

AWEJ Special issue on Translation No. (2) 2013

Pp.51-66

Translation Project Organizations: A perspective on KALIMA

Radia Kesseiri

Arabic and Middle Eastern Studies, Leeds University

Mariam Bani Hashem

Arabic and Middle Eastern Studies, Leeds University

Abstract

In recent years, Globalisation has entailed an increasingly expanding and prosperous development of translation projects with high volume translations in the Arab World. This brings up to surface the issue of quality in translation and in particular quality in translation project organizations, which is a crucial factor to their success and longevity. This paper aims at providing a brief account of how the concept of Translation Projects has developed, with particular insight into the Arab world, and attempt to decipher how quality in translation project organizations is achieved through an extensive process of editing and revising. The study will look at KALIMA as an example for a translation project in the Arab World. KALIMA is an Arabic word with an English equivalent that is 'word'. The KALIMA Project is based in the United Arab Emirates, and is a very ambitious initiative funded by the Abu Dhabi Authority for Culture and Heritage. This study will be accordingly divided into four main sections. Firstly, this paper will look at the development of translation projects in general and in the Arab world in particular. Secondly, it will explore theories behind translation and quality by looking into scholarly works in order to epitomise the various strategies and techniques used by translation project organizations to produce and ensure quality in translation. Thirdly, this study will provide an analysis of established mechanisms and structures. Finally an example of a translation project in the Arab world that is the KALIMA project will be given.

Keywords: Translation project organizations, quality, revising, editing, KALIMA

Introduction

Due to the growth of translation projects in the Arab World, it becomes important to be familiar with translation project organizations and assess the way quality is achieved within their structures. Accordingly, this study will introduce the concept of translation projects organizations and will look at its development, noticeably in the Arab World. In addition to that, and prior to investigating the way quality is assessed in these organizations, this paper will provide a brief account of literature on translation and quality in general, leading on to an investigation of established techniques and strategies used by the above mentioned organizations to assess and guarantee the quality of translations. Finally, this study will explore the role of translation project organizations in the Arab world in promoting and spreading a good practice of translation by providing a perspective on KALIMA. This paper will present the KALIMA Project as an example of a fast-growing translation project. Our aim is to reiterate its role in promoting good practice in the Arab World.

In the age of globalisation, translation project organizations are comparable to any other productive industries where established mechanisms and organised structures are in place in order to create a high quality end product. However, often, their independent nature necessitates a thorough analysis and understanding of the process and strategies in place to achieve good quality translations.

The Development of Translation Project Organizations:

The origins of translation projects can be traced back to the translation of religious scriptures such as the translation of the Bible. In fact, Wycliffe's English translation of the Bible in 1382 can be regarded as key in the nascence of translation projects. It certainly equipped hundreds of translators with the skills they needed to enable this translation (Wycliffe Bible Translators, 2010; Delisle and Woodsworth, 1995).

In the seventeenth-century, King James I of England commissioned a Bible translation project (Jones & Hamlin, 2010). This project operated according to guidelines provided by King James I, involving 47 scholars in 6 committees, whose tasks vary from translation and revising (Salama-Carr, 2009). According to Wilt (2003), the workflow and guidelines adapted in this project continued to be the building block of operations and processes in the contemporary translation projects of the Bible where there is a clear hierarchy system for translation, which involves reviewing, checking accuracy and verifying presentation and manuscript quality in order to assure the quality of the content and product to meet the organizational goals. Over the history of translation projects, the multi-tasking nature of translation which included: translating, revising, editing, proof-reading, and else (Pym 2002a) called upon the importance of teamwork for better quality of translation (Salama-Carr 2009).

Generally speaking, translation project organizations often rely on in-house translators to carry out projects commissioned. However, if the workload becomes too heavy, projects are delegated

to external translators. In such cases, in-house translators review the translations undertaken externally. Nevertheless, depending on the volume of translation projects "reviewers" outside of the translation organization might be hired to carry out any reviewing tasks.

In recent years, globalization meant that demand for translation was increasing especially as international corporations, companies, and governments had to reach wider international communities and therefore requested higher volumes of translations. The need for localized services and more freelance translators augmented in number concomitantly and translation project teams developed.

