The Criteria and Variables Affecting the Selection of Quality Book Ideally Suited for Translation:
The Perspectives of King Saud University Staff

Abdulaziz Abdulrahman Abanomey

King Saud University, Translation Center, Saudi Arabia

Mohammad Ahmed Al-Jabali

King Saud University, Translation Center, Saudi Arabia

Mohamed Mazen Galal

King Saud University, Translation Center, Saudi Arabia

(Permanent Position Faculty of Arts, Suez University, Suez, Egypt)

Abstract

This study investigated the ideal definition of QB, that is Quality Book- one that is ideally suited for translation- and the variables affecting its selection criteria among 136 members of King Saud University (KSU) academic staff. A workshop was held to elicit the ideal definition of QB to answer the first question, and a 19-item electronic questionnaire with four domains was designed to help collect the data necessary to answer the other two questions of the study. The results revealed that all four domains came low; "Authorship and Publication" came the highest with a mean score of 2.28 and "Titling and Contents" came the lowest with a mean score of 1.76. 5-way ANOVA (without interaction) was applied in accordance with the variables of the study at $\alpha \le 0.05$ among the mean scores. The analysis revealed significance of the variables of gender, those who translated a book or more before, and those who participated in a conference devoted for translation whereas the variables of qualification and revising a translated book did not reveal any statistical significance.

Key words: Quality Book, KSU, Authorship, Translation, Titling

1. Introduction and literature review

A quick review of the history of translation in the Arab World reveals that translation has witnessed progress at certain times, and retrogression at others. Translation lived its golden age during Caliph al-Mamoun's Era where care was given to translating philosophy, logic, math, science, and arts books (Baker, 2001, p. 321). These books were translated from Greek, Persian, Hebrew, Syriac, Sanskrit, Coptic, and Abyssinian languages (Alkasimi, 2006, p. 83). After that, translation retreated a lot till the beginning of the 19th century, the Era of Mohammad Ali Pasha, the ruler of Egypt at that time- who started a translation program that lasted 20 years. He used to sponsor students' missions to Europe and France as their main destination to learn languages for translation. Priority was given to translating technical subjects mostly from French (Baker, 2001, p. 323).

Zakhir points out that translation in the Arab world is progressing as a result of its openness to Western theories and methods (2008, p. 3). This progress can be inferred from the fact that during the last few decades some universities gave care for translation. Baker (2001, p. 324) mentions that translation training programs in the Arab World exist in the form of independent institutions such as King Fahd School of Translation in Tangier, or university departments such as Yarmuk University in Jordan, and Alexandria University in Egypt.

Translated books are real reservoirs of knowledge, especially if they are of real value and quality. They are among the means by which culture is conveyed from one part of the world to another, and they are vital for the development and progress of any group of people or nation. Quality book (QB), the focus of this study, refers to the type of book ideally suited for translation to satisfy the requirements of readers, whatever they may be. Unfortunately, literature on the exact definition and characteristics of this type of quality books is scanty and there seems to be neither a specific definition of what QB is, nor what its characteristics are. The preliminary part below intends to go over this issue.

Selecting books for translation is a really thrilling and enriching experience since translated books mainly have the function of cultural enrichment. According to Anderson (2014), readers are denied exposure to a very important source of knowledge because of publishers' policies. He also believes that translation is an act of an inevitable "cultural cross-

pollination". Focusing on the necessity of translation, particularly literature, Anderson stresses the importance of translation without which it would not be possible to come in touch with world important works such as *One Hundred Years of Solitude, The Little Prince* or *Gregor Samsa*. Lack of translating books, especially literature, has been a lamentable reality, where only 2-3% of world books are translated into English. Anderson states the painful reality about translating books in the English-speaking world and harshly criticizes English-language publishers for disregarding translating great stories from other parts of the world. Anderson maintains that unlike the situation in English, many countries including France, Spain, Turkey and Slovenia do far much better in terms of the number of translation titles. In France, 27% of books published are in translation; in Spain, it even goes a little higher to 28%, increasing to 40% in Turkey, and reaches 70% high in Slovenia.

