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ABSTRACT

The current study was set to investigate the relationship between unwillingness to translate and personality type of Iranian translation students. To this end, 100 Iranian EFL students studying English translation at Emam Reza and Tabaran Universities in Mashhad, Iran, were randomly selected. The participants aged from 20 to 57 years old. Two research instruments were utilized, namely unwillingness to translate (UWTT) questionnaire and personality questionnaire. The data were gathered during the second semester of the academic year. The data were analyzed through descriptive statistics correlation coefficient. The findings revealed that Perceiving personality type had a significant negative effect on participants’ UWTT. Actually, perceiving personality type is in negative direction with Factor 3 of UWTT (low salary and lack of translation motivation). In addition, the situational level UWTT is regarded as a state-specific variable which is a transient influence dependent on specific circumstance i.e., low salary and open to changes that is to say lack of translation motivation. While state-level or situational WTC empowers language learners to initiate communication within a specific context, state-level UWTT disables language learners to initiate communication within a specific context.
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RESUMO

O presente estudo foi definido para investigar a relação entre a falta de vontade de traduzir e o tipo de personalidade dos estudantes de tradução iranianos. Para tanto, 100 estudantes iranianos de EFL estudando tradução para inglês nas universidades Emam Reza e Tabaran em Mashhad, Irã, foram selecionados aleatoriamente. Os participantes tinham idades entre 20 e 57
anos. Foram utilizados dois instrumentos de pesquisa, questionário de indisposição para traduzir (UWTT) e questionário de personalidade. Os dados foram recolhidos durante o segundo semestre do ano letivo. Os dados foram analisados por meio do coeficiente de correlação estatística descritiva. Os resultados revelaram que a percepção do tipo de personalidade teve um efeito negativo significativo no UWTT dos participantes. Na verdade, perceber o tipo de personalidade está em uma direção negativa com o Fator 3 da UWTT (baixo salário e falta de motivação para traduzir). Além disso, o nível situacional UWTT é considerado uma variável específica do estado que é uma influência transitória dependente de circunstâncias específicas, ou seja, baixo salário e aberto a mudanças, ou seja, falta de motivação para tradução. Enquanto o WTC em nível estadual ou situacional permite que os alunos de idiomas iniciem a comunicação em um contexto específico, o UWTT em nível estadual desabilita os alunos de idiomas a iniciar a comunicação em um contexto específico.

Palavras-chave: Relutância em traduzir; Tipo de personalidade; WTC; Estudantes de tradução iranianos.

RESUMEN

El estudio actual se estableció para investigar la relación entre la falta de voluntad para traducir y el tipo de personalidad de los estudiantes de traducción iraníes. Con este fin, 100 estudiantes iraníes de inglés como lengua extranjera que estudian traducción al inglés en las universidades Emam Reza y Tabaran en Mashhad, Irán, fueron seleccionados al azar. Los participantes de 20 a 57 años. Se utilizaron dos instrumentos de investigación, a saber, cuestionario de falta de voluntad para traducir (UWTT) y cuestionario de personalidad. Los datos fueron recolectados durante el segundo semestre del año académico. Los datos fueron analizados mediante coeficiente de correlación estadística descriptiva. Los hallazgos revelaron que Percibir el tipo de personalidad tuvo un efecto negativo significativo en el UWTT de los participantes. En realidad, percibir el tipo de personalidad va en dirección negativa con el Factor 3 de UWTT (salario bajo y falta de motivación para traducir). Además, el nivel situacional UWTT se considera una variable específica del estado que es una influencia transitoria que depende de una circunstancia específica, es decir, un salario bajo y abierto a cambios, es decir, falta de motivación para la traducción. Mientras que el WTC a nivel estatal o situacional permite a los estudiantes de idiomas iniciar la comunicación dentro de un contexto específico, el UWTT a nivel estatal les impide a los estudiantes de idiomas iniciar la comunicación dentro de un contexto específico.

Palabras clave: Falta de voluntad para traducir; Tipo de personalidad; WTC; Estudiantes de traducción iranianos.

