



***Teacher Gatekeeping of Academic Discourse Translations: The Case of the Summary of the Arabic Translation of the Fifth Edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association***

Bouabdellah Fella

<sup>1</sup> Historical Document Translation Laboratory, Université d'Alger 2, Algeria,  
fella.bouabdellah@univ-alger2.dz

Received 10 /01 /2024 Accepted: 15/06/2024

Published:12/10/2024

**Abstract:**

Many English academic style guides have introduced bias-free language guidelines enjoining the use of an inclusive tone of speaking when referring to people and openly stating their identity, including 'gender' identity. This paper attempts to investigate how such specific guidelines are recontextualized and mediated through teacher adaptations and summaries to bring them into conformity with the target culture norms. To broach this rather intricate topic, we have chosen a summary of the 5<sup>th</sup> edition of the translation of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. A number of passages are selected to detect and interpret the motivations behind any gatekeeping operations on the part of the teacher. It is found that the teacher seems to have problematized those specific recommendations; while they were not deleted altogether, they were de-emphasised through generalization, under-definition and under-exemplification. In contrast, the other non-contentious recommendations were sufficiently elaborated.

**Keywords:** Academic style guide- academic discourse- Gatekeeping- genre- - translation summary.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Scientific translation is relatively under-researched compared to, say, political or literary translation. This is more so for academic translation, possibly because of the assumption that academics around the world are supposed to have an adequate mastery of English as a *lingua franca*, and that translation therefore is deemed to be needless. This has left many linguistic and non-linguistic aspects of academic translation unexplored, especially for languages whose scientific content is highly dependent on translation such as Arabic.

In the last decades, there has been a burgeoning interest in the study of English academic discourse in such fields as education studies, contrastive rhetoric, applied linguistics and translation. It has generally been studied as concrete texts pertaining to specific academic genres (Hyland, 2011) or in relation with other languages to pin down rhetorical conventions across different *lingua-cultures* (Lakić, Živković, & Vuković, 2015). Others had more of a critical take on the topic, criticizing the hegemonic status of English academic discourse which marginalizes “national scientific and intellectual systems” (Altbach, 2007). Along this line, and speaking from a translational perspective, Benett (2007) lamented the fact that for non-English works to make it to the English publication world, they have to be reworked in a way that obliterates their distinctive rhetorical and epistemological features (155).

While academic genres have had their fair share of scholarly attention, little has been said about the instruments that have propelled the English academic discourse to the centre stage it occupies today in the world of academic publishing. In particular, while the genre *per se* has been studied extensively, the style manuals governing how academic discourse should look like have received scant attention. This is even more so for translation studies, English style guides and publication manuals have been in wide circulation worldwide, yet little is known about who translates them, how they are translated and with what degree of mediation and if they are translated everywhere to begin with. This paper attempts to make a contribution to this research area with particular reference to Arabic.

The recent updated English academic publication manuals include prescriptions that transcend the methodological and linguistic levels. A somewhat socially committed tone has been injected into them through the introduction of some recommendations as regards inclusion; the use of inclusive language and steering clear of bias against individuals or groups on the basis of their distinguishing features or identity. Identity in such manuals includes, among others, nationality, ethnicity, but also ‘sexual identity’; a concept not necessarily shared by all cultures, particularly a highly conservative one like the Arab culture. This paper therefore probes into this very aspect of academic manual translation. It aims at understanding how such sensitive aspects of English academic publication manuals are recontextualized into Arabic and the agents involved in this process of recontextualization. This research question is divided into the following sub-questions:

What are academic publishing manuals from a generic view? How culture-embedded are they? Who translates them and mediates their trajectory from the English academic discourse community into Arab academic discourse community? What are the gatekeeping mechanisms involved? What are the potential motivations behind such gatekeeping practices?

To answer these questions, this paper is organized as follows. The following section attempts to give an overview of the Arab academic discourse in connection with the English one. Section 3 discusses the complex nature of academic style manuals from a generic point of view. Section 4 discusses how academic publication manuals, like all genres, encode the values of their creators. Section 5 discusses gatekeeping and attempts to identify the potential gatekeepers of Arabic translations of English style guides. Section 6 outlines the methodology used. An analysis of certain samples from the translation and summary of the fifth edition of the APA manual then ensues, followed by concluding remarks.

## 1. Calquing of the Arabic Academic Discourse: Absence of reference or quest for visibility?

It goes without saying that English is the first language of scientific publication. While having a universal language of science is seen in a positive light by some as it facilitates scientific communication between multilingual discourse communities, the dominance of English means that some languages are relegated to secondary ranks in terms of scientific publications, as to those whose contribution to the accumulation of knowledge is rather little, such as Arabic, they have apparently been removed from the picture altogether. This situation has prompted many countries to partially or fully adopt the English academic discourse model so as to help their academics get their papers published in high-end journals and improve the visibility of their universities. As a result, the English Academic discourse model was “exported” or “calqued” to many cultures (Benett, 2011). This calquing process, according to Benett, goes through two stages: an unintentional stage which occurs either as a result of literal translation or the conscious or unconscious imitation of English discourse patterns by writers constantly in contact with the ubiquitous English language content. The second stage, i.e. codification, is intentional, entailing the promotion of the exported discourse by the host culture authorities via organizing writing courses and publishing style manuals to get academics to internalize its rules and specificities (7-8).