According to Alberg (2014), there has been a recent interest in translated work particularly literary translation after the success made by Scandinavian authors such as Jo Nesbø . He maintains that British readers are reading foreign fiction more often and are much more attracted to translated novels. As Alberg reports, Penguin Classics is about to publish a collection of Arabic short stories, entitled *Tales of the Marvelous and News of the Strange*, translated by the Malcolm Lyons. This is a special event since, as he states, those old Arabic stories have never been printed in English in 1,000.

The boom in translation industry made translated books part of the mainstream, as Liz Foley, Harvill Secker's publishing director, states (quoted in Alberg 2014); they even came to be more appreciated. In his article in Quill and Quire, A Canadian magazine about book publishing industry, Beattie (2014) believes that the translated books in Canada might be on the upsurge, and affirms that the boom in translation works in the U.K will show itself in Canada, too. However, translation direction is from French into English. Literary works dominate the scene of translated books, there.

Contrary to some views claiming that translated books do not sell, Robinson (2014) believes that they actually do. He cites many examples of books that sold well including the *Name of the Rose*, *Sense of Snow*, *the Elegance of the Hedgehog* and *Suite Française*. He even expects a best seller in translation every couple of years. He cites three types of translated books that have proven successful sales-wise: 1) Euro Crime and Thrillers; 2) International Literary Brand; and 3) International Reader's Choice.

In a survey conducted by *Literature Across Frontiers* organization and prepared by the Budapest Observatory (Büchler, p. 2012) to obtain information from European publishers about choosing and financing translations, information was obtained form 80 publishers from 22 countries. Based on positive responses, "occasionally" and "almost always", it was found out that the majority of the translated titles are fiction. Responding to the question about publishers' methods of choosing foreign titles for translation, it was found out that "reading a sample translation", "reading a book in the original", and 'expert advisor's suggestions' ranked the highest. The media –oriented considerations came the lowest (e.g. foreign bestseller list; appearance of author in a literary event; media appearance of the author". However when ranking "almost always" answers only, the findings changed a little bit with "reading the book in the original", "expert advisor's suggestion" and "personal recommendation" ranking the highest while "foreign bestseller lists", "national literature organizations", "appearance of author in a literary event" ranking the lowest.

Geographically speaking, UK publishers favored listening to national literature organizations' recommendations, and reading sample translations as the primary method for choosing a translation title, contrary to their 'Latin' counterparts. "Book reviews in the foreign press" is what attracts French, Spanish and Italian publishers more when choosing a title for translation. For Serbs, Slovenes and their colleagues seem to favor 'using expert advice'.

In terms of the size of publishing house, findings do not seem to vary much; however, larger presses seem to opt for professional agent foreign publishers to help with selecting translation titles than small presses. Based on the findings above, methods of choosing translation titles seem to favor realistic first-hand inspection of work intended for translation, mainly relying on personal or expert scrutiny while ignoring media considerations. Findings also show different preferences relevant to geographical reasons and magnitude of the translation organization.

Based on the previous survey about the characteristics of the books intended for translation (QB in our research), the following characteristics can be listed: 1) Thrillers; 2) International brands, 3) Books chosen by readers (first-hand inspection); 4) Fiction; 5) Books recommended by experts; 6) Bestsellers; 7) Books checked in the original language; 8) Books by famous authors; 9) Books recommended by national institutions; 10) Books whose authors often appear in the media; and 11) Books recommended by professional agents. To put things right, this list is not ordered in terms of preference or priority, but it is a sort of an exhaustive list that summarizes the characteristic obtained from the sources above.

In order to set the situation within the Saudi context, in general, and the Translation Center at KSU (KSUTC) in particular, the researchers had to make an exhaustive list in a questionnaire form (i.e. Selection Criteria of Quality Books) of the possible characteristics of a quality translation title and the reasons to opting for them.

One of the main goals of this research is to define the term 'Quality Book', i.e. a book ideally suited to be translated. What makes this attempt worthy of trial is that as Macro (2007) stipulates translation studies is a fledgling field whose terms are still fuzzy; there is always no consensus among translation theorists and practitioners about the translation terminology. This call for clear terms for defining translation concepts and for avoiding confusion has also been voiced by Snell-Hornby (2007, p. 322); he states that a crucial thing about Translation Studies is that there has to be "a

compatible discourse which cultivates an awareness of differences in usage and where terms are clearly defined within the language and the school of thought for which they apply".

