

The Effect of Individual Differences on Learners' Translation Belief in EFL Learning

Amir Farzad Ashouri (Corresponding author)

M.A. Islamic Azad University, Najafabad branch, Iran

E-mail: amir_f_ashouri@yahoo.com

Zahra Fotovatnia

PhD, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad branch, Iran

E-mail: Z_fotovatnia@phu.iaun.ac.ir

Abstract

This study investigated learners' beliefs about translation and the effect of two variables of individual differences, risk taking and tolerance of ambiguity, on the mentioned variable. The participants of the study were 120 EFL learners homogenized through Oxford Placement Test. They received three questionnaires on translation belief, risk-taking and ambiguity tolerance whose validation was established and they were all in Likert-scale. Chi-square analysis reveals that participants had positive belief about translation. In order to determine the effect of risk taking on translation belief and an independent samples *t*-test was run which reveals negative effect of risk-taking on translation belief. In other words, risk-averse learners were found to have positive belief about translation. On the other hand, risk-takers were found to have negative belief about translation. Analysis of *t*-test on the effect of ambiguity tolerance on translation belief reveals that this individual characteristic had no effect on learner's translation belief.

Keywords: Translation belief, Risk-takers, Risk-averse learners, Tolerance of ambiguity

1. Introduction

Some foreign language educators may consider translation as an important way to ensure students' comprehension and an important writing exercise, but other teachers may totally discourage the use of the translation in the classroom (Liao, 2006). As Malmkjar (1998) stated, 'the issue of the use of translation in language teaching is one on which most language teachers have a view' (p.1), but practically, teachers' views are not strongly in favor of it. Since the turn of the twentieth century, many theoretical works and practical methods in language teaching have assumed that a second language (L2) should be taught without any indications to the learners' first language (L1). It has become a popular belief among teachers that the translation of L1 inhibits the acquisition of L2 (Malmkjar, 1998).

Ambiguity tolerance, as one of the variables of individual differences or characteristics was defined as perception of inadequate information to clearly understand stimuli which means range of reactions extending along a continuum from total agreement to total disagreement (McLain, 1993). Risk-taking, another variable of individual differences, was defined as eagerness to try something novel and different without putting the primary focus on success or failure regardless of embarrassment in learning (Brown, 2001). These individual differences are the reflections of people personality and they affect many aspects of people's life, learning included (Ely, 1989). In spite of the effect of individual differences on the proficiency of learners, the role of individual characteristics of learners on their beliefs about translation is worth studying.

Although a number of researchers have considered using translation in language teaching, little attention has been given specifically to the effect of individual differences on learners' belief about translation, which is, student's particular beliefs about translation and the effects of learners' characteristics such as risk-taking and ambiguity tolerance. EFL learners and teachers have different perspectives toward translation and its use in their learning and teaching activities. While most teachers ignore the role of translation in EFL learning, learners on the other hand insist on a positive role of translation in their learning (Politzer 1983; O'Malley et al. 1985b; Chamot et al. 1987).

Therefore, a gap is noticeable between what teachers consider to be important and what learners consider to be helpful for their learning and teaching activities. It appears that learners very often have a positive belief about translation to comprehend, remember, and produce a foreign language. However, little research attention seems to be dedicated to a consideration of the use of translation in language learning from the learner's points of view. In

research on learners' beliefs about foreign language learning, researchers have suggested that learners' beliefs would likely affect the way they use learning strategies and learn a foreign language (Horwitz, 1988; Wenden, 1987). Wenden's study illustrates how beliefs affected learners' choice of strategies, their attending pattern, criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of a language learning activity, and their planning priorities. Based on her survey of foreign language students, Horwitz also argues that some preconceived beliefs are likely to restrict the learners' range of strategy use.

Although some studies were carried out on the effect of individual characteristics on the process of translation or translator (Reiss, 2000; Muller, 2007), there have not been comprehensive research studies on the effect of individual differences on translation belief specifically in learning situations. Each group of learners may have different beliefs about translation based on the degree of risk taking and ambiguity tolerance. Investigating the issue may reveal if there is any effect of these individual differences on EFL learners' belief about translation and show which group of learners with specific individual characteristics has the positive or negative belief about translation.

