hence a high rate of reliability for the scoring.

4.4. Inferential Statistics

To test the hypotheses of the study the correlation estimation of the variables was necessary. Since the assumptions of parametric correlations were rejected and the scores of all tests were not normally distributed, non-parametric equivalent Spearman-Brown correlation was run. The results appear in table 17.

Table 17. Correlation coefficient of Reading and Writing, with E- P and P- E Translation

			Reading	Total Writing Scores	Total English-Persian Scores	Total Persian-English Scores
Spearman's rho	Reading	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.280**	.903**	.306**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000
		N	198	198	198	198
	Total Writing Scores	Correlation Coefficient	.280**	1.000	.244**	.917**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.001	.000
		N	198	198	198	198
	Total English-Persian Scores	Correlation Coefficient	.903**	.244**	1.000	.281**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.	.000
		N	198	198	198	198
	Total Persian-English Scores	Correlation Coefficient	.306**	.917**	.281**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.
		N	198	198	198	198

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

Null Hypothesis 1:

There is no significant relationship between reading comprehension and translation from English to Persian.

In order to test the first hypothesis, Spearman correlation was run ($r=0.90$). Given that the calculated correlation was significant, i.e. the sig value (0.00) is lower than the error level 0.01, it can be concluded that with 95% of confidence, H_0 is rejected. In other words, there is a significant relationship between reading comprehension and translating from English-Persian.

Null Hypothesis 2

There is no significant relationship between reading comprehension and translating from Persian to English.

As depicted in Table 19, the correlation between RC and Persian-English translation turned out to be positive and significant ($r=0.30$, $p=0.000<0.01$). Therefore, the second null hypothesis is also rejected. Although this correlation is significant, since the r value (0.30) is not in high amount the relationship is interpreted as a weak one.

Null Hypothesis 3

There is no significant relationship between writing in English and translating from English to Persian.

According to Table 19, the correlation coefficient between writing and translating from English to

Persian was 0.24, and the sig value was $0.001 < 0.01$. Based on the significance level in the table (0.01), this relationship is interpreted as significant; hence, null hypothesis can be rejected. On the other hand, since the r value is very low, this relationship is interpreted as a weak correlation.

Null Hypothesis 4

There is no significant relationship between writing in English and translating from Persian to English.

As shown in Table 19, the correlation coefficient between writing in English and translating from Persian to English came to be high (0.91). Since the sig value 0.000 is less than the level of 0.01, the correlation is significant. Thus, it was possible to reject the fourth null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 5

High scores of writing and reading comprehension of translation students do not significantly predict their high scores in the E-P translations.

To test this hypothesis Regression was needed.

Table 20. Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.902 ^a	.814	.813	4.02709

a. Predictors: (Constant), Reading

As displayed in the Table 20, the R square value (0.81) indicated that 81.4 percent of variance in the dependent variable (E-P translation) is explained by the model (independent variables).

Table21. ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13916.325	1	13916.325	858.107	.000 ^a
	Residual	3178.623	196	16.217		
	Total	17094.949	197			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Reading

b. Dependent Variable: Total English-Persian Scores

Table 21 shows that the model is significant ($F = 858.10$, $P = 0.000 < 0.05$).

Table22. Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	28.774	1.577		18.250	.000
	Reading	.661	.023	.902	29.293	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Total English-Persian Scores

As shown in Table 22, by virtue of the Beta sig values ($B = 0.90$, $P = 0.000 < 0.05$) for reading comprehension which was less than 0.05, it is concluded that the independent variable contributed significantly. Therefore, reading comprehension significantly predicts E-P translation, dependent variable, while writing does not ($B = 0.41$, $P = 0.2 > 0.05$).

Null Hypothesis 6

High scores of writing and reading comprehension of translation students in English do not significantly predict their high scores in the Persian -English translations.