The growth in translation projects and the access to electronic resources is certainly reflected in the organisational structure of translation projects (Zakhir 2008). In fact, translation in organisational settings became an "intricate process that involves multiple mediators or more specifically, a network of humans and technological tools" (Salama-Carr, 2009, p.143). Accordingly, the process of translation in the above mentioned organizations is characterized by "complex, collaborative work among translators, revisers, editors, experts and sometimes even source text drafters as well as a range of electronic resources" (Salama-Carr, 2009, p.143)

Translation projects organizations in the Arab World:

In the Arab world, translation can be traced back to the first half of the second century AD during the times of Assyrians, who translated a huge amount of heritage into Arabic (Prince, 2002). Furthermore, the birth of Islam had a great influence in the revival of translation in the Arab world. Khan mentions one of the projects that contributed to the flourishing of translation. He mentions prophet Mohammad assigning Zaid Bin Thabet to translate Arabic letters into Syriac, Hebrew, and Persian and vice versa (Khan, 1983, p.44). Most importantly, the translation of the Quran, is one of the most important markers to the history of Arabic translation. The first official translation of the Quran was carried out into Persian during the Abbasids (c. 750-1258). Of course, now it has been translated into almost all languages of the world with various versions of each (Mustapha 1998).

During the Abbasids Caliphate (750-1258), translation reached its climax as many Greek, Indian, and Persian scientific and philosophical texts were translated into Arabic in this period (Faiq 2006; Al-Kasimi 2006). In fact, Baghdad was the hub of translation projects. According to Delisle and Woodsworth (1995), these projects were mainly responsible for significant scientific developments in the Arab world. Interestingly, during the time of Al-Mamoun, an Abbasid caliph, the House of Wisdom (*Baytul-Hikma*) was established- a library and translation institution that was the hub of all Science (Lyons, 2010). This institution was "the modern day equivalent to the most sophisticated and well-managed institutions of translation, where the process of translation undergoes its departments –translation, editing, research, and publication" (Faiq, 2006, p.101).

According to Faiq (2006), many argue today that the current situation of translation in the Arab World is disappointing and far from the golden years of the Abbasids era. It is certainly true that there is a lack of translated books into Arabic compared to the huge translated publications in the West. Nevertheless, a breeze of revival has been sensed recently through a number of initiatives and projects that has boosted translation movements and publications in the Arab World. To

mention a few, the Arab Organization for Translation in Lebanon (established in 1999), The High Arab Institute of Translation in Algeria (established in 2005), the KALIMA Project for Translation in the UAE (established in 2005), the National Centre for Translation in Egypt (established in 2006), The National Centre for Translation in Tunisia (established in 2006), and the Mohamed Bin Rashid Foundation for Translation (TARJIM) in the UAE (established in 2008). Furthermore, translation degrees are offered now in many Arab universities beside other available translation training programs.

In fact, Arab countries are showing an increasing interest in translation and indeed developing this market further as a result of an increasing demand for translations into and from Arabic. Most importantly, what keeps such a market vibrant and competitive is the demand for quality which implies the establishment of certain mechanisms that ensure customer's satisfaction.

It is important to note that the concern of producing a good translation was one of the main motivations behind developing the structure of translation projects organizations (Gouadec, 2007). The notion of quality has become an important topic in the translation domain. It gained more interest as translation movements grew bigger. The process of translation in the past was commissioned to individuals to complete it. Nowadays, due to the growth of translations and publications, translation has become a corporate task rather than being an individual task (Salama-Carr, 2009). The contribution of many participants within translation organizations is, in fact, "to complete the task of translation and this is due to the need to manage a huge quantity of high quality translated texts, and avoid comprehension errors and mistranslation" (Dunne and Dunne, 2011, p. 277-278).

The workflow in translation project organizations varies according to the cultural boundaries and organizational goals (Samuelsson-Brown 2006). In the past, translation organizations were limited to in-house translators, revisers and editors, whereas, there is a tendency today towards outsourcing them due to costing factors and options offered by the Internet and new technologies (Samuelsson-Brown 2006). Still, these organizations adopt different degrees of quality measures in translation regardless of the operation modes (Salama-Carr 2009). As stated by Samuelsson-Brown (2006), quality in the organizational setting of translation is a crucial factor of success. Nevertheless, quality of translation is associated with the argument that translation quality is a myth and it cannot be absolute due to the nature of 'quality' as a concept.

Quality in translation project organizations:

It becomes rather pressing to underline the importance of developing a unified theory of translating that could be employed by translators. Kommissarov (1985), on the other hand, believes that translators should utilise theories more in the actual process of translating, although these theories should not necessarily tell the translator *how* to translate:

Translation theory is not supposed to provide the translator with ready-made solutions of his problems. Theory is no substitute for proper thinking or decision-making. It may narrow the choice or provide a point of departure for the translator's consideration, but it cannot guarantee the successful outcome of the

translation process. Theoretical recommendations are always of a more general nature. They are formulated to assist the translator in his work, but final success depends on whether they are properly and successfully applied by the translator in each particular case. (p. 208-9)

That is to say that the production of an accurate and adequate piece of work in translation remains subject to other factors that the translator needs to bear in mind. In the case of translation project organizations, they aim to produce good quality translation while embracing a specific process towards this objective.

