



Accepted: April, 2025

Published: July, 2025

## Research Article

# Simplification, Explicitation and Normalization in Translational and Non-translational Persian Children's Literature: A Corpus-Based Study on Chesterman's T-Universal

Sanaz Shakeri<sup>1</sup>, Guiti Mortazavizadeh<sup>2</sup> (Corresponding Author)\*

<sup>1</sup>Department of English Language, Ya.C., Islamic Azad University, Yazd, Iran

Email: shakeri2215@iau.ac.ir

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of English Language, Ya.C., Islamic Azad University, Yazd, Iran

Email: [Mortazavizadeh@iau.ac.ir](mailto:Mortazavizadeh@iau.ac.ir)

Orcid ID: 0000-0003-4688-6540

## ABSTRACT

This study investigated simplification, explicitation and normalization in translated and non-translated children's literature works. A comparable corpus consisting of two translated and two non-translated children's literature works written in the Persian language was selected as the corpus of study to extract the three components of Chesterman's T-Universals. The analysis of frequency distribution showed that non-translated books exhibited significantly higher levels of simplification, Lexical density, and shorter sentence structures compared to translated books. Conversely, the use of connectives was more common in translated texts, suggesting a tendency for explicitation in translation methods. Furthermore, normalization analysis revealed that non-translated books exhibited a greater frequency of known sentences, with a notable preference for active voice compared to translated texts. The study also highlighted that while simplification was the most frequently employed strategy across both non-translated and translated works, explicitation was the least utilized. The results provide valuable insights for both translators and scholars in the field of translation studies, emphasizing the need for a nuanced understanding of how linguistic features are adapted in translation.



**Keywords:** Translation Universals, Chesterman's T-Universal, simplification, explicitation, normalization, translated texts, non-translated texts



## 1. INTRODUCTION

A crucial focus in Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) is the notion of Translation Universals (TUs), a concept that was prominently defined by Mona Baker in her research conducted in 1993. Baker characterized translation universals as fundamental principles governing translation behavior, positing that these features may elucidate the distinctions between translated texts and those originally produced in the target language. According to her, translation universals are linguistic characteristics that commonly manifest in translated texts, as opposed to non-translated ones, and the investigation into translation universals is thought to function independently of the particular language pairs engaged in the translation process. This exploration arose simultaneously with the implementation of corpus linguistics techniques in the field of descriptive translation studies (Chesterman, 2004a). Initially developed in the 1970s, corpus linguistics involves the examination of language through text corpora, i.e., extensive collections of digitized texts selected and organized based on specific criteria such as subject matter, form, or publication date (Taghavi & Hashemi, 2022).

A variety of characteristics that are generally observed in all forms of translated texts have been recognized, primarily through contrastive analyses comparing translations with their original source texts. These features encompass simplification, explicitation, the avoidance of repetition found in the source text, normalization, discourse transfer, and Toury's principle of interference, as well as the distinct distribution of items in the target language (Laviosa-Braithwaite, cited in Baker, 1999). In the past thirty years, numerous studies have examined theories related to translational units (TUs) and provided evidence of specific linguistic characteristics associated with translated language. However, most of this research has focused on Western languages, particularly English. According to Chesterman (2004a), TUs can be classified into two main categories: S-universals and T-universals. S-universals focus on the overarching discrepancies that exist between translations and their source texts. In contrast, T-universals emphasize the distinct linguistic characteristics found in translated texts (target texts) when compared to original texts in the same target language (TL).

According to Chesterman (2012), Translation Universals (TUs) studies should be through comparable corpus. One of the universals, which is not that apart as others is simplification. According to simplification theory, translated texts tend to use simpler language than non-translated texts in the same language. That is the characteristic which can mark a text a translated text, not a non-translated one. Many investigations and studies have been done to justify simplification in various language pairs and in different text genres. Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1983) have proposed five strategies for lexical simplification and Vanderauwera (1985, as cited in Baker, 1999) has mentioned stylistic and syntactic simplification.

As mentioned above, one of the important areas explored in descriptive translation studies is Translation Universals, which focuses on the distinct, prominent characteristics of translated language compared to other types of language. Given the differences among languages, a key inquiry is whether the universal features identified (largely derived from the study of European languages) are also present in non-European languages that have been less explored or overlooked altogether. Translation universals are a controversial issue often examined in Western languages but it is still a question whether the translation strategies used in translated Persian texts are universal.

There have been several corpus-based studies that have examined the use of these so-called universal strategies, namely simplification, normalization and explicitation, in Persian translations of various genres



(e.g., Igder & Karimnia 2010; Alibabae & Salehi, 2012; Taghavi & Hashemi, 2021). However, few studies have delved into the issue of TUs to date, leaving room for further investigation into the characteristics of simplification, explicitation and normalization which is crucial and necessary in translation process. Nevertheless, another shortcoming that exists about TUs in Persian language is that all other studies are on genres other than children's literature and none of them investigated normalization.