Table23. Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.908 ^a	.824	.824	3.81207
2	.911 ^b	.829	.827	3.76993

a. Predictors: (Constant), Total Writing Scores

b. Predictors: (Constant), Total Writing Scores, Reading

As indicated in Table 23, the R and R square came to be 0.908 and 0.824, respectively. This means that 82.4 percent of variance of the dependent variable (P-E translation) is explained by the model (independent variables). The following ANOVA table shows the significance of the model.

Table24. ANOVA^c

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13375.494	1	13375.494	920.424	.000 ^a
	Residual	2848.249	196	14.532		
	Total	16223.743	197			
2	Regression	13452.334	2	6726.167	473.262	.000 ^b
	Residual	2771.409	195	14.212		
	Total	16223.743	197			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Total Writing Scores

b. Predictors: (Constant), Total Writing Scores, Reading

c. Dependent Variable: Total Persian-English Scores

In table 24 the results of the ANOVA ($F= 920.42$, $P= 0.000 < 0.05$) reports that the regression model is significant with the writing as the predictor of P-E translation scores. Table25 shows which of the independent variables contributed to the prediction of the dependent variable.

Table25. Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	5.396	2.316		2.330	.021
	Total Writing Scores	.928	.031	.908	30.338	.000
2	(Constant)	3.542	2.425		1.461	.146
	Total Writing Scores	.906	.032	.886	28.516	.000
	Reading	.052	.022	.072	2.325	.021

a. Dependent Variable: Total Persian-English Scores

Table 25 demonstrates the standardized Beta coefficient ($B= 0.90$, $t= 30.33$, $P= 0.000 < 0.05$) as an indication of the significance of the model, meaning that students' writing and reading scores could

significantly predict their P-E translation scores (reading: $B= 0.72$, $t= 2.32$, $P= 0.02<0.05$). Hence, the null hypothesis of the study was rejected. In other words, high scores of writing and reading comprehension predict their high scores of P-E translation.

3. Conclusion

This study examined the relationship among four sets of scores on a writing, reading comprehension, E-P translation, and P-E translation production tests. Based on the results of the study there was a significant and strong relationship between reading in English and translating from English to Persian, which is supported by the results of Mehrparvar (2002), Molai (2007), and Rahemi et al 's. (2013) studies.

Regarding the scores obtained from reading comprehension and P-E translation, it is obvious that there was a significant but weak correlation between reading comprehension and translating from Persian to English. Likely, Newmark, (1988); Shafey, (1985) as cited in Abdellah,(2005); Shereve et al., (1993); and Washbourne,(2012) mentioned the existence of relationship between the reading comprehension ability of students and their abilities of translation.

It was revealed through the data analysis that there existed a significant (but weak) relationship between writing in English and translating from English-Persian, which was in line with the findings of Abbasi and Shabani's (2011) studies.

Moreover, the investigation of the relationship between writing and translating from Persian- English showed that this correlation was significantly positive. Abbasi and Shabani, (2011), and Akbari Pakdaman, (2007); Aksoy, (2001); Inaba, (2009); Lefevre, (1992); Newmark, (1988); and Pouya's, (2012) studies corroborated the results of the current study.

Furthermore, the analysis of data and the results demonstrate that the independent variable (reading) contributed to the prediction of dependent variable (E-P translation). Therefore, reading was a good predictor of E-P translation in this study but writing was not.

Finally, the results of the regression also revealed that both writing and reading significantly contributed to the prediction of P-E translation in the regression model. In contrary to reading, writing was a good predictor of P-E translation. No evidence was found, in the literature about these two findings.

Based on the obtained results it can be concluded that, reading comprehension is one of the skills needed to be worked hard in translation (Abdellah, 2005; Macizo & Bajo, 2004; Newmark, 1988, and Shereve et al, 1993). Translation students first should read the original text to understand the meaning and use it in the translation process (Abdellah, 2005; Newmark, 1988, and Pouya, 2012). Students' reading must enable students to handle any type of text; comprehend it, overcome lapses in comprehension, and understand the writer's intended meaning. Moreover, the results of the current study indicates the importance of writing as an effective factor in translation (Lefevre, 1992; Mendez & Vallejo, 2003; Newmark; 1988; and Pouya, 2012). After comprehending the original text, students should be able to rewrite and reconstruct the meaning of the text in the target language (Aksoy, 2001; Inaba, 2009; Lefevre, 1992; Newmark, 1988; and Pouya, 2012). Some scholars like Aksoy, 2001; Bassnett and Lefevre, 1990; Lefevre, 1992; and Inaba, 2009 say that translation is a form of writing, and they have emphasized on the relationship between writing and translation.