Translation is arguably a contrastive exercise in the best sense of the word, whereby a translator is required to remain faithful to the source text (ST) while avoiding 'literality' in the process of translation. While fidelity to the original text is important, the ability to write correctly and sometimes idiomatically in the target text (TT) is vital to the production of a natural piece of work. This calls on the translator's ability to go beyond sheer equivalence and employ required techniques to produce a good translation. A good translation partakes in originality and fidelity and just stops short of carrying the translator's own footprint. In other words, translation renders ideas and facts that are presented in a specific structure of (ST) in the (TT) representatively.

Many translation theories have been developed on the topic, but none of them are comprehensive enough to adopt as frameworks for the study of translation (Gutt, 1990). However, all definitions indicate the necessity to reproduce an equivalent communicative message.

For many professional translators of long experience, translation theorists may be seen abstractive when it comes to translation as a practice and process. It is more about perspectives and preference of decisions for the formers rather than an application of a statement or a formula. If a piece of writing is interpreted differently among its readers, the same may occur when it goes through translation by different translators. The case in specialised institutions of translation is more complicated as both the source text (ST) and target text (TT) are processed by many operators – translators, revisers, proof-readers, editors, and others who may not agree on the interpretation of the ST and view its good translation in the target language differently. Moreover, each may decide to make their mark in the TT based on how they conceive a good quality of it. Other factors contribute in the decision making of translation within the institutional framework including the internal regulations, targeted readers, intended message, etc. This, in turn, reflects on the process of translation and puts the translator's work beyond the academic theorisation of translation for the institutional considerations that determine the course of translation.

The notion of quality has become an important topic in the translation domain. It gained more interest as translation movements grew (Samuelsson-Brown 2006). Due to the growth of the translation and publication market, the practice of translating has become a corporate task rather than an individual task. That is to say that the process of translation involves a number of

professionals such as translators, revisers, proof-readers, editors and administrators who manage and supervise the workflow of the process (Goudec 2010; Samuelsson-Brown 2006; Mossop 2010). Overall, this necessitates maintaining the concept of a 'good translation' consistently within the norms of the structural environment and bureaucratic workflow of these organizations. Similarly, translation project organizations aim to produce good quality translation while embracing a specific process towards this objective. However, the scale of translation quality within translation institutions is controversial. The experience of translators is highly respected in such places. It entitles them to express their experience and decide what strategy to follow while translating. Translation institutions usually hire their translators based on their experience, counting their years of experience, their contribution to the literature, and/or passing a placement test of translation. However, these measures do not assure a good quality and consistency in the absence of a recognised model or standards of translation quality that defines the status of the institution.

For many professional translators with long experience; translation theorists may be seen abstractive when it comes to translation as a practice and process. It is more about perspectives and preference of decisions for the formers rather than an application of a statement or a formula. If a piece of writing is interpreted differently among its readers, the same may apply when it goes through translation by different translators. The case in specialised institutions of translation is more complicated as the source text (ST) and target text (TT) is processed by many operators – translators, revisers, proof-readers, editors, and others who may not agree on the interpretation of the ST and view its good translation in the target language differently. Moreover, each may decide to make their mark in the TT based on how they conceive a good quality of it. Other factors contribute to the decision making of translation within the institutional framework including the internal regulations, targeted readers, intended message, etc. This, in turn, reflects on the process of translation and puts the translator's work beyond the academic theorisation of translation for the institutional considerations that determine the course of translation.

Approaches to translation quality assessment

1- Linguistic/final product based quality

As a final product, the notion of quality has been discussed throughout the literature of translation studies on the level of linguistic competence, where the question of quality is raised linguistically between the ST and the TT. Goudec (2007) mentions that the ultimate test of quality in translation is the effectiveness of communication. House (1997), however, argues that these theories resulted in various conceptualization of translation quality. House (1998 (ed.)) divides the existing translation quality assessment approaches into three categories: Anecdotal and subjective approaches; Response-oriented approaches; and Text-based approaches. The first category listed gives value to the translator's experience and knowledge which represents his conceptualisation of quality upon general criteria such as the TT's faithfulness to the original and its readability to the target readers (1998 (ed.))