The present study is an exploratory one. The shortage of literature on QB forms the problem of the current study, and is considered as a limitation to generalizing its results. It is hoped that the results of the study will provide insights for other researchers to enter into this topic and introduce clear criteria that can be helpful to translators from King Saud University staff (KSUS) that represents the population of the current study, in the selection of translatable quality books.

Thus, this study is intended to achieve certain objectives, namely: providing an ideal operational definition of QB, as well as its characteristics from the point of view of KSUS, and identifying the variables that affect the selection criteria of QB suited for translation. To achieve these objectives, the following questions should be answered: 1) What is the ideal operational definition of QB from the point of view of KSUS?; 2) What are the characteristics of QB from the point of view of KSUS in terms of gender, qualification, experience in translating a book, reviewing a translated book, or attending a conference devoted to translation?; 3)Are there any significant differences in the characteristics of QB from the point of view of KSUS that can be attributed to gender, qualification, experience in translating a book, revising a translated book, or attending a conference devoted to translation?

2. Methodology

Prior to carrying out this study, the researchers organized a workshop for 80 members of KSUS through the Translation Center (TC). The workshop was a brainstorming one that lasted for four hours. During this workshop, the participants worked in groups to discuss its themes, namely: the ideal operational definition of QB as well as its characteristics. After that, each participant put down the ideal operational definition of QB from his/her point of view and handed the definition to the researchers.

The population of this study consisted of all KSUS. The sample consisted of 136 participants as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of sample according to study variables

Independent Variable:	IV Levels	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	109	80.1
	Female	27	19.9
	Total	136	100.0
Qualification	Doctorate	120	88.2
	Master	16	11.8
	Total	136	100.0
Have you ever translated a book or more?	Yes	75	55.1
	No	61	44.9
	Total	136	100.0
Have you ever reviewed a translated book or work?	Yes	62	45.6
	No	74	54.4
	Total	136	100.0
Have you ever participated in a translation conference?	Yes	41	30.1
	No	95	69.9
	Total	136	100.0

2.1 Tools of the study

To achieve the objectives of the study, the researchers have undertaken two procedures. First, they organized a workshop to elicit the ideal operational definition of quality book. Second, they designed a questionnaire entitled "Criteria for Selecting Quality Books". Here are the procedures followed while designing the questionnaire of the study.

2.2 Content validity of the study questionnaire

The researchers designed the first draft of the questionnaire. After that, it was approved by two university professors in each of the fields of: psychology, general curricula and instruction, measurement and assessment, English Language, and Arabic Language.

2.3 Construct validity of the study questionnaire

The questionnaire was applied to a random sample of 20 faculty members who were excluded from the targeted sample. This procedure was carried out aiming to calculate the Pearson Correlation Coefficient between the items of the questionnaire and its domains as in Table 2.

Table 2. Correlation coefficient values between the items of the questionnaire and its domains

Domain	Item ID	Item Direction	Selection Criteria of Quality Books	Correlation with: domain	Scale
Titling & Contents	1		The title of the book should be appealing	0.70	0.48
	2		The title of the book should be clear to the reader	0.68	0.48
	6		The contents of the book should be consistent with the title	0.64	0.49
	19		The size of the book should be reasonable (300-500 pages)	0.67	0.55
Book Specifications & Freshness	8		The book should be in the specialty field of the translator	0.75	0.39
	9		The book be translated should be in Arabic	0.57	0.42
	11	Neg.	It is not required that the book be translated to be in the specialty field of the translator	0.73	0.27
	10		The book should not be written in another language than the native language (translated from another language)	0.30	0.32
Books Topics	4		The book must address a vital topic in a serious way	0.54	0.49
	5		The theme of the book should not be inconsistent with the culture of the target community	0.62	0.57
	12		The book should be suitable for most groups of learners of the target language	0.49	0.44
	13		The book should be specialized and suit a specific group of the target language speakers: (doctors/engineers/etc.)	0.45	0.38
	14		The book should be educational and raise awareness	0.72	0.53
	15		The book should be entertaining	0.51	0.27
Authorship & Publication	3		The book should not be already translated to the target language	0.62	0.52
	7		The book should be newly published (not more than five years)	0.67	0.57
	16		The book should be classified among bestselling books	0.64	0.54
	17		The author should be internationally renowned	0.71	0.57
	18		The book should be issued by a famous publishing house	0.69	0.59

