

International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies

ISSN: 2308-5460



Factors Influencing the Peer-Review of Translated Books: The Translation Center at King Saud University as a Model

[PP: 107-117]

Mohammad Ahmed Al-Jabali

King Saud University

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Abdul-Aziz bin Abdulrahman Abanomey

King Saud University

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the factors that can influence the peer review process of translated books at King Saud University. A 4-domain questionnaire was distributed electronically to collect the data necessary to answer the questions of the study. The mean scores showed that the “Review ethics” domain came first, and “Experience of the reviewer” came last. ANOVA and MANOVA showed that the variables of gender, academic rank, major, and review experience did not reveal significant differences, while experience in translation variable revealed significant differences. It was concluded that the review of translated books does not differ considerably from the review of studies published in peer-reviewed journals. Unlike a research paper, a translator of a book does not have to draw findings and conclusions. The findings of this study support the findings of peer review studies in terms of the insignificance of training, academic rank, experience in review, and gender.

Keywords: *Translation, Review Ethics, Academic Rank, Translated Books, Peer-Reviewed Journals*

ARTICLE	The paper received on	Reviewed on	Accepted after revisions on
INFO	21/02/2019	19/03/2019	05/04/2019

Suggested citation:

Al-Jabali, M. & Abanomey, A. (2019). Factors Influencing the Peer-Review of Translated Books: The Translation Center at King Saud University as a Model. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 7(1). 107-117.

1. Introduction

Peer-review is among the most important tasks or duties a university professor does to a field of study. It is a procedure adopted by all accredited scientific journals all over the world. Peer-review includes the review of the articles to be published in scientific peer-reviewed journals and books translated or authored by faculty staff, as is the case at the Translation Center (TC) at King Saud University (KSU). In general, reviewers play a crucial role in improving the level and content of the task assigned. Their role is “to provide an expert perspective that helps the editorial team determine the fitness, relevance, and significance of the manuscript for readers of Urban Education”, (SAGE/Guidelines/peer-review). Mathison (2005: 300), in the *Encyclopedia of Evaluation*, “... peer review refers generally to the evaluation of professional performance and products by other professionals and, more specifically, to a set of procedures for evaluating grant proposals and manuscripts submitted for publication”.

Peer-review is pivotal (Ferreira et al. 2015), and a cornerstone to science (Bruce, Chauvin, Triquart, Ravaud, and Boutron: 2016; Chauvin, Ravaud, Baron, Barnes, and Boutron: 2015; Rockwell: 2006). According to Park, Peacey, and Munafò (2014), peer review is the gatekeeper between circulating and defending or criticizing ideas. Esarey (2016) found that the heterogeneity of a journal’s readership (and reviewer pool) is the most important influence on the character of its published work, regardless of the structure of peer review. Djupe (2015: 350) assures that peer-review “makes the publishing world go round. Young (2003) considers manuscript rejection/ selection as the primary aim of peer review that makes this process transparent, accurate, and practical. Also, Goodman et al. (1994) declare that the quality of manuscripts that are peer-reviewed is improved, and Li and Agha (2015) explain that peer-review helps identify the contribution of the manuscript to the field investigated. Furthermore, Solomon (2007) describes the value of peer review as it enhances publications’ quality. The researchers add that diligent peer-review serves all those benefiting from this process:



producers (researchers, authors, and translators), intermediate (editors, reviewers), and client (the reader). In essence, peer review serves the researcher, author, and translator through fixing or clarifying problematic points or making some ambiguous information clearer. In addition, it serves the editor through approaching the decision whether to accept or reject a study or a translated book. It also serves the reviewers by giving them the chance to improve the work of others and control inappropriate studies. It serves the readers by providing them with high quality articles, books, or translations. Hence, peer-review of an expert might “generate insights” or “added value”, (Li & Agha, 2015). Rojewski and Domenico (2004) consider “providing suggestions for improving the manuscript prior to publication” a responsibility of the reviewer.

Peer-review of translated books at the Translation Center (TC) of King Saud University (KSU) can be comparable with peer-review of studies published through peer-reviewed scientific journals. If a manuscript of a translated book obtains 70%, it passes and counts for 1 complete point for the purpose of promotion. Reviewers of translated books are awarded SAR2000 for a manuscript that is less than 500 pages, and SAR4000 for a manuscript of 500 pages and more.

Like scientific journals that have desk rejection, TC has a committee that checks the quality of translation before assigning reviewers for the manuscript. This committee cannot reject the manuscript, but they can return the manuscript to the translator to fix all problems first. We (the researchers) estimate that the percentage of returned manuscripts is about 15% which is less than the desk rejection of *International Studies Quarterly*, which reached 46.2% of its submissions in 2014 (Nexon 2014), and also less than the *American Journal of Political Science*, whose desk-rejection reached 20.7% of its submissions in 2014 (Jacoby et al 2015). In addition, when the manuscript passes, the translator is given the chance to fix or defend his/her opinion or falsify all notes provided by the reviewers like researchers.

Peer review is an honor (Benos et al., 2003) provided by editors, or their equivalent in the case of TC, to selected reviewers to serve the scientific community. Their contribution is recognized whether they approve a manuscript or reject it.

1.1 Problem of the study

During their work for the TC/KSU as members of the translation quality assurance committee, the researchers noticed that reviewers of translated books sometimes vary a lot in their judgments of the same manuscript. Sometimes one of them might give a total mark of 90% whereas the other gives 70% or less. Another reviewer might give a full mark for a certain point whereas the other says “not applicable” or gives it 2 on the scale where 10 is the highest and 0 the lowest. Or sometimes both reviewers give the translated book 95% with lots of praise, but when the translation is checked for quality assurance, all of translation quality assurance committee members agree that the translated work is not worth that mark or praise.