1.1 Review of literature

1.1.1 Individual differences and translation

The study of individual differences is a branch of personality psychology that has developed from just attempting to understand personality by observing small samples of subjects (Rogers, 1967) to searching for a way to objectively compare and test individual differences, an approach known as trait theory (Cooper, 2002, p. 102). According to Cooper, trait theories are now broadly believed to be the most useful means of studying personality, although which trait theory is the most appropriate is still debated amongst personality psychologists (2002). William's (2005) study indicated the cultural significance, one of the variables of individual differences which is closely related to other variables like ambiguity tolerance and risk-taking, in the act of translation. The study defined culture as life itself, neither simply as knowledge nor as manner. From this point of view, translation referred to the act of negotiating cultural and linguistic codes, and the perspective supported Kramsch's theory: "nature, culture and language are interrelated" (p.24). In short, William's study indicates that a lack of cultural knowledge can cause misuse or misunderstanding of language, and the aspect negatively affects the performance of translation.

1.1.2 Ambiguity tolerance in learning

A definition of tolerance for ambiguity must separately define and integrate the concepts ambiguity and tolerance. Tolerance/intolerance describes a range of reactions extending along a continuum from rejection to attraction. The common feature of any ambiguous stimulus is a lack of information. Ambiguity describes the perception of inadequate information to clearly understand stimuli or "their temporal or spatial interrelationships" (McLain, 1993, p.183). Ambiguous stimuli may be perceived as new and unfamiliar, unpredictable, or may be too complex to understand. Ambiguous stimuli may also be perceived as having more than one contrary interpretation. (McLain, 1993)

Many of the ambiguous situations are also common in language learning and it happens in the classroom with a group of students (Ely, 1995) or individually when people engage in self-instructed language study (White, 1999). This is simply because both linguistic input and cultural knowledge is very likely to represent one of the ambiguous situations. For example, in the simplest sense when students encounter new lexical and grammatical structures, they often face shortage or even a lack of information, multiple meanings, vagueness, and so on (Grace, 1998). Ambiguity in language learning can cause anxiety (Ehrman, 1999), which may create "a degree of apprehension and frustration which may be deleterious to progress" (White, 1999, p.451).

Apart from linguistic forms and text structures which students are supposed to tackle for successful comprehension of texts, they often have to carry on with their incomplete background knowledge (Alderson, 2000) and compensate for the lack of essential elements to complete the task of comprehension (Grabe and Stoller, 2002). Furthermore, people from different cultural backgrounds bring different outlooks and habits to the language learning environment, which entails establishing shared meanings. Making sense of different cultural standards can also cause ambiguity (Lustig and Koester, 1993), and increase the cognitive load of learning which may negatively influence reading comprehension (Alptekin, 2006).

The level of ambiguity tolerance may also influence the use of certain language learning strategies. Ehrman and Oxford (1990) found that learners with intuitive kinds of personalities who have moderately higher levels of ambiguity tolerance reported that they often guessed from context while sensing type of personalities with lower ambiguity tolerance reported that they disliked having to guess from context. More recently, Nishimo's (2007) case study of two Japanese learners of English also demonstrated the influence of ambiguity tolerance on the use of strategies. The first student who was comfortable with ambiguity did not want to use a dictionary in extensive

reading and wanted to carry on without looking up unfamiliar words. However, the second student who was not so tolerant “first figured out the sentence structure, checked the meanings of unknown words, and then translated it into Japanese” (Nishimo, 2007) to reduce any possible ambiguity.

Some of the studies conducted about ambiguity tolerance tried to investigate the relationship between these individual characteristics and other learning skills. Using Budner's Scale of Tolerance-Intolerance of Ambiguity with a group of high school students learning French as a foreign language, Naiman et al. (1978) reported that tolerance for ambiguity scores were significantly correlated with scores on a listening comprehension task and an imitation task. Chapelle (1983) used Norton's (1975) Measure of Ambiguity Tolerance and a group of subjects from different language backgrounds (Arabic, Japanese, and Spanish) to investigate the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and success in learning English as a second language. The results of her study showed no significant correlations between ambiguity tolerance and beginning of semester language scores but the correlations between ambiguity tolerance and end-of-semester scores were, in almost every case, significantly positive. She reported that ambiguity tolerance was positively related to end-of-semester scores on a multiple choice grammar test, a dictation test, and parts of a speaking test. She concluded that "an individual's ambiguity tolerance is related to his progress in some aspects of L2 learning"(p.94).