Besides, the researchers calculated the correlation coefficient for each domain in the questionnaire and for the whole questionnaire as well as the inter-correlation coefficient values using Pearson Correlation Coefficient as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Correlation coefficient values between the study questionnaire domains and the inter-correlation coefficient values of the domains

Correlation With:	Statistics	Titling & Contents	Book Specifications & Freshness	Books Topics	Authorship & Publication
Book Specifications & Freshness	Pearson Correlation	0.21			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.013			
Books Topics	Pearson Correlation	0.58	0.24		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.006		
Authorship & Publication	Pearson Correlation	0.53	0.37	0.54	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	
Selection Criteria of Quality Books	Pearson Correlation	0.75	0.59	0.80	0.84
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

2.4 Reliability of study questionnaire

To check the internal consistency of the questionnaire and its domains, Cronbach's Alpha was run for the pilot study. To check the reliability of the questionnaire and its domains, it was applied again on the same sample of the pilot study three weeks later. Pearson Coefficient was used to calculate the Test-Retest results, as in Table 4.

Table 4. Values of internal consistency and reliability coefficients for the questionnaire and its domains

Questionnaire and its Domains	Cronbach's Alpha	Stability Index	N of Items
Titling & Contents	0.87	**0.90**	4
Book Specifications & Freshness	0.77	**0.91**	4
Books Topics	0.85	**0.85**	6
Authorship & Publication	0.86	**0.88**	5
Over Whole	0.89	**0.81**	19

Table 4 shows that the over whole internal consistency of the questionnaire was 0.89 ranging between 0.77-0.87 and the Stability Index was 0.81 ranging between 0.85-0.90 for the domains.

2.5 Rating the questionnaire

To judge the mean scores over the whole questionnaire, domains and items, the statistical model with absolute grading was carried out as follows:

Degree	Means
High	> 3.49
Moderate	2.50-3.49
Low	< 2.50

3. Results

To answer the first question, the written definitions of QB provided by the workshop participants were carefully scrutinized. These definitions showed different points of view that could have been influenced by the participants' academic field of study and interests. One of the participants said that QB is one of the rare books that help build the mind and feed the soul such as textbooks. Seven participants indicated that QB should be unique in content and method, and be authored by a specialist. Five participants proposed that QB should be an asset to the library, and also be attractive to all readers: university professors, lecturers, students, and the public. Two participants assured that QB should be in the field of science not humanities. Many others said that QB should be specialized, should tackle its subject accurately, and cope up with the latest changes. To sum up, these definitions included the characteristics of QB. Therefore, the researchers agreed that QB is the comprehensive, reasonable, specialized in theme, and authentically authored book.

To answer the second question, we measured the mean scores and standard deviations of the whole questionnaire and its domains. Table 5 shows the means and standard deviations of the questionnaire and its domains in a descending order.

Table 5. Means and standard deviations of Selection Criteria of Quality Books and its domains in descending order

Rank	Domain ID	Selection Criteria of Quality Books	Mean	Std. Dev.	Degree
1	4	Authorship & Publication	2.28	0.53	Low
2	3	Books Topics	2.05	0.41	Low
3	2	Book Specifications & Freshness	2.01	0.51	Low
4	1	Titling & Contents	1.76	0.46	Low
		Over Whole	2.04	0.36	Low

Table 5 shows that the degree of Selection Criteria of Quality Books and its domains was *low* according to the criterion aforementioned in part 2. The domains of the questionnaire were in the following descending order:

1-	Authorship and Publication	
2-	Books Topics	Top-Down Ranking
3-	Book Specifications and Freshness	
4-	Titling and Contents	

We also measured the mean scores and standard deviations of the items of each domain. Table (6) shows the domain items in a descending order.