The second category focuses on Nida's dynamic equivalence (Nida 1964) maintaining equal effect to the ST in the TT by means of three fundamental criteria:

- | | | |
|----|---|-------------------|
| 1. | The efficiency of
the communication process; | The efficiency of |
| 2. | Comprehension
of intent; | Comprehension |
| 3. | Equivalence of
response | Equivalence of |

(Nida, 1964, p.182)

Another set of criteria was introduced later to assess the quality of translation. To mention but a few, Carroll (1966) suggested to measure quality by testing informativeness and intelligibility-how the TT is accurate and adequate in terms of the information it transfers and how intelligent in sounding normal in the target language (Lambert & Moser-Mercer 1994 p.106). However, it appears that this model was designed mainly to "assess the translation of scientific texts where information dominate rhetoric and style" (Al-Qinai 2000 p.498). House (1998) argues that "tests suggested for implementing such criteria, such as cloze or elicitation of a receptor's reaction to different translation, are not rigorous enough to be considered theoretically valid or reliable" (p. 198). It is also criticised for the absence of the ST in evaluating the translation, which in turn allows more room for relying subjectively on personal impressions and background (Al-Qinai 2000 p.498).

The third category, House lists for assessing the quality of translation (House 1998) is the text-based approaches. She states that it covers linguistic, comparative, and functional models to translation quality assessment (House 1998).

Although many of these models face criticism for either being subjective or for the absence of a practical norm against which the quality of translation is assessed, they established the principles for developing other attempts towards more objective models of assessment today, which continue to evolve. Yet, House (1981), states that "it seems unlikely that translation quality assessment can ever be objectified in the manner of natural science" (p. 64). That is due to the relativity of the concept of quality in general and the nature of perceiving and interpreting texts in particular as Larose (1998 p.163) stresses on the subjective nature translation evaluation. Moreover, Al-Qinai (2000) mentioned that "there is neither a definitive reading of a text nor a perfect rendering which achieves the goals of ST, translation assessment and criticism could go forever" (p.498). Thus, a good translation remains up to how a translator or a translation entity realizes the concept of quality upon which the models listed above were developed.

2- *Standards of translation in translation projects organizations*

Neubert and Shreve (1992) state that translation is a kind of text production and that quality can be assured by analysing the means of production and controlling the process of translation. In

fact, it is a result of activating the competence of procedures that comprise the translation process.

Gouadec (2010) points out to a strong correlation between quality standards and good practices of translation. He emphasizes that quality of translation is good if and when satisfying translation provision process and its result. Similarly, George and Salice (1994) conclude that applying quality management systems to translation is possible by following the process approach, only when standards and specifications of procedures are defined. This echoes a central concept of the total quality management, which is referred to above, where the process is central to quality assurance and management (Fiegenbaum 1991; Mukherjee 2006). While identifying requirements and standards for translation quality is significant, the yardstick of measuring the quality of translation in professional settings remains relative since its degree is subjected to preferences and viewpoints of the translator, project manager or client (Gouadec 2010; George and Salice 1994; Bowker 2001). However, zero defects and errors in the sense of mistranslation and translation mistakes at the linguistic competence level continues to be a prominent evidence of translation quality that cannot be tolerated (Gouadec 2010, Gouadec 2007, Matis 2011). Bass (2010) also notes that “providing well-translated content is barely a minimum standard for delivering high quality translation and localization services” (p.2). On the other hand, the quality of translation should involve technical aspects like “timely delivery, final presentation, hardware/software compatibility, customer liaison and feedback, training” (Moore, 1994, p.14-15). In translation professional settings, there are three areas in which quality should apply:

1. *administration and project management (delivery on time, and prompt, appropriate management response;*
2. *presentation (a word-processed/DTP[desktop publishing], checked and uniformly laid-out document, and/or soft copy);*
3. *actual quality of the translation itself (accuracy, completeness, terminological consistency, stylistic appropriateness, spelling and grammatical accuracy)*

(George and Salice, 1994, p.49)

Gouadec (2010, 2007) explains that the areas, good practices and prerequisites for quality in translation can be easily listed according to work objectives, and they should involve all players that are involved in the process of translation including the work provider (customer/commissioner or the translation organization itself), the project manager, the translator, and other professional players concerned with translation quality control and assurance such as revisers, editors, terminologists, or those professional players who are concerned with the presentation of the TT with regard to the desktop publishing, Web mastering or graphic design.

With regard to translator and translation organizations, Williams (1989), emphasises the need for a consistent and valid system to evaluate the quality in translation workplace that should take into account the procedures of production which, in turn, includes the customers' requirements,

timelines, language quality accuracy, etc. Moreover, Goudec (2010) insists on meeting procedure-based codes of good practices along with complying with the conditions for quality assurance (standards) to obtain to a good quality end-product.