1.2 Significance of the study

It is hoped that this study will try to bridge the gaps between reviewers, and to a large extent unite their judgments, or bring them closer together, by providing them with clear unbiased criteria which are proposed by the findings of the study. The researchers' survey of the literature about this topic, as listed below, shows that no previous studies have investigated this topic in the same way.

1.3 Objectives and questions of the study

The current study aims to achieve several objectives. First, it seeks to determine significant functional working criteria agreed upon by the respondents, which might help approach the reviewers' assessments of translated books. Second, it aims to identify preferable criteria with reference to the respondents' gender, academic rank, major, and experience in translation of books or assessment of translated book. Finally, it identifies if the respondents favor a certain domain of the questionnaire.

Thus, the questions of the study are:

1) What are the respondents' most agreed upon working criteria that might help influence the reviewers' assessments of translated books with reference to the respondents' gender, academic rank, major, and experience in the translation of books or in the review of translated books?

2) Are there any significant differences among the domains of the questionnaire favored by the respondents due to the variables (or their levels) of: gender, academic rank, major, and experience in the translation of books or the review of translated books?

1.4 Context of the study

TC provides the service of book translation for faculty staff at KSU, following a specific process. First, a university professor, planning to translate a book, selects a book and applies to TC for approval. Second, a committee at TC checks the application, making sure it fulfills the established requirements, such as the relevance of the book and the relationship between the specialty of the professor (supposed translator) and the proposed book. Third, once approval is granted, TC applies to the publisher to obtain permission for translation and pay the intellectual property or copyright. Fourth, when the permission is obtained, TC and the professor/translator sign a contract for translation to begin, following certain regulations. As soon as the translator finishes the translation and submits the manuscript, it is sent to 2 reviewers for peer-review following a specific format provided by TC as proposed by the Scientific Council at KSU. The same format is used to assess all translated reference book or textbook of all tracks: science, health or literary.

Reviewers review the manuscript and provide reports that contain their opinions, assessment of translation, comments, and recommendations. After that, if the manuscript passes and obtains 70% or more from each reviewer, it is given back to the translator with the reviewers' comments and recommendations. The translator then acts upon all comments and submits a new copy to TC to make sure that the reviewers' comments have been considered or confuted.

1.5 Limitation of the study

The researchers suffered considerable shortage of studies on translated book peer review; therefore, they resorted to peer review of articles since it is the nearest topic to their study. Also, due to lack of humanities studies in this field, the researchers mostly used the literature from studies examining the peer review of scientific works.

2. Literature Review

Benhaddou (1991: 237) attributes discrepancies in translation evaluation to impressionistic judgments, unfamiliarity with translation evaluation, and building judgments based entirely on their knowledge of their native language. In the same context, Bornmann, Mutz, and Danial (2010), Schroter et al. (2008), and Goodman et al. (1994) reveal low levels of agreement

among reviewers in their assessments of a manuscript.

Callaham, Wears, and Waeckerle (1998) reveal no significant change in any performance measurement after a 4-hour workshop on peer review. No effect could be identified in subsequent performance as measured by editors' quality ratings or reviewer performance statistics. Employing a number of predictors to predict performance of high-quality peer reviews, Callaham and Trecier (2007) reveal that academic rank, formal training in critical appraisal and statistics, or status as principal investigator of a grant failed to do so. Though the predictive power was weak for the predictors of being on an editorial board and doing formal grant review, it was significant for those working in a university-operated hospital versus a teaching environment, and those who were relatively young (with under ten years of experience). Houry, Green, and Callaham (2012) reveal that mentoring or pairing new reviewers with high-quality senior reviewers did not improve the quality of their subsequent reviews.

Although Stevenson (2015) received no training, she expresses her pride of being an expert reviewer as part of an editorial board and a member of a College of Reviewers. She describes herself as a reliable and supportive reviewer who thinks her review report is comprehensive enough to offer the author requisite advice. She adds that most of her reviewing has been done intuitively.

Callaham (2012) mentions that the findings of several studies showed that factors such as special training and experience (including taking a course on peer review, academic rank, experience with grant review, etc.) were not reflected in the quality of reviews subsequently performed by reviewers.

Kliwer, Freed, DeLong, Pickhardt, and Provenzale (2015) reveal that there was significant correlation between quality score and younger reviewers from academic institutions, while gender, academic rank, years of reviewing and subspecialty of the reviewer has not correlated with high quality peer reviews. Evans, MC Nutt, Fletcher, and Fletcher (1993) reveal that reviews of young reviewers coming from top academic institutions well known to the editor produced good reviews. It also reveals that assistant professors produced better reviews than associate and full professors did. Furthermore, additional postgraduate



degrees and more time spent on the review had some positive effect on good review. http://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx2cm=oe_tobe/clUHwCmVay.

A survey carried out by NBCC reveals that a book review can be assigned to a casual acquaintance of the editor or someone who wrote a book about the same subject regardless if their views agree or contradict with that of the author's. However, the survey also reveals that reviewers acknowledged or recommended by the author should be barred and banned from review to ensure objectivity. Concerning ethics, a reviewer should read the entire book, not parts of it and they should say what they think of the book. Moreover, the same reviewer may repeatedly review for the same author. <http://bookcritics.org/blog/archive/Ethics-in-Book-Reviewing-Survey>

To sum up, having explored relevant literature, the researchers believe that the process of peer review of a manuscript, whether an article or translated book, is affected negatively by the subjectivity of the reviewer. It also shows that most of the variables investigated so far revealed significance. The survey concludes that being young or known to the editor are factors increasing the likelihood of a good peer review.

