

PERSONALITY IN TRANSLATION

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
PERSONALITY TRAITS OF STUDENT TRANSLATORS AND
TRANSLATION QUALITY

Word count: 10.789

Margaux Gevaert

Student number: 01506205

Supervisors: Prof. dr. Lieve Jooken, Prof. dr. Sonia Vandepitte

A dissertation submitted to Ghent University in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master in Translation

Academic year: 2019 - 2020

VERKLARING I.V.M. AUTEURSRECHT

De auteur en de promotor(en) geven de toelating deze studie als geheel voor consultatie beschikbaar te stellen voor persoonlijk gebruik. Elk ander gebruik valt onder de beperkingen van het auteursrecht, in het bijzonder met betrekking tot de verplichting de bron uitdrukkelijk te vermelden bij het aanhalen van gegevens uit deze studie.

PREAMBULE

Het hoofddoel van mijn onderzoek was om na te gaan of er een link is tussen de persoonlijkheid van een vertaler en de kwaliteit van zijn vertaling. Om dit te onderzoeken lieten we tweedejaarsstudenten uit de bachelor Toegepaste Taalkunde een fragment van een literaire tekst vertalen uit het Engels naar het Nederlands. Vervolgens lieten we ze een persoonlijkheidstest invullen om hun persoonlijkheidstype te meten. Voor deze studie hebben we gebruik gemaakt van een onlineversie van de Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), aangezien we in het bijzonder geïnteresseerd waren of er een significant verschil was in de vertalingen van participanten met een Sensing/Intuitive persoonlijkheid.

De oorspronkelijke planning van mijn onderzoek is niet beïnvloed geweest door de coronacrisis. Voor het begin van de lockdown wegens de coronacrisis had ik het materiaal voor mijn literatuurstudie al verzameld en had ik het grootste stuk daarvan al geschreven. Ik heb veel geluk gehad dat het experiment dat deel uitmaakte van mijn onderzoek in de week voor de lockdown heeft plaatsgevonden, namelijk op maandag 9 maart 2020, waardoor alle nodige data op tijd verzameld was. Wegens technische redenen heb ik wel toelating gekregen om mijn masterproef later in te dienen dan de voorziene deadline.

Deze preambule werd in overleg tussen de student en de promotor opgesteld en door beiden goedgekeurd.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between personality traits of student translators and translation quality. Its main objective is to examine whether Intuitive translators produce literary translations of a statistically higher quality as a result of their personality. In this study, student translators were asked to produce a translation from English into Dutch of a literary text. The source text used for the experiment was a paragraph from the short story 'The bodies vest' from the *Not the end of the world* short stories collection by Kate Atkinson (2002, pp. 247-249). After completing the translation task, the students were asked to fill in a personality test, i.e. the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The translation tasks were assessed analytically and holistically by four assessors. For the purpose of this study, a univariate analysis of variance was performed for both dependent variables. From the analysis, it can be concluded that our null hypothesis could not be rejected. The Sensing participants of the experiment outperformed the Intuitive participants for the analytical and holistic assessment.

(175 words)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to thank my friends, who have supported me throughout this year. They were always there for me when I needed to vent or to give me advice. Their support motivated me and made me feel less alone during those hard months.

I would like to thank my supervisors in particular. I am grateful for their extensive feedback and their helpful advice. They were always there for me when I needed them, ready to answer any questions I would have. Even though they were originally not meant to be my supervisors, they jumped in to help me and get me on track with my dissertation as quickly and smoothly as possible.

Table of contents

VERKLARING I.V.M. AUTEURSRECHT	3
PREAMBULE.....	5
ABSTRACT	7
LIST OF TABLES	12
1 INTRODUCTION.....	13
2 RESEARCH ON LITERARY TRANSLATION WITHIN THE FIELD OF TRANSLATION STUDIES	15
2.1 The importance of <i>style</i> and <i>creativity</i> in literary translation.....	15
2.2 Source-oriented vs. target-oriented literary translation	16
2.3 Evaluating literary translation	17
3 PERSONALITY PSYCHOLOGY: PSYCHOMETRICS	20
4 REVIEW OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH: PERSONALITY RESEARCH IN TRANSLATION STUDIES.....	24
4.1 Hubscher-Davidson (2009; 2013)	24
4.2 Karimnia & Mahjubi (2013).....	27
4.3 Lehka-Paul & Whyatt (2016)	28
4.4 Shaki & Khoshsalighehi (2017)	29
5 METHODOLOGY.....	31
5.1 Research question.....	31
5.2 Methods for data collection.....	31
5.3 Methods for data analysis.....	32
5.4 Hypotheses	34
6 RESULTS.....	36
6.1 Data	36
6.2 Inferential statistical analysis	39
7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY	47
APPENDIX A	50
APPENDIX B.....	52
APPENDIX C.....	53
APPENDIX D	54
APPENDIX E.....	56
APPENDIX F.....	60
APPENDIX G	62
APPENDIX H	64

Word count: 10.789

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The four dichotomies of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.....	23
Table 2: Personality types of participants in the study.....	33
Table 3: Average score for the analytical assessment.....	36
Table 4: Average score Sensing/Intuitive for the analytical assessment.....	37
Table 5: Participants who did not translate every literary item for the analytical assessment	37
Table 6: Average score of the holistic assessment.....	37
Table 7: Average score Sensing/Intuitive for the holistic assessment.....	38
Table 8: Participants who did not translate every literary item for the holistic assessment.....	38
Table 9: Average score Intuitive/Sensing participants for both assessments	39
Table 10: Tests of Normality.....	39
Table 11: Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances.....	40
Table 12: Descriptive statistics for the analytical assessment.....	40
Table 13: Tests of Between-Subject Effects	40
Table 14: Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variances.....	41
Table 15: Descriptive statistics for the holistic assessment.....	41
Table 16: Tests of Between-Subject Effects	42

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, research into the personality of the translator has gained more popularity. The relationship between personality and translation, and the possible insight it could provide into translation behaviour and the quality of translation, has long been overlooked. One of the first researchers who showed interest in the personality of translators, was Katharina Reiss. In 1971, she published her book *Translation Criticism: The Potentials and Limitations*, in which she discusses how reliable criteria for Translation Quality Assessment can be developed, and in this context, she also refers to the individuality of the translator. She categorised six forms of personality according to Spranger's typology (1920): theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, aggressive, and religious. She suggests that "certain personalities are better suited than others for translation" (as cited by Hubscher-Davidson, 2009, p. 178). Her ground-breaking comments on the personality of translators paved the way for future interdisciplinary research between the fields of Translation Studies and Psychology, a number of which will be discussed in the literature review (Hubscher-Davidson (2009; 2013), Karimnia & Mahjubi (2013), Lehka-Paul & Whyatt (2016) and Shaki & Khoshsalighehi (2017)).

The personality of a translator may assumed to be particularly visible in literary translation, as the literary translator has to find creative and innovative solutions to translation problems, and is confronted with stylistic choices during the translation process. A poem, for example, may be decoded according to a variety of interpretations suggested by its style and the association between linguistic form and meaning. As translators translate a literary text, they need to interpret the meaning suggested by the literary style before they can make stylistic choices in the target language. In making these choices, the personality of the literary translator may also impact the translation product, as will be clarified in the literature review. The following chapters will cover the notions of *style* and *creativity*, the translation strategies of source- and target-oriented translation (Toury, 1995; Venuti, 1995/2008), and the evaluation of literary translation.

In order to investigate the personality of (literary) translators, the following chapters will cover the way in which personality is tested. During the 20th century, a number of researchers (Katharine Cook Briggs & Isabel Briggs Myers, 1956; Hans Eysenck, 1975; Costa & McCrae, 1978; Ashton & Lee, 2004) developed personality tests to determine an individual's personality, each with their own characteristics.

This study will investigate the possible influence of a translator's personality on the quality of the translation they produce, in particular literary translation. The main objective of our study is to examine whether translators with an intuitive personality are significantly better at translating a literary text than translators with a sensing personality, as a result of their personality. In order to investigate this, we will use the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI).

2 RESEARCH ON LITERARY TRANSLATION WITHIN THE FIELD OF TRANSLATION STUDIES

The following chapter includes a discussion of the elements *style* and *creativity*, two of the main elements in the process of literary translation. In addition, we will discuss two fundamental literary translation strategies: source-oriented and target-oriented translations (Toury, 1995; Venuti, 1995/2008). Finally, we will discuss the process of evaluating literary translations.

2.1 The importance of *style* and *creativity* in literary translation

The major textual characteristic that distinguishes literary texts from non-literary texts is their meaningful use of style. Jooken & Rooryck (2019, p. 179) argue that style is the element that all literary texts share, and it is what makes these texts a “layered form of communication”. This is the main difference with other forms of communication, where conveying a clear and transparent message is the most important objective. Furthermore, they suggest that translating literary texts is difficult because the form of the message in the source text is inextricably linked with the message (p. 179). As a result, the literary translator will have to find a way to either preserve the original form of the source text in his translation, or he will have to find a creative translation solution that works in the target culture and retains the complexity of the original literary style. The way in which a literary translator solves this fundamental translation problem may be dependent on his individual style and personality traits (see chapter 3 of this study). Baker (2000), for example, suggests that literary translators have their own individual style, distinct from the author’s style. Boase-Beier (2011) suggests that stylistics could be closely linked with translation because “both are concerned with the fine linguistic detail of a text and how it can be seen as a reflection of a writer’s textual choices and as the source of effects on readers” (p. 393). In addition, Boase-Beier (2011) discusses an important feature of style, namely weak implicatures (p. 394). The *weak implicatures* that she refers to are “aspects of the meaning of a text not made explicit but left open to the reader’s interpretation”, metaphors or ambiguous expressions, for example (p. 394). They are often hard to translate, as the meaning of these elements is suggested by specific word choices and stylistic elements and are open to interpretation. It is the translator’s job to convey the same aspects of meaning in the target text.

Furthermore, it is important to discuss the notion of *creativity*. Mayer (1989) suggests that “creativity is the ability to solve problems that one has not previously learned to solve” (p. 205). Literary texts contain various literary techniques and figures of speech, for example metaphors,

similes, imagery. It is the task of the literary translator to find a creative, and at the same time acceptable translation solution for these literary elements. Depending on someone's personality, some people might find this task easier than others. We will discuss this in greater detail in chapter 3 of this study.