Arabic is one of the languages which has and still is witnessing a pervasive calquing of the patterns of English academic discourse. In fact, some even argue that “[Arab] scientific discourse is a translation activity, as Arabic is usually a target language, and creation and reasoning are done in another language” (Farghal & Shunnaq, 1999). Upon reading through paper abstracts written in Arabic, anyone who is familiar with EAD may readily realize that they exhibit certain features usually associated with English abstracts. This includes, at the lexical level, calqued research terms such as ورقة بحثية, a calque for ‘research paper’, which is starting to be normalized in some journals despite its unpalatableness, as well as the decreasing authorial presence via some syntactic choices such as the extensive use of the passive voice and abstract active constructions such as تهدف هذه الدراسة/ تبنى البحث منهجية (this study aims at/ the research adopts a methodology..) whereby actions are attributed to inanimate objects such as the paper, hypotheses, findings, etc instead of the human actor, i.e. the researcher. Furthermore, there doesn’t seem to be style manuals on Arabic scientific/academic writing out there. The few guidelines scattered here and there on the World Wide Web are few pages long and seem to be translations themselves; they generally introduce principles of scientific writing such as clarity and objectivity and focus more on methodological and ethical aspects of scientific discourse than the lexicogrammar and rhetorical conventions of Arabic scientific discourse. This lack of a modern frame of reference for Arabic academic writing seems to have accelerated the process of the calquing of the English academic discourse model. English style manuals, then, apart from being the main linguistic mechanism for the standardization of English academic discourse among Anglophone discourse communities, have arguably served as a crucial tool for its internationalization, mainly through translations and adaptations.

## 2. The genre/ Metagenre of Academic Style Manuals

A general overview of style manuals might be useful for the sake of systematicity. It will help us classify the text under study, identify its features, and understand some related concepts that will guide us through our research.

Starting from the premise that discourse is “language use in institutional, professional or more general social contexts” (Bhatia, 2004), Bhatia indicates that the analysis of written discourse can be approached from different analytical traditions, namely discourse as text, discourse as genre, discourse as professional practice and discourse as social practice (3-4). He defines genre as “recognizable communicative events, characterized by a set of communicative purposes identified and mutually

understood by members of the professional or academic

community in which they regularly occur”(26). In simpler words, genre is generally taken to mean conventionalized language use among a homogeneous group of people (in terms of interests and goals) to serve certain communicative purposes. To disambiguate the rather fuzzy concept of discourse community, Swales (1990) distinguished it from “speech community”. For him, the latter is a sociolinguistic grouping of people with shared linguistic, regulative and cultural rules, whose communicative needs are centered around the ‘group’ and their linguistic behavior is thus socially determined, while discourse community is a socio-rhetorical grouping whose communicative needs are centered around their shared ‘goals’, and thus their linguistic behavior is functionally determined (Wardle & Downs, 2011, pp. 470-471). He also defined discourse communities in terms of the characteristics shared by their members. A discourse community is supposed to have:

- 1) Broadly agreed public goals,
- 2) Mechanisms in place for intercommunication,
- 3) Participatory mechanisms used primarily for providing information and feedback,
- 4) Conventionalized genre or genres to further their aims,
- 5) Specialized lexis or what we might call a ‘communi-lect’ and
- 6) A threshold level of members with an adequate degree of content and discursal expertise that live up to the community’s standards (471-473).

Swales (2016) then expanded the notion of discourse community, categorizing it into three types to map each discourse community’s territory. The first type is local discourse communities, referring to groupings of individuals working in the same place or sharing the same occupation in the same area, global discourse communities, which are recreational or professional associations reaching across a region, a nation or internationally, and lastly folocal discourse communities whose members, as the portmanteau suggests, subscribe to both communities.

If we are to consider academic user guides as a homogeneous class of texts with shared linguistic features and goals, they can be said to form a class of their own given that they pertain to the genre of procedural or instructional texts which Aouladomar and Saint-Dizier (2005, para, 2) define as texts which “explain how to realize a certain goal by means of actions which are at least partially temporally organized”. This definition applies to Academic style manuals such as APA Publication Manual, which comprises a set of linguistic and extra-linguistic recommendations telling academics and researchers how to make their research readable and publishable within academia.

Academic style guides can also be viewed as a genre that regulates another genre, and here the umbrella concept of meta-genre comes in handy as a classificatory term. Coined by genre theorist Giltrow (2002) to mean “situated language for situated language” (190), it indicates that a genre sets out rules and guidelines on how another written genre should read like. In the context of academic style manuals, they are created by academics and publishers and serve to show how academic discourse, broadly speaking, should be like and enjoins specific rhetorical practices to be adhered to by researchers to make their works worthy of publication. Against this backdrop, academic style guides exhibit hybrid features of both instructional discourse and academic discourse. On one hand, they contain instructions (methodological, editorial, linguistic, rhetorical...etc) typical of instructional texts, on the other hand, they obviously relate to academic discourse in that 1) they revolve around the content and texture of academic writing, 2) they are read and used by university students and academics just like textbooks and

reference works 3) and stylistically exhibit a writing style similar to that found in academic genres.

It is stated in the preface of the 5<sup>th</sup> edition of the APA publication manual (2001) that the manual started “In 1928 [when] editors and business managers of anthropological and psychological journals met to discuss the form of journal manuscripts and to write instructions for their preparation”. As such, the APA was first intended for a small disciplinary audience, i.e. the psychological and anthropological discourse communities. Yet, slowly but surely, the guidelines gained more ground as they started to be used in the sciences, education, engineering...etc, and above all, they began to be used by academics worldwide. That being said, the APA discourse community can be said to have expanded from local to focal with the globalization of the English academic discourse model.

