

( )

( )

“ ” .

(  
/ . \*

( )

(102)

(30)

(72)

.

(52)

( )

(0.38)

(3.15)

(0.62)

(4.09)

(0.47)

(3.70)

(0.44)

(3.59)

(0.05 =  $\infty$ )

(3.71)

(0.05 >  $\infty$ )

.

(3.43)

) ( )

$(0.05 < \infty$

.(3.48) (54 .3)

( )

$(0.05 = \infty)$

.(3.49) (3.57)

.(0.675)

.

## ABSTRACT

**Dr. Jamal Abu Maraq/ Hebron University.**

This study aims at investigating the advantages and disadvantages of translation as viewed by instruction staff in Hebron University, Alquds Open University and Polytechnic University at Hebron district. It also aims at showing the differences in the variables (gender, specialization, education degree) at Hebron district. The study tends to reveal the efforts of Muslims philosophers in translation and localization using content analysis and descriptive analysis approach. The sample was 102 (72 males and 30 females). A questionnaire was applied on the sample after investigating its reliability and validity and being piloted on a sample of 52.

The study showed that the total degree for the advantages and disadvantages of translation as viewed by instruction staff is very high as the mean reached (3.70) and a standard deviation of (0.38) and in the rest of the domains of the questionnaire were very high. For example, the mean of human science domain was 4.09 and with a standard deviation of 0.62. In the pure science, the mean was 3.70 with a standard deviation of 0.47. The mean of human and pure science domain was 3.59 and with a standard deviation of 0.44. The results also showed that there is a statistical significant differences on the level (0.05) in the advantages and the disadvantages in the subjects regarding the gender domain since the statistical significance was ( $\alpha < 0.05$ ) for the favor of females (mean 3.71) and males (mean = 3.43).

Results also showed that there are no differences in the specialization domain since the statistical significance was ( $\alpha < 0.05$ ) and this is not statistically significant. The responses means of the total degree were (3.57) compared with (3.49).

Results also showed that there a significant correlation between the two domains of human and pure science. This correlation coefficient was positive (0.675). The study concluded various recommendations and conclusions.

( / ) .

:

.

( ...)

.45

( )

:

.

(156:1979)

.

.

.( )

.

.

.

.

.

(65:2004)

:

.

( 44 :2003 )

( )

.

.4 ( ) :

.

:

( )

Localization

Translation " " :

(Term) Form

:

:

(4:2005)

.

( )

( )

.

.

.

.

(156:1979)

.

:

.



(1983)

...

...

....

.

.

(333:2005) :

"  
.

.

...

"  
.

(50)

.

(18)

:

.

(17:1963)

)

.(

(1500)

(800)

)

.(

:

•

.

•

.

•

.

•

.

•

.

•

.

•

.

•

.

•

.

•

.

:

.1

.

.2

.  
(144:2000)

dissimilation

.

.

( )

.

:

( 801)

185

:

" "

(866)

252

(18: )

.  
 (269:1970)  
 (24:1993) .  
 (                      ) (                      )  
 .  
 (240:                      ) (                      )  
 . " " .  
 : :  
 ( 950 -872) ( 339 -259)  
 .  
 .  
 (7:1970)  
 .  
 (                      )

(19:1981)

(35:1968)

- 420)

:  
( 1030

(4:1991)

(20:1980)

370-)

2

: :  
( 1537 -980) ( 428  
.161

) (13:1993) (38:1980)  
 ) ( . ( .  
 ( ) (133:1970)  
 . 100  
 :  
 : .  
 .  
 .  
 .  
 " "  
 ( ) (121 ) (362 )  
 .  
 .

:

"

"

..!

.

.

450-)

:

:

( 1111 -1058)

( 505

.

:

.

(23:1975-25)

.

(27:1978)

.

(6:1975)

:

.53

(

)

( 520-595)

:

( 1198 -1126)

( )

(38:1978)

(12:1981)

.

.

:

.



.

.

.

:

.

.

(32:1986)

( )

( 832 - 217)

:

( ) ( )

. ...

.

( )

.

.

.

:



:

.

.2007

:

:

-

.

(72)

:

/

-

.

-

(7)

.

.	(22)	(15)	
	(15)		.1
			:
1 :	(5)	:	
			.14 13 8 3
2 :	(4)	:	
			.15 12 4
:	(6)	:	
			.11 10 9 7 6 5
(15 9 8 6 4 3 )			
			.
			.
			.
			:
:1952) Berlsson			
(38 :1973) Van Dalen			(80 -71
			.

:

.

:

(30                      72                      )                      (102)

)

.