2.2 Source-oriented vs. target-oriented literary translation

The two types of translation strategies that have been defined for a broad range of text types, i.e. the source-oriented strategy and the target-oriented strategy, also apply to translating a literary text. The first type is a literary translation oriented towards the source text, which Toury (1995) defines as *source-oriented* and Venuti (1995/2008) as a case of *foreignization*. The aim of a source-oriented literary translation is to make the target audience familiar with “the foreign” giving them access to a different culture they would otherwise not get access to, and to enrich the target text with elements of the source culture. This exposure to different cultures does not occur if the translator opts for a target-oriented approach, because in that case the elements of the source culture would have been adapted to the target audience. Literary translators who opt for a source-oriented approach want to stay as close to the original source text as possible in terms of style, register and the use of foreign elements, for example foreign words and phrases from the source culture (Venuti, 1995). The target text is mainly perceived as a derivative of the source text (Hermans, 1985, p, 115). The second type of literary translation is one which is oriented towards the target culture, referred to as *target-oriented* by Toury (1995) and as a case of *domestication* by Venuti (1995/2008). The target-oriented approach to literary translation adapts the source text to make it more suitable to the target audience, eliminating foreign elements which remind the reader that he is reading a translation. This choice is often motivated by the need to produce a stylistic equivalent. The Dutch translator of Zadie Smith's *White Teeth* (2000), for example, can only render the Creole inflected speech of the characters by opting for a Dutch regional variant, as in “Hoe vaak moet ik het nog zeggen ... je heb geen tijd voor jongens!”, which is the translation of “How many times must I tell you – you got no time for bwoys!” (quoted in Jooke, 2018, p.18). The aim of this approach is to make the reader forget that he is, in fact, reading a translation. Within this approach, the source and target text are perceived as equal instead of perceiving one or the other as “superior”. Furthermore, Hermans (1985) argues that literary translations have their own national literary canon, and that they are not merely “derivative products of primary source texts” (p. 115). The

disadvantage of a target-oriented approach, however, is that the reader does not get access to the source culture and is deprived from its cultural elements.

2.3 Evaluating literary translation

The evaluation of literary translations in terms of quality or adequacy has traditionally been a subject of debate (Toury, 1995; Venuti, 1995/2008; Vanderschelden, 2000). The main issue facing assessments of the quality of a literary translation is that criteria that define a “good” literary translation are hard to measure and state in universal terms. They depend on a translator’s appraisal of the literary style of the source text and his capacity to match that style in target text equivalents. Venuti (1995) argues that comments on the quality of a literary translation are often “vague, subjective and unsubstantiated” and that they often come from implicit personal assumptions (as cited by Vanderschelden, 2000, p. 287). This statement suggests that the evaluator’s personal appreciation or interpretation of a literary text have a significant impact on the evaluation of the literary translation of that text. Furthermore, Vanderschelden (2000) claims that the criteria to evaluate the quality are “far from universal or systematic, and they are not explicitly provided anywhere” (p. 287). However, Vanderschelden wrote this statement about 20 years ago. Significant research progress has been made since then.

The PETRA-E network (PETRA = Plateforme Européenne pour la traduction littéraire, the ‘E’ stands for Education), for example, developed the PETRA-E Framework for Literary Translators to provide literary translators with a reference tool that consists of various criteria (Framework of reference for the education and training of literary translators, n.d.). The framework can be used for “self-assessment or as a reference tool for universities, trainers and schools” (“Introduction”, n.d.). PETRA-E is a network for the education and training of literary translators in Europe. In addition to developing a framework, they also created a database with courses and programs for literary translation. Their Framework for literary translators includes five levels of competency: LT1 (Beginner), LT2 (Advanced Learner), LT3 (Early Career Professional), LT4 (Advanced Professional) and LT5 (Expert). When a literary translator has reached the LT5 (Expert) level they are, presumably, capable of producing an adequate literary translation. Furthermore, it describes eight competences: transfer competence, language competence, textual competence, heuristic competence, literary-cultural competence, professional competence, evaluative competence and research competence. The Framework

uses descriptors to define the competences for the different levels, and these descriptors “encapsulate all the things a literary translator should know and (be able to) do at a particular level” (“Introduction”, n.d.). The textual competence, for example, requires translators to have a thorough understanding of literary genres and styles and it requires them to use that understanding to analyse source texts and produce target texts. The literary-cultural competence requires translators to have a deep knowledge about literature in the source and target culture and to apply that knowledge while producing a literary translation. At the LT3-level, for example, a literary translator “can effectively deal with culture-specific elements” and “can effectively deal with differences between source culture and target culture” (Framework of reference for the education and training of literary translators, n.d.). In terms of literary creativity, the PETRA-E framework suggests that at the LT5-level, a literary translator “can find solutions and make choices beyond learned procedures and methods” and has an “optimal creative ability”. Although the participants of our study are student translators, these competences will be important on a LT1 (Beginner) level.

The present study will rely on two important criteria to assess the literary translations of the participants in the experiment. The first criterion will be *adequacy*, as we described in the paragraph above. The second criterion observed in the assessment is *acceptability*. Toury (1980) suggests that an acceptable literary translation is a translation that is accepted by the target-culture reader because it follows the norms present in the target language and culture (as cited by Schäffner, pp. 235-244). The notion of *acceptability* is elusive, however, and defining *acceptability* continues to be an ongoing debate in the field of literary translation. A translation that was considered acceptable according to criteria in the past, might not be acceptable according to the present criteria. In addition, we cannot discuss the notion of *acceptability* without including a discussion on *equivalence*.

Firstly, the notion of equivalence has long been and continues to be a subject of debate in Translation Studies, in the translation industry, and it has been ever since the very beginning of translation practice. Bloemen (2019) suggests that since the creation of the first Bible translations, a translation has been expected to be an equivalent representation of the original source text. However, every translator will relate to the fact that a fully equivalent representation is nearly impossible (p. 73). In addition, the status of the source text has an impact on the degree of equivalence that is required for the translation. In addition, Bloemen (2019) suggests that the translation of source texts with a high status, i.e. sacred texts, demand

a high degree of equivalence (p. 76). Furthermore, one could argue that the task of acquiring equivalence is particularly hard in the case of literary translations in general. Jakobson (2004/1959) argues that an equivalent representation becomes unattainable once the linguistic form of the message acquired poetic characteristics. He claims that poetry is untranslatable (as cited by Bloemen, 2019, p. 74).

Secondly, there are several types of equivalence. Formal equivalence, for example, which requires a translation to retain as many formal elements of the source text as possible, is also known as a word-for-word translation. Another example is Nida's dynamic equivalence, which focuses on translating the meaning of phrases or sentences. Nida (1964) strived to find equivalents that were more closely connected to the "natural" language use of the target culture (Bloemen, 2019, p. 83). Another important type of equivalence is stylistic equivalence. When a translator translates a literary text, for example a poem, he will have to ensure that the style of the target text reflects the style of the source text. Boase-Beier (2011) suggests that "we read the translated text as a blend resulting from stylistic choices made by the translator" (p. 238).

3 PERSONALITY PSYCHOLOGY: PSYCHOMETRICS

This research paper will investigate the possible correlation between a translator's personality features and the quality of a literary translation delivered by that translator. In order to investigate this link, it is important to define *personality* in psychological terms. According to Larsen, Buss, Wismeijer & Song (2017, p. 3), personality can be defined as follows:

Personality is the set of psychological traits and mechanisms within the individual that are organized and relatively enduring and that influence his or her interactions with, and adaptations to, the intrapsychic, physical and social environments.

By examining and defining a person's individual personality according to a set of parameters, researchers are able to predict and explain behaviour in fairly reliable terms. With this information from the field of psychology, we can investigate the possible influence of a translator's personality on their behaviour and the decisions they make during the translation process. What is interesting for our present study, is that we might be able to correlate certain patterns of translator behaviour with the quality of the translation they have produced. For example, we might find that certain translators, as a result of their personality type, feel more comfortable solving new problems and are confident in finding creative and innovative solutions to solve them. As a result, they would excel in translating literary texts, which often require creative solutions to translation problems.

During the 20th century, a number of personality researchers (Katharine Cook Briggs & Isabel Briggs Myers, 1956; Hans Eysenck, 1975; Costa & McCrae, 1978; Ashton & Lee, 2004) took important steps in the development of personality tests to examine an individual's personality. One of the most popular personality researchers of this period was Hans Eysenck, a German psychologist who worked in Great Britain. Together with Sybil B. G. Eysenck, he developed a personality test named the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) in 1975 based on his model of personality (1947). The EPQ was based on three main personality traits or factors: Extraversion-Introversion (E), Neuroticism-Emotional Stability (N) and Psychoticism (P). Larsen et al. (2017) suggest that "he called these three traits 'super-traits', and each of these 'super-traits' are located at the top of its own hierarchy and subsume a number of narrow traits". For example, some of the narrow traits Psychoticism (P) incorporates are: aggressive, cold, egocentric, impersonal and impulsive. These narrow traits are located at the second level of

Eysenck's hierarchical structure. There is also a third level in the hierarchical structure, which Eysenck refers to as *habitual acts*, followed by the lowest level in the hierarchical structure called *specific acts*. For example, one of the narrow traits of Extraversion (E) is sociability. One habitual act that sociability incorporates could be talking on the telephone. The specific act, then, is talking on the telephone with a friend.

Another personality test worth mentioning is the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI) and the revised version, the NEO PI-R, based on the Big Five theory. In 1978, Costa & McCrae developed a personality theory called the Big Five Inventory. In contrast to Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire, this personality inventory describes an individual's place along a spectrum of Big Five personality traits, namely: Openness to experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. The personality inventory was developed based on earlier psycholexical studies performed by Allport (1969). Costa & McCrae selected these five traits because they believed them to be fundamental to personality. Johnsson (2009) suggested that "the selection of these five traits was based on studies (e.g., Fiske 1949, cited in Funder, 2007) that demonstrated that the five traits were the most useful and recurrent when rating personality" (p. 2). Furthermore, Johnsson (2009, p. 3) suggests that the NEO PI-R is the most popular and most used instrument based on the Big Five theory. Another personality inventory is the HEXACO Personality Inventory or HEXACO model. It was developed by Ashton & Lee (2004) and one of the main differences between the NEO Personality Inventory is that it covers six personality dimensions instead of five: Honesty-Humility (H), Emotionality (E), Extraversion (X), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C) and Openness to Experience (O). de Vries & Born (2013) suggest that the model is the result of a reanalysis of lexical data from seven different countries (p. 224). In addition, one of the main differences with the NEO Personality Inventory is that the HEXACO model covers six dimensions instead of five, the additional one being Honesty-Humility.