The discourse community (DC) involved in the genre/metagenre of publication manuals consists of the manual drafters (addressers), namely editors and publishers, and authors wishing to carve out a niche within academia. The three parties belong to the academic community as a whole, albeit with differing power dynamics; with editors and publishers assuming gatekeeper roles as they get to decide on whose contribution lives up to the discourse community’s expectations. As such, meta-genres are inherently normative as they may “control what kinds of writing can happen and how they happen in such a way as to sweep any evidence of discord or disagreement under the rug”. (Doody, 2020). The notion of power, then, is very much present in the metagenre of Anglophone academic publication manuals as suggested above. Apart from the fact that Anglophone style manuals are one of the most crucial mechanisms for the internationalization of the English scholarly discourse- whose hegemonic status, according to Benett (2007) rendered other ways of knowledge invisible or “swallowed up in a process of ‘epistemicide’”- they also serve as gatekeeping tools in the hands of editors and publishers within academia; controlling what kind of discourse is allowed entry into the discourse community. Van Djik speaks of this in terms of discourse access management (1993) which is “one of the crucial social dimensions of dominance” (257).

### 3. Values in Academic Publication Manuals: Global or Culture-specific?

Although English language style guides have been devised with an English speaking audience in mind, the dominance of the English academic discourse model has made academics worldwide under the feeling that they are obliged to master its particulars if they are to succeed in their academic career. This explains why some translations into different languages are not uncommon on the World Wide Web. These translations or adaptations are done either by universities, websites offering academic services or adapted by specific journals as part of their author instructions. By and large, most of these adaptations provide succinct account of the main points and updates brought to each edition of the source manual, with particular emphasis on citation guidelines so as to help students and academics avert any form of intentional or unintentional plagiarism.

One recurrent feature in genre-related studies is that “genres are seldom seen to maintain static values” (Bhatia, 1997). Although Bhatia’s conception of values here has to do with socio-rhetorical values within academic discourse communities, we argue that the statement is equally tenable if values are to be understood as a macro concept which refers to a set of personal, social or religious codes of ethics. Discourses are not created *ex nihilo*; they develop in tandem with the evolving environment in which they are created; encapsulating the worldview and changing value systems of their creators. The moral embeddedness of genres has been especially discussed in relation with film and mass media genres, where it was argued that generic conventions reflect the values and ideologies in vogue at the time of their production (Fiske, 1987, as cited in Chandler, 1997).

Research on values indicate that values can be either explicit or implicit; while explicit values “refer to values as captured by verbal expressions; they are conscious valuations expressed by individuals, groups or organizations”, implicit values are “non-verbal and embedded in actions” (Løvaas, 2022, p. 16). Academic style manuals can be said to reflect the values of their drafters,

which are essentially mirror images of their social environment. In 1999, the 5<sup>th</sup> edition of the APA publication manual rolled off the press. It introduced new items including guidelines for unbiased language use in academic writing. The excerpt below explains the rationale behind the said guidelines:

APA is committed both to science and to the fair treatment of individuals and groups, and this policy requires authors of APA publications to avoid perpetuating demeaning attitudes and biased assumptions about people in their writing. Constructions that might imply bias against persons on the basis of gender, sexual orientation, racial or ethnic group, disability, or age should be avoided. Scientific writing should be free of implied or irrelevant evaluation of the group or groups being studied (APA, 2001. 61).

The quote above can be described as a value statement explicitly outlining the values or principles endorsed and recommended by APA as far as equity and inclusivity are concerned. It suggests that the motivations behind the championed values are both scientific (avoidance of value judgments) and social (justice and equality). The values lay emphasis on certain social groups that are likely to be addressed with bias due to their identity markers (gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, disability or age). These values seem to be in synch with the prevailing atmosphere of 1990's America, marked with concerns for women, gender and racial minorities and individual liberalism (Foner, 1994). They basically reflect but also appear to inscribe such values as equality, diversity and embracing minority groups by instituting within the fabric of academic discourse specific discursive practices that are believed to reflect them in the linguistic realm. This goes to prove that genres and values are mutually constitutive since "a genre develops according to social conditions; [and] transformations in genre and texts can influence and reinforce social conditions" (Thwaites et al. 1994, as cited in Chandler, 1997). It is when such discursive requirements are recontextualized into different setting with different value systems that their underlying values may come to be questioned and resisted or simply glossed over.

If we are to speak of the concept of 'gender identity' in the Arab context, the concept may readily be associated with how people identify themselves, either male or female. This conceptualization of gender is deeply rooted in the Arab culture and manifestly reflected in the Arabic language which is known to be a highly gendered one; with verbs and adjectives assigned either to male or female pronouns. Gender identity however, as now understood from a western perspective, has been broadened to encompass binary and non-binary groups whose self-identification is basically incongruent with their biological identity. These non-binary identities (gays, transgender people ...) are rarely spoken of in the Arabo-Islamic world where there is a firm belief that sex is biologically defined and should be confined to the male-female dichotomy, and that all other sexualities are but forms of excessive freedom and deviance. It comes as no surprise then that speaking of this category of people in translated works into Arabic may be highly challenging for any translator or language mediator and involves a high degree of censorship. This holds true for style guides committed to the inclusion of sexual minorities because they pose both linguistic and cultural problems. While gender-inclusive guidelines form part of the publication ethics laid down by many Western scholarly journals, this is not particularly the case for most, if not all Arab journals

#### **4. Scientific Methodology Teachers as Gatekeepers of Translated Academic Style Guides**

While early translation studies focused on translation as merely a linguistic transfer, modern translation studies are predominantly sociological in their orientation; translation is basically viewed as a social practice. Apart from broaching educational and professional aspects of translation, sociological perspectives take particular interest in, inter alia, translator and agency, translation and activism, translation and globalization as well as the socio-political aspects of the translation activity (Inghileri, 2009, p. 279). One of the topics strictly linked to the social-practice view of translation production and reception is gatekeeping. The notion of

gatekeeping appeared in communication and journalism studies to refer to a set of decision-making operations on what items qualify as news-worthy through “the process of selecting, writing, editing, positioning, scheduling, repeating and otherwise massaging information to become news” (Shoemaker, Vos, & Reese, 2009, p. 73).