3. Methods and Procedures

As descriptive statistics is the most appropriate means for this type of study and its objectives, it was used to investigate the levels and domains of the criteria for peer-review of translated books at TC/KSU, as well as to investigate the impact of the demographic variables on each level and domain.

3.1 Sample

The sample of the study is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of the sample according to the variables of the study

IV	Levels of IV	Frequency	Percent
<i>Gender</i>			
	Female	18	17.3
	Male	86	82.7
	Total	104	100
<i>Academic Rank</i>			
	Assistant Prof	32	30.77
	Associate Prof	32	30.77
	Full Prof	40	38.46
	Total	104	100.00
<i>Major</i>			
	Health Sciences	15	14.42
	Human Sciences	56	53.85
	Other Sciences	33	31.73
	Total	104	100.00
<i>Years of Experience in Academic Work</i>			
	at 1 to 9 years	22	21.15
	More than 9 years	82	78.85
	Total	104	100.00
<i>Translation Experience</i>			
	More than 1 Book	33	31.73
	Never Done	48	46.15
	Only 1 Book	23	22.12
	Total	104	100.00
<i>Review Experience</i>			
	More than 1 Book	59	56.73
	Never Done	23	22.12
	Only 1 Book	22	21.15
	Total	104	100.00

3.2 Validity of the tool

The tool was constructed by the researchers who later discussed the appropriateness of its items with a number of translators and reviewers in a seminar held at TC. To check content validity, the tool was refereed by specialists in the fields of: translation, languages, psychology, assessment, curricula and instruction, and law. They all approved all items with minor changes.

To check construct validity and to calculate Pearson correlations between all the items and domains, the tool was applied to an exploratory sample of translators who were later excluded from the sample of the study. The correlation coefficient values of the relation between the "Major" domain items and its domain ranged from 0.36 to 0.80 and with the whole tool from 0.25 to 0.54. The correlation coefficient values of the relation between the "Experience of the Reviewer" domain items and its domain ranged from 0.52 to 0.78 and with the whole tool ranged from 0.45 to 0.59. The correlation coefficient values of the relation between the "Review Ethics" domain items and its domain ranged from 0.43 to 0.64 and the relation with the tool ranged from 0.39 to 0.58. Finally, the correlation coefficient values of the relation between the "Mechanisms Prior to Review" domain items and its domain ranged from 0.36 to 0.70 and with the whole tool ranged from 0.29 to 0.69.

These values of construct validity show that the Pearson correlation coefficient of each domain item's relation with the tool and its affiliated domains did not go below 0.20, which indicates the quality of construction of the tool's items. (Ouda, 2010)

In addition, the values of Pearson correlation coefficients of the domains' relation with the tool ranged from 0.61 to 0.84. Furthermore, the values of Pearson inter-correlation coefficients with domains' relations to each other ranged from 0.15 to 0.51.

3.3 Reliability of the tool

To verify the reliability of internal consistency of the tool and its domains, Cronbach's α was used relying on the data of the exploratory sample, where the value of the internal consistency stability of the whole tool was 0.89 and the value of the domains ranged from 0.63 to 0.74.

3.4 Tool rating scale

The statistical model with relative scaling has been adopted in order to give judgments on the mean scores of the tool and its affiliated domains and items of the domains as follows:

Table 2: Tool relative rating scale for judging the mean scores of the domains as well as their items

Mean score	Level
more than 3.66	High
between 3.66-2.34	Moderate
less than 2.34	Low

3.5 Data Analysis

The data collected have been processed using SPSS as follows:

- **To answer the first question**, the mean scores and standard deviations of the tool and its affiliated domains and items of the domains have been calculated taking into consideration the arrangement of affiliated domains in descending order according to their mean scores.
- **To answer the second question**, the mean scores and standard deviations of the tool and its affiliated domains have been calculated in accordance with the variables, followed by a 5-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) without interaction in accordance with the variables of the study. It was also followed by a Multivariate 5-way Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) without interaction between domains in accordance with the variables, followed by a 5-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) without interaction between domains in accordance with the variables.

4. Results

The study aimed to detect the level of "Developing Review Criteria for Translated Books" as well as the effect of demographic variables on it and its domains by answering the following two questions:

First, the following are the results related to the first question of the study; **“What are the respondents' most agreed upon working criteria that might help influence the reviewers' assessments of translated books with reference to the respondents' gender, academic rank, major, and experience in the translation of books or in the review of translated books?”**

To answer this question, the mean scores and standard deviations of "Developing Review Criteria for Translated Books" and its affiliated domains have been calculated taking into consideration the arrangement of affiliated domains in descending order in accordance with its means as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Mean scores and standard deviation for all tool domains together in descending order according to their mean scores

Rank	ID	Scale and its Domains	Mean	Std. Dev.	Degree
1	3	Review Ethics	3.61	0.34	High
2	4	Mechanisms Prior to Review	3.35	0.34	High
3	1	Major	3.03	0.55	High
4	2	Experience of the Reviewer	2.98	0.54	Moderate
Whole			3.28	0.30	High

Table 2 shows that the degree of "Developing Review Criteria for Translated Books" has been classified as High in accordance with its mean. The order of the domains was as follows: the domain of "Review Ethics" came first, followed by "Mechanisms Prior to Review", then "Major", and finally "Experience of the Reviewer", which came last with a "Moderate" degree.