The final test to be discussed is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), a personality test based on Carl Jung's theory of psychological types developed by Katharine Cook Briggs and her daughter Isabel Briggs Myers in the 1940s (Hubscher-Davidson, 2009, p. 181). Wicklein & Rojewski (1995) claim that "Jung's theory of personality focuses on how people gather information about the world (perception), how they conclude about what they have perceived (judgment) and what their sources of energy are (attitude or orientation)" (as cited by Karimnia & Mahjubi, 2013, p. 39). However, Myers and Briggs added another dichotomous dimension:

Judging vs Perceiving (Lehka-Paul & Whyatt, 2016, p. 4). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator tests for eight preferences (i.e. four dichotomies): Extraversion (E)/Introversion (I), Sensing (S)/Intuition (I), Thinking (T)/Feeling (F), Judging (J)/Perceiving (P) and describes a total of 16 different personality types: ISTJ, ISTP, ESTP, ESTJ, ISFJ, ISFP, ESFP, ESFJ, INFJ, INFP, ENFP, ENFJ, INTJ, INTP, ENTP, ENTJ. Table 1 summarizes the main differences between the four dichotomies of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator based on the research of Shaki & Khoshsalighehi (2017, p. 361):

Dichotomy	Main characteristics
Extravert (E) vs Introvert (I)	<p>Myers et al. (1998) describe Extraverts as expressive, sociable, outgoing, talkative and initiators of conversation.</p> <p>Jung (2014) suggested that Extraverts are more oriented to the external world.</p> <p>Introverts draw their energy from “the inner world of ideas and concepts”.</p>
Sensing (S) vs Intuitive (N)	<p>The Sensing/Intuitive dichotomy is based on the way individuals gather information.</p> <p>Sensors have a preference for taking in information through their five senses and they “pay attention to what is real, concrete, and practical”.</p> <p>In terms of problem-solving, Sensors are experience-dependent: “they dislike new problems, unless their prior experience helps them solve the problem”.</p> <p>Intuitors prefer to gather information using their intuition and have no problem with solving new problems: they like to solve problems using their inspiration and imagination.</p> <p>Intuitive types tend to rely more on their intuition and imagination and tend to be more creative than sensing types.</p>
Thinking (T) vs Feeling (F)	<p>The dichotomy between Thinking and Feeling personality types has to do with the decision-making process.</p> <p>Myers et al. (1998) suggests that Thinking personality types prefer to be analytical and objective during the decision-making process.</p> <p>Feeling personality types tend to be more subjective when making decisions.</p>
Judging (J) vs Perceiving (P)	<p>Felder, Felder, & Dietz (2002) and Capretz & Ahmed (2010) suggest that individuals with a Judging personality type prefer their lives to be planned and decisive. In addition, when a Judger is presented with a task, they prefer to finish it before the deadline.</p>

	Perceivers prefer a flexible and spontaneous way of living. Furthermore, they don't tend to pay much attention to the deadline when finishing a task.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Table 1: The four dichotomies of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

Pittenger (2005) argues that the personality test was created to use in the fields of education, counselling, career guidance and workplace team-building, but it is also used in the setting of hiring new employees (as cited by Larsen, Buss, Wismeijer & Song, 2017, p. 95). In addition, Boyle (1995) and Thompson & Ackerman (1994) correlate the popularity of the personality test to its widespread use by career counsellors and human resource departments (as cited by Capraro & Capraro, 2002, pp. 593-594).

Although the MBTI is one of the most popular personality tests, it has also received criticism over the years. For example, some argue that the results of the MBTI are difficult to understand (Bayne, 1997), while others suggest that the personality test is not very reliable (Pittenger, 1993) because when you take the MBTI twice, you often get a different result (as cited by Johnsson, 2009, p. 5). This suggests that the test-retest reliability might not be very high for the MBTI and its results might have to be interpreted with care. However, Capraro & Capraro (2002) argue that “the MBTI, on average, tends to yield scores with acceptable reliability across studies” (p. 599). Comrey (1983) and McCrae & Costa (1989) argue that the MBTI does not portray Jung’s theory in an accurate way, while other researchers (Girelli & Stake, 1993; Vacha-Haase & Thompson, 1999) disapprove of “the forced-choice response format and false assumptions that all people can be divided into groups” (as cited by Capraro & Capraro, 2002, p. 595). Nevertheless, Bayne (1997) and Quenk (2000; 2002) suggest that “substantial evidence supports the validity of the MBTI”, for example “the MBTI is related to other personality measures, especially the Big Five. Despite its criticisms, the MBTI is still a commonly used instrument for assessing personality” (as cited by Johnsson, 2009, p. 5).

For the purpose of this study, we will focus on the Sensing/Intuitive dichotomy of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The motivation for the selection of this dichotomy of the MBTI will be discussed in the chapter 4 of this study.

4 REVIEW OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH: PERSONALITY RESEARCH IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

The research of personality within the field of Translation Studies is an under-researched field of study, however, which implies that few comparable studies can be discussed to synthesise a state of the art. Daisy (2009) argues that “the existing literature on this issue does not provide us with consistent and fruitful results” (as cited by Karimnia & Mahjubi, 2013, p. 42). Nevertheless, it is of significant importance to study the translator’s personality for educational purposes: the knowledge retrieved from personality tests may be added to educate translators on the possible impact of their personality on their translation performance provided that sufficient experimental evidence emerges of a correlation between personality and performance.

Previous research (Hubscher-Davidson (2009, 2013)), a selection of which will be discussed in the following paragraphs, has suggested that the Sensing/Intuitive dichotomy provides the most significant results out of the four dichotomies of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (henceforth MBTI) regarding its influence on translation quality. Because of this reported reliability of the MBTI test and the S/I dichotomy, it has been selected for the current experimental design. Furthermore, it has been argued (Hubscher-Davidson, 2009) that individuals with an intuitive personality show higher levels of creativity in their translation performance. Therefore, analysing this dichotomy will provide us with useful information to investigate the quality of literary translations.

Several scholars have attempted to investigate the link between an individual’s personality and translation competence. In the next paragraph we will discuss research by the following scholars: Hubscher-Davidson (2009; 2013), Karimnia & Mahjubi (2013), Lehka-Paul & Whyatt (2016) and Shaki & Khoshsalighehi (2017). For this state of the art, we opted for a chronological overview of a selection of the most recent studies in order to give an up-to-date account of the current state of research.

4.1 Hubscher-Davidson (2009; 2013)

Hubscher-Davidson is one of the most prominent researchers in the field of interdisciplinary research in Translation Studies. In 2009, she studied the individual differences and diverse personalities in translation profiles. The aim of her study was to investigate whether and how

the presence of personality traits influences a student translator's performance in translation, more specifically their decision-making processes, and whether their personality traits would be perceptible to target readers. Hubscher-Davidson is an important advocate of incorporating the field of psychology, personality psychology in particular, into the field of Translation Studies. She argues that "as studying translators and how they function is an activity in which people are involved, the insights and benefits to be gained by adopting a psychological approach are therefore clear" (2009, p. 176).

The data collected for her 2009 study were part of her doctoral work in 2004. The study included 20 English-speaking students enrolled in the MA in Translating and Interpreting at the University of Bath. Firstly, they were asked to fill in a background questionnaire which would provide information about their translating experience and education. Secondly, they had to translate a 221-word literary text from French to English and verbalise while they translated, a method known as TAP or think-aloud-protocol. Then their translations were collected and a retrospective questionnaire as well as a personality test were applied. The personality test used in this study was the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Hubscher-Davidson did not communicate that the participants would have to take a personality test "to minimise potential preconceptions about the study" (2009, p. 182). Four translation lecturers were asked to mark and comment on the translations, using a marking sheet. The results of the study showed a possible correlation between the Sensing/Intuitive trait dichotomy and the quality of the translations. However, Hubscher-Davidson advises not to interpret the results of her study in a prescriptive manner: "The translation process can be affected by a number of different factors and, although care was taken in this study to control experimental conditions, and to combine and triangulate methodologies and data, this does not mean that the students taking part in the study were not influenced by other factors alongside potential personality traits." (p. 188). Hubscher-Davidson (2009, p. 184) found that the five students who scored the highest scores in the task were all intuitive types, while the five students with the weakest scores were all sensing types. The 10 intuitive participants in the study obtained average scores of 66.14% while the 10 sensing participants obtained average scores of 57.8%, a significant difference of more than 8%. Furthermore, according to the marking sheets, sensing students often translated the literary texts too literally and their translations often contained important semantic errors. Myers & Myers (1995, p. 59) argued that "sensing types like to take a practical approach to tasks, and tend not to be at ease when needing to use their imagination" (as cited by Hubscher-Davidson, 2009, p. 186). As a result, translating a literary text might be more challenging for translators with a

sensing personality type. The intuitive students, on the other hand, received positive feedback from the markers of the task, who stated that they had produced a “thoughtful and sensitive target text”, and some of the translations were described as “lively and inventive” or “creative and original” (p. 187).

Hubscher-Davidson (2009, p. 187) suggests that the strong performance of the intuitive students in the translation task could be attributed to their personality type. As we discussed in section two, intuitive types tend to rely more on their intuition and imagination and tend to be more creative than sensing types. As a result of these findings, Hubscher-Davidson (2013) performed another study on the relationship between personality and translation, this time focusing on the role of intuition in the translation process. The aim of this case study was to demonstrate the influence of intuition on decision-making during the translation process and to explore the implications of this influence. The data for this study was also collected as part of her doctoral work in 2004, which had already argued that there was a strong correlation between the intuitive participants’ personality and success in the translation task. Hubscher-Davidson (2013) selected the TAPs of one of those intuitive participants who performed very well in the task and scored very highly on intuition, and reviewed the protocols to “highlight the mechanisms of intuitive behavior during the translation process and to gain a better understanding of its influence during decision-making [...]” (pp. 219-220). The case study illustrated a number of interesting processing behaviours. For example, she found that some intuitive translation judgements were followed by a conscious effort to reason and rationalize the judgement, and thus verifying their intuition. Nevertheless, she argued that these judgements “could be considered suspiciously and can be difficult to shake off” (p. 223). It appears that intuitive translators should be aware of the possible dangers of their intuitive translation judgements and they should make sure to verify these judgements before implementing them in their translation. One could conclude that a translator may rely on their intuition; however, the inclusion of a reasoning processes is not only essential but also necessary. Furthermore, Hubscher-Davidson (2013, pp. 225-226) mentions that recent research suggests that it might be possible for individuals to develop intuition. For example, Bălăcescu (2006) suggests that it would be beneficial for student translators to be trained in how to act upon intuitive translation judgements during their training (as cited by Hubscher-Davidson, 2013, p. 226).