Lori (1990) investigated the relationships that exist among ambiguity tolerance, self-concept, English achievement, Arabic achievement, overall school achievement, and students' attitudes toward learning English as a foreign language. He collected data from 280 high school senior enrolled in 13 high schools in Bahrain. He measured their tolerance of ambiguity by using the MAT-15 (Norton, 1975). The result of data analysis showed that tolerance of ambiguity correlated significantly but very low with English achievement, Arabic achievement, self concept, and overall school achievement. The result also showed that tolerance of ambiguity correlated significantly low with attitudes toward learning English as a foreign language.

Research into tolerance of ambiguity so far has focused on its relationship to other personality traits (Ehrman, 1999), language achievement and reading comprehension (Lori, 1990). The results of these studies indicate that there may be positive correlation between the degree of tolerance and the levels of language achievement. For example, they illustrate that tolerance of ambiguity is one of the factors associated to end-of-term achievement in multiple choice grammar tests, dictation tests, and parts of speaking tests. Tolerance of ambiguity has also been shown to be related to achievement in listening comprehension and imitation tasks by Naiman et. al. (1978) and Lori (1990), too, identified a positive correlation between tolerance of ambiguity and English achievement.

Related to this study, El-Koumy (2000) found a positive relationship between tolerance of ambiguity and reading comprehension. Having classified learners into 3 levels, he administered a general tolerance of ambiguity scale (Norton, 1975) and reading comprehension subtest of TOEFL. His results showed that the middle ambiguity tolerance group outscored both the low and high tolerance groups. There was no difference between the high and low tolerance groups.

Tolerance of ambiguity has also been shown to be one of the important affective factors in reading. Kondo-Brown (2006) identified avoidance of ambiguity as a factor in her search of understanding affective variables in reading ability. Correlational analysis revealed a close relationship between ambiguity tolerance and intrinsic motivation. She stated, “Only those with higher intrinsic orientation are more likely to work at reading Japanese. These students are also more likely to be tolerant of ambiguity in learning Japanese and adopt analytical approaches in studying kanji”. This was somehow in line with what Chapelle (1983) described as longer endurance on tasks when students had higher levels of ambiguity tolerance.

1.1.3 Risk-taking in learning

According to Brown (2001), Risk taking is the willingness to venture into the unknown. It is an eagerness to try something new and different without putting the primary focus on success or failure. Learning is the reward of taking risk. Linguists defined risk-taking as an ability of being eager to try out new information intelligently regardless of embarrassment in linguistics. Risk-taking is not only the third affective area in personality factors but also one of the important parts in learning second language. Because of a strong intention of achieving success on learning, language learners are willing to absorb new knowledge from their teacher. The easiest way to interact with teachers is to take the risk. Although it may be too awkward to make a mistake, a good learner should require this trait to succeed in Second Language Acquisition (Brown, 2001). According to Brown, “interaction requires the risk of failing to produce intended meaning, of failing to interpret intended meaning, of being laughed at, of being shunned or rejected. The rewards, of course, are great and worth the risks” (2001). In other words, risk-taking is a crucial interactive process to learn a language in the ESL/EFL classroom.

Hofstede (1997) conducted comprehensive studies on the effect of cultural dimension in many countries. He

reported:

Iran's highest ranking of Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) indicates the society's low level of tolerance for uncertainty. In an effort to minimize or reduce this level of uncertainty, strict rules, laws, policies, and regulations are adopted and implemented. The ultimate goal of this population is to control everything in order to eliminate or avoid the unexpected. As a result of this high Uncertainty Avoidance characteristic, the society does not readily accept change and is very risk adverse.