Moreover, the mean scores and standard deviations for the items in the domain of "Major" have been calculated and classified in a descending order as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Mean scores and standard deviations for Major domain items



Rank	ID	Items of Major	Mean	Std. Dev.	Degree
1	1	The translated book should be reviewed by two reviewers majoring in the field of the translated book	3.66	0.80	High
2	2	The translated book should be reviewed by two reviewers, one majoring in the field of the book, and the other majoring in the foreign language of the source book	3.24	0.76	High
3	15	The translated book should be reviewed by two reviewers, one majoring in the field of the book, and the other majoring in the field of translation	3.19	0.74	High
4	17	The translated work should be reviewed by three reviewers, the first majoring in the field, the second majoring in the foreign language, and the third majoring in Arabic	2.89	0.82	Moderate
5	4	The translated work should be reviewed by two reviewers majoring in the foreign language of the source book, regardless of the field of the translated book	2.12	0.91	Moderate

Table 3 shows that the items in the domain of “Major” “Major” have been classified in accordance with their mean scores in two levels: (i) High for items from 1 to 3 and (ii) Moderate for items from 4 and 5.

Mean scores and standard deviations for the items in the domain of “Experience of the Reviewer” have been calculated and classified in a descending as shown in table 4.

Table 4: Means and standard deviations of “Experience of the Reviewer” domain items

Rank	ID	Items of Experience of the Reviewer	Mean	Std. Dev.	Degree
1	8	The reviewer’s attention should be on the specialized aspects of the work, and how far the work is complete	3.23	0.63	High
2	19	The reviewer should have previously published in peer-reviewed periodicals at least two studies in the language of the work being translated	3.22	0.75	High
3	6	The reviewer should have already reviewed at least one translated book	2.82	0.75	Moderate
4	5	The reviewer should have already translated at least one book	2.78	0.79	Moderate
5	16	The reviewer should not be less than an associate professor	2.74	1.08	Moderate

Table 4 shows that the items in the domain of “Experience of the Reviewer” have been classified in accordance with their mean scores in two levels: (i) High for items from 1 and 2 and (ii) Moderate for items from 3 to 5.

Moreover, mean scores and standard deviations of the items in the domain of “Review Ethics” have been calculated and classified in a descending order as shown in table 5.

Table 5: Means and standard deviations of “Review Ethics” domain items

Rank	ID	Items of Review Ethics	Mean	Std. Dev.	Degree
1	13	During reviewing the translated work, the reviewer should be unbiased even if it is against his/her personal views	3.80	0.40	High
2	12	If the reviewer accepts to assess the translated work, and has a relation of any kind with the translator, he/she should be objective and should not favor the translator of the work	3.73	0.55	High
3	9	The reviewer should clearly vary between what is an opinion, and what the translator should consider	3.56	0.54	High
4	11	The reviewer should refrain from reviewing the translated work, if the work is not in his/her major	3.56	0.64	High
5	22	The reviewer should provide unbiased explanations for his/her judgments	3.52	0.52	High
6	10	The reviewer should refrain from reviewing the translated work, if there is any kind of relation with the translator in case of affecting the review of the work	3.49	0.61	High

Table 5 shows that all items of this domain have been classified as “High”.

Mean scores and standard deviations of the items in the domain of “Mechanisms Prior to Review” have been calculated and classified in a descending order as shown in table 6.

Table 6: Means and standard deviations of the items in the domain of “Mechanisms prior to Review”

Rank	ID	Items of Mechanisms Prior to Review	Mean	Std. Dev.	Degree
1	23	Providing the reviewer with a clear review form along with the work to be reviewed	3.69	0.46	High
2	14	Providing the reviewer with specific criteria that act as a model for him/her in the review process	3.65	0.50	High
3	24	Developing specific criteria for review that have been approved by everyone	3.56	0.52	High
4	20	The reviewer should be familiar with the institution's policies that he/she reviews books for	3.48	0.60	High
5	7	The translator should present the translation to a proofreader so as not to bother the reviewer with language errors	3.46	0.64	High
6	25	The Translation Center should hold a workshop for potential reviewers to discuss the review criteria	3.45	0.54	High
7	27	The Translation Center should hold a training session for potential reviewers from university faculty members about reviewing translated books	3.42	0.54	High
8	21	The reviewer should be familiar with the purpose of translating the book and the potential readers	3.39	0.55	High
9	18	The Translation Center should hold a training session in reviewing translated books for potential reviewers of university faculty members	3.32	0.59	High
10	3	The translator can nominate ten people in the field of the translated work to review it	2.82	0.79	Moderate
11	26	Removing the paragraphs about “the importance and modernity of the book” from the currently used review form in the Translation Center	2.56	0.89	Moderate

Table 6 shows that the items in the domain of “Mechanisms Prior to Review” have been classified into two levels: (i) High for items from 1 to 9 and (ii) Moderate for items from 10 to 11.

Secondly, the following are the results related to the second question of the study; “Are there statistically significant differences at $\alpha=0.05$ between the mean

scores of “Developing Review Criteria for Translated Books” attributed to the variables of: gender, academic rank, major, years of experience in academic work, translation experience, and review experience?

To answer the second question, the mean scores and standard deviations of the tool and its domains have been calculated in accordance with their variables as shown in table 7.