INTRODUCTION

Translation is considered as a pivotal means of communication due to the diversity of languages all over the world as well as human beings' inherent tendencies to sociality. A brief glance at the history and bibliography of translation studies reveals the proliferation of the innovations and rapid developments of this field in the past few decades. The coincidence of these increasing developments in translation studies and the striking achievements in other domains of science and technology, has increased the demand for translation and expanded it into sphere of a great deal of grounds. Generally, translation is a process of rendering meanings, ideas, or messages of a text from one language to another language. Moreover, “Translation is a phenomenon that has a huge effect on everyday life” (Hatim & Munday, 2004, p. 3). There are some considerations which follow this process and related to the psychological, physiological, sociological circumstances of someone who translate the text or translator. It means that it is an important thing to consider translator’s conditions which play a prominent role in
translation process. One of the crucial factors in translation which can highly affect a translator’s work and translation process is “unwillingness”.

Despite the significance of the subject in translation studies, there has been a dearth of research in the domain of unwillingness to translate (UWTT) and investigations of traits and factors contributed to this approach, particularly, among the translation studies students/educated figures. Thus, in order to shed further light on UWTT, the present study set out to scrutinize the UWTT and its potential association with the factors which influence this trend within Iranian translation studies students. Correspondingly, the unwillingness to communicate may be in parallel association with unwillingness to translate. In the light of the potential association between translation and communication and the scarcity of research on unwillingness to translate, the study attempted to review a number of studies conducted in the scope of unwillingness to communicate. But newly very few studies have just been done about willingness to communicate (WTC) by some scholars such as MacIntyre (1998), Clément and Baker (2003), and Ghonsooly et al. (2012).

Correspondingly, willingness to communicate was originally conceptualized for first language communication (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). It was based on previous works on unwillingness to communicate (Burgoon, 1976). Burgoon called her construct "Unwillingness to Communicate" and defined it as "enduring and chronic tendency to avoid or devalue oral communication.

Another factor which has been examined in this study is referred to personality. The origin of personality goes back to Freudian psychology. Up to now, there have been many disputes among psychologists, behaviorists and philosophers on the definitions and psychological theories of personality. But there has not been any definite theory or definition for personality until Bandura’s time. Essentially what Bandura believes is that human’s behavior is affected by and affects the world or environment around them (O’Grady & Hoch, 2012).

Statement of the problem
Personality theory is rich in complexity and variety. There have been many disputes among psychologists, behaviorists and philosophers on the definitions and psychological theories of personality. Moreover, unwillingness is a psychological phenomenon and has many complexities. Furthermore, the mood of translator increases the complexity of the translation. Then the problem gets worse when we consider unwillingness which itself depends on so many other elements. Regarding WTC, Mac Croskey and Baer (1985) argued that personality variables lead to variability in talking. And unwillingness is a determinant factor in our personality variable. But the question is whether unwillingness influences translation or not and why one translator succeeds as an interpreter while another translator fails in doing so. As well, it is difficult to analyze human being that is a multi-dimensional creature. Thus, finding the role of unwillingness in the domain of translation and investigating the relation between unwillingness to translate and personality is a difficult job which this study tried to do.

Research question
Is there any statistically meaningful relationship between unwillingness to translate and personality of translation students of this study?

Review of related literature
The willingness to communicate (WTC) construct was originally proposed to identify the trait-like personality that people reveal when communicating in their first language (McCroskey & Baer, 1985). Given that there might be some variables other than language aptitude and competence that would otherwise explain WTC in a L2, this construct was later applied to L2 context to explore the factors contributing to L2 learners’ psychological readiness.
to initiate communication (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998).

Based on the findings of Burgoon (1976), Mortensen et al. (1977) and McCroskey and Richmond (1987) proposed WTC to be the individuals’ tendency to initiate communication when they are free to do so. They proposed WTC to be a trait-like predisposition (as cited in Zarrinabadi & Abdi, 2011).

Similarly, scholars suggest that conversational interaction is an essential part of learning a L2 (Mackey, 1999). It is also suggested that WTC is “the most immediate determinant of L2 use” (Clément & Baker, 2003, p. 12). Thus, a fundamental goal of L2 instruction should be to produce learners who are willing to use the language for authentic communication (MacIntyre et al., 1998). Undoubtedly, generating L2WTC as the primary goal of L2 instruction (MacIntyre et al., 2003) can help produce more active learners. In other words, higher levels of L2 WTC greatly contribute to L2 development and successful communication in a variety of L2 communication contexts. These potential advantages of L2WTC provide the necessary impetus for the scholars to vigorously investigate various variables and antecedents underlying the construct in language study.

Personality study has a long history in the field of foreign language teaching and learning. Brown (1987) considers that personality will influence both the quality and quantity of foreign language learning. Rivers (1981) proposes that in a class group, instructors should identify personality factors which influence participation in discussion in the language (Personality Theories, 2015).