In translation, gatekeeping has been mostly studied in connection with journalistic translation, overlapping with ‘trans-editing’ (translating and editing simultaneously) (Cheesman & Nohl, 2011). It was discussed as part of localizing strategy whereby news agencies introduce overt or implicit stylistic and content adjustments to make their news items relevant and comprehensible for their international audiences (218) or for ideological motivations whereby unwanted news are de-emphasized through under-coverage and under or non- translation (Valdeón, 2022). In scientific translation, Olohan (2013) historically discussed gatekeeping in connection with the translated articles of an 19<sup>th</sup> century English scientific periodical, tracing the editor-publisher’s decisions on what should or should not be translated and the agents influencing his decisions as well as the criteria for selection.

As stated above, there is a marked shortage or absence, if you may, of purely Arabic style guides for academics. As a result, translations of Anglophone style guides abound on the net, with different length and quality. Overall, translated manuals focus primarily on sound scientific thinking and general scientific writing principles (clarity, objectivity, etc) and updates related to editorial style, particularly citation guidelines. The first encounter of Arab university students with such guidelines is arguably during scientific method class, where they are introduced to the philosophy of science and the specificities of scientific writing. These courses may either be a synthesis of existing Arabic manuals which are themselves translations or adaptations of English manuals or, partial translations performed by a panel of university professors of the original manuals under the auspices of the university they are affiliated with.

Thornton (1989) describes teachers as ‘curricular-instructional gatekeepers’ since “they are normally the primary determinant of content, sequence and instructional strategy”. In this vein, Arab university teachers, particularly those imparting lectures on scientific method, may well act as gatekeepers since they get to decide on what manuals to use as references, and most importantly on what passages within those manuals are to be selected for inclusion in the lectures. The process of (de)selection, being one of the gatekeeping mechanisms described above, seems to be made based either on linguistic considerations; since certain guidelines are mostly English-language specific, or based on the extent of cultural incongruity that is likely to render the manual culturally irrelevant, thereby undermining its acceptability for the target audience. The former may be considered as a form of resistance to globalizing trends which “hybridise local identities in favour of Anglocentric textual models” (Gotti, 2012), whereas the latter can be seen as some sort of a culture clash of two disparate value systems. That being said, university professors are likely to act as mediators between the original manual and students, shaping how it should be understood and applied. The gatekeeping operations brought to adaptations or summaries of English publication manuals may go completely unheeded since such summaries exhibit some of the same features observed in gist translation (Mason, 2018), also called summary or abstract translation:

In abstract translation a condensed translation of all the information in ST is made in order to give the client “rapid access to specific types of information (1990:335, translated). This may be done in various ways. Firstly, the generic themes of the text may be translated; secondly, a description may be given of the generic content and the objectives of the text and its sub-units; thirdly, an abridged translation of all the useful content of the text may be supplied (1990:335) (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2014)

In line with this, these summaries or adaptations inherently entail semantic condensation which is achieved through selection whereby specific chunks are left out. They essentially camouflage the gatekeeping processes, with the deleted parts presumed to be an inevitable result of summarization rather than motivated intervention.

## II. Methods and Materials:

For the purpose of our research, we have chosen as a case study a translation summary of the 5th edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. The summary was uploaded to the website of the Excellence Research Centre for Science and Mathematics Education which is based in Saudi Arabia and draws on the translation of Al Badayina (2005). The summary was chosen for many reasons. First, it is a bit more detailed compared to the APA manual summaries available on the net and includes passages about the very aspect we are investigating. Second, the summary is based on a translation that, to a large degree, subscribes to the SL norms; this sparked our curiosity to uncover and interpret the teacher's reception of the translation and identify the way she mediated it to students. Third, the summary was devised to be presented at a lecture given at a Saudi-based research centre, this will lend support to our assumption that the gatekeeping interventions were undertaken to enhance the translation acceptability for a rather conservative audience.

Since the study analyzes a summary of a translation, we will juxtapose the original passage and the first integral translation along with the summary. Then, we will uncover the gatekeeping operations at work, highlighting deletions, generalizations, under-definitions and under-exemplifications. Some passages might be long for the obvious reason that we are not comparing an ST and a TT at a micro level, but an abridged version of relatively lengthy guidelines in the ST and their translated counterparts in the integral translation. This would spare us drawing simplistic and subjective conclusions since sometimes it wouldn't be possible to know which parts are de-emphasised unless they are juxtaposed with the ones which have actually been emphasised in the summary. It is noteworthy that certain sentences have been left out whenever deemed to have no impact on our analysis.