Table 6. Mean scores and standard deviations of the domain items of Selection Criteria of Quality Books in a descending order

Domain	Rank	Item ID	Item Direction	Selection Criteria of Quality Books	Mean	Std. Dev.	Degree
Titling & Contents	1	19		The size of the book should be reasonable (300-500 pages)	2.13	0.85	Low
	2	1		The title of the book should be appealing	1.93	0.74	Low
	3	2		The title of the book should be clear to the reader	1.54	0.57	Low
	4	6		The contents of the book should be consistent with the title	1.47	0.56	Low
Book Specifications & Freshness	1	9		The book wanted to be translated should be in Arabic	2.37	0.93	Low
	2	11	Neg.	It is not required that the book be translated to be in the specialty field of the translator	2.18	0.97	Low
	3	10		The book should not be written in another language than the native language (translated from another language)	1.82	0.82	Low
	4	8		The book should be in the specialty field of the translator	1.68	0.73	Low
Books Topics	1	15		The book should be entertaining	2.85	0.75	Moderate
	2	14		The book should be educational and raise awareness	2.17	0.78	Low
	3	13		The book should be specialized and suit a specific group of target language speakers: (doctors/engineers/etc.)	2.14	0.76	Low
	4	12		The book should be suitable for most groups of learners of the target language	2.04	0.72	Low
	5	5		The theme of the book should not be inconsistent with the culture of the target community	1.74	0.90	Low
	6	4		The book must address a vital topic in a serious way	1.34	0.53	Low
Authorship & Publication	1	16		The book should be classified among bestselling books	2.62	0.80	Moderate
	2	17		The author should be internationally renowned	2.58	0.74	Moderate
	3	18		The book should be issued by a famous publishing house	2.38	0.77	Low
	4	7		The book should be newly published (not more than five years)	2.18	0.93	Low
	5	3		The book should not be already translated to the target language	1.63	0.73	Low

Table 6 shows that all items in the ranking relevant to the domain "Titling and Contents" received a low degree of agreement. All the items of the domain "Book Specifications and Freshness" also received a low degree of agreement. However, items of the domain "Book Topics" received two degrees of agreement: (i) moderate for item Number 15,

and (ii) low for the other items. Finally, items of the domain "Authorship and Publication" received two degrees of agreement: (i) moderate for items 16 and 17, and (ii) low for the other items.

To answer the third question, we measured the mean scores and standard deviations of the criteria used by KSUS; the results are shown in Table 7:

Table 7. Mean scores and standard deviations of Selection Criteria of Quality Books according to study variables

IVs	IV Levels	Mean	Std. Dev.
Gender	Male	**2.06**	0.37
	Female	1.95	0.27
Qualification	Doctorate	2.05	0.36
	Master	2.01	0.36
Have you ever translated a book or more?	Yes	2.01	0.36
	No	**2.08**	0.35
Have you ever reviewed a translated book or work?	Yes	2.06	0.34
	No	2.02	0.37
Have you ever participated in a translation conference?	Yes	**2.11**	0.29
	No	2.01	0.38

Table 7 shows differences between the mean scores of the questionnaire that can be attributed to having different levels for the variables. To examine the significance of these differences, we used the 5-way ANOVA (without interaction) as shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Results for 5-way ANOVA without Interaction for Selection Criteria of Quality Books according to the variables

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	0.277	1	0.277	**4.407**	0.038
Qualification	0.001	1	0.001	0.023	0.879
Have you ever translated a book or more?	4.455	1	4.455	**70.993**	0.000
Have you ever reviewed a translated book or work?	0.019	1	0.019	0.299	0.585
Have you ever participated in a translation conference?	4.481	1	4.481	**71.411**	0.000
Error	8.158	130	0.063		
Total	17.392	135			

Table 8 shows no significant difference at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the mean scores of the whole questionnaire attributed to the two variables of: "Qualification" and "Have you ever reviewed a translated book or work?" However, there is a significant difference at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the two mean scores attributed to the variable of gender favoring males.

Table (8) also shows significant differences between the questionnaire mean scores at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) attributed to the variable "Have you ever translated a book or more?" favoring "No" respondents. There is also a significant difference in the mean scores at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) attributed to the variable "Have you ever participated in a translation conference?" favoring "Yes" respondents.