4.2 Karimnia & Mahjubi (2013)

Karimnia & Mahjubi (2013) investigated the relationship between Iranian translation students' personality types and the quality of their translations from English into Persian of different text types. They suggest that the reason behind this research objective is the fact that "the existing literature on this issue does not provide us with consistent and fruitful results" (p. 42). In total, 35 Iranian undergraduate translation students majoring in English translation at the Fasa Islamic Azad University participated in the study. Their ages ranged from 22 to 39.

Firstly, a background questionnaire was administered to the students to provide the researchers with demographic information about the participants. Secondly, the participants were asked to translate three different English texts to Persian. The translation task included the translation of an advertisement, a scientific text and a narrative text. The translation task of the narrative text included a paragraph from *The Alchemist* by Paulo Coelho (2002). When they had finished the translation task, the participants were administered a retrospective questionnaire to ask them about translation difficulties and their experience of the translation task. Next, the participants were asked to fill in the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (retrieved from www.humanmetrics.com). In the next step, the translations were sent to three instructors of translation for assessment. The instructors were given a marking sheet (this marking sheet became popular after Hubscher-Davidson had developed it in 2009) to evaluate the translations and score them. The results of their research showed no significant differences between the Sensors over the Intuitors and the Feelers over the Thinkers with respect to their translations of the advertisement and the scientific text. However, the results did reveal a significant difference between the Intuitors and the Sensors with respect to the narrative text. Karimnia & Mahjubi (2013, p. 47) found that the participants with an Intuitive personality outperformed the participants with a Sensing personality in the translation of the narrative text ($p = 0.017$). Furthermore, they argued that the weak performance of the Sensing participants was due to a lack of creativity and self-confidence. Creativity and imagination being key elements of literary translation, this could explain the weak performance of Sensing personality types. In addition, Bush (1998) argues that "sensors' tendency to take a practical approach to tasks does not guarantee their success in literary translations" (as cited by Karimnia & Mahjubi, 2013, p. 50).

4.3 Lehka-Paul & Whyatt (2016)

The aim of Lehka-Paul & Whyatt's (2016) research was to investigate whether a translator's personality features influence the quality of their translation, and furthermore whether some personality factors play a role in a translator's decision-making. They incorporated translation process research and product evaluation into their research in order to investigate the cognitive functions involved in translating and to observe the influence of personality traits in relation to the translation product.

In order to test the personality of the participating translators, Lehka-Paul & Whyatt (2016) applied the HEXACO Personality Inventory and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The HEXACO Personality Inventory is based on the trait approach. Lehka-Paul & Whyatt (2016, p. 3) suggest that "the proponents of this approach focus on measuring the strength of certain personality characteristics as opposed to others, and then make predictions as to the possible ways of thinking and behaving". The MBTI, on the other hand, predicts people's behaviour by describing their psychological functions (2016, p.4). As mentioned before, the MBTI distinguishes 16 different personality types. Lehka-Paul & Whyatt (2016, p.4) suggest that this is referred to as personality typology and is often seen as the opposite of the trait approach. However, they argue that in their study these two approaches are treated as complementary because it "attempts to describe translators' personality through traits as stable characteristics, and cognitive functions as dynamic entities" (2016, p.4).

One of the hypotheses developed in the study involves the Sensing vs. Intuitive type dichotomy. Lehka-Paul & Whyatt (2016, p. 13) suggest that "Sensing types are more practical, experience-dependent and trust factual information received from their senses while Intuitive types are more abstract-minded and attach more importance to meaning and its interpretation than facts". Their hypothesis was that Intuitive types rely on external sources less frequently than the Sensing type. In total, 103 participants participated in their study, ranging from translation students to professional freelance translators and a control group of students from a technical university. The participants were asked to translate 250-word extracts of expressive and informative texts from English into Polish. The translation task for the expressive text consisted of an extract from *Gigolo and Gigolette* by W.S. Maugham. Lehka-Paul & Whyatt (2016) then used Translog II to collect data about the translation process. Furthermore, they applied a retrospective questionnaire to gather more details about the participants' personality and their

experience with the translation task. They were able to draw tentative conclusions from their research on personality and translation competence, although they do admit that the study has its limitations, mainly because of the limited number of participants. Lehka-Paul & Whyatt (2016, p. 25) were able to confirm their hypothesis on the Sensing vs. Intuitive type dichotomy. They suggest that “Sensing types tend to be more scrupulous and often rely on external resources, while the Intuitive types are more self-reliant and depend on internal resources, e.g. previous experience” (p. 25). However, they suggest that it is more relevant to professional translators rather than student translators. In conclusion, they suggest that the personality of the participants did interact with their translation process and product, although this interaction might not be decisive for a successful translation product.

4.4 Shaki & Khoshsalighehi (2017)

Shaki & Khoshsalighehi (2017) investigated the link between the personality types of Iranian translation students and the quality of their translation of expressive, informative and appellative texts from English to Iranian. Furthermore, they investigated what personality types are better at translating these text types. Shaki & Khoshsalighehi (2017, pp. 362-363) incorporated a discussion on the topic of creativity and its link with successful translation performance in their research. The general idea is that patterns of creativity are correlated with personality, and that creativity occurs when solving a problem for which one has no previous experience.

As mentioned before, Intuitive types experience fewer difficulties in solving new problems than Sensing types: they like to solve problems using their inspiration and imagination. As a result, Intuitive types tend to have more creative personality characteristics, which often leads them to be more successful translators, in particular in the context of literary translation.

103 MA graduates and students of five major universities in Tehran and Mashhad participated in the 2017 study, all of them native speakers of the Persian language. Data were collected pertaining to the participant’s personality using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). After taking the personality test, the participants were asked to translate three paragraphs of three different text types (following the text typology of Reiss (1971)) of about 150 words: expressive, operative and informative. Furthermore, the participants were asked to fill in a retrospective questionnaire to ask them about their experience in performing the translation

task. Then, three evaluators assessed the translated texts by means of the holistic method to translation quality assessment (validated by Waddington, 2001) and the evaluators also gave comments on the translation tasks. The conclusions drawn on the scores of the expressive texts are particularly important to our own research paper. Shaki & Khoshsalighehi (2017) found that Intuitive types outperformed the Sensing and Thinking types among the participants. The weak performance of the Sensing types was visible in the rankings of the scores given for the translation of the expressive text: only two Sensing types made it to the top 20 in the ranking. Shaki & Khoshsalighehi (2017, p. 367) suggest that “the weak performance of sensing types in translation tasks is due to their lower reading comprehension skills and creativity compared to intuitive ones and other personality types”. Boase-Beier (2006, p. 55) suggests that creativity is a necessary element of the translation of expressive texts due to the nature of this text type (as cited by Shaki & Khoshsalighehi, 2017, p. 367). As a result, Sensing types might be less successful in translating expressive texts because of their comparative lack of creativity.

5 METHODOLOGY

5.1 Research question

The aim of this study is to investigate the potential relationship between personality traits of student translators and the quality of the translations they produce. In order to investigate the personality traits of the participants, we opted to use the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), focussing on the Sensing-Intuitive dichotomy in particular. For the purpose of this study, we have chosen to focus on literary translation, as we want to examine whether Intuitive translators show higher levels of creativity in their literary translations than Sensing translators, and, as a result, produce literary translations of a statistically higher quality. In addition, we want to investigate whether Intuitive translators produce literary translations that are more acceptable in the target culture than Sensing translators. The present study intends to replicate elements from the studies discussed in chapter 4 of this study.

5.2 Methods for data collection

5.2.1 Description of participants and conditions of study

A total of 48 second year-students of the Bachelor of Arts in Applied Language Studies at Ghent University participated in this study, of whom 40 were female and 8 were male. However, one of the participants did not fill in the personality test so her results of the translation task could not be used for our study. The programme of this bachelor's degree consists of a combination of at least two languages. All participants study Dutch (mother tongue) and English, and another foreign language of their choice. The students were all between 19 and 20 years old. There were thirteen EN-FR students, seven EN-DE students, sixteen EN-SP students, six EN-RU students, three EN-IT students, one EN-TU students, and one student who is enrolled in a preparatory programme.

5.2.2 Description of the translation task

The participants were asked to produce a translation from English into Dutch of a literary text of 501 words. The students had a CEFR level of C1. Before the start of the translation task, the students were given a short introduction. In the introduction they were told that they had two hours to finish the translation task and that they could use any resource they might need. Next, they were asked to sign a form of consent (see Appendix A). The source text used for the

translation task was a paragraph from “The bodies vest”, a short story published in *Not the end of the world*, a collection of twelve short stories by British writer and Whitbread laureate Kate Atkinson (2002, pp. 247-249) (see Appendix B). In an article from 2002, published in *The Guardian* by Helen Falconer, the collection of short stories is described as follows:

In this themed collection, Atkinson has chosen to be a playful as well as erudite goddess of the pen. Her tales are largely set in modern Scotland, but she compels the reader to adopt the awed perspective of an ancient Greek. Real life trundles on, but only look twice and you can see the fingerprints of the gods plastered over every "accident" of fate (and we're not talking here about the avuncular Christian type of god but about lustful, arrogant immortals who love to play with mortal lives and spray their seed in human wombs).

The translation task was part of the course English: Language Practice D (E2PD), taught by An Baeyens and Joeri Van Liefferinge. The participating students were provided with the translation task through Ufora and were asked to translate the literary text during one of the seminars in the second term.