Therefore, there is still a need for further research to gain a deeper understanding of how these strategies are employed in practice. Additionally, there is a lack of comprehensive studies that compare the application of these strategies in non-translated Persian children's literature with their use in translated texts. As Laviosa (1998a) examined simplification in translated and non-translated newspaper and narrative texts by using a corpus-based method, in this current study simplification, explicitation and normalization will be examined in translated children's literature by comparing them with the comparable non-translated counterparts through a corpus-based method. This gap in the literature presents a significant problem, as it hinders our ability to fully comprehend the impact of these strategies on the quality and accessibility of children's literature in Persian. To fill this gap, this study compared the non-translated Persian texts (Konserve Ghoul & Goor Shah) with translated texts literature (Charlie va karkhane Shokolat sazi & Mary Poppins) with regard to T-Universals. To do so, the following research questions were formulated:

RQ1. Is simplification hypothesis (lexical density & short sentence) verified in the genre of children's literature?

RQ2. Is explicitation hypothesis (connectives) verified in the genre of children's literature?

RQ3. Do the translated Persian works demonstrate a tendency for normalization (active voice)?

RQ4. Are T-universals supported in translated children's literature genre-Charlie va Karkhane Shokolat Sazi & Mary Poppins?

## **2. LITRATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Translation Universals**

Numerous proposed translation universals, including universal tendencies in the translation process, translation laws, and norms, have been put forward by scholars such as Blum-Kulka (1986), Baker (1993), Laviosa-Braithwaite (1998a), and Toury (1995). The following processes, procedures, or operations have been proposed as potential candidates for translation universals: explicitation, simplification, disambiguation, conventionalization, standardization, levelling out, avoidance of repetition, and the over- or under-representation of elements from either the source or target language, along with the overall emergence of what is referred to as a third code.

In recent decades, there has been significant scholarly interest in the field of translation studies concerning the identification and analysis of what are known as 'universals' or 'characteristics of translation.' It is widely accepted that translations exhibit certain differences from non-translated texts; however, discussions continue regarding the nature and extent of these differences. This ongoing debate is reflected in the diverse theories proposed by various researchers. Notably, Baker (1993) and Toury (1995) present differing perspectives on how to examine the features of translation.

Most translation studies focused on the final product aim to find evidence that either supports or refused the translation universal (TU) hypotheses, which pertain to characteristics of translational language



as the distinct "third code" of translation (Frawley, 1984) purportedly different from both the source and target language. Translation Universals (TUs) which was originally defined by Baker (1993) pertains to characteristic aspects of translated language that distinguish it from other linguistic simplification, explicitation, and normalization. In recent years, TUs have been a significant focus of research and discussion in Descriptive Translation Studies. Some scholars contend that it's impossible to make universal claims about translation, while others argue that the primary value of general laws of translation is their explanatory power. Additionally, others (e.g., Chesterman, 2004a) see universals as a potential pathway to high-level generalizations.

Chesterman (2004a) makes a further distinction between two types of TUs: S-universal and T-universal. One relates to the process from the source to the target text (what he calls 'S-universals') while the latter covers the universal differences between translations (target texts) as compared to non-translated, native TL texts.

## 2.2 Chesterman's Norms

Toury's idea of norms primarily serves as a descriptive tool to recognize translation practices (Munday, 2001). Nonetheless, these seemingly non-prescriptive norms can still elicit social approval or disapproval. Similarly, Chesterman (2004a) asserts that all norms impose a prescriptive influence. He introduces a classification of norms that extends beyond Toury's initial and operational norms, dividing them into two groups: (1) product or expectancy norms and (2) process or professional norms.

1) Product or expectancy norms are shaped by the anticipations of readers regarding what a translation of a certain type should entail (Chesterman, 2004a, p. 64). These norms are influenced by factors such as the dominant translation tradition within the target culture, the discourse norms of similar target language genres, and various economic and ideological factors. Chesterman highlights two key aspects of these norms:

a) Expectancy norms facilitate the evaluation of translations, since readers possess a sense of the 'appropriate' or 'acceptable' qualities of a translation for a specific text type, leading them to favor translators who meet these expectations (Chesterman, 2004a).

b) Expectancy norms can sometimes be "validated by a norm-authority of some kind" (Chesterman, 2004a, p. 66). For instance, a teacher, literary critic, or a publisher's reader can affirm the dominant norm by endorsing translations that adhere to it. An example would be a translation that aligns with target language standards of readability and fluency, while a literary critic might point out flaws in a translation that deviates from this norm, potentially harming the book's reception among general readers. Additionally, as noted by Chesterman (2004a), there may occasionally be conflicts between norm 'authorities' and public opinion.