In addition to what was aforementioned, the mean scores and standard deviations of the questionnaire domains according to the variables have been measured, as shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Mean scores and standard deviations of the domains of Selection Criteria of Quality Books according to study variables

IVs	IV levels	Statistic	Domains of the Questionnaire			
			Titling & Contents	Book Specifications & Freshness	Books Topics	Authorship & Publication
Gender	Male	Mean	1.78	2.01	2.07	2.32
		Std. Dev.	0.47	0.53	0.43	0.54
	Female	Mean	1.70	2.03	1.93	2.11
		Std. Dev.	0.39	0.42	0.30	0.42

Qualification	Doctorate	Mean	1.77	2.01	2.05	2.29
		Std. Dev.	0.45	0.52	0.40	0.54
	Master	Mean	1.75	2.00	2.02	2.21
		Std. Dev.	0.49	0.45	0.52	0.46
Have you ever translated a book or more?	Yes	Mean	1.73	2.02	2.02	2.23
		Std. Dev.	0.46	0.51	0.45	0.51
	No	Mean	1.81	2.01	2.08	2.34
		Std. Dev.	0.45	0.51	0.37	0.54
Have you ever reviewed a translated book or work?	Yes	Mean	1.75	2.05	2.09	2.28
		Std. Dev.	0.45	0.49	0.42	0.53
	No	Mean	1.77	1.98	2.01	2.28
		Std. Dev.	0.46	0.52	0.41	0.53
Have you ever participated in a translation conference?	Yes	Mean	1.82	2.18	2.07	2.34
		Std. Dev.	0.39	0.47	0.40	0.42
	No	Mean	1.74	1.94	2.04	2.25
		Std. Dev.	0.48	0.51	0.42	0.57

Table 9 shows observed differences between the mean scores of the domains resulting from differences in variable levels. To examine the significance of these differences, the correlation coefficient between the domains has been measured. Then, it was followed by applying Bartlett's Sphericity Test according to the variables to identify the best analysis of variance that should be used (ANOVA or MANOVA) as shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Results of Bartlett's Sphericity Test of the domains of Selection Criteria of Quality Books according to variables

Correlation due to IVs	Titling & Contents	Book Specifications & Freshness	Books Topics
Book Specifications & Freshness	**0.20**		
Books Topics	**0.58**	**0.23**	
Authorship & Publication	**0.52**	**0.36**	**0.53**
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity			
Likelihood Ratio	**Approx. χ^2**	**df**	**Sig.**
0.000	**134.396**	9	0.000

Table 10 shows a significant difference at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) between the means of the questionnaire attributed to the variables. To verify the significant difference we should use the 5-way ANOVA without Interaction for all the domains according to the variables as shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Results for the 5-way ANOVA without Interaction for all the domains of Selection Criteria of Quality Books according to the variables

Effect	MANOVA Test Type	MANOVA Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Gender	Hotelling's Trace	0.040	1.282	4	127	0.280
Qualification	Hotelling's Trace	0.003	0.094	4	127	0.984
Have you ever translated a book or more?	Hotelling's Trace	0.029	0.936	4	127	0.445
Have you ever reviewed a translated book or work?	Hotelling's Trace	0.030	0.950	4	127	0.438
Have you ever participated in a translation conference?	Hotelling's Trace	0.067	2.116	4	127	0.083

Table 11 shows no significant differences for all domains at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) for the variables of "gender", "qualification", "Have you ever translated a book or more?", "Have you ever reviewed a translated book or a work?" ,and "Have you ever participated in a translation conference?".

4. Discussion

The study yields a number of significant ramifications that may contribute to the existing literature on methods of selecting books for translation.

As regards the first question, "What is the ideal operational definition of QB from the point of view of KSUS?", respondents' answers showed some disagreement on the ideal operational definition of QB. This disagreement is understandable in view of the fact that there is no clear dictionary definition or definition of any other source or type. The definitions provided may reflect the influence of the respondents' majors, interests, attitudes, experience, or level of education. Moreover, to arrive at an ideal definition of such term in one meeting with this number of participants is not as easy as one might think of. The definition provided in the "Results" section came up after a long argument among the researchers around the specifications for QB put down by the participants.