Similarly, Allport (1937) believes that personality is biologically determined at birth, and shaped by a person’s environmental experience. Allport’s theory of personality emphasizes the uniqueness of the individual and the internal cognitive and motivational processes that influence behavior. For example, intelligence, temperament, habits, skills, attitudes, and traits (O’Gray & Hoch, 2012).

Likewise, twin studies can be used to see if personality is genetic. However, the findings are conflicting and non-conclusive. Shields (1976) found that monozygotic (identical) twins were significantly more alike on the Introvert (I) _ extrovert (E) and Psychoticism (P) dimensions than dizygotic (non-identical) twins. Loehlin, Willerman and Horn (1988) found that only 50% of the variations of scores on personality dimensions are due to inherited traits. This suggests that social factors are also important (O’Gray & Hoch, 2012).

In the same way, trait theories of personality imply personality is biologically based, whereas state theories such as Bandura’s (1977) Social Learning Theory emphasize the role of nurture and environmental influence. Sigmund Freud’s (1923) Psychodynamic Theory of Personality assumes there is an interaction between nature (innate instincts) and nurture (parental influences) (O’Gray & Hoch, 2012).

**METHODOLOGY**

**Participants**

This study was conducted in Emam Reza and Tabaran Universities in Mashhad, Iran. In order to investigate the relationship between UWTT and personality 100 students were chosen. The participants aged from 20-57, 30% male and 70% female and their major was English translation. Nearly 60% were B.A. and 40% were M.A. students. To measure participants’ UWTT and their personality, 5 classes were chosen to administer the questionnaire.

**Instruments**

Two questionnaires were used in this study, unwillingness to translate (UWTT) questionnaire and personality questionnaire. A modified version of the likert-type questionnaire was used for measuring students’ unwillingness to translate. The scale
comprises 33 items which range from 1 to 5 (1 = extremely disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = extremely agree). Personality was measured by 60 items from Kathrine Cook Briggs and her daughter Isabel Briggs Myers (1944). The MBTI (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator) questionnaire was based on the typological theory proposed by Carl Jung (1921). In MBTI questionnaire each dichotomy measures by 15 items which are including: Extrovert/Introvert, Sensing/Intuitive, Thinking/Feeling, Judging/Perceiving.

**Procedure**

The data were gathered during the second semester of the academic year at Emam Reza and Tabaran universities in Mashhad, Iran. The two questionnaires were given to one hundred translation students. Firstly, the emphasis was on the completion and collection of the UWTT and MBTI questionnaires. The participants were cognizant that their participation in this study would not affect other aspects of their accomplishment. The participants were also acquainted that the data would be collected anonymously and kept confidential by the researcher. The questionnaires took about twenty minutes of class time to complete.

**RESULTS**

After administering the questionnaires, the obtained data were analyzed using SPSS version 22. The data collection and analysis methods used in the present study were determined by the research questions which guided the study. Descriptive statistics provided a simple summary or overview of data. In this study, descriptive statistics of the relationship between UWTT and personality were calculated and the influential factors of personality were also computed. Each participant had two marks, willingness to translate and personality, both of them achieved from quantitative process. Finally, for examining the relation between unwillingness to translate and personality and also determining the most influential factors of personality, correlation was used. Table 1 has shown descriptive statistic of UWTT and MBTI questionnaires which includes mean, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation of research variables.

| Table 1. Descriptive statistic of UWTT & MBTI (N= 100). |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| UWTT            | factor1         | factor2         | factor3         | factor4         | factor5         | JJ              |
| N               | Statistic       | Statistic       | Statistic       | Statistic       | Statistic       | Statistic       |
| 100             | 7.12            | 5.00            | 4.00            | 5.00            | 5.00            | 15.00           |
| Min.            | Statistic       | Statistic       | Statistic       | Statistic       | Statistic       | 15.00           |
| 14.5876         | 2.9643          | 2.4900          | 2.4033          | 3.7067          | 3.7067          | 9.7857          |
| Max.            | Mean            | Std. Deviation  | Std. Deviation  | Std. Deviation  | Std. Deviation  | Mean            |
| 22.50           | 0.24049         | 2.40490         | 0.06849         | 0.68494         | 0.76255         | 9.0099          |
| Mean            | Std. Error      | Std. Error      | Std. Error      | Std. Error      | Std. Error      | Std. Error      |
| 15.00           | 4.13242         | 4.13242         | 0.41744         | 4.13242         | 4.13242         | 4.13242         |
| Std. Deviation  | Statistic       | Statistic       | Statistic       | Statistic       | Statistic       | Statistic       |
| 2.40490         | 2.40490         | 2.40490         | 2.40490         | 2.40490         | 2.40490         | 2.40490         |
| Valid N         | (listwise)      | 84              |
| 84              | 84              | 84              | 84              | 84              | 84              | 84              |
In the same way, a Pearson Correlation was used to examine relationship between UWTT and MBTI. Also, its result is shown in table 2.