Table 7: Mean scores and standard deviations for all domains and variables

IV	Statistic	Domains of the Scale				Whole
		Major	Experience of the Reviewer	Review Ethics	Mechanisms prior to Review	
<i>Gender</i>						
Female	Mean	3.14	2.89	3.55	3.39	3.29
	Std. Dev.	0.31	0.47	0.34	0.33	0.20
Male	Mean	3.00	3.00	3.62	3.34	3.28
	Std. Dev.	0.59	0.55	0.34	0.34	0.32
<i>Academic Rank</i>						
Assistant Prof	Mean	3.08	2.76	3.53	3.34	3.23
	Std. Dev.	0.41	0.56	0.37	0.34	0.32
Associated Prof	Mean	3.07	2.95	3.62	3.36	3.29
	Std. Dev.	0.61	0.51	0.35	0.30	0.29
Full Prof	Mean	2.95	3.18	3.66	3.35	3.32
	Std. Dev.	0.60	0.49	0.30	0.37	0.31
<i>Major</i>						
Health Sciences	Mean	3.11	3.05	3.60	3.45	3.35
	Std. Dev.	0.42	0.65	0.23	0.30	0.26
Human Sciences	Mean	3.09	3.00	3.61	3.37	3.30
	Std. Dev.	0.57	0.54	0.36	0.34	0.31
Other Sciences	Mean	2.89	2.92	3.60	3.27	3.22
	Std. Dev.	0.56	0.50	0.36	0.35	0.31
<i>Years of Experience in Academic Work</i>						
at 1 to 9 years	Mean	3.21	2.82	3.60	3.36	3.28
	Std. Dev.	0.29	0.64	0.33	0.34	0.29
More than 9 years	Mean	2.98	3.02	3.61	3.35	3.28
	Std. Dev.	0.59	0.51	0.34	0.34	0.31
<i>Translation Experience</i>						
More than 1 Book	Mean	2.92	3.16	3.62	3.34	3.30
	Std. Dev.	0.51	0.49	0.26	0.36	0.24
Never Done	Mean	3.15	2.84	3.60	3.38	3.29
	Std. Dev.	0.54	0.55	0.40	0.33	0.33
Only 1 Book	Mean	2.92	3.01	3.60	3.29	3.24
	Std. Dev.	0.58	0.53	0.33	0.34	0.35
<i>Review Experience</i>						
More than 1 Book	Mean	2.98	3.10	3.62	3.35	3.30
	Std. Dev.	0.60	0.56	0.34	0.36	0.33
Never Done	Mean	3.25	2.82	3.62	3.32	3.28
	Std. Dev.	0.39	0.48	0.34	0.29	0.26
Only 1 Book	Mean	2.92	2.81	3.57	3.37	3.23
	Std. Dev.	0.51	0.47	0.35	0.33	0.29

Table 7 shows observed differences between the mean scores of the tool and its domains due to differences of the variables’ levels. In order to investigate the significance of these observed differences of the tool and variables, a 5-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) without interaction was conducted as shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Results of 5-Way Analysis of variance without interaction for all domains and variables

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<i>Gender</i>					
	0.00	1	0.00	0.02	0.89
<i>Academic Rank</i>					
	0.21	2	0.10	1.06	0.35
<i>Major</i>					
	0.26	2	0.13	1.32	0.27
<i>Years of Experience in Academic work</i>					
	0.06	1	0.06	0.62	0.43
<i>Translation Experience</i>					
	0.05	2	0.03	0.26	0.77
<i>Review Experience</i>					
	0.06	2	0.03	0.30	0.74
<i>Error</i>					
	9.00	93	0.10		
<i>Total</i>					
	9.58	103			

Table 8 shows that there were no statistically significant differences at $\alpha=0.05$ between the mean scores of the tool that can be attributed to the variables of gender, academic rank, major, years of experience in academic work, and review experience.

Moreover, table 8 shows statistically significant differences at $\alpha=0.05$ between the mean scores of the tool that can be attributed to the “Translation Experience” variable. As this is a multi-level variable, Scheffe’s Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons Test was applied to determine the source of these differences as shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Results of Scheffe’s Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons Test for the Levels of Translation Experience variable

Translation Experience	Never Done	Only 1 Book	More than 1 Book
Scheffe	Mean 2.86	3.26	3.62
Never Done	2.86		
Only 1 Book	3.26	0.40	
More than 1 Book	3.62	0.75	0.36

Table 9 shows that the differences were in favor of the “More than 1 Book” level compared to the “Only 1 Book,” and “Never done,” levels, and in favor of the “Only 1 Book” level compared to the “Never Done” level.

Moreover, in order to investigate the significance of the observed differences of the tool, correlation coefficients between the domains of the tool have been calculated, followed by a Bartlett Test of Sphericity in accordance with the variables to identify the most suitable analysis of variance to be used: Multivariate 5-way Analysis of Variance (MANOVA), or 5-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as in Table 10.

Table 10: Results of Bartlett Test of Sphericity for all domains and variables

Correlation	Major	Experience of the Reviewer	Review Ethics
Experience of the Reviewer	0.43		
Review Ethics	0.14	0.41	
Mechanisms Prior to Review	0.30	0.52	0.52
<hr/>			
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. χ^2	df	Sig.
	115.43	9	0.00



Table 10 shows that there is a statistically significant relationship at $\alpha = 0.05$ between the domains that can be attributed to the variables, which necessitated applying 5-way MANOVA without interaction for the whole tool and its variables as in Table 11.

Table 11: Results of 5-Way MANOVA without interaction for all domains and variables

Effect	Test of MANOVA	Value of MANOVA	Whole F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Gender	Hotelling's Trace	0.03	0.77	4	89	0.55
Academic Rank	Wilks' Lambda	0.90	1.15	8	178	0.33
Major	Wilks' Lambda	0.95	0.63	8	178	0.75
Years of Experience in the academic work	Hotelling's Trace	0.04	0.95	4	89	0.44
Translation Experience	Wilks' Lambda	0.91	1.03	8	178	0.42
Review Experience	Wilks' Lambda	0.90	1.15	8	178	0.33

Table 11 shows that there are no statistically significant effects for the variables of: "Gender", "Academic Rank", "Major", "Years of Experience in Academic Work", and "Review Experience." Yet, there is a statistically significant effect for the "Translation Experience" variable at $\alpha = 0.05$ on all tool domains. To identify which of these domains the "Translation Experience" variable had an effect on, 5-way (ANOVA) without interaction was applied on each domain separately as shown in Table 12.