As for the quality of the translation process in organizations, Mossop (2010) notes that quality assurance means that all members of a translation organization collaborate to meet its objectives. These objectives should consider three levels to achieve: Quality of service (e.g. meeting deadlines); quality of the physical product (e.g. layout); and Quality of the text (e.g. language quality, terminology, etc) (Mossop, 2010, p.118). Similarly, Matis (2011) suggests that quality assurance in translation projects should undergo two aspects; linguistic and technical. Accordingly, the linguistic levels consider the actual translation in terms of accuracy and meeting the linguistic requirements such as grammar and spelling, whereas the technical levels include a number of steps to check consistency of technical details like the layout, figures, and proper nouns.

Gouadec (2007) classifies the process of translation within a professional setting in three stages as follows:

1. Pre-translation “includes anything that takes place up to the moment the translator actually receives the material for translation: everything that has to do with getting the job, writing out estimates, negotiating, getting the specifications right, contracting”
2. translation which he divides into three stages:
 - a. pre-transfer “includes all operations leading up to the actual ‘translating’, including preparation of the material, documentary searches, alignment, memory consolidation, terminology mining, deciding on options, etc”
 - b. transfer “is the well-known core activity of shifting to another language-culture combination” .
 - c. post-transfer “covers anything that has to be done to meet the quality requirements and criteria prior to delivery of the translated material. It mostly pertains to quality control and upgrading. It also includes formatting and various preparations for delivery” (p.13).

Under this stage, Gouadec (2007) listed five categories under which quality should be controlled. These are 1. Quality controls by the translator; 2. Quality controls by the reviser; 3. Quality controls by the work provider; 4. Corrections and adaptations by the translator and/or reviser; 5. Final checks.

3. post-translation “covers all activities that follow delivery of the translated material (as in simulation of subtitles, layout prior to publishing, integration in a Web site or in an international soundtrack, etc.) but also, of course all the “administrative” business of getting paid, setting up an archive of the project, consolidating the terminology for future users, and much more” (Gouadec, 2007, p.13). Gouadec (2007) discussed and analysed these stages thoroughly in very detailed steps for all professional players that may get involved in the process of translation including managers, translators, and revisers. His detailed and clarification of the translation process is listed in 156 steps. For

Samuelsson-Brown (2006), translation in translation organizations should be realized as a system, as follows:

1. Inputs: include untranslated ST, human resources, practical skills and experience, physical resources, e.g. hardware and software, information and reference material, intellectual skills, project management, consumables;
2. Translation process: includes terminology research and development, draft translation, checking, editing, quality control;
3. Outputs: covers translated TT, intellectual skills improvement, extended terminology bank, satisfied customers, and profit (p.56)

Despite the variety in perceiving the translation process in organizations of translation projects, it can be concluded from the illustration above that there is a consensus that translation includes many professional players, stages and steps although they may differ relatively in terms of details. The most common components of the process of translation should be taken into account when integrating quality. Nevertheless, the size of the organizations and its objectives determine the workflow of the translation process, as well as the tasks of each player who may get involved in the process (Bass 2006). For instance, when the objectives of the organization focus on profit and customers satisfaction, quality, therefore, should give more significance and efforts related to the stage of pre-translation (Gouadec, 2007), whereby management understands the requirements of its customers; as well as the post-translation stage (ibid) which assures the fulfilment of their needs through a process of translation revision.

3- Translation Revision

Translation revision is a crucial factor for the quality of translation (Robert 2007). Mossop (2010) defines revising as “the process of checking a draft translation for errors and making appropriate amendments” (Mossop, 2010, p. 201). He describes revision in some instances as synonymous with quality control, which is “checking all or part of a translation, and either all or just some of the parameters” (ibid). The European Committee for Standardisation (2006, p. 6) defines the revision in the context of translation as “to examine translation for its suitability for the agreed purpose, compare the source and the target texts and recommend corrective measures”. The importance of the practice of translation has been growing due to the increasing interest in translation quality and the publication of translation standards such as EN 15038 (Künzli 2007; Mossop 2007; Robert 2008). One needs to note that EN15038 is a quality standard developed for translation providers, in an attempt to provide certification of translation-specific quality management. It aims at ensuring the consistent quality services. Mossop (2010) notes that revision is important because it enables the translated text to conform to the target language rules governing writing, reach acceptable quality, and achieve quality.

Although the literature of translation revision is relatively limited (Robert 2008), there is still a number of views regarding revision practices. However, “one might expect that there is no one method that yields the best results (i.e. everything depends on individual psychology), but on the other hand the whole point of empirical studies is to determine whether such expectations are true” (Mossop, 2007, p.19).