According to Dufeu (1994, pp. 89-90), "To reinforce risk-taking, it is necessary to develop an ample affective framework to overcome learner's anxiety of learning the target language". Therefore, removing learners' own uneasiness is the only way to improve the quality of taking risks about the language. Furthermore, high risk taking will yield positive results in second language learning (Brown, 2000). Therefore, "successful second language learners would like to make ready and accurate guesses" (Brown, 2000, p.150). In brief, language learning which is involved with risk-taking can be succeeded positively for second language learners.

McClelland (1961) stated that some learners recognize the chance of reaching goals as being medium-risk tasks, and respond to such challenges on the basis of a past history of success with such tasks. Unsuccessful learners, as McClelland argues, will tend to be those who set extremely high or low goals for themselves, with neither of these outcomes likely to lead to continuous learning. A study by Ely (1989) suggested that class proficiency, class participation, and risk-taking are inter-dependent factors. Aptitude and motivation are thought to influence both classroom participation and proficiency. A result of this study led to the assumption that risk-taking learners participate more in the classroom and consequently, they may increase their language proficiency, especially if it is considered that language proficiency appears to increase remarkably by more use of the language.

Skehan(1989) noticed that within the TESOL field, risk-taking has been seen, in situations that involved social interaction, as likely to increase opportunities to hear language and obtain participation. Risk-takers were not afraid to get involved in any kind of interaction with others, to speak language, and use output and engage in functional practice because they preferred what they wanted to say without worrying about the small details or errors. A risk-taker is more likely to be the one who takes his existing language system to the limit. Such a learner is more likely to change and more resistant to fossilization.

1.1.4 *Learners' Beliefs about Translation*

Few studies specifically examined learners' beliefs about using translation in their foreign language learning, but it could be expected that students may have different views on this issue. In one instance, Horwitz (1988) found that the majority of German and Spanish students (70% and 75%) reported the idea that learning a foreign language is mainly a matter of learning to translate from English, while 15% of the French students agreed or strongly agreed to the same report. Also, Kern (1994) stated that even though foreign language teachers and learners realized the unavoidability of mental translation in reading L2 texts, both groups often view translation as an undesirable strategy. In addition, in comparing the use of both translation and context in learning L2 vocabulary, Prince (1996) observed that learning vocabulary in context is broadly perceived by teachers as a desirable strategy, but students often do not accept it and believe that the translation learning, with the new word which are linked to its native language equivalent, is more effective in learning new vocabulary.

In students' views about L2 writing through translation versus writing directly in the L2, Kobayashi and Rinnert (1992) reported that 88% of the higher proficiency Japanese participants favored direct composition to translation, whereas 53% of lower proficiency students also preferred direct composition. Some students said that they preferred direct writing because they wanted to be able to think in English. In the same subject Liao (2006) stated," because students have often been encouraged by their teachers to think in the target language, some students may believe that it is harmful for them to depend on their native language while learning and using the target language"(p.195).

Hsieh (2000) found that translation benefited Taiwanese students' English reading in terms of increasing their reading comprehension, reading strategies, vocabulary learning, and cultural background knowledge. He gave a questionnaire regarding attitudes and thoughts toward translation to Taiwanese college students at the end of one year of EFL instruction using a translation method. Among 52 participants, 85% reported that translating can help them pay attention to the coherence and contextualization of English reading text; 73% of the students reported that they learned the importance of their native language (Chinese) through translation; 65% said that they became more aware of multiple meanings of an English word; and 62% reported that translation helped expand vocabulary knowledge and reading skills. Liao (2006) conducted both quantitative and qualitative surveys on 351 Taiwanese students on their belief about translation. Liao (2006) reported participants believed that translation helped them acquire English language skills like reading, writing, speaking, vocabulary, Idioms and phrases.

This study aimed to investigate learners' belief about translation in order to see whether they had positive or negative attitudes toward using translation in their EFL learning. Two variables of individual differences were studied under the question of whether they had any effect on learners' belief about translation or not. The study measured learners' degree of ambiguity tolerance and risk-taking and investigated their effect on their belief about translation. In other words, the study sought to recognize whether groups of risk-takers and risk-averse learners along with those with high and low tolerance for ambiguity had different beliefs about translation or not.