### Table 2. Correlations between UWTT & MBTI.

|         | JJ | P   | FF  | T    | NN  | S    | In   | EE   |
|---------|----|-----|-----|------|-----|------|------|------|
| Pearson |    |     |     |      |     |      |      |      |
| Correlation | .167 | - .206* | .092 | .092 | .035 | -.121 | -.022 | -.022 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .100 | .042 | .363 | .363 | .740 | .231 | .826 | .833 |
| N       | 98 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 94  | 100  | 100  | 91   |

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As regards the result of table 2, there is not any significant relation between UWTT and Judging personality type of MBTI in the level of below 0/05 because the results have shown that P > 0/05, and r (95) = 0/167. Otherwise, it seems that there is a significant relation between UWTT and Perceiving personality type of MBTI but it is negative since P < 0/05, and r (95) = - 0/206. Obviously, there is not any significant relation between UWTT and other MBTI personality types.

Thus, UWTT has just a significant and negative relationship with one personality type of MBTI means Perceiving. Then they are in opposite direction to each other. It implies that, if UWTT increases Perceiving decrease and vice versa and so Perceiving personality type has a negative effect on UWTT. Here for further explanation, it is preferable to state the relationship between each factor of UWTT questionnaire and each type of MBTI personality questionnaire. Results are shown in table 3 below.

### Table 3. Correlation between components of UWTT and personality types of MBTI.

|        | JJ  | P    | FF  | T    | NN  | S    | In   | EE   |
|--------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|------|------|
| factor1|     |      |     |      |     |      |      |      |
| Pearson Correlation | .069 | -.081 | .019 | .019 | .133 | -.084 | .105 | -.108 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .499 | .425 | .851 | .851 | .202 | .404 | .299 | .309 |
| N       | 100 | 100  | 100 | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  |

factor2

|        | JJ  | P    | FF  | T    | NN  | S    | In   | EE   |
|--------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|------|------|
| Pearson Correlation | .027 | -.036 | .078 | .078 | -.022 | -.068 | -.012 | -.092 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .794 | .724 | .442 | .442 | .834 | .504 | .903 | .388 |
| N       | 100 | 100  | 100 | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  |

factor3

|        | JJ  | P    | FF  | T    | NN  | S    | In   | EE   |
|--------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|------|------|
| Pearson Correlation | .277** | -.298** | .115 | .115 | -.032 | -.119 | -.153 | .172 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .006 | .003 | .253 | .253 | .757 | .238 | .128 | .103 |
| N       | 100 | 100  | 100 | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  |

factor4

|        | JJ  | P    | FF  | T    | NN  | S    | In   | EE   |
|--------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|------|------|
| Pearson Correlation | .017 | -.116 | -.029 | -.029 | .211* | -.226* | -.096 | .090 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .866 | .254 | .772 | .772 | .042 | .024 | .340 | .398 |
| N       | 100 | 100  | 100 | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  |

factor5

|        | JJ  | P    | FF  | T    | NN  | S    | In   | EE   |
|--------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|------|------|
| Pearson Correlation | .244* | -.252* | .154 | .154 | -.183 | .075 | .062 | -.103 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .016 | .012 | .127 | .127 | .077 | .456 | .537 | .331 |
| N       | 100 | 100  | 100 | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