Table 12: The results of the 5-way (ANOVA) without interaction of each single domain in accordance with the variables

Source of Variance	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	Major	0.12	1	0.12	0.48	0.49
	Experience of the Reviewer	0.00	1	0.00	0.01	0.92
	Review Ethics	0.14	1	0.14	2.05	0.16
	Mechanisms Prior to Review	0.00	1	0.00	0.10	0.75
Academic Rank	Major	0.00	2	0.00	0.00	1.00
	Experience of the Reviewer	0.87	2	0.44	3.06	0.05
	Review Ethics	0.10	2	0.05	0.77	0.47
	Mechanisms Prior to Review	0.23	2	0.12	2.61	0.08
Major	Major	0.28	2	0.14	0.58	0.56
	Experience of the Reviewer	0.02	2	0.01	0.07	0.93
	Review Ethics	0.01	2	0.01	0.09	0.92
	Mechanisms Prior to Review	0.01	2	0.01	0.15	0.86
Years of Experience in Academic Work	Major	0.03	1	0.03	0.14	0.71
	Experience of the Reviewer	0.12	1	0.12	0.85	0.36
	Review Ethics	0.08	1	0.08	1.20	0.28
	Mechanisms Prior to Review	0.00	1	0.00	0.00	0.99
Translation Experience	Major	5.44	2	2.72	11.16	0.00
	Experience of the Reviewer	11.58	2	5.79	40.47	0.00
	Review Ethics	4.15	2	2.07	30.64	0.00
	Mechanisms Prior to Review	6.46	2	3.23	72.59	0.00
Review Experience	Major	0.15	2	0.07	0.31	0.74
	Experience of the Reviewer	0.56	2	0.28	1.95	0.15
	Review Ethics	0.15	2	0.07	1.10	0.34
	Mechanisms Prior to Review	0.03	2	0.01	0.33	0.72
Error	Major	22.41	92	0.24		
	Experience of the Reviewer	13.17	92	0.14		
	Review Ethics	6.22	92	0.07		
	Mechanisms Prior to Review	4.09	92	0.04		
Total	Major	30.85	102			
	Experience of the Reviewer	29.83	102			
	Review Ethics	11.32	102			
	Mechanisms Prior to Review	11.43	102			

Table 12 shows statistically significant differences at $\alpha=0.05$ between the mean

scores of the tool domains that can be attributed to the "Translation Experience" variable. As this is a multi-level variable, the Scheffe Multiple Comparisons Test was used for this domain to discover the source of these differences, as shown in Table 13.

Table 13: Results of the Scheffe multiple comparisons Test for the domain of "Translation Experience"

Major	Translation Experience	Never Done	Only 1 Book	More than 1 Book
	Scheffe Mean	2.66	2.95	3.39
	Never Done	2.66		
	Only 1 Book	2.95	0.30	
	More than 1 Book	3.39	0.74	0.44
Experience of the Reviewer	Translation Experience	Never Done	Only 1 Book	More than 1 Book
	Scheffe Mean	2.48	2.85	3.50
	Never Done	2.48		
	Only 1 Book	2.85	0.37	
	More than 1 Book	3.50	1.02	0.65
Review Ethics	Translation Experience	Never Done	Only 1 Book	More than 1 Book
	Scheffe Mean	3.20	3.69	3.78
	Never Done	3.20		
	Only 1 Book	3.69	0.47	
	More than 1 Book	3.78	0.56	0.09
Mechanisms prior to Review	Translation Experience	Never Done	Only 1 Book	More than 1 Book
	Scheffe Mean	2.93	3.33	3.67
	Never Done	2.93		
	Only 1 Book	3.33	0.39	
	More than 1 Book	3.67	0.73	0.34

Table 13 shows that differences between the two domains "Experience of the Reviewer" and "Mechanisms Prior to Review" were in favor of those who responded by "More than 1 Book" compared to those who responded by "Only 1 Book," then "Never Done," then in favor of "Only 1 Book" compared to "Never Done". It also shows that differences in the "Major" domain were in favor of "More than 1 Book" compared to "Only 1 Book," then "Never done." Finally, table 12 shows that the "Review Ethics" domain differences were in favor of "More than 1 Book" compared to "Only 1 Book," with "Never done" coming last.

5. Discussion

The findings showed, at the level of domains, that the domain of "Review ethics" came first with a "High" degree for all its items, and the domain of "Experience of the reviewer" came last with a "Moderate" degree. This indicates that KSU staff are interested in ethics more than experience, and this could be attributed to a number of factors. First, there is the cultural background and sense of integrity that give priority to ethics. Second, ethics is a major characteristic that a university professor should be distinguished by. Third, KSU staff are part of the academic body in which long experience is not of great impact. This makes this finding in line with the previous findings of Callaham (2012) and Kliewer et al. (2005).

At the item level, the mean scores of the 27 items of the questionnaire showed that 20 items were classified under "High" with the mean scores ranging between 3.80

(Item 13); “During reviewing the translated work, the reviewer should be unbiased even if it is against his/her personal views”, and 3.19 (item 15) “The translated book should be reviewed by two reviewers, one majoring in the field of the book, and the other majoring in the field of translation”. However, 7 items were classified under “Moderate” with the mean scores ranging between 2.89 (item 17); “The translated work should be reviewed by three reviewers, the first majoring in the field, the second majoring in the foreign language, and the third majoring in Arabic”, and 2.12 (item 4) “The translated work should be reviewed by two reviewers majoring in the foreign language of the source book, regardless of the field of the translated book”.