1.2 Research questions

Considering the theoretical and empirical issues discussed above, the present study attempted to provide plausible answers to the following questions:

1. Do Iranian EFL learners have positive or negative beliefs about using translation in learning English?
2. Does risk-taking have any effect on learner's belief about translation?
3. Does ambiguity tolerance have any effect on learner's belief about translation?

2. Methodology

2.1 Participants

The participants of the study were 120 Iranian learners of English whose age ranged from 15 to 25 years with the average of 22.4 years and they studied at intermediate level. They were homogenized through an Oxford placement test by selecting those whose scores on the test were one SD above and one SD below the mean. Males and females were equally represented; none of them had any experience of being in English speaking countries. Participants had not been exposed to the target questionnaires or subjects under investigation and none of them had any experience of translation professionally or academically. Brief instruction was given exactly before the questionnaires were given to participants.

2.2 Instruments

This study involved four sets of tests concerning risk-taking, ambiguity tolerance and translation belief as well as an Oxford placement test. First, Oxford placement test was used in order to homogenize learners based on their English language skill. In order to measure two variables of individual differences, two sets of questionnaires, one for measuring ambiguity tolerance and the other for measuring risk taking of learners, were used. Test of tolerance for ambiguity developed by McLain (1993) contains 22 items. Test of risk-taking which contained 26 items was developed by the Education and Training Organization of Iran, counseling and psychological center. For translation beliefs measurement, the Inventory for Beliefs about Translation (IBT) which contained 24 items and designed by Liao (2006) was used. All of the Questionnaires were translated to Farsi in order to help all students read and answer the tests adequately. All questionnaires were in Likert scale. The internal consistency of all questionnaires was calculated using Chronbach's alpha by SPSS version 17 and validity of the questionnaires was determined by experts. Reliability of all tests was ranged from .83 to .88.

2.3 Procedures

The research was conducted in Gooyesh English language institute in Tehran. The participants were homogenized through OPT with one standard above and below the mean. The instruction and the time for answering each test were clarified, and then the three sets of tests of ambiguity for tolerance, risk-taking and translation belief were given to them. Beforehand, a pilot was conducted in order to know about the clarity of instructions and questions, effectiveness of data gathering and procedures. Participants were notified to put information about name, age and gender on the papers in order to identify those with high and low ambiguity tolerance and risk taking and their belief about translation. Participants were divided into two groups of risk-taker and risk-averse based on the criteria score designed by the test developer which make those with scores higher than 100 to be risk-takers and those with scores below 70 to be risk-averse learners. For the last research question, participants were divided into two groups with high and low ambiguity tolerance based on the criteria of scores above 1 standard deviation and below -1 SD.

3. Results

In this study, data gathered from four sets of questionnaires were analyzed by means of chi-square and independent samples *t*-test. Chi-square was used in order to answer the first research question which investigated learners' translation belief. Independent samples *t*-test was used to answer the rest of research questions, which addressed the effect of risk-taking and ambiguity tolerance on learners' translation belief.

For translation belief analysis, the frequency of each scale was measured and displayed in Table 1. There are five level responses which ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. As the data show, about 56 percent of level

responses were chosen to agree which indicates that participants had a positive belief about translation. Chi-square was performed to investigate the differences of participant choices of each level response regarding their translation belief in order to address the first research question (Morgey, 1999). Analysis of chi-square (goodness of fit) indicates that the difference between response levels is significant, $\chi^2(4, n=1824) = 1652.84$, $p = .000$.

To answer the second research question, participants were divided into two groups of risk-taker and risk-averse learners based on the criteria score designed by the test developer which make those with scores higher than 100 to be risk-takers and those with scores below 70 to be risk-averse learners. As shown in table 2, two groups of risk-takers and risk-averse learners performed differently. Risk-averse learners' mean is 114, which is significantly higher than risk-taker learners' mean. An independent samples *t*-test was run using the scores of risk-taking and translation belief and the result shows a significant difference between risk-taker group and risk-averse group on their belief about translation, $t(32.2) = 7.2$, $p = .000$.