5.3 Methods for data analysis

5.3.1 Personality test

Having finished the translation task, the target texts were collected, and the students were asked to fill in a personality test, i.e. the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The students were not informed of the personality test before the start of the translation task in order not to influence their translation performance. For this study, an online version of the MBTI (<http://www.humanmetrics.com/>) was used, which took approximately 10 to 15 minutes. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) was selected because of its widespread use in interdisciplinary research on the relationship between personality traits of a translator and the quality of their translations. In addition, we used the MBTI for the purpose of this study as we wanted to investigate the Sensing-Intuitive dichotomy of the MBTI and whether intuitive translators are indeed more creative than sensing translators, as suggested by a number of researchers (Hubscher-Davidson, 2009, 2013; Karimnia & Mahjubi, 2013; Lehka-Paul & Whyatt, 2016; and Shaki & Khoshsalighehi, 2017). Table 2 includes the number of each personality type of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator represented in this study:

Dominant trait N/S	Personality type	Total number of participants for each type
Intuitive-Thinking	INTJ	3
	INTP	1
	ENTJ	2
	ENTP	0
Intuitive-Feeling	INFJ	8
	INFP	2
	ENFJ	8
	ENFP	6
Sensing-Judging	ISTJ	2
	ISFJ	5
	ESTJ	0
	ESFJ	7
Sensing-Perceiving	ISTP	0
	ISFP	1
	ESTP	1
	ESFP	1

Table 2: Personality types of participants in the study.

In total, 30 participants had an Intuitive personality and 17 participants had a Sensing personality.

5.3.2 Qualitative assessment of the translation task

For the purpose of this study, the translation task has been assessed according to two different criteria, involving two assessors for each criterion. Firstly, the comparative evaluation, which will be referred to as *analytical assessment*, assessed the adequacy of the target text in comparison to the source text. The individual assessment by assessors A and B focussed on 20 literary elements that had been identified before the start of the experiment and were deemed essential for the analytical assessment. If the participants were able to translate these elements in an adequate way, they scored a ‘yes’ for each item. Secondly, two researchers of the TRACE research group, both of whom are also professional literary translators, performed a holistic assessment. They are referred to as assessors C and D. The main focus of the holistic assessment was to evaluate the acceptability of the target text in the target culture, again focusing on the 20 literary items that had been identified before the start of the experiment.

The analytical assessment by assessors A (see Appendix E) and B (see Appendix F) assigned a *yes* or *no* score to each of the 20 translation choices. The two assessors motivated their decision through the following statement: if creativity could be detected in the translation of a literary element, or if a translation solution was particularly creative, it had been ranked as *yes*. A

translation solution that was translated in a creative way, but which did not comply with the context or literary interpretation of the target text, in other words which did not render a stylistically equivalent creative alternative to the literary element in the source language, was given a *no*. When the evaluators gave a literary element a *yes*, it would get a score of 1; if it was given a *no*, it would get a score of 0. The sum of the scores by assessors A and B was used for the statistical analysis of the results and the translations of the participants were scored on a scale of 40. Certain participants did not translate every literary element, presumably due to lack of time. To indicate the instances where a participant did not translate a certain literary item, assessor A used the symbol \emptyset and assessor B wrote “nt vt”. These instances were given the same score as a *no* would receive, namely a 0.

Assessors C (see Appendix G) and D (see Appendix H) performed a holistic assessment to evaluate the acceptability of the target text in the target culture. They evaluated the literary quality and level of idiomatic usage of the complete text of the translation. Both assessors evaluated the 20 literary elements giving them a score of: A (= good), B (= satisfactory), C (= poor), D (= unacceptable) and O (= incomplete). In order to test their assessment statistically, I made a range of the holistic score and put them on a scale of 20: A (= 16), B (= 12), C (= 8), D (= 4) and O (= 0). Some literary elements were given a double score, for example D/O. In this case, the student would receive a score of 4.

5.4 Hypotheses

The main objective of this study is to examine whether Intuitive translators show higher levels of creativity in their literary translations than Sensing translators, and, as a result, produce literary translations of a statistically higher quality. We will test the literary quality of the translation tasks in two ways: by performing an analytical assessment and a holistic assessment.

For the purpose of this study, the null hypothesis (H_0) assumes that translators with an Intuitive personality score equally well or worse than translators with a Sensing personality: $H_0: \mu_{sensing} \geq \mu_{intuitive}$. The alternative hypothesis (H_1) assumes that translators with an Intuitive personality score statistically higher than translators with a Sensing personality: $H_1: \mu_{sensing} < \mu_{intuitive}$. The hypotheses will be tested based on two criteria: the scores of the analytical assessment and the scores of the holistic assessment. The analytical assessment will focus on how well the participants were able to translate the 20 literary elements in the source text, which

were agreed upon before the start of the experiment, and the holistic assessment will focus on how acceptable the translations would be in the target culture. Therefore, we can subdivide the alternative hypothesis in the following statements:

- H_{1a} : Intuitive translators produce literary translations that are assessed as being of statistically higher quality as a result of their preference for using intuition during decision-making in translation.
- H_{1b} : Because Intuitive translators will produce literary translations of statistically higher quality, their translations will be more acceptable in the target culture.

Hypothesis H_{1a} assumes that translators with Intuitive personalities benefit from this trait when translating literary texts. Research within the field of psychology (Myers-Briggs, 1940s) has suggested the correlation between individuals with an intuitive personality and higher levels of creativity. Interdisciplinary research on the correlation between personality and the translation of literary texts (Hubscher-Davidson, 2009, 2013; Karimnia & Mahjubi, 2013; Lehka-Paul & Whyatt, 2016; and Shaki & Khoshsalighehi, 2017) has suggested that translators with an intuitive personality show higher levels of creativity in their translation performance.

Hypothesis H_{1b} focuses on the quality of the target text. The strength of this hypothesis will be tested by comparing the judgement/opinions of the evaluators on the quality of the translation with the personality type of the translator of the specific translated literary text.

6 RESULTS

For the purpose of this study, a univariate analysis of variance will be performed for both dependent variables, namely *analytical assessment* and *holistic assessment*. For the H_{1a} , the results of the analytical assessment, scored on a scale of 40 (i.e. the sum of the assessment by assessors A and B), will be used to determine whether the null hypothesis can be rejected (see Appendix D). For the hypothesis H_{1b} , the results of the holistic assessment scored on a scale of 40 (i.e. the sum of the assessment performed by assessors C and D) will be used.

6.1 Data

6.1.1 Analytical assessment

The results of the analytical assessment performed by assessors A and B yielded an average score of the sum of both assessors of 16.8 on a scale of 40. Table 3 includes the average scores for each assessor:

Average score assessor A (/20)	Average score assessor B (/20)	Average score total (/40)
8.8	8	16.8

Table 3: Average score for the analytical assessment

Then, the average scores of participants with a Sensing personality were compared with the average scores of participants with an Intuitive personality. As Table 4 illustrates, the Sensing participants outperformed the Intuitive participants. In total, the average score of Sensing participants was 17.1 on a scale of 40 and 16.6 for Intuitive participants. These results suggest that, on average, the Sensing participants of this study outperformed the Intuitive participants in terms of *adequacy* and showed more creativity in the translation of the 20 literary elements. However, the difference between both groups is relatively small, and this outcome is mainly influenced by assessor B. For the assessment of assessor B, the Intuitive participants scored slightly higher than the Sensing participants, although the difference in scores between the Intuitive and Sensing participants is rather small.

	Assessor A (/20)	Assessor B (/20)	Total (/40)
Average score Sensing participants	9.4	7.8	17.1
Average score Intuitive participants	8.4	8.1	16.6

Table 4: Average score Sensing/Intuitive for the analytical assessment

Certain participants did not translate all of the 20 literary elements from the source text. Both assessor A and B noted that participants 28, 43, 45 and 47 did not translate every literary item, and assessor B noted that participant 7 and 14 did not either. As Table 5 illustrates, four of these participants have Intuitive personalities, and the other two have Sensing personalities. Two of the participants did not translate literary element 15, and four of the participants did not translate literary elements 16-20.

Participant	Number of literary items untranslated	Personality
Participant 7	3/20	Intuitive
Participant 14	9/20	Intuitive
Participant 28	6/20	Sensing
Participant 43	7/20	Intuitive
Participant 45	5/20	Sensing
Participant 47	5/20	Intuitive

Table 5: Participants who did not translate every literary item for the analytical assessment

6.1.2 Holistic assessment

The results of the holistic assessment performed by assessors C and D yielded an average score of the sum of both assessors of 15.9 on a scale of 40. Table 6 includes the average scores of the assessment:

Average score assessor C (/20)	Average score assessor D (/20)	Average score total (/40)
8.9	7	15.9

Table 6: Average score of the holistic assessment

Then, the average scores of participants with a Sensing personality were compared with the average scores of participants with an Intuitive personality. In total, the average score of

Sensing participants was 16.9 on a scale of 40 and 15.3 for Intuitive participants. These results suggest that, on average, the Sensing participants of our study scored higher than the Intuitive participants in terms of how acceptable their literary translation is in the target culture, and were able to find acceptable creative alternatives to the literary elements from the source text. Table 7 includes the average scores for Sensing and Intuitive participants:

	Assessor C (/20)	Assessor D (/20)	Total (/40)
Average score Sensing participants	9.4	7.5	16.9
Average score Intuitive participants	8.7	6.7	15.3

Table 7: Average score Sensing/Intuitive for the holistic assessment

As Table 8 illustrates, six of the 47 participants from the experiment did not translate all of the 20 literary elements from the source text, as assessed by assessors C and D. Four of the participants have an Intuitive personality, and the other two have a Sensing personality. It can not be observed how many of the literary elements were not translated or which literary items were most frequently not translated, as assessors C and D did not specify this in their assessment.

Participant	Personality
Participant 7	Intuitive
Participant 14	Intuitive
Participant 28	Sensing
Participant 43	Intuitive
Participant 45	Sensing
Participant 47	Intuitive

Table 8: Participants who did not translate every literary item for the holistic assessment

6.1.3 The Intuitive vs the Sensing translator

As Table 9 illustrates, the Sensing participants of our study obtained average scores of 17.1 on a scale of 40 for the analytical assessment and 16.9 for the holistic assessment. The Intuitive participants obtained average scores of 16.6 on a scale of 40 for the analytical assessment and 15.3 for the holistic assessment. The difference between Sensing and Intuitive participants is

fairly small for the analytical assessment, however, the Sensing participants scored significantly higher for the holistic assessment.