2) Professional norms govern the translation process itself (ibid) and are subordinate to expectancy norms. Chesterman identifies three types of professional norms:

a) The accountability norm (ibid) pertains to ethical standards, emphasizing the translator's responsibility for the work created for both the client and the audience.

b) The communication norm (ibid) is a social norm that focuses on ensuring effective communication between all parties involved.

c) The 'relation' norm (ibid) refers to the linguistic aspect that addresses the relationship between the source text (ST) and the target text (TT).



## 2.3 Empirical Studies

In another study Taghavi and Hashemi (2022) examined the application of translation universals, namely simplification and explicitation in Persian translations. They utilized a comparable corpus consisting of both non-translated and translated Persian expository texts to examine two T-universals. Their findings contradicted the suggested universals, as none of the identified features aligned with the propositions established in earlier studies.

Another case study by Golchinnezhad and Afrouz (2021) examined Translation Universals on the animated movie *Frozen* (2013) and its three Persian dubbed versions. The reflection of the following translation universals on a character's speech were tested: Simplification, explicitation and normalization. It was used only for one character in the movie. And the results showed that simplification and explicitation are the most frequent strategies that were adopted in the dubbed versions. Furthermore, another strategy, namely Exaggeration, is observed in the data.

Raoufkazemi et al. (2020) in their research discussed the probable relation between expertise and explicitation in two Arabic-English translation of the Holy Quran. they investigated the cohesion in context, cohesive markers and the relationship among features of cohesion by comparing the non-translated text and the translation. As a result, no clear relationship between the level of expertise of translators and explicitation in translation was discovered.

Benyahia and Kouidri (2020) investigated the concept of normalization in translation, which serves as a crucial tool for translators. The objective is to assess the extent to which normalization influences the target text. By employing descriptive translation studies alongside methods of political discourse analysis, the research analyzes various patterns within the selected samples. The findings reveal that normalization impacts both the syntactic and lexical dimensions of the target texts, as well as influences the audience's perception. Furthermore, it reflects the translator's ideology, thereby raising questions concerning their fidelity to the source material.

Xiao (2014) investigated the lexical and grammatical features of translational Chinese within the broader framework of translation universals, utilizing two one-million-word balanced comparable corpora of translated and non-translated native Chinese texts. This empirical research into the characteristics of translational Chinese has provided an opportunity to reassess mainly English-centric hypotheses related to translation universals.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

### 3.1. Design of the Study

This study used a corpus-based approach congruent with its objectives. The corpus-based approach begins with an established theoretical framework, which is then subjected to validation through the analysis of corpus data (Saldanha & O'Brien, 2014).

### 3.2. Corpus of the Study

In the present study the population included children's novels that were in Persian and had Persian-speaking authors, as well as children's novels that were translated into Persian published in the 1390s and 1400s. In other words, all the novels investigated in the study were in Persian language. However, some of them were written in Persian and some others were translated into Persian. The monolingual comparable corpus of the study consisted of two sets of texts in Persian language, containing non translated Persian language (Konserve Ghoul & Goor Shah) and translated texts (Charlie va Karkhane Shokolat Sazi & Mary



Poppins). Table 1 presents the basic information of the corpus.

**Table 1**  
*Basic Information of the Corpus*

Book's title	No. of pages	Total No. of words	Book's author	Publication time	Translators of the Books	The language
Konserve Ghoul	216	39257	Mehdi Rajabi	1393	_____	Persian
Goor Shah	256	49386	Siamak Golshiri	1401	_____	Persian
Mary Poppins	200	35927	P.L. Travers	1393	Shahla Tahmasbi	Persian
Charlie va Karkhane Shokolat Sazi	248	29642	Roald Dahl	1402	M. Najafkhani	Persian

For the purpose of the current study purposive sampling was used. Those items including simplification, explicitation, and normalization features were selected. Each feature involves different items. Due to time constraints, purposing sampling focused on specific aspects: lexical density and sentence length (short sentences) in simplification, connectives in explicitation and active voice in normalization.

### 3.3. Data Collection and Analysis Procedure

In this study software *Wordsmith 7.0* was used to analyze explicitation (connectives) and lexical density (content words) using word list. Since the PDF books were not accessible, all pages were photographed, scanned, and converted to pdf using the *Alefba* Persian software. These scans were then converted to text



files for use in *Wordsmith 7.0*. Subsequently, examples of explicitation and lexical density were identified. As an example of explicitation:

هوا ملایم و گرم شدو دیدند در جنگل پردرختی هستند که صدای جیک جیک از آن به گوش می رسید.

As an example of simplification:

عزیزم آگهی بده. بله حدسم درست بود. این پدر نیست.