As regards the second question, "What are the characteristics of QB from the point of view of KSUS in terms of gender, qualification, and experience in translating a book, reviewing a translated book, or attending a conference devoted to translation?", the mean scores of the domains have shown domain 4 "Authorship & Publication" to rank the highest with a mean score of 2.28, and domain 1 "Titling & Contents" to rank the lowest with a mean score of 1.76. The reasons why this is so might reside in the fact that this domain, in particular, includes most of the points that reflect the true content and value of books. These particular points are of relevance to the classification of a book as a bestseller, the considerable fame of the author, the freshness of the book and the considerable eminence of the publishing house. These issues are really of great caliber for any book value, hence no wonder that they fared high with respondents. The domain "Titling & Contents" came lowest for various possible reasons. This domain tackles only highly marginal issues such as book size (300-400 pages), wording or phrasing of a book title (book titles are misleading in some cases based on marketing and advertising issues), clarity of the title (not necessarily a good sign of the book content and even contradicts book marketing rules about having an *attractive* title). Domains 2 and 3 are mix of both formal and substantial issues about book selection, and it looks quite natural that they hold only middle ranks.

The fact that "Authorship & Publication" came highest is in agreement with Robinson (2014). Robinson cites authors as the second reason why translated books are successful sales-wise. This is also in agreement with Budapest Observatory study (Büchler, p. 2012) referred to in the introduction citing content as the really what matters for the most for choosing a book for translation. Moreover, since 'reading a sample of translation' came as the top method from selecting a book for translation also proves the importance of the 'content' factor.

As regards the mean scores of items within each domain, size seems to matter the most for the domain *Titling and Contents*. The reason could be that bulky books are not very attractive for readers, and even more so when those books are translated. There have been complaints that reading is not a very popular hobby in the local and regional contexts of this area of the world; relatively small-sized books would be a good beginning for those who would like to read books in general and translated books in particular.

This result, however, is not supported by the literature surveyed since book size or volume did not seem to matter with respect to selecting a translation title. On the contrary, as indicated by Alberg (2014), collections of short stories are now in wide circulation.

The fact that "the book to be translated should be in Arabic" ranked the highest for the "Book Specifications & Freshness" domain seems to contradict the world trends reported in the literature surveyed where translation into rather than from European languages is on the rise. However, this may reflect a desire by the Arab respondents to present Arab culture and cultural products to the other. It may also reflect apprehensiveness about the dominance of other cultures by translating books into Arabic while disregarding Arabic legacy. Respondents do not seem to count very much on the translator's specialization for translating books in his/her respective area. It reflects a belief into one-translator-fits-all perception.

The attractiveness of the book in terms of being entertaining scored the highest compared to the other items for the domain "Books Topics". This seems to suggest that the process of selecting a book for translation must cater for the general rather than specialized readership, which is confirmed by the fact that the item "The book must seriously address a vital topic" got the lowest rank. This is confirmed even further by the fact that the highest-ranking item for the "Authorship and Publication" domain is "the book should be classified among bestselling books", which demonstrates the importance of a book's media recognition and publicization.

In view of the findings of the study, it seems that the issue of revising a book is not very important for taking a decision about a selecting a book for translation. Since reviewing, a translated book is a highly specialized work and most respondents did not have the chance to attempt the process, it seems natural that people in this category would not have a say about the process of selecting a book for translation. Revising a book for translation is an expert work that is often optional and depends on having wide experience on the part of the reviser. Moreover, there is no consensus about the limits of revising process itself. Martin (2007, p. 58) states that the term revision (reviewing) is not precisely defined and that there is "confusing array of would-be (but not-quite) synonyms increasingly used to express the revision concept, viz. cross-reading, checking, re-reading, proofing, reviewing, QC-ing, etcetera". Yi-yi Shih (2006, p. 295) is almost of the same view about the issue arguing that "there is not even a precise definition of 'revision".

As regards the third question, "Are there any significant differences in the characteristics of QB from the point of view of KSUS due to gender, qualification, and experience in translating a book, reviewing a translated book, or attending a conference devoted to translation?", the study shows a significant difference between the two mean scores of the questionnaire attributed to the variable of gender favoring males. The fact that most translators who apply for translating books in the TC are males and that most translated work revisers are males would explain the findings in this connection. In a developing community such as the TC context, males are generally more ready to embark on learning

opportunities in general and take initiatives towards translation. Moreover, translation is an enduring work that requires devoting much time whether during work hours or at home, and given the pressures on women to dedicate home time to husband and children makes men more accommodating and more ready to try and consequently show more interest in translation. This social issue probably needs to be taken care of.