	Analytical assessment (/40)	Holistic assessment (/40)
Average score Sensing participants	17.1	16.9
Average score Intuitive participants	16.6	15.3

Table 9: Average score Intuitive/Sensing participants for both assessments

6.2 Inferential statistical analysis

The first step in the inferential statistical analysis was to check if the numeric variables *analytical assessment* and *holistic assessment* were normally distributed by performing a normality check. The sample size is 47 for both variables which means that the Shapiro-Wilk test should be used to test normality. For the *analytical assessment*, $p = 0.292 > 0.05$, which suggests a normal distribution. As a result, a univariate analysis of variance will be carried out. For the *holistic assessment*, $p = 0.001 < 0.05$ which means that the variable is not normally distributed, however, we opted to perform a univariate analysis of variance as well because even though the dependent variable is not normally distributed, the residuals of the model are. Table 10 includes the results of the Tests of Normality.

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Analytical assessment	.115	47	.144	.971	47	.292
Acceptability	.194	47	.000	.909	47	.001

Table 10: Tests of Normality

6.2.1 Personality effect and analytical assessment results

To see whether significant differences existed between the participant's results of the analytical assessment with regard to their personality type, a univariate analysis of variance was run. Firstly, Levene's test was run to test the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. As Table 11 suggests, Levene's test did not reject the assumption of equal variances that is needed to perform our univariate analysis of variance, $p = 0.730$.

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Dependent variable: Analytical assessment	.120	1	45	.730

Table 11: Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Next, a univariate analysis of variance was conducted to examine the effect of personality on the analytical assessment scores. The output of the univariate analysis of variance suggests that on average the Sensing participants ($M = 17.12$, $SD = 4.675$) of our study scored higher than the Intuitive participants ($M = 16.57$, $SD = 5.090$) on the analytical assessment. Table 12 includes the descriptive statistics for the analytical assessment.

Personality	M	SD	N
Intuitive	16.57	5.090	30
Sensing	17.12	4.675	17
Total	16.77	4.900	47

Table 12: Descriptive statistics for the analytical assessment

However, as Table 13 illustrates, there was not a statistically significant interaction between the effects of personality on the analytical assessment scores, $F(1,45) = 0.135$, $p = 0.715$. These results suggest that our null hypothesis, $H_0: \mu_{sensing} \geq \mu_{intuitive}$ cannot be rejected based on the results of the analytical assessment.

Source	SS	df	MS	f	p
Corrected Model	3.294	1	3.294	.135	.715
Intercept	12311.975	1	12311.975	503.154	.000
Personality	3.294	1	3.294	.135	.715
Error	1101.131	45	24.470		
Total	14316.000	47			
Corrected Total	1104.426	46			

Table 13: Tests of Between-Subject Effects

6.2.2 Personality effect and results of the holistic assessment

The dependent variable *holistic assessment* was not equally distributed, however, we opted to perform a univariate analysis of variance. Levene's test was run to test the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups. As Table 14 suggests, Levene's test did not reject the assumption of equal variances that is needed to perform our univariate analysis of variance, $p = 0.288$.

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Dependent variable: Acceptability	1.154	1	45	.288

Table 14: Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

After having established that our data met all the conditions, the univariate analysis of variance was run. A univariate analysis of variance was conducted to examine the effect of personality on the scores of the holistic assessment. As Table 15 illustrates, the output of the univariate analysis of variance suggests that on average the Sensing participants ($M = 16.94$, $SD = 6.713$) of our study scored higher than the Intuitive participants ($M = 15.33$, $SD = 5.365$) on the holistic assessment.

Personality	M	SD	N
Intuitive	15.33	5.365	30
Sensing	16.94	6.713	17
Total	15.91	5.867	47

Table 15: Descriptive statistics for the holistic assessment

However, as Table 16 illustrates, there was not a statistically significant interaction between the effects of personality on the scores of the holistic assessment, $F(1,45) = 0.811$, $p = 0.372$. These results suggest that our null hypothesis, $H_0: \mu_{sensing} \geq \mu_{intuitive}$ cannot be rejected based on the results of the holistic assessment as the Intuitive participants did not score equally well or better than the Sensing participants.

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>p</i>
Corrected Model	28.052	1	28.052	.811	.372
Intercept	11302.945	1	11302.945	326.967	.000
Personality	28.052	1	28.052	.811	.372
Error	1555.608	45	34.569		
Total	13488.000	47			
Corrected Total	1583.660	46			

Table 16: Tests of Between-Subject Effects

7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The objective of the experimental study reported in this research paper was to investigate the (possible) relationship between personality traits and translation quality. More specifically, this study aimed to investigate whether translators with Intuitive personalities produce literary translations that are assessed as being of a statistically supported higher quality as a result of their preference for relying on intuition during decision-making in translation. In addition, this study aimed to investigate whether intuitive translators will also produce literary translations which will be more acceptable in the target culture.

The results of the analytical and holistic assessment suggest that the literary translations of the Intuitive participants in this study were not assessed as being of equal or better quality, nor did they produce literary translations that are equally acceptable or more acceptable in the target culture than the Sensing participants. The Sensing participants outperformed the Intuitive participants for both the analytical and the holistic assessment. The results of the univariate analysis of variance, performed for both dependent variables, suggest that the null hypothesis $\mu_{sensing} \geq \mu_{intuitive}$ cannot be rejected. The statistical tests have shown that the difference between both personality groups is not significant. It cannot be assumed that Sensing literary translators will always score higher than Intuitive literary translators. For example, the research of Hubscher-Davidson (2009; 2013), Karimnia & Mahjubi (2013), Lehka-Paul & Whyatt (2016), and Shaki & Khoshsalighehi (2017) suggests that Intuitive (literary) translators outperform Sensing (literary) translators, because individuals with an intuitive personality show higher levels of creativity in their translation performance, and therefore produce literary translations of a statistically higher quality (Hubscher-Davidson, 2009). Sensing (literary) translators generally have weaker performances. For example, the results of Hubscher-Davidson's 2009 study show that five of the 10 Sensing students that participated in the study scored the lowest average scores for their translation tasks (p. 185). Karimnia & Mahjubi (2013) suggest that the weak performance of the Sensing students in their research was "due to a lack of creativity and perhaps the presence of uncertainty about their abilities" (p. 49).

The results of the translation tasks analysed in the present study suggest that certain participants did not translate all the literary elements. Both assessor A and B noted that participants 28, 43, 45 and 47 did not translate each literary item, and assessor B noted that participants 7 and 14 did not either. It may be noted that four of these participants have Intuitive personalities, and

the other two have Sensing personalities. However, from the total of 47 participants, only 17 had Sensing personalities and 30 had Intuitive personalities. As a result, these results have to be interpreted carefully. In addition, assessors A and B noted that four out of the 47 participants did not translate the literary elements 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20. The reason why these specific elements were not translated may be due to the limited amount of time that the participants had to complete the translation task, namely two hours, as these literary elements are near the end of the source text.

Another element that might have influenced the results of the translation task, is the fact that the participants of this study were second year-students. It is unclear how much experience these students had regarding reading skills and literary translation at the start of the experiment. As discussed before, individuals with a Sensing personality depend on experience to solve problems. Shaki & Khoshsalighehi suggest that “in terms of problem-solving, Sensors are experience-dependent: they dislike new problems, unless their prior experience helps them solve the problem” (p. 361). As a result, it is unclear how much experience the participants in this study with a Sensing personality had to depend on. The results of the statistical analysis, however, suggest that the Sensing participants in the experiment outperformed the Intuitive participants, which is surprising in regard to the findings of previous research.

One limitation of this study is the restricted number of participants in the experiment. Although the results of the statistical analyses suggest that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, the results reveal important observations in the analytical assessment and the holistic assessment for the Sensing/Intuitive dichotomy. A larger-scale experiment may well yield a more significant output and could lead to better insight into the influence of personality on translation. In addition, future research that focuses on the Sensing/Intuitive dichotomy and its relation to translation quality would benefit from including an equal number of Sensing and Intuitive participants in their research, as it might yield more significant results and it would allow to measure possible significant differences between translators with Sensing and Intuitive personalities.

In regard to the assessment of the translation tasks, assessors A and B were instructed to assess the adequacy of the target text in comparison to the source text for the analytical assessment, and assessors C and D were instructed to assess the acceptability of the target text in the target culture. However, a more detailed uniform protocol for assessing the translation tasks could

have been more beneficial. The four assessors were not given specific instructions as to how they should assess the translation task. For example, they were not instructed on how to assess literary elements that were not translated. In addition, the assessors were informed that the creative aspect of the translation was the main focus in the experiment, but it was not clear to which extent any contextual restrictions imposed by the larger context in which the passage appears also needed to be adhered to. However, the average scores of the four assessors suggest that, in general, the assessors agreed on the assessment of literary translation quality for the translation tasks in this study. Assessors A, B, and C had average scores of 8.8, 8, and 8.9 respectively (on a scale of 20), while assessor D had the lowest average score, namely 7. Due to lack of time, no kappa-scores were calculated for the assessments of assessors A, B, C and D.

The results of this experiment may further be determined by other factors that may have influenced the translation performance of the participants in this experiment, for example, the limited amount of time that was given to the participants to finish the translation task. Hubscher-Davidson (2009) suggests that “it has been acknowledged that experience, linguistic competence, time spent on the task etc. can all affect the quality of a target text [...]” (p. 188). The participants of this study were second year-students of the Bachelor of Arts in Applied Language Studies at Ghent University, who do not have much (or any) experience in literary translation, and only had two hours to finish the translation task.