The formula used to calculate the lexical density was Ure's method (1971, p.34),

$$\text{Lexical density} = \frac{\text{Number of lexical items} * 100}{\text{Total numbers of words}}$$

Another aspect of simplification was evaluating sentence length. To determine this, all complete sentences with fewer than five words were manually counted. Additionally, an artificial intelligence tool called *Sentence Counter* was used to calculate the total number of sentences in the books and determine the ratio of short sentences to the total number. A human rater also verified the machine's counting accuracy.

Finally, to identify examples of normalization, specifically sentences with active voice construction, the number of passive voice constructions in each book was counted manually. Then subtracted this count from the total number of sentences in the book to obtain the number of active voice sentences. For the purpose of analyzing the data, descriptive statistics and chi-square tests were conducted.

#### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

To answer the first research question 'Is simplification hypothesis (lexical density& short sentences) verified in the genre of children's literature?', descriptive statistics was run and the results were presented in following tables. Table 2 illustrates the results of descriptive statistics.

**Table 2**

*Frequency Distribution of Simplification Strategy in Translated Books (N = 65569)*

Simplification Strategies	Frequency	%
Lexical density	31796	48.49
Short sentences	1814	2.76

As the Table 2 shows, translated books contained a total number of 65569 words. The frequency of lexical density was 31796 (48.49%) and the frequency of short sentences as another component of simplification was 1814 (2.76%).

Moreover, a chi-square test was performed to determine if a difference between frequency of simplification strategies in translated and non-translated texts is due to chance, or is due to a relationship between the variables of study. Table 3 presents the results.



**Table 3***Chi-Square of Simplification between Translated and Non-translated Books*

Book	Strategy				Sig
	Simplification		The rest		
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Translated	36233	55.3	29336	44.7	
Original	56300	63.5	32343	36.5	*<0.001

According to the Table 3, the frequency of simplification in translated books was statistically different from the non-translated books (chi-square = 1069.89,  $p < .001$ ).

To answer the second research question ‘Is explicitation hypothesis (connectives) verified in the genre of children's literature?’, descriptive statistics was conducted whose results are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4***Frequency Distribution of Explicitation Strategy in Translated Books*

Connectives(N=5883)	Frequency	%
و	3638	61.84
که	1438	24.44
اما	350	5.95
به	255	4.33
اگر	103	1.75
یا	99	1.69

According to the Table 4, the most frequently used connective in translated books was “و” with the frequency of 3638 among 5883 words (61.84%) and the lowest was “یا” with the frequency of 99 among 5883 words (1.69%).

The descriptive statistics regarding application of explicitation in the non-translated books are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5***Frequency Distribution of Explicitation Strategy in Non-translated Books*

Explicitation (N=4491)	Frequency	%
و	2147	47.81
که	1612	35.89



اما	172	3.83
به	381	8.48
اگر	84	1.87
يا	95	2.12

As the Table 5 shows, as the components of explicitation in the non-translated books and among 4491 words, “و” had the frequency of use of 2147 (47.81%), “که” 1612 (35.89%), “به” 381 (8.48%), “اما” 172 (3.83%), “يا” 95 (2.12%), and “اگر” 84 (1.87%).

To compare the frequency of explicitation in the translated and non-translated books, a chi-square was conducted and the results are provided in Table 6.

**Table 6**

*Chi-Square of explicitation between the Translated and Non translated Books*

Book	Strategy				Sig
	Explicitation		The rest		
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	
Translated	5883	9	59686	91	
Original	4491	5.1	84152	94.9	*<0.001

The results of the chi-square presented in the Table 6 shows that a significant statistical difference was observed in the frequency of explicitation between the non-translated texts and their translated counterparts (chi-square = 916.36,  $p < .001$ ).

In order to answer the third research question ‘Do translated Persian works demonstrate a tendency for normalization (active voice)?’, descriptive statistics of normalization strategy was run, as shown in tables 7 and 8.

**Table 7**

*Frequency Distribution of Normalization in the Translated Books (N = 4437)*

Active Voice	Frequency	%
Number of passive sentences	45	1.02
Number of active sentences	4392	98.98



According to the Table 7, the frequency of passive sentences as one of the components of normalization in the translated books was 45 (1.02%) among 4437 sentences, and the number of active sentences was 4392 (98.98%).

**Table 8**

*Frequency Distribution of Normalization in the Non- translated books (N=7562)*

Active Voice	Frequency	%
Number of passive sentences	10	0.03
Number of active sentences	7552	99.97

According to the Table 8, the frequency of passive sentences is one of the components of normalization in the non- translated books was 10 (0.03%) among 7562 sentences, and the number of active sentences was 7552 (99.97%).