In her experimental study *Translation Revision Procedures: An Explorative Study*, Isabelle Robert (2008) concluded with her belief of controversy over revision practices such as choosing between revising on a paper or on screen on. In other words, revising translation should be on paper rather than on screen as it proved to be much better in terms of eliminating more errors, saving time consumed in scrolling screens, and less tiresome for the eyes (Mossop, 2010).

The process of revision consists of a number of parameters for which revision is carried out. These parameters vary according to the objectives of the text (Mossop (2010); Robert (2008); Rasmussen & Schjoldager (2011)). In Mossop terms (2010 p.125), “the revision parameters are the things a reviser checks for—the types of errors”. Rasmussen and Schjoldager (2011 p.92) argue that models of revision parameters that were presented by scholars such as Thaon and Horguelin (1980); Horguelin and Brunette (1998); Lee (2006); Mossop (2010)) are similar but they differ relatively in terms of degree of complexity.

KALIMA Project

KALIMA is a non-profit organisation which funds translations and publications in the Arab world. Ranging from classic to contemporary writing, KALIMA selects its books from various languages and translates them into Arabic.

At its foundation in 2008, KALIMA aimed at translating 100 books yearly. After three years only of its establishment, its publications exceeded 700 translated books. It also currently involves 500 translators and editors from all over the Arab World.

It is important to bear in mind that the KALIMA project uses freelance translators and accordingly, it relies on publishing houses to carry out translations. In other words, KALIMA’s publishers are responsible for the selection of translators depending on the translation genre requested. However, it seems that in the future KALIMA intends to collect a database of translators who will be directly employed by the organization.

The quality parameters followed in KALIMA can be identified through the selection, revision and publication process of its selected titles. As for the selection process, KALIMA targets leading books in various languages from around the world so as to be translated into Arabic. It guarantees the funding of good quality publishing houses in the Arab world in order to translate, print and distribute the various translations. The translated publications of KALIMA cover various genres such as general knowledge, philosophy and psychology, religion, social sciences, languages, natural and exact sciences, arts, games, sports, literature, history, geography, biography, children and young people books.

An informal visit to KALIMA in 2010 indicated that it has established specific management practices for its objectives. Furthermore, given the large number of publications carried out in a record time, it can be assumed that it has specific structural norms and quality management systems in place for the translation process. Further research needs to be carried out on

KALIMA's organisational structure and explore the adopted practices to achieve the quality of translation while considering other aspects of the translation process. The website of KALIMA does not reveal much information about its organisational structure, quality management systems or the workflow of translation. However, and most importantly, the organization certainly pays great attention to its customers (readers) and interacts with them. It has also embraced social media with its Twitter and Facebook pages which allow its readers and audiences to communicate their comments and for it to deal with feedback and reviews of translations after publication.

Establishing an institution such as KALIMA stems from the need to fill a gap in translation in the Arab World, where translated literary and scientific works are only available in the native language. It, therefore, aims at allowing Arabic readers to have wider access to more varied works. KALIMA has established its reputation in the UAE, as well as the Arab World. The figures above emphasize KALIMA's determination to revive translation as a movement in the Arab World.

KALIMA is indeed very prominent and active in promoting the movement of translation in the Arab world and ensuring quality translation. This was done through, among other activities, the organization of seminars and conferences on Translation, such as the Abu Dhabi International Conference on translating, held in February 2012 and organized by KALIMA in conjunction with the Abu Dhabi International Book Fair. Dr Ali Bin Tamim, project manager of KALIMA, insisted that KALIMA exerted maximum efforts in order to provide distinct translation books for Arab readers so as to enable them to benefit from them and equally enjoy them.

In April 2013 the KALIMA project organised the 2nd Abu Dhabi international Conference for Translation. The conference held workshops under the title: *Enabling Translators*. This is in addition to organising seminars discussing the reality and problems of translation. This shows the active role played by KALIMA to improve the movement of Translation and its endeavour to provide current professional translators and the next generation of translators (national university translation students) with the necessary tools to enable them to produce good quality translations.

During this conference, Dr Ali Bin Tamim, reiterated the role of translation in building bridges between civilizations and peoples, and the necessity to ensure a new generation of translators in order to ensure the transfer of cultures, science and literature from and into Arabic. He explained that KALIMA recognizes the importance of the role of translation in the revival of nations, and the role it plays in interacting with each other. Translation provides common points of contact, bridges the gaps between cultures, and fosters cultural exchange. Therefore, the KALIMA project aims at reviving the translation movement and making it a truly genuine cultural and educational gesture as clearly stated in its website.