REFERENCES

- Abasi, Sh. & Shabani, Gh.** (2011). The Effect of Proficiency in Writing on EFL Students' Translation. *International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 26, 521-525.
- Abdellah, A. S.** (2005). The nature and importance of translation. Retrieved from <http://www.proz.com/translation-articles/articles/299/1/What-Every-Novice-Translator-Should-Know/print/299>
- Akbari Pakdaman, H. (2007).** The relationship between English writing ability and Persian- English translation ability among translation trainees. Unpublished MA Thesis, Islamic Azad University: Tehran, Science and Research Branch.
- Aksoy, B.** (2001). Translation as a rewriting: the concept and its implications on the emergence of a national literature. *Translation Journal*, 5(3). Retrieved from <http://www.bokorlang.com/journal/17turkey.htm>

- AlamBeigi, F., JamshidiFar, H. (2013).** TOEFL Practice Online (TPO):12 Official Practice Tests. Tehran: Mehr Language.
- Bajo, M. T., Macizo, P. (2006).** Reading for repetition and reading for translation: do they involve the same processes? *Cognition*, **99**, 1–34.
- Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. (eds). (1990).** *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter.
- Chamberlin, D., White, G. (1993).** *Advanced English for Translation*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Inaba, T. (2009).** Is Translation a Reviewing of an Original Text? Retrieved from <http://www.translationdirectory.com> on December, 20, 2014
- Jacobs, H. L., Zingraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, D. F., Hughey, J. B. (1981).** Testing ESL composition: A practical approach. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Khanmohamad, H., & Osanloo, M. (2009).** Moving toward objective scoring: A Rubric for Translation Assessment. *JELS*, 1(1), 131-153.
- Lefever, A. (1992).** *Translation, Reviewing and the manipulation of literary fame*, London and NewYork: Routledge.
- Mehrparvar, M. T. (2002).** The relationship between reading comprehension ability in the SL and the ability to translate among Iranian translators. (Unpublished master's thesis), Allameh Tabatabai University, Tehran, Iran.
- Méndez, R. F., and Vallejo, J. D. P. (2003).** Writing and Translation. Retrieved from <http://www.translationdirectory.com/article427.htm>
- Molai, S. (2007).** The relationship between reading comprehension and translation ability of male and female translation trainees. (Unpublished master's thesis), Science and Research Branch of Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
- Newmark, P. (1988).** *A textbook of translation*, NewYork and London: Prentice Hall.
- Pazargadi, A. (2006).** *The Art of English- Persian Translation* (2nd ed.), Tehran: AmirKabir.
- Pouya, F. (2012).** On the effect of translation on promoting reading Ccomprehension in ESP. *J. Basic. Appl. Sci. Res.*, 2(7) 6495-6502.
- Rahemi, E. F., Jufri, M., Havid Ardi, S. (2013).** The correlation between reading comprehension and translation ability: A correlational study on fourth year students at English Department of UNP. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(2), 178-186.
- Salas, C. G. (2000).** Teaching Translation, Problems and solutions. *Translation journal*, 4(3), 1-15.
- Shreve, M., Shaffner, C., Danks, H. and Griffin, J. (1993).** Is there a special kind of reading for translation? *Target*. 5, 1:21-41.
- Washbourne, K. (2012).** Active, strategic reading for translation trainees: Foundations for transactional methods. *Translation & Interpreting*,4(1), 38-55.
- Weigle, S.C. (2002).** *Assessing Writing*. White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley, Longman