In order to answer third research questions, participants were divided into two groups with high and low ambiguity tolerance based on the criteria of scores above 1 standard deviation and below -1 (McLain, 1993). The mean for low ambiguity tolerance group is 105, which is slightly higher than the mean for high ambiguity tolerance group which is 102 as shown in Table 3. An independent samples *t*-test was run using the scores of ambiguity tolerance and translation belief and the result shows no significant difference between high ambiguity tolerance group and low ambiguity tolerance group on their belief about translation, $t(28) = .458$, $p = .650$.

4. Discussion

Based on the cumulative distribution on each scale, the chi-square revealed most learners had a positive belief about using translation strategies in their EFL learning. Finding of the study is somehow consistent with Prince's (1996) study, which notified students believed translation to be more effective than context learning in learning new words. Also the findings were similar to Hsieh's (2000) study which concluded that students thought translation helped them with reading comprehension and vocabulary learning which can be somehow accounted as their positive belief about translation. Liao (2006) conducted the interview about learner's translation belief and came up with the same results:

(1) Translation can help students comprehend English; (2) translation can help students to check whether their comprehension is correct; (3) translation eases memory constraints in memorizing more words, idioms, grammar, and sentence structures; (4) translation can help students develop and express ideas in another language; and (5) translation can help reduce learning anxiety and enhance motivation to learn English. (p.201)

Analysis of the data for the effect of risk-taking and ambiguity tolerance on learners' translation belief confirmed that risk-taking had an effect on learners' belief about translation. This indicates that high risk-takers had a negative belief about translation and its use while risk-averse learners had a positive belief about translation. If we assume risk-takers as being eager to try out new information intelligently regardless of embarrassment in linguistics (Brown, 2001), we can consider risk-takers as a type of learners who are willing to learn and use target language without transferring it into their mother tongue for the sake of embarrassments or complexities involved. On the other hand, risk-averse learners mostly avoid uncertain situations and try to recheck their learning with their mother tongue even if it took more time and effort as a result they might use translation to compensate their uncertainties.

Hofstede (1997) in his comprehensive study on the effect of cultural dimension on many countries reported Iranian to be mostly risk-averse in many aspects of their life. Being aware of individual characteristics of the population might be useful in determining the type of learning strategies used by learners. On the other hand, teachers should define the level of risk-taking which is appropriate for learning situation and according to these levels prescribe or inhibit strategies used by learners. For instance, Brown (2000) considered high risk-taking as a positive characteristic which could enhance learning; on the other hand, McClelland (1961) stated that medium risk-takers were more successful in learning. Ely (1986) stated risk-takers participate more in the class and as a result, they may increase their language proficiency. Skehan (1989) reported risk-takers were not afraid to participate in interaction and consequently they have the better speaking skill.

The study shows there was no difference between those with high and those with low ambiguity tolerance in their belief about translation. Those with low tolerance for ambiguity might have a positive belief about translation because they consider English as a novel and unfamiliar context compared with their mother tongue, conversely, students with high ambiguity tolerance are expected to feel more comfortable with learning a new language without mediation of L1 as a result they might not have a positive belief about translation (Ely, 1995). However analysis of the data verified the hypothesis that ambiguity tolerance had no effect on learners' translation belief. Although the significant effect of ambiguity tolerance on learners' translation was rejected, it does not mean that ambiguity tolerance does not have any effect on other aspects of EFL learning. Investigating the effect of ambiguity tolerance

on other learning strategies could give us clear picture especially on the realm of language proficiency. For instance Chapelle's (1983) study indicated that an individual's ambiguity tolerance was related to his progress in some aspects of L2 learning. Naiman et. al. (1978) and Lori (1990), also, identified a positive correlation between tolerance of ambiguity and English achievement.

As Ely (1995) stated, the ideal case for the learners is that to be on the midpoint in their tolerance of ambiguity which means to be neither high nor low in ambiguity tolerance. El-Koumy (2000) reported the same result which indicated moderately tolerant students were more successful than both high and low students in the process of reading in a foreign language. However, Kazamina (1999) stated that defining the midpoint fully is not that easy. All levels of ambiguity tolerance should be considered and the effect of other individual traits which are closely related to this trait better to be measured. On the other hand, Alptekin (2006) reported that high ambiguity tolerance negatively influenced reading comprehension.