For the purpose of comparing the frequency of use of normalization in the translated and non- translated books, a chi-square test was conducted and the results are presented in Table 9.

**Table 9**

*Chi-Square Comparing Normalization in the Translated and Non-translated Books*

Book			Strategy	Sig
	Normalization		The rest	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Translated	8829	13.5	56740	86.5
Original	15114	17.1	73529	82.9
				*<0.001

As the results of the chi-square in the Table 9 show, there was a significant difference between the use of normalization strategy in the translated and non-translated books (chi-square = 369.37,  $p < .001$ ).

To address the fourth research question ‘Are T-universals supported in translated children's literature genre (Charlie va Karkhane Shokolat Sazi & Mary Poppins)?’, descriptive statistics of the data was run with the results presented in tables 10 and 11.

Table 10



*Frequency Distribution of T-Universal Strategies in the Translated Books (N=65569)*

T-Universal Strategies	Frequency	%
Simplification	36233	55.26
Explicitation	5883	8.97
Normalization	8829	13.47
The rest	14624	22.3

From the total number of 65569 investigated words in translated books, the most frequently applied strategy was simplification (n = 36233, 55.26%). The second rank in this regard belonged to normalization (n = 8829, 13.47%), explicitation (n = 5883, 8.97%), and other strategies (14624, 22.3%), respectively.

The Table 11 illustrates the frequency distribution of the strategies used in the non-translated books.

**Table 11**

*Frequency Distribution of T-Universal Strategies in the Non-Translated Books (N = 88643)*

<b>T-Universal Strategies</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
Simplification	56300	63.51
Explicitation	4491	5.07
Normalization	15114	17.05
The rest	12738	14.37

According to the Table 11, among 88643 investigated words in non-translated books, the highest frequency belonged to simplification with the frequency of 56300 (63.51%). Normalization with the frequency of 15114 (17.05%) stood in the second place, and explicitation with the frequency of 4491 (5.07%) had the lowest frequency of use in non-translated texts.

The findings regarding the first research question inquiring, “Is simplification hypothesis verified in the genre of children's literature?” showed that the non-translated texts in Persian demonstrated more simplification compared to the translated ones. In other words, non-translated books written for children were simpler based on their vocabulary density and length of the sentences compared to translated texts into Persian. Translated texts had longer sentences with a variety of words that showed them against the principle of reader-friendly, which is the main aim of stories in children genre (Shaba, 2021). This can be attributed to the cultural differences between Persian and English languages. Knowledge base of English and Persian audience is different due to different issues including educational context, social context, macro-level policies, etc. This can contribute to different amounts of coverage of simplification hypothesis in translated and non-translated texts.

These findings support the previous claim for the simplification in Persian and English. According to Kadar (2019), in general, the English texts exhibited higher lexical density than their Persian counterparts. English, due to its reliance on auxiliary verbs and frequent use of function words, tends to create more information-dense sentences. In other words, the translators provided more literal translations and did not consider the function of the sentences that resulted in a complicating text. In this regard, Laviosa (2002) argues that the consideration of simplification as a process inherent in translation is a mistake since it is a strategy that is adapted for a specific type of text. His argument indicated the shifts in simplification at sentence-level that occurs during the process of translation and showed that it could happen either way.



In other words, simplification could observe in the source text and it can affect the translated equivalence making it have different features compared to the language it is translated into (Alibabae & Salehi, 2012). In contrast, Persian translations often showed a reduced number of content words, primarily due to the language's syntactic structure, which allows for more concise expressions (Golchinzadeh & Afrouz, 2021). The findings are also consistent with previous research in translation studies that suggests languages like Persian tend to simplify lexical choices, making them more accessible to readers without compromising the overall message (Pym, 2010). This reduction in lexical density aligns with a broader trend in scientific translation, where clarity and readability are prioritized (Gile, 2009).

The findings of the current study also lend support to the previous claims for the high rate of simplification in non-translated texts in Persian compared to translated ones from English into Persian that challenges and limits the validity of simplification hypothesis (Alibabae & Salehi, 2012). Nevertheless, the results are a rebuttal of the claim that based on simplification hypothesis, simplification is inherent in translation peers no matter what cultural or linguistics differences exist between them (Hellegren, 2005). The reason for the findings of the current study could be explained by reference to Toury (1995), who declared that translated texts are sometimes more complicating than the non-translated text. The existence of a lower information load in the non-translated text is the origin of the problem since ambiguous information in the non-translated text has been made clearer or removed.

In this study, the overall pattern observed indicated that Persian translations of English texts in children's genre tend to simplify the non-translated texts. This simplification could be achieved by reducing lexical density and breaking down long sentences into shorter ones. These changes make the translated texts more accessible, especially for readers who may not be familiar with complex scientific language. However, the simplification process must be carefully managed to avoid the loss of essential details or nuances. Therefore, in most cases, the translated texts are not as simple as non-translated texts in Persian (Golchinzadeh & Afrouz, 2021) that can explain the logic behind the results found in this study.