Finally, research into the personality of translators may lead to important insights for student translators and include important implications for translator training. For example, student translators could take a personality test at the start of their training, so that they know what their personality type is and what the possible consequences are for their translation performance. Student translators can benefit from understanding their personality as they would be able to identify their strengths and weaknesses. They would be able to work on becoming a better translator in a more precise way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baker, M. (2000). Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator. *Target*, 12(2), 241-266.
- Boase-Beier, J. (2011). Stylistics and translation. M. Burke (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics* (pp. 393-420). Oxon: Routledge.
- Boase-Beier, J. (2016). Stylistics and Translation. V. Sotirova (Ed.), *The Bloomsbury Companion to Stylistics* (pp. 231-243). London: Bloomsbury.
- Capraro, R. & Capraro, M. (2002). Myers-Briggs Type Indicator score reliability across studies: a meta-analytic reliability generalization study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 62(4), pp. 590-602.
- de Vries, R. & Born, M. (2013). De Vereenvoudigde HEXACO Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijst en een additioneel interstitieel Proactiviteitsfacet. *Gedrag & Organisatie*, 26(2), 223-245.
- D'hulst, L., Van de Poel, C. (red.) (2019). *Alles verandert altijd. Perspectieven op literair vertalen*. Leuven, Universitaire Pers Leuven. (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International Public License)
- Falconer, H. (2002, November 9). Homer comes to Scotland. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2002/nov/09/featuresreviews.guardianreview19>
- Framework of reference for the education and training of literary translators*. Retrieved from <https://petra-educationframework.eu/>
- Hermans, T. (1985). *The manipulation of literature. Studies in literary translation*. London/Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2009). Personal diversity and diverse personalities in translation: a study of individual differences. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 17(3), 175-192.
- Hubscher-Davidson, S. (2013). The role of intuition in the translation process: A case study. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 8(2), 211-232.
- Introduction*. Retrieved from <https://petra-educationframework.eu/introduction/>
- Johnsson, F. (2009). Personality measures under focus: The NEO-PI-R and the MBTI. *Griffith University Undergraduate Student Psychology Journal*, 1, 1-6.
- Jooken, L. (2018). Witte tanden en *kissing teeth* [Abstract]. *Filter*, 25(3), pp. 13-23.
- Jooken, L., Rooryck, G. (2019). De winst van het verlies: Literaire vertaling en interculturele transfer. In De Sutter, G., Delaere, I. (Ed.), *In Balans: een inleiding tot vertaal- en tolkwetenschap* (pp. 177-200). Leuven/Den Haag: Acco.

- Karimnia, A., Mahjubi, M. (2013). Individual differences and quality of translation: a personality-based perspective. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 17(1), 37-64.
- Larsen, R., Buss, D., Wismeijer, A., & Song, J. (2017). *Personality Psychology: Domains and Knowledge about Human Nature* (2nd ed.). London: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Lehka-Paul, O., Whyatt, B. (2016). Does personality matter in translation? Interdisciplinary research into the translation process and product. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 52(2), 1-33.
- Mayer, R. (1989). Cognitive Views of Creativity: Creative Teaching for Creative Learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 14, 203-211.
- Paloposki, O. (2011). Domestication and foreignization. *Handbook of Translation Studies*, 2, 40-41.
- Schäffner, C. (2010). Norms of translation. *Handbook of Translation Studies*, 1, pp. 235-244. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.1.nor1>
- Shaki, R., Khoshsalighehi, M. (2017). Personality type and translation performance of Persian translator trainees. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 360-370.
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Vanderschelden, I. (2000). Quality Assessment and Literary Translation in France. *The Translator*, 6(2), 271-293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2000.10799069>
- Venuti, L. (1995/2008). *The translator's invisibility. A history of translation*. London/New York: Routledge.

APPENDIX A

VTC, UGent, Groot-Brittanniëlaan 45, 9000 Gent

Gent 28 februari 2020

Informatiebrief: Onderzoek

Beste student

Deze studie kadert in mijn masterproefonderzoek dat uitgevoerd wordt onder leiding van een onderzoeksteam uit de vakgroep Vertalen, Tolken en Communicatie (TRACE en EQTIS, prof. L. Jooken en prof. S. Vandepitte).

We willen de kwaliteit van literaire vertalingen bij student-vertalers onderzoeken. We focussen daarbij op vertalingen van het Engels in het Nederlands en willen ons vooral op de vertalingen van beginnende vertalers concentreren.

Je zal gevraagd worden thuis een tekst te vertalen gedurende maximum twee uur (minder mag ook) en een online-testje af te leggen op <http://www.humanmetrics.com/>. De vertaling laad je nadien op in het Ufora-leerplatform voor de cursus *Nederlands: vertaling uit de vreemde taal*, ten laatste op maandag 9 maart 2020. Je vertaling zal geanonimiseerd worden en er zullen kwaliteitstests op uitgevoerd worden. Daarna zullen de onderzoekers de resultaten bekendmaken, opnieuw anoniem.

Margaux Gevaert

Informed Consent

Ik ondergetekende,, verklaar hierbij dat ik, als participant deelneem aan een masterproefonderzoek van Margaux Gevaert binnen de onderzoeksgroepen EQTIS en TRACE (L&W) van de Universiteit Gent. In dit onderzoek worden mijn vertaalgegevens verzameld en zorgvuldig en anoniem verwerkt voor de doeleinden van het onderzoek.

Ik begrijp dat

(1) me de mogelijkheid wordt geboden om op elk ogenblik bijkomende informatie te verkrijgen over het onderzoek.

(2) ik totaal vrijwillig deelneem aan het onderzoek.

(3) ik de toestemming geef aan de proefleiders om mijn werk dat ik doorstuur via UFORA op anonieme wijze te bewaren, te verwerken en te rapporteren.

(4) ik op de hoogte ben van de mogelijkheid om mijn deelname aan het onderzoek op ieder moment stop te zetten.

(5) ik ervan op de hoogte ben dat ik op aanvraag een samenvatting van de onderzoeksbevindingen kan krijgen.

Gelezen en goedgekeurd te(plaats) op(datum)

Handtekening van participant:

APPENDIX B

The following short story excerpt contains a variety of literary elements. Are you up for a challenge and keen on exploring your creative language skills? Would you like to discover if you have a talent for literary translations? Then this translation task is the one! We expect you to write an idiomatic text in Dutch with respect for the original literary aspects of the source text. You have two hours to finish the task and can use any resources available to check references and lexical alternatives. Afterwards, you will be asked to complete a short survey that will take about 10-15 minutes. Please don't forget to write the results of the survey at the bottom of your translation task. Thank you for participating in my research project!

Kate Atkinson, *The bodies vest* (in *Not the end of the world*, Doubleday, 2002, pp. 247-249)

Vincent's father, Billy, died a woman's death in 1959. He had been washing the windows of their tiny Edinburgh eyrie and in an act of reckless bravado tried (and fatally failed) to reach the awkward top corner of the living-room bay. Billy was just twenty-four years old, a reluctant widower who had embraced his role as Vincent's lone parent with enthusiastic incompetence. Vincent's mother, Georgie, was already four years dead by the time her foolish husband plummeted onto the cracked concrete path in front of their tenement home on one of the long summer evenings of Vincent's childhood. Vincent had a good view of his father's final moments, sitting as he was, one neighbouring storey lower, in the window of Mrs Anderson's flat, finishing off a supper of fried potatoes and Lome sausage. Mrs Anderson was a homely barge of a woman, her grandmotherly bulk wrapped in a flowered Empire apron, who supplemented Vincent's rather meagre diet with a bottomless cornucopia of custard creams and bread and dripping. Mrs Anderson's small polished flat, scalloped everywhere with beige crochet mats and antimacassars and perfumed with Lifebuoy and fried mince, was a haven of domestic bliss compared to Vincent's own home. For all Billy's efforts at housekeeping, father and son occupied a dingy sett in which every available surface seemed to be crumbed with cigarette ash and desiccated fragments of pan loaf. Their clothes, washed to a uniform scummy grey, were hung to dry on the pulley above the gas cooker so that the scent of fried bacon was always on their skin.

Worst of all, perhaps, were the bed sheets, unwashed from one to the next, pastel-striped flannelette on which no pastel stripes were now discernible and which were heavily impregnated with tangy male aromas. Vincent shared a bed with Billy even though there was a small box bed in the wall that would have done very well for him if it hadn't been occupied by an old dismembered BSA motorbike.

The windows, the cause of Vincent's orphan status at the tender age of six, had not been washed since his mother's funeral, when Mrs Anderson had paid her own window cleaner to take care of them as a mark of respect. Vincent was two years old when Georgie died and had no memory of her at all so that what he felt was her absence rather than her loss. Vincent had an image of what life would have been like if his mother had lived. It involved living in a warm house and eating fruit and grilled chops, wearing clean, ironed pyjamas and sitting in front of a blazing coal fire while Georgie read out loud to him from the *Dandy*. Both Billy and Mrs Anderson implied, in their own ways, that it wouldn't necessarily be like that if Georgie was still around. 'Georgie was ... flighty,' Mrs Anderson said, searching for an enigmatic word, so that Vincent imagined his mother as a ball of feathers wafted on a kindly wind.

APPENDIX C

The following list of 20 literary items was extracted from the source text for the assessment of the target texts in terms of *adequacy*.

1. in an act of reckless bravado
2. (and fatally failed)
3. a reluctant widower
4. with enthusiastic incompetence
5. Lorne sausage
6. a homely barge of a woman,
7. her grandmotherly bulk wrapped in a flowered Empire apron,
8. a bottomless cornucopia of custard creams and bread and dripping
9. scalloped everywhere with beige crochet mats and antimacassars and perfumed with Lifebuoy and fried mince
10. a haven of domestic bliss
11. occupied a dingy sett
12. a uniform scummy grey
13. so that the scent of fried bacon was always on their skin.
14. pastel-striped flannelette on which no pastel stripes were now discernible and which were heavily impregnated with tangy male aromas
15. an old dismembered BSA motorbike.
16. the cause of Vincent's orphan status at the tender age of six
17. so that what he felt was her absence rather than her loss.
18. the *Dandy*.
19. 'Georgie was ... flighty,'
20. as a ball of feathers wafted on a kindly wind.