Investigating the effect of risk-taking and ambiguity tolerance as the two variables of individual characteristics of the learners reported one variable to be effective on learners' belief about translation and the other one to be not effective. This might give the impression that first of all, individual differences is effective on learners' translation belief, however effectiveness of the type of individual differences under study is important. Some variables might be highly effective and some might not as in the current study for the effect of risk-taking and ambiguity tolerance. Learners' positive belief about translation can emerge in different aspects in the class ranging from using specific types of strategies to reactions of the learners towards the approach prescribed by the teacher. Learners with different beliefs may use different approach in their learning.

5. Conclusions

The study indicated that EFL learners had a positive belief in EFL learning. They mostly agreed that they had a positive belief about the role of translation in their learning activities. Also, the study reported that risk-taking affected learners' translation belief significantly in the way that risk-averse learners had a positive belief which is in contrast with risk-takers who had negative belief about translation. Analysis of the data on the effect of ambiguity tolerance on learners' translation belief indicated that ambiguity tolerance had no effect on learner's translation belief. As a result, the study reported one variable to be significantly effective on translation belief and the other variable of individual differences not to be effective.

Regarding the limitation of the study, the size of the population under study could be larger, or different region of the country could be investigated in order to have a better picture of learners' beliefs about translation and the effect of risk-taking and ambiguity tolerance. Due to the limitation of time and fund, analyzing larger population or conducting research in different cities was not possible. Another limitation of the study was the number of individual differences under study. It would give us better image of the effect of individual differences on learners' belief about translation if we addressed more variables of individual differences in a way to create a whole picture of personality traits of the learners. Dealing with more than two factors of individual differences would make the research more complex, analysis of the data more difficult and number of research questions too many.

For further researches, other variables of individual characteristics like self-esteem, introversion, extroversion can be accounted to be investigated. Learners can be classified into different proficiency levels in order to know about learners' beliefs in different levels. Current study dealt with translation belief from learners' perspective. Another research could investigate teachers' belief about translation or other learning strategies in the class.

Acknowledgment

I am grateful to Dr. Omid Tabatabaie for his helpful comments on this article.

References

- Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alptekin, C. (2006). Cultural familiarity in inferential and literal comprehension in L2 reading. *System*, 34, 494-508.
- Beebe, L.M. (1983). *Risk-taking and the language learner*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. (pp. 149-150). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
- Budner J. (1962). Tolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable. *Journal of Personality*. 30, 29-40.
- Chamot, A., O'Malley, J. M., Küpper, L., & Impink-Hernandez, M. V. (1987). *A study of learning strategies in foreign language instruction: First year report*. Rosslyn, VA: InterAmerican Research Associates.
- Chapelle, C. (1983). *The relationship between ambiguity tolerance and success in acquiring English as a second language in adult learners*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.