The results of the study regarding the second research question posing the question, "Is explicitation hypothesis (connectives) verified in the genre of children's literature?", showed that the connectives were observed in both non-translated text and translated texts under investigation. However, examination of texts showed that the frequency of use of connectives was higher in translated texts into Persian compared to the texts that were originally written in Persian. In other words, the analysis has revealed significant differences in the deployment and functionality of connectors in both linguistic contexts. While native Persian texts demonstrate a rich and varied use of connectors that reflects the language's unique syntactic and rhetorical structures, translated texts exhibit a tendency to rely more heavily on certain connectors that mirror the source language's discourse patterns. This disparity highlights the influence of translation strategies on the target language, emphasizing the need for translators to be cognizant of the linguistic and cultural nuances inherent in both the source and target languages (Baker, 1992).

Moreover, the findings suggest that the connectors used in translated texts may contribute to a less idiomatic style, as they often reflect the syntactical preferences of English rather than the natural flow of Persian discourse. This trend calls into question the adequacy of translation practices that prioritize fidelity to the source text over the idiomaticity of the target language (Nida, 1964; Venuti, 1995). The findings of the study were also in line with Beikian et al. (2013), who mentioned that there are similarities between translated texts and non-translated texts in the use of cohesive devices, in particular connectives. However, the frequency of use of connectives in translated texts to Persian was higher than the non-translated texts in Persian. Furthermore, the findings of the study fitted the model of shift analysis proposed by Leuven-Zwart (1990), in which she mentioned the differences between non-translated texts and translated texts regarding connectives. In her framework, alterations in word order and the use of cohesion represent instances of



microstructural changes that do not indicate deficiencies or errors in translation. Instead, these variations serve as mechanisms to adhere to the norms that influence the translation process (Munday, 2001).

To sum it up, the results would demonstrate the fact that the effect of the source language on the target texts in Persian might be responsible for the differences observed in terms of the frequency of use of connectors in translated and non-translated texts in Persian.

To address Research Question Three, “Do translated children's literature genre demonstrate a tendency for normalization (active voice)?”, the non-translated and translated Persian texts were investigated. The results showed that non-translated texts had more instances of active voice compared to the translated ones.

In other words, the analysis of passive sentence usage in Persian texts compared to translated texts from English to Persian reveals significant differences in frequency and stylistic application. Persian, as a language, tends to favor active constructions due to its syntactic and semantic characteristics, which emphasize the subject's agency. Conversely, English employs passive constructions more liberally, often to create a sense of formality or to obscure the agent's identity (Hoffmann, 2016). When translating from English to Persian, it has been observed that translators may retain passive structures, especially when they align with the non-translated text's intent. However, this can lead to a higher frequency of passive sentences in translated texts than in non-translated Persian writings (Farahzad, 2012).

The findings of the study, regarding the substitution of passive sentences in English with active ones in Persian translations, were in line with Ghorbani and Sherafati's (2015) study. They reported that the substitution of passive sentences with active ones was obvious in the texts they investigated, however, there is no obligation as a rule to do the substitution. Baker (1999) argues that the use of passive voice in written English can lead to significant challenges in translation because of differences in the syntactic structures of the target language, therefore, translators need to render voice literally. In fact, in some studies focusing on the structure of the verbs in active voice, the high frequency of the use of active-intransitive verbs in comparison with the target texts in English has been indicated (Tabatabaei & Rostampour, 2011).

To talk about the linguistics structure of the two languages under investigation, studies have shown that the occurrence of passive voice is much more common in English rather than Persian (Jabbari, 2003). This phenomenon can consequently explain the reason for the high substitution of passive sentences in the source texts with the target texts as their equivalent in Persian. Research indicates that while native Persian texts predominantly utilize active voice for clarity and directness, translated texts may reflect English's passive voice tendencies, resulting in a stylistic shift (Mohaghegh, 2013). This adaptation in translation practices highlights the influence of source language structures on target language outputs, showcasing the complexities of linguistic transfer. The findings suggest that translators must be mindful of these differences to maintain the natural flow of Persian while respecting the source material's integrity.

To address the fourth research question, “Are T-universals supported in translated children's literature genre (Charlie va Karkhane Shokolat Sazi & Mary Poppins)?” the findings of the study showed that simplification as one of the components of T-universals had the highest frequency of occurrence in both translated and non-translated texts and the lowest frequency of use among the components of T-universal strategies belonged to explicitation. Other strategies among the ones belonging to T-universals, such as normalization, which was investigated in this study in a separate section, in addition to other strategies of this category showed that the null hypothesis regarding the fourth research question was rejected.