Items 13 and 12 of the ethics domain came on the top of all 27 items in the questionnaire, indicating that the respondents’ preference represents a call for objectivity; a moral value they possess, or a reaction to a previous experience of getting a paper or translated book rejected due to reviewers’ subjectivity resulting from either unclear criteria or guidelines. A reviewer should be objective regardless of the relationship with the translator, whether a friend or colleague, A reviewer respects others’ views and assesses their performance without any kind of bias or attitude. “Older reviewers may conceivably be more entrenched in their opinions, tending to harbor harsher views towards perspectives that do not coincide with their beliefs and experiences” (Kliever et al., 2005). This could also be supported by Benhaddou (1991: 237) who ascribed discrepancy in translation evaluation to impressionistic judgments and unfamiliarity with evaluation criteria.

Items 25, 27, and 18 in the domain of “Mechanisms Prior to Review” concerning training potential, reviewers did not reveal much interest among the respondents for such a trend. This could be ascribed to their recognition or sense of insignificance of training as David and Jadad (2003) declare “... but almost no formal or standardized training for peer reviewers exists.” Callahan and Trecier (2007) confirm, “There are no easily identifiable types of formal training or experience that predict reviewer performance.” However, their responses showed that they preferred items 23, 14, and 24 of the same domain, which requires providing potential reviewers with clear and specific peer review criteria.

Item 23, “Providing the reviewer with a clear review form along with the work to be reviewed”, in the domain of “Mechanisms Prior to Review”, occupied the 3rd rank at the level of the questionnaire and the 1st at the level of the domain, indicating that the 81 respondents, who have had previous experience in review of translated books, experienced shortage in clear-cut criteria and guidelines that might have helped them review the assigned task objectively. Their preference for this item followed with items 14 and 24 (occupying the 5th and 6th ranks respectively) supports their preference to items 13 and 12, which calls for objectivity of the review and reviewer. Results support that objectivity is attained if there are clear and standardized criteria and guidelines provided in advance to reviewers. An examination of the peer review process for 38 journals by Ferreira et al. (2015) shows that “there is complete absence of guidelines and unclear criteria, to more formal systems with forms and defined criteria.”

Moreover, item 3 “The translator can nominate ten people in the field of the translated work to review it” obtaining of a “Moderate” degree means that the respondents prefer blind peer review when there are clear criteria and guidelines. This also supports the call for objectivity of peer review on behalf of both the translator and reviewer.

Even though the domain of “Major” consisted of 5 items only, the mean scores of its items showed great discrepancy. Item 1, “The translated book should be reviewed by two reviewers majoring in the field of the translated book,” obtained 3.66, ranking 3rd at the level of the questionnaire. However, item 4, “The translated work should be reviewed by two reviewers majoring in the foreign language of the source book, regardless of the field of the translated book,” obtained only 2.12, ranking 27th at the level of the questionnaire. This implies a call for specialization in the field of the book translated to guarantee consistent assessment by both reviewers and overcoming the probability of concentrating on secondary points that do not reflect the gist of the translated book.

The variable concerning “experience in translation” showed significance for those who translated more than one book compared with those who translated one book or never translated, and those who translated one book compared with those who never translated books, indicating that



those who practiced translation benefited from their experience and the experience of others in peer reviewing. It could also indicate the way they hope the process of peer review would be.

6. Conclusion

Blind peer review of translated books where neither the authors nor the reviewers know each other remains subjective and subject to criticism. The findings of this study support the findings of peer review studies in terms of the insignificance of training, academic rank, experience in review, and gender. This also asserts the idea that the process is still impressionistic, lacking governing factors.

Moreover, findings support that reviewers still believe in theory more than in practice in the process of peer-review of translated books. This was clear in the preference of items in the domains of "Review Ethics", Mechanisms Prior to Review", and "Major" to items in the domain of "Experience of the Reviewer" that occupied the last rank with "Moderate", and a mean score of 2.98. The whole process of peer-review whether it is a review of a translated book or a research paper does not differ greatly, which indicates that this process has not yet developed due to inherent differences between translation and research papers. First, a research paper has certain components that should be available. Second, a research paper is much shorter than a translated book. Third, unlike a research paper, a translator of a book does not have to draw findings and conclusions; all a translator has to do is to rewrite a certain book in another language.

Recommendations

1. An open peer review system (Khanam: 2013) where reviewers and authors are not blinded may bring transparency to the process of peer review as both reviewers and authors may fear criticism.
2. The review process requires both integrity and responsibility. The reviewer is responsible for purifying publications through his/her task as a gatekeeper between circulating and defending or criticizing ideas (Park, Peacey, and Munafu, 2014).
3. There is a need to stress the importance of imposing an ethical code for translation review process. There is an urgent need to embark on this work.
4. Seminars, conferences, etc., should be held to discuss clear translation assessment rules.
5. It is important to cultivate a spirit of objectivity among translation reviewers and practitioners.
6. TC reviewers should be assessed in terms of their objectivity, and those proved subjective should be excluded.
7. More peer review studies are needed in the field of humanities.