APPENDIX D

Participant	Assessor A (/20)	Assessor B (/20)	Assessor C (/20)	Assessor D (/20)	Average	Personality
1	12	11	8	8	9,75	Sensing
2	9	4	12	12	9,25	Sensing
3	8	7	4	12	7,75	Intuitive
4	12	7	4	8	7,75	Intuitive
5	7	0	4	8	4,75	Intuitive
6	11	9	16	12	12	Intuitive
7	5	10	4	12	7,75	Intuitive
8	9	10	4	8	7,75	Intuitive
9	10	11	16	8	11,25	Intuitive
10	7	5	8	4	6	Sensing
11	11	5	4	4	6	Sensing
12	9	13	4	8	8,5	Intuitive
13	10	8	8	4	7,5	Intuitive
14	2	1	4	4	2,75	Intuitive
15	10	9	16	4	9,75	Intuitive
16	9	8	4	12	8,25	Sensing
17	6	4	4	8	5,5	Intuitive
18	9	6	16	12	10,75	Sensing
19	8	7	8	8	7,75	Intuitive
20	10	15	16	4	11,25	Intuitive
21	8	7	4	4	5,75	Sensing
22	10	5	4	4	5,75	Sensing
23	9	6	8	8	7,75	Intuitive
24	10	8	16	8	10,5	Intuitive
25	4	11	12	4	7,75	Intuitive
26	11	11	16	8	11,5	Intuitive
27	9	7	16	8	10	Sensing
28	5	5	8	4	5,5	Sensing
29	10	9	4	8	7,75	Intuitive

30	15	10	8	8	10,25	Sensing
31	9	14	16	12	12,75	Sensing
32	11	13	12	8	11	Intuitive
33	7	6	8	8	7,25	Sensing
34	5	7	4	8	6	Intuitive
35	12	14	12	12	12,5	Sensing
36	8	9	12	8	9,25	Sensing
37	7	6	8	4	6,25	Intuitive
38	12	8	12	4	9	Sensing
39	11	10	12	8	10,25	Intuitive
40	8	3	8	4	5,75	Intuitive
41	9	5	4	4	5,5	Intuitive
42	10	15	4	4	8,25	Intuitive
43	7	7	12	4	7,5	Intuitive
44	9	7	8	4	7	Intuitive
45	7	8	8	4	6,75	Sensing
46	6	8	4	4	5,5	Intuitive
47	9	7	16	4	9	Intuitive
Average	8,8	8	8,9	7,0		

APPENDIX E

Original assessment assessor A

Literary items EN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
in an act of reckless bravado	y	y	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
and fatally failed	y	y	n	y	n	y	n	n	n	y	n	n	n	n
a reluctant widower	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	n	y	n	n	n
with enthusiastic incompetence	y	n	n	y	n	y	n	y	y	n	y	y	n	n
Lorne sausage	n	y	y	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	n	y
a homely barge of a woman	n	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
her grandmotherly bulk wrapped in a flowered Empire apron	y	y	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	n
a bottomless cornucopia of custard creams and bread and dripping	n	n	n	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
scaloped everywhere with beige crochet mats and antimacassars and perfumed with Lifebuoy and fried mince	n	n	n	y	n	n	y	n	y	n	y	n	y	n
a haven of domestic bliss	y	n	y	y	y	n	n	y	n	y	y	n	y	n
occupied a dingy set	y	y	n	y	n	y	y	n	n	y	y	y	y	y
a uniform scummy grey	y	n	y	n	n	y	n	y	y	y	n	y	n	n
so that the scent of fried bacon was always on their skin	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	y	y	n	y	n

pastel-striped flannelette on which no pastel stripes were now discernible and which were heavily impregnated with tangy male aromas	y	n	n	n	n	y	n	y	n	y	n	y	y	n
an old dismembered BSA motorbike	n	n	n	y	n	n	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	n
the cause of Vincent's orphan status at the tender age of six	y	n	y	y	y	y	n	y	n	n	y	n	n	n
so that what he felt was her absence rather than her loss	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	y	n
the <i>Dandy</i>	y	n	n	y	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
Georgie was ... flighty,'	n	y	y	n	n	n	n	n	y	n	n	y	y	n
as a ball of feathers wafted on a kindly wind	y	y	n	y	y	n	n	y	y	n	y	y	n	n

Literary items EN	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47		
in an act of reckless bravado	n	j	n	n	n	j	n	n	n	j	n	n	n	n	n	j	n	j	n	n	n	n	n	n	j	j	n	n	n	n	n	n	n		
and fatally failed	j	n	n	j	n	n	j	n	j	j	n	n	n	j	j	n	j	j	j	n	n	n	j	j	n	n	n	n	n	j	n	j	n	n	
a reluctant widower	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	j	n	n	n	j	n	n	n	j	n	n	n	n	n	n	j	n	n	j	
with enthusiastic incompetence	j	j	n	j	j	j	j	j	j	j	n	j	n	n	n	j	j	j	n	n	j	j	j	n	j	j	j	j	j	j	j	j	n	j	
Lorne sausage	j	j	j	j	n	j	n	j	j	j	j	j	n	j	j	j	j	n	n	n	j	n	j	j	j	j	j	j	n	n	j	j	j	n	
a homely barge of a woman	j	j	n	j	n	j	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	j	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	j
her grandmotherly bulk wrapped in a flowered Empire apron	n	j	j	n	n	n	n	n	j	j	j	j	n	j	n	j	j	j	j	n	n	j	n	j	n	j	j	j	n	n	n	n	j	j	

a bottomless cornucopia of custard creams and bread and dripping	n	n	n	n	n	j	n	n	j	n	n	n	n	n	j	n	j	n	n	n	n	n	j	n	n	n	j	j	n	n	j	j	
scalloped everywhere with beige crochet mats and antimacassars and perfumed with Lifebuoy and fried mince	n	j	j	n	n	n	n	j	n	j	j	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	j	n	n	n	n	j	n	j	n	n	
a haven of domestic bliss	n	j	n	j	j	n	n	j	j	j	n	j	j	j	j	n	n	j	j	j	n	n	n	j	n	j	j	j	n	j	n	n	
occupied a dingy set	n	n	n	n	n	j	n	j	n	n	n	j	j	j	j	n	n	n	j	n	n	j	j	j	n	n	n	n	j	j	j	n	j
a uniform scummy grey	j	n	n	n	n	j	n	n	n	j	n	n	j	n	j	n	j	n	j	j	j	n	j	j	n	n	j	j	j	j	n	j	
so that the scent of fried bacon was always on their skin	n	n	n	n	n	n	j	n	n	n	n	j	j	n	n	j	n	j	n	n	j	j	n	n	n	n	j	j	n	n	n	n	j
pastel-striped flannelette on which no pastel stripes were now discernible and which were heavily impregnated with tangy male aromas	j	n	n	j	j	j	n	j	n	j	j	j	j	n	n	j	n	j	j	j	j	n	n	j	j	n	j	j	∅	j	n	n	n
an old dismembered BSA motorbike	n	n	j	n	n	j	j	n	n	n	n	n	j	∅	j	j	n	n	n	n	j	n	n	n	j	n	j	n	∅	n	n	n	j
the cause of Vincent's orphan status at the tender age of six	j	n	j	j	j	n	j	j	j	n	n	j	n	∅	n	j	n	j	n	n	j	n	n	j	j	j	n	n	∅	n	∅	n	∅
so that what he felt was her absence rather than her loss	j	j	n	j	j	n	j	j	n	n	n	n	j	∅	j	j	j	n	j	n	j	n	j	n	j	j	j	n	∅	j	∅	j	∅
the <i>Dandy</i>	j	j	j	n	j	n	j	j	j	j	n	j	j	∅	j	j	j	j	j	n	j	j	j	j	j	j	n	j	∅	n	∅	j	∅
Georgie was ... flighty,'	n	n	n	j	j	n	n	j	j	n	n	j	n	∅	j	n	j	n	n	j	j	j	n	n	n	n	n	j	∅	j	∅	n	∅

as a ball of feathers wafted on a kindly wind	j	n	n	n	j	j	j	n	n	n	n	j	j	∅	j	j	j	j	n	n	j	j	j	j	j	j	j	j	∅	j	∅	j	∅
-----------------------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

APPENDIX F

Original assessment assessor B

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	Ja	ja	ja	Ja!	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	Ja!	nee	nee	nee	nee	Ja!
2	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	Nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee
3	Ja	nee	nee	nee	Ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	Nee	ja	nee	Ja	nee	nee
4	nee	nee	nee	ja	Ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee	Ja!	ja	Nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee
5	Nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	Nee
6	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja
7	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja	Ja!	nt vt	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	Nt vt	Nt vt
8	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee
9	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja
10	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee
11	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja
12	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	ja
13	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	ja
14	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt
15	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja
16	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	Ja!	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee
17	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee
18	ja	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee
19	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee	ja
20	nee	nee	nee	ja	Ja!	ja	Ja!	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja
21	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee
22	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee
23	nee	ja	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja
24	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	Ja!	nee	ja	nee	ja
25	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	Ja!	ja	ja	Ja!	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja

26	Ja!	ja	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	Ja!	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee
27	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	Ja!	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja
28	nee	nee	nee	Ja!	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt
29	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja
30	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja
31	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	Ja!	ja	ja	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja
32	Ja!	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	ja	Ja!	ja	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	ja
33	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	Ja!	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja
34	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja
35	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	ja
36	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja
37	nee	ja	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja
38	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee
39	nee	ja	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja	Nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee
40	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee
41	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja
42	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	Ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja
43	nee	nee	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt
44	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee
45	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	nee	nee	nee	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt
46	nee	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	nee	nee
47	ja	nee	nee	nee	nee	ja	ja	nee	ja	ja	ja	nee	ja	nee	nee	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt	nt vt

APPENDIX G

Tekst	Beoordelaar C
1	C
2	B
3	D
4	D
5	D
6	A
7	D
8	D
9	A
10	C
11	D
12	D
13	C
14	D incompleet volledig ernaast
15	A
16	D
17	D
18	A
19	C
20	A
21	D
22	D
23	C
24	A
25	B
26	A
27	A
28	C
29	D
30	C
31	A
32	B
33	C
34	D
35	B
36	B
37	C
38	B
39	B
40	C
41	D
42	D
43	B maar Onvolledig
44	C
45	C maar Onvolledig
46	D

APPENDIX H

Original assessment of assessor D

A	Goed
B	Voldoende
C	Zwak
D	Slecht
O	Onvolledig

Tekst	Evaluatie
1	C
2	B
3	B
4	C
5	C
6	B
7	B/O
8	C
9	C
10	D
11	D
12	C
13	D
14	D /O
15	D
16	B
17	C
18	B
19	C
20	D
21	D
22	D
23	C
24	C
25	D
26	C
27	C
28	D/O
29	C
30	C
31	B
32	C
33	C
34	C
35	B
36	C
37	D
38	D
39	C

40	D
41	D
42	D
43	D/O
44	D
45	D
46	D
47	D/O