### III. Analysis and discussion:

#### Example 1:

| ST                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | TT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Summary                                                                                                                                                                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>when you refer to a person or persons, choose words that are accurate, clear, and free from bias...</p> <p>When in doubt, it is better to be more specific rather than less.. For example, using man to refer to all human beings is simply not as accurate as the phrase men and women. To describe age groups, it is better to give a specific age range ("ages 65-83") instead of a broad category "over 65"; When describing racial and ethnic groups, be appropriately specific and sensitive to issues of labeling. For example, instead of describing participants as Asian American or Hispanic American, it may be helpful to describe them by their nation or region of origin (e.g., Chinese Americans, Mexican Americans). <i>If you are discussing sexual orientation, realize that some people interpret gay as referring to men and women, whereas others interpret the term as including only men (for clarity, gay men and lesbians currently are preferred)</i></p> <p>p.62-63</p> | <p>عند الإشارة إلى شخص أو أشخاص، اختر الكلمات الدقيقة والواضحة والخالية من التحيز...على سبيل المثال، استخدام كلمة الرجل لتعني البشر ببساطة ليست بدقة الجملة الرجال و النساء. و لوصف عمر المجموعات من الأفضل إعطاء مدى محدد للعمر (أعمار 65-83) بدلا من الفئة العامة (من 65 فأكثر). و عند وصف الجماعات الاثنية و العرقية، من المناسب أن تكون محددا و حساسا لمواضيع الوصم، على سبيل المثال، فبدلا من وصف المشاركين كأمركيين آسيويين أو أمريكيين إسبان، فمن المفيد أن تصفهم بجنسيتهم أو منطقة الأصل (مثال، صينيون، أمريكيان، مكسيكيون)، و إذا كنت تناقش التوجه الجنسي، أدرك بأن بعض الناس يفسر المخنث (gay) لتعني الرجال و النساء بينما الآخرون يفسرون المصطلح ليشمل الرجال (للتوضيح الرجال المخنثون، و السحاقيات حاليا هي الكلمات المفضلة). P.90-91</p> | <p>عند الإشارة إلى شخص أو أشخاص اختر الكلمات الدقيقة الواضحة الخالية من التحيز....</p> <p>عندما تشك عليك أن تكون أكثر تحديدا وليس أقل تحديدا، (ليس رجل وإنما رجال والنساء)</p> |

The first guideline has to do with being explicit while referring to people, their age, ethnicity, nationality and ‘sexual orientation’. The Arabic translation is highly faithful, detailing how academic writers are expected to avoid bias when talking about these aspects. The summary gives the primary instruction: choosing exact and unbiased words and simply mentioned one common example about gender: explicitly mentioning men and women instead of simply using men to refer to both. Other examples, including the ones about sexual orientation were deleted. The teacher may have assumed that the requirement as articulated in the first sentence was self-explanatory and so chose to mention just one example, although handling bias towards age-groups, racial, ethnic and sexual groups also needed some explanation. While it is premature to draw hasty conclusions of there being any ideologically-motivated choice here, her avoidance of stating examples about people who don’t identify within the man/woman gender binary seems to be a recurrent trend as will be shown below.

### Example 2:

| ST                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | TT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Summary                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Gender is cultural and is the term to use when referring to men and women as social groups. Sex is biological; use it when the biological distinction is predominant. Note that the word sex can be confused with sexual behavior. Gender helps keep meaning unambiguous, as in the following example: "In accounting for attitudes toward the bill, sexual orientation rather than gender accounted for most of the variance. Most gay men and lesbians were for the proposal; most heterosexual men and women were against it." P. 63 | النوع (gender) و هو مصطلح ثقافي يستخدم للإشارة إلى الرجال و النساء كمجموعات اجتماعية. أما مصطلح الجنس (sex) فيبيولوجي، و يستخدم عندما يكون التمييز البيولوجي سائدا. لاحظ أن كلمة جنس يمكن ان تتيه مع السلوك الجنسي. يساعد النوع في الحفاظ على المعنى غير مبهم كما في الأمثلة التالية: "في إحصاء الاتجاهات نحو المشروع، فإن التوجه الجنسي و ليس النوع كان مسؤولا عن غالبية التباين. غالبية الرجال المخنثين و السحاقيات كانوا مع المشروع، غالبية الرجال و النساء ذوي الجنسية الغيرية كانوا ضد المشروع" p. 91 | حدد النوع والجنس لا ترمز له |

‘Sex’ and ‘gender’ are not the same as per the modern western worldview. Sex refers to biological differences and is assigned to people at birth; either male or female. Gender, as per the definition of the World Health Organization, refers to "the socially constructed characteristics of women and men – such as norms, roles and relationships of and between groups of women and men. It varies from society to society and can be changed" (Sex and gender, n.d). Gender therefore is not static since some people within the male-female biologically-based identity may later identify themselves outside of it. The definition above suggests that this construct is culture-specific and thus perceptions of male and female characteristics and roles may vary considerably across different societies. The TT presents a full translation of the passage, clarifying the western distinction between sex and gender and introducing lexis related to sexuality (gay, homosexual, heterosexual). The teacher chose to simply condense the paragraph into one sentence which reads: « identify the sex and gender, don’t state it implicitly”. In the Arab context, there is hardly any differentiation between the two terms. Tentative translations have appeared recently, these include the borrowed جندر, and the adjective and noun الجنسانية/جنساني. Yet none of these are used widely enough; except perhaps in academic feminist and gender studies. The third tentative translation is نوع, the one used by the teacher in her summary, yet it is a polysemous word which also means “type” and “genre”. This is complicated by the fact that the guideline also distinguished between gender and sexual behavior, which might have a negative connotation in the minds of many Arabs as it refers to actual sexual behaviors and may thus be equated with deviance. While the ST spells out the differences through definitions and examples, the teacher did not consider explaining the differences, possibly because the distinction is not relevant to most Arabs, but also, elucidating

the differences would entail giving examples that may be judged to be rather too western and unacceptable as per the Islamic ethics the target audience subscribe to.