The findings of the study were supported by the ones reported by Taghavi and Hashemi (2021), who investigated explicitation and simplification as two components of T-universals and found the same results as the current study. In addition, Beikian et al. (2013) conducted a corpus-based analysis of explicitation and found that translated texts utilize a higher frequency of explicit connectives compared to non-translated



texts, which aligns with the results of the present study. Other studies like the one conducted by Vahedikia and Quliaeinia (2016) and the investigation carried out by Ahangar and Rahnemoon (2019) showed the foot print of T-universals in both non-translated and translated texts.

Skopos Theory foregrounds the translator's intention, suggesting that the specific purpose of a translation can lead to deviations from the source text. In contrast, T-Universals suggest that these deviations may conform to broader patterns observed in translated texts (Toury, 1995). Thus, while a translator may adapt a text to serve a specific skopos, the resulting translation may still reflect certain universal tendencies observed in translation practices. This might explain the reason why in some cases some instances of T-universals were absent in the investigated texts.

## 5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study comparing simplification, explication, and normalization in non-translated Persian texts versus Persian translated texts revealed significant differences in linguistic and stylistic features. The findings indicate that translated texts tend to exhibit a higher degree of linguistic complexity and nuanced expression, which can be attributed to the challenges of conveying idiomatic expressions and cultural references from English to Persian. In contrast, non-translated texts often show a tendency towards simplification and normalization reflecting the rich cultural and contextual elements inherent in the language.

The study revealed that non-translated Persian texts exhibited significantly higher levels of simplification, explication, and normalization compared to texts translated from English to Persian. This finding suggests that non-translated texts tend to present ideas in a more direct and coherent manner, while translations may retain complexities and nuances from the source language that can lead to reduced clarity. The results highlight the importance of considering these linguistic features when evaluating the effectiveness of translations and underscore the potential challenges faced by translators in conveying meaning while maintaining the integrity of the non-translated content.

Explication emerged as a common strategy in translations, where translators provided additional information to clarify meanings that may not be directly translatable. This approach, while beneficial for reader comprehension, sometimes led to a loss of the non-translated text's subtleties and depth. Overall, the study highlights the impact of translation practices on the preservation of linguistic richness and cultural authenticity, suggesting that translators must balance the need for clarity with the desire to maintain the integrity of the non-translated text. These insights contribute to a deeper understanding of translation strategies and their implications for language and literature in the context of Persian studies.

In sum, it is concluded that translated and non-translated texts are different in terms of Chesterman's norms. As explained above, this leads to the conclusion that translated and non-translated texts are not the same in terms of Chesterman's norms due to some reasons including cultural, social, and linguistic issues. By nature, Persian and English audience do not have the same characteristics and it is natural that translated and non-translated texts do not follow the same norms.

The findings of this study have some implications for the discipline or translation studies. The use of the results could be categorized widely from a discipline-level understanding of variation in translation theory to applications to translation practice, cross-cultural communication, and education. The findings could also help professional translators balance their higher quality of translation that provide significant contextual resonance to an implied audience.



One of Chesterman's (1997) notable contributions is his exploration of the concept of "translation strategies" and his discussion of the translator's position as a mediator between source and target cultures. By understanding these concepts, translators can better navigate the challenges of conveying meaning across different linguistic and cultural contexts.

Furthermore, in the study, the potential of the translators to support the substitution of some phrases or words in the target text was highlighted and could show them the way to put it into practice. The findings of the study could have implications for university professors specifically the ones dealing with article or thesis writing. They know, more or less, what form is mostly wide-spread in both source and target texts. Translator or interpreter trainers could be assisted with the rules and substitutions they have to provide for their trainees to have a smoother and more professional result.

This study highlights the need for translators to be mindful of simplification strategies, especially when dealing with complex scientific content. Further research could expand on this analysis by incorporating a larger corpus of texts, exploring the role of genre-specific language, or comparing simplification across other language pairs. Future studies could also investigate the impact of simplification on the reader's comprehension and retention of scientific information.

The frequency and types of connectors employed in Persian texts compared to their English equivalence could provide insights into the translation process and the linguistic characteristics of Persian. Future research could further investigate the implications of these findings for translation pedagogy and the development of more effective translation strategies that embrace the linguistic richness of Persian while respecting the source text's integrity.