KALIMA is certainly a valuable cultural initiative that intends to contribute to Arab cultural revival, and to provide new channels of information to the reader. It is investing primarily in the

revival of translation in the Arab World by organising workshops and translation seminars. It also undertakes to translate great works from various languages to Arabic in order to satisfy the needs of an increasingly demanding readership. The KALIMA Project bridges the gap between local and regional Arabic cultures and guarantees access to global culture in order to improve understanding of all cultures in a globalised world and to recognize the specific and unique nature of other societies and cultures.

Conclusion

Insuring quality in translation project organizations is a process with much significance. It cannot be overlooked or certainly not adhered to. Quality is even more difficult to achieve in translation projects, where the task is vastly bigger and involves more than one translator. In such cases, i.e., in the case of translation organizations projects, it all depends on various approaches adopted to guarantee the quality of a product by controlling, assessing and editing the product while it is being made.

Project translation organizations comprise many professional actors, involved not only in the process of translation but also in the process of editing, revising and managing the whole stages and steps. Quality is integrated at each step of the process. Depending on the size of the organization and the workflow, quality will be achieved according to the tasks of each player. One must recognise the role played by the process of management in the overall stages of translation. This is important as translation project organisations' major concern is often to achieve profit, satisfying customers and quality. In the case of KALIMA, quality is an essential drive of its many initiatives. Being a fast growing translation project in the Arab World, KALIMA is very keen to revive the Arabic language and give a boost to the translation movement in the World by promoting translation through the organization of conferences and by increasing the target number of works to translate. This will allow the Arab readership to be acquainted with academic and scientific works produced by non-Arab writers. It is essential to stress the importance of "quality" in such organizations. That is to say that the work produced by an organization such as KALIMA is not concerned by quantity but with quality. To achieve quality, various processes can be adopted by translation project organization based in the UAE and other parts of the Arab World. These range between translation, editing and revising. All of these stages allow for a good quality translation to be produced. KALIMA seems to be working towards symbolizing the work of translators and spreading good quality translations and practices, with an ultimate goal that is maintaining the Arabic language alive, while communicating its seductive and rich character to the reader.

About the authors:

Dr Radia Kesseiri graduated from the University of Algiers in 1998 with a BA in Interpreting and Translation (Arabic -French –English.) In 1999, she obtained an MA in Interpreting and Translation (Arabic-English –Arabic) from Leeds University. Dr Kesseiri has been teaching Translation and Interpreting at Higher Education level since 2006 and is currently teaching at Leeds University.

Mariam Alhashmi is a professional translator and a research student working towards a PhD in Translation Studies in the School of Modern Languages and Cultures at the University of Leeds. She graduated from the University of Leeds with a Master degree in Translation Studies and interpreting. Her research interests revolve around translation management and evaluation.

References

- Al-Qinai, J. (2000). Translation quality assessment: Strategies, parameters and procedures, *Meta*, XLV, 3, 497-519.
- Al-Kasimi, A. (2006). *Athar attarjama fi maarifat addaat wa idrak alakhar*. 2nd. Edition. Rabat: Juthoor Publications.
- Bowker, L. (2001). Towards a methodology for a corpus-based approach to translation evaluation. *Meta*, 46(2), 345-364.
- Bowker, L. (March (2005). Productivity vs quality? A pilot study on the impact of translation memory system. *Localisation Focus*, 13-20.
- Brunette, L. (2000). Towards a terminology for translation quality assessment: A comparison of TQA practices, *The Translator*, 6(2), 169-182.
- Carroll, J. B. (1966). An Experiment in Evaluating the Quality of Translations. *Mechanical Translation*, 9, 55-66.
- Delisle, J. and Woodsworth, J. (1995). *Translators through history*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- El Shiekh, A. (1991). *A Study Of Two Major Translations Of The Holy Koran*. PhD Thesis (Unpublished), Faculty Arts, Alexandria University, Egypt.
- Ernst-August, Gutt. (1990). "A theoretical account of translation - without a translation theory," *Target: International Journal of Translation Studies* 2 (2) , 135-164
- European Committee for Standardisation. (2006). *Translation services: service requirements*. Brussels: Nederlands Normalisatie-instituut.
- Evans, J. (2010). *Quality & Performance Excellence*. Mason: Cengage Learning.
- Faiq, S. (2006) Medieval Arabic Translation: A Cultural Consideration. *Mediaevalia: an interdisciplinary journal of medieval studies worldwide*, 26 (1-2), 101.
- Feigenbaum, A. V. (1991). *Total quality control*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gouadec , D. (2010.) Quality in translation. In: Gambier, and Doorslaer , L. (eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies* (270-275). 1st ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamin publishing,
- Gouadec, D. (2007). *Translation as a Profession*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Halliday, M.A.K, Macintosh, A.,& Stevens, P. (1965). *The Linguistic Sciences And Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hamlin, H., & Jones, N. (2010). *The King James Bible after 400 years: Literary, linguistic, and cultural influences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *Translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.