References

- Benhaddou, Mohamed. 1991. "Translation Quality Assessment: a Situational/Textual Model for the Evaluation of Arabic/English Translations". PHD thesis, University of Salford, Salford, England.
- Benos, D. J., Kirk, K. L., & Hall, J. E. 2003. How to review a paper. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 27 (3), pp. 47-52.
- Bornmann, LLutz, Rudiger Mutz, and Hans-Dieter Danial. 2010. A Reliability-Generalization Study of Journal Peer Reviews: A Multilevel Meta-Analysis of Inter-rater Reliability and Its Determinants. *PLoS One* 5 (12): e14331. *Doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0014331*.
- Bruce, Rachel; Anthony Chauvin; Ludovic Triquart; Phillippe Ravaud; and Isabelle Boutron. 2016. Impact of Interventions to Improve the Quality of Peer Review of Biomedical Journals: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *BMC Medicine*, 14 (85), *Doi: 10.1186/12910-016-0631-5*.
- Callaham, Michael. 2012. What Characteristics Identify a Good Reviewer. Elsevier.com/editors-update/story/peer-review/what-characteristics-identify-a-good-reviewer
- Callaham Michael L., and John Trecier. 2007. The Relationship of Previous Training and Experience of Journal Peer Reviewers to Subsequent Review Quality. *PLOS Medicine* 4 (1): e40. *Doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0040040*
- Callaham Michael L., Robert L. Wears, and Josheph F. Waeckerle. 1998. "Effect of Attendance at a Training Session on Peer Reviewer Quality and Performance. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 32: 3 pp. 318-22. *Doi.org/10.1016/S0196-0644(98)70007-1*
- Chauvin Anthony, Philippe Ravaud, Gabriel Baron, Caroline Barnes, and Isabelle Boutron. 2015. The Most Important Tasks for Peer Reviewers Evaluating a Randomized Controlled Trial are not Congruent with the Tasks Most Often Requested by General Editors. *BMC MED.*; 13: 158. *Doi: 10.1186/s12916-015-0395-3*
- David Moher, Alejandro R Jadad. 2003. How to Peer Review a Manuscript. In: Tom Jefferson, Peer Review in Health Sciences, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 183-190

- <http://www.bmj.com/sites/default/files/attachments/resources/2011/07/moher.pdf>
- Djupe, Paul. 2015. Peer Reviewing in Political Science: New Survey Results. *PS: Political Science & Political April*: 346-51.
- Esarey, Justin. 2016. "Does Peer Review Identify the Best Papers? A Simulation Study of Editors, Reviewers, and the Scientific Publication Process." jee3.web.rice.edu/peer-review.pdf
- Evans NT, MC Nutt RA, Fletcher SW, and Fletcher RH. 1993. The Characteristics of Peer Reviewers Who Produce Good Quality Reviews. *J Gen Intern Med.* 8 (8): 422-8.
- Ferreira, Catarina, Guillaume Bastille-Rousseau, Amanda M. Bennet, E. Hance Ellington, Christine Terwssen, Cala Austin, and Adrian Borlestean, et al. 2015. The Evolution of Peer Review as a basis for Scientific Publication: Directional Selection towards a Robust Discipline? *Biological Reviews*, 91: 3, 597-610. DOI: 10.1111/bry.12185.
- Goodman, Steven N., Jesse Berlin, Suzanne W. Fletcher, and Robert H. Fletcher. 1994. Manuscript Quality before and after Peer Review and Editing at Annals of Internal Medicine. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 121: 11-21.
- Houry, Dedra, Steven Green, and Michae Callaham. 2012. Does Mentoring New Peer Reviewers Improve Review Quality? A Randomized Trial. *BMC Medical Education* 12(83) doi:10.1186/1472-6920-12-83
- Jacoby, William G., Robert N. Lupton, Miles T. Armaly, and Marina Carabellese. 2015. "American Journal of Political Science Report to the Editorial Board and the Midwest Political Science Association Executive Council." April. <https://ajpsblogging.files.wordpress.com/2015/04/ajps-editors-report-on-2014.pdf>.
- Khanam, Shazia. 2013. Frequently Asked Questions about Peer Review. www.editage.com/insights/frequently-asked-questions-about...
- Kliwer, Mark A., Kelly S. Freed, David M. DeLong, Perry J. Pickhardt, and James M. Provenzale. 2015. Reviewing the Reviewers: Comparison of Review quality and Reviewer Characteristics at the American Journal of Roentgenology. *AJR*, 184, pp 1731-35.
- Li, Danielle, and Leila Agha. 2015. "Big Names or Big Ideas: Do Peer-Review Panels Select the best Science Proposals?" *Science* 348 (6233): 434-38. DOI: 10.1126/science.aaa0185
- Mathison, s. 2005. *Encyclopedia of Evaluation*. London: SAGE.
- Nexon, Daniel H. 2014. "ISQ Annual Report, 2014." December 5.
- <http://www.isanet.org/Portals/0/Documents/ISO/ISO%202014%20Annual%20Report.pdf>.
- Park, In-Uck, Mike W. Peacey, and Marcus R. Munafo. 2014. Modelling the Effects of Subjective and Objective Decision Making in Scientific Peer Review. *Nature*, 506, pp. 93-96. Doi: 10.1038/nature12786.
- Rockwell, Sara. (2006). Ethics of Peer Review: A Guide for Manuscript Reviewers. Available at: <http://ori.dhhs.gov/education/products/yal/prethics.pdf>.
- Rojewski, Jay W.; & Desirae M. Domenco. 2004. The Art and Politics of Peer Review. *Journal of Career and Technical Education*, 20 (2), pp 41-54.
- Schroter, Sara, Nick Black, Stephen Evans, Fiona Godlee, Lyda Osorio, and Richard Smith. 2008. "What Errors Do Peer Reviewers Detect, and Does Training Improve Their Ability to Detect Them?" *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 101: 507-14.
- Solomon, David J. 2007. The Role of Peer Review for Scholarly Journals in the Information Age. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 10 (1). Doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451/0010107>[<http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451/0010107>]
- Stevenson, Jacqueline. 2015. The Importance of Training in Peer Review. [Http://editorresources.taylorandfrancisgroup.com/the-importance-of-peer-review](http://editorresources.taylorandfrancisgroup.com/the-importance-of-peer-review).
- Young, S. N. 2003. Peer Review of Manuscripts: Theory and Practice. *Journal of Psychiatry & Neuroscience*, 28, pp. 327-330.