**Example 3:**

| ST                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | TT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Summary                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Respect people's preferences; call people what they prefer to be called.<br>A common occurrence in scientific writing is that participants in a study tend to lose their individuality; they are broadly categorized as objects (noun forms such as the gays and the elderly) or, particularly in descriptions of people with disabilities, are equated with their conditions- the amnesiacs, the depressives, the schizophrenics, the LDs, for example. One solution is to use adjectival forms (e.g., "gay men," "elderly people," "amnesic patients"). Another is to "put the person first," followed by a descriptive phrase (e.g., "people diagnosed with schizophrenia"). P. 63-46 | من الشائع في الكتابة العلمية أن يزع المشاركون في الدراسة لفقدان فرديتهم، أنهم يصنفون عامة كمواضيع (نماذج أسماء مثل المختنون وكبار السن)، خاصة في وصف الأفراد ذوو الإعاقات بما يساوي ظروفهم- فاقدو الذاكرة و المكتئبون و الفصاميون و ذوي الإعاقات التعليمية على سبيل المثال، أحد الحلول هو استخدام صيغ الصفات (مثل الرجال المختنون، النساء كبار السن و مرضى فقدان الذاكرة). و حل آخر هو "ضع ضع الفرد أولا متبوعا بجملة قصيرة وصفية ' مثال الناس المشخصون بالفصام)، لاحظ أن الحل الأخير مفضل عند وصف المعاقين P. 91-92 | الفرد العاجز تصبح الفرد المصاب بالعجز الطفل القاصر تصبح الطفل ذو القصور منذ الولادة<br>الطفل المتخلف عقليا تصبح الناس الذين شخصوا بأنهم على الخط الفاصل. المكتئبون تصبح الناس المكتئبون الصرعاء تصبح الأفراد الذين يعانون من الصرع<br>المرضى العصائبيون تصبح المرضى بالعصاب عاجزو التعلم تصبح الأطفال ذوو عجز التعلم<br>احترم تفضيلات الآخرين، خاطبهم بما يفضلون<br>تجنب وصم الأفراد قدر الإمكان بأية صفة و الحل استخدم صيغ الصفات الناس ذوو الاكتئاب بدلا من مكتئبين<br>تجنب وصم الأفراد قدر الإمكان بأية صفة و الحل استخدم صيغ الصفات الناس ذوو الاكتئاب، بدلا من المكتئبين |

This guideline revolves around avoiding stigmatizing people through labels and using adjectival forms instead. The examples mentioned include the gays, the elderly, and people with disabilities. The summary of the guideline seems to be exhaustive enough, outlining the linguistic procedure proposed, and providing seven examples about how to refer to people with disabilities in an unbiased way and no example whatsoever about the elderly or homosexuals. Moreover, most of the examples above are neither in the text, nor in the translation. The teacher added them herself to elaborate on this guideline. This rules out the possibility that her choices were due to space constraints (since the lecture was in fact a slide-based presentation) and supports our assumption that the selection is done intentionally. Her emphasis on people with different types of disabilities may be rooted in the Arabic/Islamic culture which calls people to show compassion and empathy towards vulnerable people, hence the over-exemplification, by contrast, her reluctance to state any examples about groups who identify themselves as non-binary is reflective of her and the audience's religion which prohibits any form of sexual intercourse between a male and a female out of wedlock, let alone sexual intercourse between people of the same sex. The gatekeeping then, once more seems to be exercised to avoid any conflict with the audience and to make the lecture go smoothly.

**Example 4:**

| ST                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | TT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Summary |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| The unparallel nouns in the phrase man and wife may inappropriately prompt the reader to evaluate the roles of the individuals (i.e., the woman is defined only in terms of her relationship to the man) and the motives of the author. The phrase husband and wife or man and woman is parallel and undistracting. Usage of normal may prompt the reader to make the comparison of abnormal, thus stigmatizing individuals with differences. For example, contrasting lesbians with "the general public" or with "normal women" portrays lesbians as marginal to society. More appropriate comparison groups might be "heterosexual women," "heterosexual women and men," or "gay men." P. 64-65 | إن الأسماء غير المتوازنة في الجملة القصيرة الرجل والمرأة قد لا تكون مناسبة لبحث القارئ على تقييم أدوار الأفراد (مثل، قد عُرفت المرأة بناء على علاقتها بالرجل) و دوافع المؤلف. إن الجملة القصيرة الزوج و الزوجة أو الرجل و المرأة مناظرة و غير مشتتة. ربما يثير القارئ استخدام كلمة طبيعي لعمل مقارنة مع الشواذ، و بالتالي وصم الأفراد بالفروق. على سبيل المثال: مقارنة السحاقيات مع "عامة الناس أو مع "المرأة الطبيعية" يظهر السحاقية على هامش المجتمع. المقارنة الأكثر مناسبة للجماعات ربما "النساء ذوات الجنس الغيري" و الرجال ذوات الجنس الغيري " أو "الرجال المختونون" p.93 | Deleted |

This is yet another instance of culture clash that warranted the full activation of gatekeeping mechanisms. This guideline advises against using any phraseology which might suggest that a woman is identified only in connection with her relationship to the man, or using the adjective 'normal' when referring to heterosexual people on account of the fact that this stigmatizes sexual minorities. It is recommended that adjectives such as 'heterosexual' and 'gay' be used instead. This passage was de-selected from the summary, since these people are actually looked upon as abnormal for most Arabs and Muslims. This is deeply bound up with the religious beliefs of the teacher and the audience, as the Quran explicitly states: O mankind! We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that ye may know each other (not that ye may despise (each other) [sūrat l-ḥujūrāt: 49]. Moreover homosexuals bring to the mind of Muslims the people of Lut who were punished because of committing sodomy. Yet, we don't rule out the possibility that the teacher deleted it simply because she thought the passage was unimportant and repetitive since avoiding bias towards sexual groups had been emphasised before. Another possible explanation is that the translation of the passage leaves much to be desired; it is hardly readable for someone who has no immediate access and understanding of the ST.