## REFERENCES

- Ahangar, A. A., & Rahnemoon, S. N. (2019). The level of explicitation of reference in the translation of medical texts from English into Persian: A Case Study on basic histology. *Lingua*, 10(2), 228-236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2019.06.005>
- Alibabae, A., & Salehi, Z. (2012). A comparative study of Persian translated and non-translated political texts: focus on simplification hypothesis. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation (LCT)*, 1(3), 1-13.
- Baker, M. (1993). Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications, in Mona Baker, Gill Francis, and Elena Tognini-Bonelli (eds), *Text and technology* (pp.233–250). In Honor of John Sinclair. John Benjamins.
- Baker, M. (1999). The role of corpora in investigating the linguistic behavior of professional translators. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 4(2), 281-298. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.4.2.05bak>
- Beikian, A., Yaramadze, N., & Karimpurnatanzi, M. (2013). Explicitation of conjunctive relations in Ghabraei's Persian translation of "The Kite Runner". *English Language and Literature Studies*, 3(2), 81-89. 10.5539/ELLS.V3N2P81
- Benyahia, A., & Kouidr, L. (2020). Tracing Signs of Normalization in Translation Case study. Palestinian cause & the dam renaissance. *Doctoral dissertation, University Kasdi Merbah Ouargla*. [dspace.univ-ouargla.dz](https://dspace.univ-ouargla.dz)



- Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation. In J. House, & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlinual and intercultural communication*. Gunter Narr.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Levenston, E. A. (1983). Universals of Lexical Simplification. In Claus Færch and Gabriele Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 119-139). Longman.
- Chesterman, A. (2004a). Beyond the particular. In Mauranen. A & Kujamaki. P (Eds.), *Translation universals: Do they exist* (pp.33-50). John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Chesterman, A. (2012). Models in translation studies. In Cambier. Y & Doorslaer. L. V (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp.108-114). John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Farahzad, F. (2012). Translation criticism: A three-dimensional model based on CDA. *Iranian Journal of Translation Studies*, 9(36). <https://journal.translationstudies.ir/ts/article/view/1082>
- Ghorbani, M. r., & Sherafati, H. (2015). Contrastive analysis of passive voice in English and Persian. *Iranian EFL Journal*, 11(2), 41-61. <https://civilica.com/doc/221974>
- Gile, D. (2009). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. John Benjamins.
- Golchinnezhad, M., & Afrouz, M. (2021). Exploring universals in audiovisual translation: A case study of *Frozen* dubbed into Persian. *Kervan. International Journal of Afro-Asiatic Studies*, 25(2), 267-285. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13135/1825-263X/6255>
- Hellegren, S. (2005). Tracing translation universals and translator development. *Computer and Information Science*, 4(2), 1-17.
- Hoffmann, T. (2016). *Duns Scotus bibliography from 1950 to the present* (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Tobias Hoffmann.
- Igder, R., & Karimnia, A. (2010). Explication in English into Persian translation: A study of text types. *Iranian Journal of Translation Studies*, 8(29), 69-86. <https://journal.translationstudies.ir/ts/article/view/220>
- Kádár, D. Z. (2019). Translation and the problem of simplification. *Translation Studies*, 12(3), 230-247.
- Laviosa, S. (1998a). The corpus-based approach: A new paradigm in translation studies. *Meta*, 43(4), 474-479. <https://doi.org/10.7202/003424ar>
- Laviosa, S. (2002). *Corpus-based translation studies. theory, findings, applications*. Rodopi.
- Leuven-Zwart, K. M. V. (1990). Translation and original: Similarities and dissimilarities II. *Target*, 2(1), 69-95. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.2.1.05leu>
- Mohaghegh, A., & Pirnajmuddin, H. (2013). The trace of translators' ideology: A case study of English translations of the Qur'an. *The southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 19(1), 51-64. <http://irdoi.ir/543-985-297-530>
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies. Theories and applications*. Routledge.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. E.J. Brill.
- Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring translation theories*. Routledge.



- Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2014). *Research methodologies in translation studies*. Routledge.
- Shaba, V. H. (2021). Lexical simplification: A universal feature of translation. *Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities*, 28(3, 1), 1-22. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.25130/jtuh.28.3.1.2021.20>
- Tabatabaei, O., & Rostampour, A. (2011). Analysis of equivalent structures in Persian for the translation of English passive sentences based on translations of “Animal Farm”. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(10), 1354-1360. doi:10.4304/tpls.1.10.1354-1360
- Taghavi, M., & Hashemi, M. (2022). A critical corpus-based study of translation universals: A comparison of translational and original Persian. *Language Related Research*, 13(1), 701-745. <http://lrr.modares.ac.ir/article-14-44062-en.html>
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. John Benjamins.
- Vahedikia, M., & Ouliaeinia, H. (2016). Explication across literary genres: Evidence of a strategic device? *Translation & Interpreting*, 8(2), 82-95. <http://www.trans-int.org/index.php/transint/index>
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.
- Xia. Y (2014). *Normalization in translation: Corpus-based diachronic research into Twentieth-century English–Chinese fictional translation*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