- House, J. (1981). A model for translation quality assessment. Tübingen, Gunter Narr.
- House, J. (1997). Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- House, J. (1998). Quality of translation, in Baker, M. and Malmkjaer, K. (eds.), Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies (197-200). London: Routledge.
- Kalima.ae (2013) *Kalima Translation - What we do*. Retrieved from <http://KALIMA.ae/en/pages/WhatWeDo.aspx>
- Kalima.ae (2013) *Kalima Translation - Dr. Ali Bin Tamim*. Retrieved from <http://www.kalima.ae/en/pages/AliBinTamim.aspx>
- Khan, M. (1983) A Chapter On Roman (Byzantine) Sciences In An Eleventh Century Hispano-Arabic Work, *Islamic Studies*, 22 (1), 41-70. Retrieved from <http://jstor.org/stable/20847229>
- KOMMISSAROV, V. (1985). The practical value of translation theory, Babel. *International Journal of Translation*, 21 (4), 208- 213.
- Künzli, A. (2007). Translation revision - A study of the performance of ten professionals revising a legal text. In Gambier, Shlesinger, M. and Stolze, R. (eds.), (2013) *Doubts and directions in Translation Studies* (115-126). 1st ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Lambert, S, & Moser-Mercer, B. (1994). *Bridging the gap: empirical research in simultaneous interpretation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Larose, R. (1998) Méthodologie de l'évaluation des traductions. *Meta*, 43 (2), 163. Retrieved from <http://erudit.org/revue/meta/1998/v/n2/003410ar.html>
- Lyons, J. (2010). *The house of wisdom: how the Arabs transformed Western civilization*. New York: Bloomsbury Press.
- Matis, N. (2011). Quality Assurance in the translation workflow - A professional's testimony. In: Depraetere, I (eds.), (2011) *Perspectives on translation quality*. 1st ed. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Mossop, B. (2007, July 8). Empirical studies of revision: What we know and need to know. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 5-20. Retrieved from <http://jostrans.org/>
- Mossop, B. (2010). *Revising and editing for translators*. 2nd ed. Manchester: St. Jerome Publications.
- Mukherjee, P. (2006). *Total Quality Management*. New Delhi : PHI Learning.
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies: theories and applications*. London: Routledge.
- Mustapha, H. (1998). Qur'an Translation. In Baker, M. (ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (200-3). London: Routledge.
- Neubert, A. and Shreve, G. (1992). *Translation as text*. London: Kent State University Press.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Prince, C. (2002). The historical context of Arabic translation, learning, and the libraries of Medieval Andalusia. *Library History*, 2, 73-87. Retrieved from <http://ingentaconnect.com/content/maney/lbh/2002/00000018/00000002/art00001>.

- Pym, A. (2010a). *Exploring Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.
- Rasmussen, K. & Schjoldager, A. (2011). Revising Translations: A Survey of Revision Policies in Danish Translation Companies. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 15, 87-120. Retrieved from http://jostrans.org/issue15/art_rasmussen.pdf
- Robert, I. (2007). Translation Revision Procedures. In: Boulogne, P. (eds.), *Translation and its others: Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar*, 1-25. Retrieved from <http://kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/papers.html>
- Roffe, J. (2004). Translation. In: Reynolds, J. & Roffe, J. (eds.), *Understanding Derrida*, (107). New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Salama-Carr, M. (2009). Institutional translation. In: Baker, M (eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (141-144). 2nd ed. London: Routledge,
- Salis, L. & George, P. (1994). Quality assurance in quality circles. In: Picken, C. (eds.), *ITI Conference 7 Proceedings -- Quality- Assurance, Management and Control* (42-47). 1st ed. London: ITI.
- Sallis, E., & Hingley, P. (1991). *Total quality management*. Bristol: The Staff College.
- Samuelsson-Brown, G. (2006). *Managing translation services*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Widdowson, KALIMA. G. (1978). *Teaching Language As Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, M. (1989). The Assessment of Professional Translation Quality: Creating Credibility out of Chaos. *Erudit*, 2(2), 13-33. Retrieved from <http://erudit.org/revue/ttr/1989/v2/n2/037044ar.pdf>
- Wilss, W. (1982). *The Science of translation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Wycliffe, J. (2010). *Wycliffe Bible Translators: a Man Ahead of his Time*. Retrieved from <http://wycliffe.org/About/OurHistory/JohnWycliffe.aspx>
- Zakhir, M., 2008. *The history of translation*. Retrieved from <http://translationdirectory.com/articles/article1695.php>.