The results show a significant difference between means of the questionnaire attributed to the variable "Have you ever participated in a translation conference?" Conference attendance is one of the issues that sharpen the abilities of faculty in general. Conferences offer opportunities for faculty to widen knowledge horizons and, thus, open up their eyes to what is needed in the academic field. The activity of attending conferences is a part of professionalization and it is not strange to find conferences attendees more decisive about the types of books to be selected for translation. KSUS attending conferences are likely to come across the products of other educational institutions and research centers, which is bound to offer good opportunities for recognizing good books and selecting them for translation.

5. Conclusion

In the light of the study findings and the discussion above, a lot of conclusions may be drawn. The definition of QB is still argumentative as literature on it is not enough if it is not rare. Thus, there is a need to hold conferences or organize more workshops and seminars to tackle what QB is, and what its characteristics are. The study is a step on the way of defining QB. Given the results of the study, selecting books for translation has to focus on choosing books that are internationally renowned and those newly published in view of the information explosion the world is witnessing and the need to keep the readers updated about fresh knowledge. In the light of the operational definition given of a QB in the study, there seems to be a preference of specialized types of books compiled by famous authors. The study, therefore, recommends careful inspection of books so that a list of famous authors and specialized books be regularly drawn up. This requires maintaining close contact with world publishing houses. However, this should not be an exhaustive issue since books have to be well inspected in terms of real information they carry, and formal aspects (title, size, etc.) should not be given much attention when it comes to proposing books for translation. Since the issue of gender is particularly prominent in this study, female staff should be encouraged to voice their views about selecting books for translation. This can be enhanced by holding workshops, seminars, mini-conferences that raise their awareness to the process; even a quota can be assigned for them to choose their favorite titles for translation. Finally, since Arabic has been flooded by translation from other languages, this study gives a wake-up call for considering translation Arabic works to other languages.

References
Alberg, D. (2014, August 24). British readers lost in translations as foreign literature sales boom. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from   http://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/aug/24/british-readers-translations-foreign-literature-sales-boom-stieg-larsson-jo-nesbo.
Alkasimi, A. (2006). *Torjomiat [Traditology], "Athar Attarjamati Fi Ma'arifat ath-that wa idraku al akhar' [The impact of translation on the perception of self and recognition of the other]*. Rabat: Rabat Edition of Racines.
Anderson, H. (2014). Why won't English speakers read books in translation? *BBC Culture Section* [online]. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.com/culture/story/20140909-why-so-few-books-in-translation
Baker, M. (2001). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Retrieved from http://acc.teacmideast.org/texts.phd?module_id=1&reading_id=1
Beattie, S. (2014). Books in translation take off in the U.K.; can they do the same in Canada? *Quill and Quire*. Retrieved from http://www.quillandquire.com/book-culture/2014/08/25/books-in-translation-take-off-in-the-u-k-can-they-do-the-same-in-canada/.
Büchler, A. (ed.). (2012). *Literature across Frontiers: Survey of key national organizations supporting literary exchange and translation in Europe developed by the Budapest Observatory.* Mercator Institute for Media, Languages and Culture, Aberystwyth University, Wales, UK.
Marco, J. (2007). The terminology of translation. Epistemological, conceptual and intercultural problems and their social consequences. *Target* 19(2), 255-269.
Martin, T. (2007). Managing risks and resources: a down-to-earth view of revision. *The Journal of Specialised Translation* [on-line serial], 8. Retrieved from http://www.jostrans.org.
Robinson, S. (2014) *Do books in translation sell? A chestnut considered*. Melville House. Retrieved from http://www.mhpbooks.com/do-books-in-translation-sell-a-chestnut-considered.
Snell-Hornby, M. (2007). What's in a name? On metalinguistic confusion in Translation Studies. Target, 19(2), 313-325.
Yi-yi Shih, C. (2006). Revision from translators' point of view. An interview study. *Target 18(2)*: 295-312.
Zakhir, M. (2008). *The history of translation*. Retrieved from http:// www. translationdirectory.com/ articles/article1695.