- Clifford, M. M., and Chou, F. C. (1991) Effects of Payoff and Task Context on Academic Risk Taking, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83.4, 499-507.
- Cooper, C. (2002). *Individual differences*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dufeu, B. (1994). *Teaching Myself*. Oxford: Oxford. University Press.
- Ehrman, M. & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *Modern Language Journal*, 74, 311-326.
- Ehrman, M. (1999). Ego boundaries and tolerance of ambiguity in second language learning. In Arnold, J. (ed.). *Affect in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- El-Koumy, A. S. A. (2000). Differences in FL reading comprehension among high-, middle-, and low-ambiguity tolerance students. *Paper presented at the national symposium on English language teaching in Egypt*, March 21-23, 2000, Ain Shams University, Egypt.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ely, C. (1989). Tolerance of ambiguity and use of second language strategies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22, 437-445.
- Ely, C.M. (1995). Tolerance of ambiguity and the teaching of ESL. In Reid, J. M. (ed.). *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Grabe, W. And Stoller, F.L. (2002) *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Malaysia: Pearson Education.
- Grace, C. (1998). Personality type, tolerance of ambiguity, and vocabulary retention in CALL. *CALICO Journal*, 15 (1-3), 19-46.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultural dimensions*. Retrieved on February 10, 2009 from <http://www.geert-hofstede.com>
- Horwitz, E.K. (1988). The Beliefs about Language Learning of Beginning University Foreign Language Students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72, 283-94.
- Hsieh, L. T. (2000). The Effects of Translation on English Vocabulary and Reading Learning, paper presented at the Ninth International Symposium on English Teaching, Taipei, Taiwan, ROC.
- Kazamina, V. (1999). How tolerant are Greek EFL learners of foreign language ambiguities. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics*, 7, 69-78. Retrieved on February 11, 2009 from: <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/linguistics/WPL/WP1999/kazamina> .
- Kern, R. (1994). The Role of Mental Translation in Second Language Reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 441-61.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (1992). Effects of First Language on Second Language Writing: Translation versus Direct Composition. *Language Learning*, 42, 183-215.
- Kondo-Brown, K. (2006). Affective variables and Japanese L2 reading ability. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 18 (1), 55-71.
- Liao, P. S. (2006). EFL Learners' Beliefs about and Strategy Use of Translation in English Learning, *RELC Journal* 37(2), 191-215.
- Lori, A. A. (1990). *Self-concept, tolerance of ambiguity, English achievements, Arabic achievement, and overall school achievement as factor contributing to Bahraini high school seniors' attitudes toward learning English as a foreign language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.
- Lustig, M. & Koester, J. (1993). *Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Malmkjar, K. (1998). *Translation & language teaching: language teaching & translation*. Manchester. UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- McClelland, D.C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- McLain, D. L. (1993). The MSTAT-I: A new measure of an individual's tolerance for ambiguity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53,183-189.
- Mogey, N. (1999). So You Want to Use a Likert Scale?. *Learning technology dissemination initiative*. Heriot-Watt University.
- Moghadasian-Rad, Z. (1994). The Role of Risk-taking in EFL Reading Comprehension. An Unpublished MA Thesis. Tehran University.
- Muller, M. (2007). What's in a word? Problematizing translation between languages. *Area*, 39 (2), 206-213.

- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H. & Todesco, A. (1978). *The Good Language Learner*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Nishimo, T. (2007). Beginning to read extensively: a case study with Mako and Fumi. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 19 (2), 76-105.
- Norton, R.W. (1975). Measurement of ambiguity tolerance. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 39, 607-619.
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Kupper, L. & Russo, R. P. (1985). Learning Strategies Used by Beginning and Intermediate ESL Students. *Language Learning*, 35, 21-46. *Oxford Placement Test*. Retrieved Sep. 10, 2009 from: www.esperanto.ru
- Politzer, R.L. (1983). An Exploratory Study of Self-Reported Language Learning Behaviors and their Relationship to Achievement. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6, 54-68.
- Prince, P. (1996). Second Language Vocabulary Learning: The Role of Context versus Translation as a Function of Proficiency. *Modern Language Journal*, 80, 478-93.
- Reiss, K. (2000). *Translation criticism _ the potentials and limitations* . Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Rogers, C.R. (1967). *On becoming a person*. London: Constable.
- Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second Language learning*. London: Edward Arnold. The Power of Risk-taking. Retrieved Oct. 10, 2009 from <http://www.fchrz.ir>
- Wenden, A.L. (1987). Metacognition: An Expanded View on the Cognitive Abilities of Second Language Learners. *Language Learning*, 37.
- White, C. (1999). Expectations and emergent beliefs of self-instructed language learners. *System*, 27, 443-457.
- Williams, D. S. (2005). *The belief systems of cultural brokers in three minority communities in America*. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Table 1. Observed and expected frequency in translation belief

	Observed N	Expected N	Percent
Strongly Disagree	48	364.8	2.6
Disagree	144	364.8	7.9
No Idea	288	364.8	15.8
Agree	1032	364.8	56.6
Strongly Agree	312	364.8	17.1
Total	1824		

Table 2. Translation belief in risk-takers and risk-averse learners group statistics

Group Risk-Taking	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Translation Belief Risk-averse L	30	114.40	5.685	1.038
Risk-takers	30	81.90	24.034	4.388

Table 3. Translation belief in high and low ambiguity tolerance learners group statistic

Group ambiguity tolerance	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Translation Belief Low Ambiguity Tolerance	15	105.47	20.573	5.312
High ambiguity Tolerance	15	102.07	20.044	5.175