As it is presented in table 3, there is not any significant relationship between Factor 1 of UWTT which is Low mastery of L1 and L2 and low translation aptitude, and none of personality
types of MBTI. Because for all MBTI personality types $P > 0.05$, thus there is not any significant relation in this level. Similarly, there is not any significant relationship between Factor 2 of UWTT which is Low self-efficacy, and none of personality types of MBTI. But, as represented in table 3 there is a significant relationship between Factor 3 of UWTT which is Low salary and lack of motivation to translate and Judging and Perceiving personality types of MBTI. Since, $\text{sig}$ is lower than $0.05$ ($P < 0.05$), but for Perceiving type of personality this relation is negative ($r(95) = -0.298$). Nonetheless, there is not any significant relationship between Factor 3 of UWTT and other personality types of MBTI because $\text{sig}$ is higher than $0.05$ ($P > 0.05$). Furthermore, Factor 4 of UWTT that is Low educational training and its weak relation to market needs, has significant relationship with Intuitive and Sensing personality types of MBTI. For the reason that, $\text{sig}$ is lower than $0.05$ for both of them but the relation is negative for Sensing personality type because ($r = -0.226$). Otherwise, other personality types of MBTI have not any significant relation with Factor 4 of UWTT. Besides, Perceiving and Judging personality types of MBTI have significant relation with Factor 5 of UWTT because their $P$ is lower than $0.05$ but for Perceiving type it is negative since $r = -252$.

**DISCUSSION**

The current study was set to investigate the relationship between unwillingness to translate and personality type of Iranian translation students. The results revealed that Perceiving personality type had a significant negative effect on participants’ UWTT. Actually, perceiving personality type is in negative direction with Factor 3 of UWTT (low salary and lack of translation motivation). Along with MacIntyre, Clement, Dornyei, and Noels (1998), it was claimed that when WTC comes to L2, it is quite different from L1 because communication confidence can range from 0% to 100% in L2, while most people have a high level of communicative competence in L1. Moreover, WTC is indeed a multi-faceted construct that integrates affective, social-psychological, linguistic, and communicative variables and can describe, explain, and predict language learners’ communicative behavior in a L2. As a result, the study illustrated that the level of UWTT could be changed by personality.

Besides, Dörnyei (2005) argues that “it is not uncommon to find people who tend to avoid entering L2 communication situations even if they possess a high level of communicative competence”. Accompanied by WTC, UWTT is a multi-faceted construct that integrates affective, social-psychological, linguistic, and communicative variables and can describe, explain, and predict language learners’ communicative behavior in a L2. Therefore, UWTT can incorporate social-psychological variables i.e., low salary and lack of translation motivation and also can describe or explain peoples’ communicative behavior i.e., Perceiving.

Correspondingly, Martin (1997) asserted, when Perceiving personality type comes to dealing with the outer world, people who tend to focus on taking in information prefer Perceiving because they stay open to a final decision in order to get more information and also, they stay open to respond to whatever happens. Here, perceiving personality type is completely exposed to outer world and stay open to respond to the situation means that low salary and lack of translation motivation. Thus, the more participants have perceiving personality type, the less they are unwilling to translate. In other words, by increasing salary and translation motivation, UWTT decreases in participants.

In addition, results have shown that Judging personality type of MBTI has a positive effect on Factor 3 of UWTT (low salary and lack of translation motivation). Consistent with McCroskey and Baer (1985), the trait level WTC refers to a learner’s stable personalities or ‘enduring influences’ that represent no fluctuations across different contexts. However, the situational level WTC is regarded as a situation-specific variable which is a transient influence dependent on a specific context and open to changes across situations (MacIntyre et al., 1998). Furthermore, MacIntyre, Babin, and Clément (1999) argue that trait-level and situational level
WTC are complementary and could be integrated in second language acquisition (SLA). In addition, the trait-like WTC has a preparatory role in L2 communication milieu, while state-level or situational WTC empowers language learners to initiate communication within a specific context (Xie, 2011). Subsequently in the study, the situational level UWTT is regarded as a state-specific variable which is a transient influence dependent on specific circumstance i.e., low salary and open to changes that is to say lack of translation motivation. While state-level or situational WTC empowers language learners to initiate communication within a specific context, state-level UWTT disables language learners to initiate communication within a specific context.

CONCLUSION

The present study offered valuable information for the purpose of coping with many challenges of translation domain. In addition, the results of this study have confirmed that UWTT needs to be seen as an important component of translation studies. Therefore, it seems that an augmented knowledge of the nature of UWTT would be beneficial. Taking into account aforementioned literature review it can be concluded that personality traits as well as situational variables are highly influential in UWTT and the role of each one is as well as the other. Taking into consideration the fact that a plenty of L2 learners tend to avoid second language communication, a number of researchers set out to investigate the variables influential in student’s tendency to evade communication within second language. The results from these studies showed that situational variables have more likely been effective in L2WTC. But more researches are needed in this important area, UWTT, to discover the most influential factors. Further researches on UWTT should focus on the situational nature of this construct in order to provide a complete understanding of UWTT and more useful insights into its role in translation studies.
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