**Example 5:**

| ST                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | TT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Summary               |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Sexual orientation is not the same as sexual preference. In keeping with Guideline 2, sexual orientation currently is the preferred term and is to be used unless the implication of choice is intentional. The terms lesbians and gay men are preferable to homosexual when referring to specific groups. Lesbian and gay refer primarily to identities and to the culture and communities that have developed among people who share those identities. Furthermore, homosexuality has been associated in the past with negative stereotypes.... Sexual behavior should be distinguished from sexual orientation; some men and women .....p.67 | التوجه الجنسي ليس هو التفضيل الجنسي، و تماشيا مع البند (2) فإن التوجه الجنسي هو المصطلح المفضل و الواجب استخدامه، إلا إذا كانت مضامين الاختيار قصدية. إن مصطلحات مثل السحاقيات و الرجال المختونون مفضل على مصطلح الجنسية المثلية عندما توجه إلى مجموعات خاصة. يدل مصطلح السحاقيات و المختونون أساس على الهويات و الثقافة الحديثة و الاتصالات، و التي تطورت بين الناس الذين يشتركون في هذه الهويات. و الأكثر من ذلك أن الجنسية المثلية قد اقترنت في السابق ب الصور النمطية السلبية.....يجب أن يميز السلوك الجنسي عن التوجه الجنسي، بعض الرجال و النساء...p.95 | عرف المصطلح بشكل دقيق |

This passage exhibits an abundance of terms related to sexuality, including sexual orientation, sexual preference and sexual behavior. The teacher must have felt overwhelmed since these terms not only required lengthy elucidation, but also because they entail practices that are deemed to be wrong and against human nature as per the teachings of Islam. Moreover, the terms at issue are under-lexicalized in Arabic. Admittedly, under the influence of globalization and the spread of movie translations, tentative translations are used, like the one used by the translator above. Yet, they have not gained currency as they are under-used. This means that the Arab lexical equivalents themselves might sometimes need to be defined for many Arabs who are not familiar with the concepts they refer to. The teacher chose not to take the initiative to disambiguate them, possibly she could not make out the differences herself since the translation is rather clumsy in some parts. She lexically condensed the content of this guideline “sexual orientation” into a fairly general and ambiguous injunction: ‘define the term precisely’, which reflects her uneasiness with this guideline and her struggle to communicate it to the addressees. A struggle that yielded a summary that is far from being clear given the inadequacy of the information presented.

### **Conclusion:**

This paper sought to study the trajectory of the fifth edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association and the agents involved in its translation and dissemination as well as the gatekeeping operations involved along the way, if any, of contentious recommendations related to the use of inclusive language when speaking of sexual minorities.

It was observed that, as a result of the internationalization of the English scholarly discourse model, and short of Arabic style guides, English style guides are frequently adapted by Arab academic institutions, academic websites and teachers. These adapted style guides play a major role in shaping students’ perception of academic writing. Academic English style guides, we argued, are complex genre-wise; they fall under the genre of procedural texts which lay down injunctions to get something done, but also can be described as falling under the more global ‘metagenre’, as they regulate and govern the genre of academic discourse. This may account for the fact that they exhibit features typical of the two, that is, procedural texts and academic texts.

Like any type of texts, style guides reflects the changing values of their drafters which are strictly linked to the environment or ‘ethosphere’ in which they appeared. APA publication guidelines for instance has become more and more committed to the promotion of inclusive language which involves speaking of gender identities and orientations (binary and otherwise) clearly and openly calling them with what they prefer.

Based on the analysis of a translation summary prepared by a Saudi-based teacher of a highly literal and faithful translation, it has been found that teachers imparting lectures on scientific methodology and scientific writing may have a crucial role in mediating style guide translations. Given the power they have as course designers, they are in a position to make selections about what guidelines should be emphasized and what guidelines are less worthy of attention and emphasis, especially when these go against TL social norms. While the translation itself was very much SL oriented, mirroring all the linguistic and cultural properties of the manual- sometimes even at the expense of intelligibility- the teacher engaged in some gatekeeping operations to bring it into line with target reader expectations. These involve highlighting non-contentious guidelines such as using inclusive language when talking about people with disabilities, the elderly, racial and ethnic minorities and de-emphasising contentious recommendations which might strike Arab audiences as inappropriate. Recommendations involving speaking of people who identify as non-binary or with same-sex orientations have been left mostly undefined and unexamplified, or were left out completely.

The gatekeeping selections made seem to be ideologically motivated since the TL audience belongs to a conservative culture where such identities are rarely spoken of. That is not to say that such categories are non-existent in the Arab world, it is rather their social perception from an ethical point of view that is poles apart from their perception in the west. Another plausible explanation for the teacher's apparent reticence about such recommendations is that Arab researchers generally shun topics related to gender issues given their controversial nature. Even in research where participants are asked to identify themselves, participants identifying as non-binary tend to keep a low profile and are well unlikely to describe themselves outside the male-female gender binary, that is why the teacher might have considered talking about 'other' gender categorizations unnecessary and irrelevant.

All this considered together, one may conclude that university students are presented with an adapted and domesticated version of APA guidelines. As such, teachers, through the gatekeeping operations done, may be said to play a crucial role in the shaping of modern Arabic scholarly discourse. Although the latter is largely calqued from the English academic discourse model, teachers may act as the gatekeepers who limit the extent of this calquing and exercise some form of discursive resistance which not only reflect different rhetorical traditions, but also different ethical positionings and priorities.