(1)                      .(

**(1)**

%		
70.6	72	
29.4	30	
50.9	52	
49.1	50	
30.4	31	
69.6	71	

:

Pearson )

(Correlation  
.(2)

(2)

(Pearson Correlation)

	( )		
0.061	0.191	.	.1
0.008	0.269 **	.	.2
0.000	0.698 **	.	.3
0.000	0.683 **	.	.4
0.000	0.415 **	.	.5
0.000	0.551 **	.	.6
0.000	0.141 **	.	7.
0.000	0.570	.	.8



0.013	0.645 **	.	.9
0.058	* 0.251	.	.10
0.002	0.193	.	.11
0.000	0.312 **	.	.12
0.000	0.406 **	.	.13
0.000	0.366 **	.	.14
0.061	**0.436	.	.15

.(0.000) \*\*

.

:

(Cronbach Alpha) (0.70)

.

:

(T Test)

(Cronbach Alpha)

(PearsonCorrelation)

.SPSS

:

.

:

.(3)

( )

.



(4)

	0.67	4.39		2	.1
	0.77	4.27		1	.2
	0.68	4.20		10	.3
	0.79	4.09		11	.4
	0.75	3.99		5	.5
	0.72	3.82		12	.6
	0.82	3.81		15	.7
	0.71	3.59		13	.8
	0.87	3.57		7	.9

	0.88	3.20		14	.10
	0.92	3.08		6	.11
	0.97	2.92		3	.12
	1.104	2.77		4	.13
	1.278	2.62		9	.14
	1.319	2.39		8	.15

(4)

.

(2)

(0.67)

(4.39)

(1)

(0.77)

(4.27)

(10)

(0.68)

(4.20)

(11)

(0.79)

(4.09)

		(5)
	.(0.75)	(3.99)
(8)		
(2.39)		
(9)		(1.31)
(2.62)		
(4)		(1.27)
(2.77)		
(3)		(1.10)
(2.92)		
	(6)	(0.97)
.(0.92)	(3.08)	

:

:

(0.05 =a)

.

(T.test)

.(5)

( )

(T. test)

. ( = )

.	-2.684		.	.		
			.	.		
.	.		.	.		
			.	.		
.	- .		.	.		
			.	.		
.	- .		.	.		
			.	.		

( )

(0.05 =a)

(0.05> a)

.

(3.43)

(3.71)

(3.98)

(4.35)

. (3.90) (3.62)

(3.79) (3.51)

:

(0.05 =a)

(T.test)

.(6)

( )

(T test)

.808	0.890	48	0.59	4.14	52		
		45	0.65	4.03	50		
.986	1.041	48	0.48	3.75	52		



		45	0.47	3.64	50		
.939	0.204	48	0.44	3.60	52		
		45	0.44	3.58	50		
.604	0.811	48	0.36	3.54	52		
		45	0.41	3.48	50		

( )

(0.05 =a)

. (0.05< a)

.(3.48) (3.54)

(4.14)

(4.03)

(3.64)

(3.75)

(3.60)

(3.58)

.

:

(0.05 =a)

(T.test)

.(7)

( )

(T. test)

.708	0.889	26	0.62	4.17	31		
		67	0.62	4.05	71		
.	0.287	26	0.48	3.72	31		
		67	0.47	3.69	71		
.011	0.988	26	0.54	3.66	31		



:(8)

** 0.000	** 0.675	102	

.(0.05 =a)

\*\*

(8)

(0.05 =a)

(0.000)

(0.675(\*\*))

.

:

:

.

—

—

.

—

.

—

.

—

.

—

.

—

.

:

—

.

.

—

—

.

—

.

—

.

.

	:		
	:		
.	.	:	.1
			.2
	.		
			.3
.	( )	( )	
			.4
		.	
			.5
.			
	:	:	
.			■
			■
.			

	:	
	.	.1
(1970)		.2
	.	
(1963)		.3
.		
	(1978)	.4
"	"	
.		
	(1979)	.5
	.175 156	
:	(2005)	.6
.23 1		
	(1991)	.7
	.	
. 2	( )	.8
	(1978)	.9
	.	
.( )		.10
	(1986)	.11
	.	
. 2	(1970)	.12

	(2005)	.13
	(2000)	.14
	( )	.15
:	" 1989)	.16
	(1987)	.17
	(1975)	.18
	2	.19
	(1981)	.19
	3	.20
	(1983	.20
	( )	.21
3	(1968)	.22
	(2003)	.23
	/	.24
	(1980)	.24
	2	



:	(1988)	.25
3	(1980)	.26
	(1993)	.27
	(1981)	.28
		.2

- :
- Berelsson, B. (1952) content Analysis in communication Research, Glencoe. P.( 71 – 80).
  - Van Dalen.D.b. (1973) Understanding Educational Research. New York, MC Gruw Hill.co.p ,( 38).