## References

1. Al-Hassnawi, A. (2009). Aspects of Scientific Translation: English into Arabic Translation as a Case Study.
2. Altbach, P. G. (2007). The Imperial Tongue: English as the Dominating Academic Language. *Economic and Political Weekly* , 42 (36), 3608-3611.
3. American Psychological Association. (2001). Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5<sup>th</sup> Ed.). American Psychological Association.
4. Aouladomar, F., & Saint-Dizier, P. (2005). Towards generating procedural texts: An exploration of their rhetorical and argumentative structure. *The Tenth European Workshop on Natural Language Generation*. Ann Arbor.
5. Benett, K. (2007). Epistemicide! The Tale of a Predatory Discourse. *The Translator* , 13 (2), pp. 151-169.
6. Benett, K. (2011). The Scientific Revolution and its Repercussions on the Translation of Technical Discourse. *The Translator* , 17 (2), pp. 189-210.
7. Bhatia, V. (1997). Genre- Mixing in Academic Introductions. *English for Specific Purposes* , pp. 181-195.
8. Bhatia, V. (2004). *Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
9. Cheesman, T., & Nohl, A.-M. (2011). Many voices, one BBC World Service? The 2008 US elections, gatekeeping and trans-editing. *Journalism* , 12 (2), 217-233.
10. Doody, S. (2020). *Interdisciplinary Writing Should Be Simple, But it Isn't: A Study of Meta-Genres in Interdisciplinary Life Sciences Doctoral Programs*. Montreal: McGill University.
11. Farghal, M., & Shunnaq, A. (1999). *Translation with Reference to English and Arabic*. Irbid: Dar Al-Hilal for Translation.

12. Foner, E. (1994). The Meaning of Freedom in the Age of Emancipation. *The Journal of American History* , 81 (2), pp. 435-460.
13. Giltrow, J. (2002). Meta-genre. In R. Coe, L. Lingard, & T. Teslenko (Eds.), *The Rhetoric and Ideology of Genre: Strategies for Stability and Change* (pp. 187-205). Hampton Press.
14. Gotti, M. (2012). Cross-cultural Aspects of Academic Discourse. *Brno Studies in English* , 38 (2), 59-78.
15. Hyland, K. (2011). Academic Discourse. In K. Hyland, & B. Paltridge (Eds.), *Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis*. (pp. 171-184). London: Continuum.
16. Inghileri, M. (2009). Sociological Approaches. In M. Baker, & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd edition, pp. 279-282). Routledge & Taylor & Francis Group.
17. Isani, S. (2019). Of technical writing, instructions for use as a specialised genre and discourse communities. *ASp* , 75, pp. 3-23.
18. Janks, H. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education List of Issues* . , pp. 329-342.
19. Lakić, I., Živković, B., & Vuković, M. (2015). *Academic Discourse Across Cultures*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
20. Losada, B. M., Jaramillo, C. M., & Velásquez, R. V. (2019). Applying rhetorical analysis to processing technical documents. *Acta Scientiarum. Language and Culuture* , 41, 1-11.
21. Løvaas, B. J. (2022). Values at Work: Mapping the Field Through the Lens of Methodological Approaches. In G. Espedal, & e. all, *Researching Values* (pp. 15-38). Palgrave Macmillian.
22. Mason, I. (2018). *A Dictionary of Translation and Interpreting*. Unpublished.
23. Moreno, A. I., & Swales, J. M. (2018). Strengthening move analysis methodology towards bridging the function-form gap. *English for Specific Purposes* , 50, 40-63.
24. Muangsamai, P. (2018). Analysis of moves, rhetorical patterns and linguistic features in New Scientist articles. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences* , 39 (2), 236-243.
25. Olohan, M. (2013). Gate-keeping and localizing in scientific translation publishing: the case of Richard Taylor and Scientific Memoirs. *British Society for the History of Science* , 433–450.
26. *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
27. Sex and gender .(n.d). Retrieved from <https://www.coe.int>
28. Shoemaker, P. J., Vos, T. P., & Reese, S. D. (2009). Journalists as Gatekeepers. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen, & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *The Handbook of Journalism Studies* (pp. 73-87). Routledge.
29. Shuttworth, M., & Cowie, M. (2014). *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Routledge.

30. Swales, J. M. (2016). Reflections on the Concept of Discourse Community. *ASp* , 69, pp. 7-19.
31. Thornton, S. J. (1989). Aspiration and Practice: Teacher as Curricular-Instructional Gatekeeper in Social Studies. *the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. San Francisco.
32. Valdeón, R. A. (2022). Gatekeeping, ideological affinity and journalistic translation. *Journalism* , 23 (1), 117-133.
33. Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Introduction: What Is Critical Discourse Analysis? In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & S. Deborah (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (Second Edition, pp. 466-485). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
34. Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4 (2), pp. 249-283.
35. Wardle, E., & Downs, D. (2011). *Writing about Writing: A College Reader* . Boston: Bedford/St. Martins.
36. جمعية علم النفس الأمريكية. (2005). التوثيق العلمي : دليل النشر العلمي، (ترجمة ذياب البداينة). عمان: دار المناهج (العمل الأصلي نشر في 2001).
37. عبد الغفار، غ (2012). التوثيق العلمي : دليل النشر العلمي: ترجمة ذياب البداينة [شرائح باوربوينتو].  
<https://ecsme.ksu.edu.sa> جامعة الملك سعود