

Journal of Social Sciences (COES&RJ-JSS)

ISSN (E): 2305-9249 ISSN (P): 2305-9494

Publisher: Centre of Excellence for Scientific & Research Journalism, COES&RJ LLC

Online Publication Date: 1st October 2020

Online Issue: Volume 9, Number 4, October 2020

<https://doi.org/10.25255/jss.2020.9.4.1543.1558>



Computer Programming and Readability Scoring Tests between Arabic and English of *Surat Al-Fātiḥah*

Dr. Ibrahim Bani Abdo

School of Foreign Languages, University of Jordan, Aqaba, Jordan

Abstract:

The present paper investigates computer programming of the readability feature in *Al-Fatihah* (Arabic: *الْفَاتِحَة*), the first chapter (Surah) of the Quraan, with its English equivalent and whether the different statistics scores of readability may affect the translation's value of the holy text (*Al-Fatihah*) compared to its target text equivalent. This paper uses the computer programming of readability tests. It uses different formulas as (i) Flesch Kincaid Reading Ease; (ii) Flesch Kincaid Grade Level; (iii) Gunning Fog Score; (iv) SMOG Index; (v) Coleman Liau Index; and (vi) Automated Readability Index. These formulas identify the easiness of the source text compare to the translated text (target text). This study identifies the readability scores that may affect the translation text compared to the source text. The study reveals that the readability scoring tests between Arabic (ST), Arabic –Latin (Transliteration), and the target text (TT) English version of *Surat Al-Fātiḥah* from The holy Book *Al Quraan* are different. The ST is much easier to read by their audience than the TT readers. It also affirms that the translating process may cause slightly changes in the TT compared to the ST ones. Finally, the lack of knowledge of such computer software during the translating process may increase or decrease the complexity of the text for readers.

Keywords:

computer programming, translation, readability, English, Arabic, holy script, Quraan

Citation:

Bani Abdo, Ibrahim Mohamad Khalefe (2020) Computer Programming and Readability Scoring Tests between Arabic and English of *Surat Al-Fātiḥah*; Journal

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Introduction

The translation process from a language into another involves many aspects and one of them is the text's difficulties or easiness of readability. Arabic translators may face problem in translating other languages. Hence, Arabic translation is different from other translations. It has its own style. The translation, as craft, may describe the translator style, background, the source text's style, and cultural backgrounds (Bani Abdo and Abu-Hammad, 2019). Translators may face problems translating metaphors of the source text into the target text especially of different cultures. Park (2009) also states that typical linguistic problem that translators face in communication with TL (target language) readers is the translation of author's style. Bani Abdo and Abu-Faraj (2019) state that it is not easy rendering someone's writing style into another language. Translation needs to make sense, to transfer the spirit and the taste of the original, to have a natural and easy form of expression. Therefore, this study investigates the easiness or the difficulties of readability of *Surat Al-Fātiḥah* and its English equivalent. Bani Abdo and Awwad (2019) believe that translation is important as a source of transferring knowledge of every kind. Understanding cultures and scripts' style is crucial for translators and successful English Arabic translation. There is a mismatch in cultural norms and beliefs between the Arab and Western cultures. Each different language has its own individuality, words, and style of writing that denotes things and put them in a distinct category of thought. Newmark (1988, p.5) defines translation as "rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text". Dweik and Suleiman (2013) believe that the differences between languages are challenging and may lead for misinterpretations. Understanding the language elements deliver the message adequately into other languages.

By the beginning of the 20th century, English has been translated into many languages and Arabic is one of them. A considerable amount of English literary texts have been translated from the Western culture into the Eastern ones and vice versa. In addition, the advanced technologies used these days are critical practical procedures in the translation field. Not only, was the technical field of the translators' interest, but also the technical devices used by programming into the translation process itself. Consequently, this study investigates the use of these computer programs into the translation process to measure the readability of the source text compares to its Arabic equivalent. The Arabic translation texts might differ from the original text. These differences appear clearly in the author style, semantic, syntactic, authorial weight, and other fields. Structuring a text involves the author's style of writing. As a result, the translator should be aware

Computer Programming and Readability Scoring Tests between Arabic and

of the author style in order to translate a text (Bani Abdo, 2017). The computer programming has given the readers the ability to check any text before reading to measure the readability of that text (Al-Tamimi, Jaradat, Aljarrah, & Ghanim, 2014). In this study, the readability feature of the computer programming system is measuring whether the source text is equivalent to the target text and vice versa.

Readability is not a language that it's used in poems and other kinds of writings, but an ordinary language that used in different cases to deliver some idea and point of view, and the translation of it must keep this idea and deliver it without any loss for the intended meaning. Bani Abdo and Yaseen (2019) state that the translation process, between English and Arabic, is a process of mapping all related fields between two different language systems (ST and TT). Many aesthetic expressions are used all the time to express different contents by authors.

Syllables, words and sentences are important to evaluate the readability of any text. The computer programming software gives us a quick calculation tools to measure these factors easily where it might be beneficial into the translation field. Additionally, the readability tests involve also the length, the grammar, and the language that the author used which affect the level or degree of the readability score. These tests are computer- calculated indexes that tell you roughly the level of education that readers need to be able to understand the text easily. This study comes to find out whether these calculations were taken into the translator's mind in translating the religious text *Al-Fatihah* (Arabic: *الْفَاتِحَة*) into its English version equivalent.

Statement of the Problem

The different language systems may create a challenge for translators. English and Arabic are two different systems that vary extensively. Translators always do their best on order to render a text from a language into another. Arabic – English translators are not aware of all aspects and features that they need to render beside the semantic or the structural parts. On the other hand, technology and computers' programs made our life easier. Computer programming and readability have made our curricula (text) much better to suit the target readers. The study claims that many translators are not aware of such formula as 'readability' programming feature where it might lead to huge differences between the source text and the translated text. This feature might lead to a better understanding in the translation field, if the translators have taking such a computer programming into their consideration. Accordingly, this study introduces the difference that might translators get into without paying attention to such computer programming feature. It studies the readability of in

Al-Fatihah (Arabic: **الْفَاتِحَة**) compared to its English equivalent and whether the different readability feature statistics affect the translation value compares to the source text.

Purpose of the Study

The study aims to discuss the author's style compared to the translator style using the readability feature. It also shows the differences between the source text and the translated text in terms of how the texts' structures have been built in both versions. In addition, it also discusses the differences that might happen of whom the writer is targeting (who is the intended target reader?). Finally, this study might shift the Arabic translators into a better understanding of the computer programming and they may benefit from those programs to build a similar text of the source one.

Research Questions

This research investigates the readability feature of computer programming between *Al-Fatihah* (Arabic: **الْفَاتِحَة**) with its English translated equivalent and whether the different statistics of readability feature may affect the translation value compared to the source text.

Readability and Computer Formulas

Readability measures the ease with which a written text can be understood by readers from different educational levels. This measurement started by Kitson (1921) who showed that sentence and word length were best markers of a text being easy to read. Then, other scholars such as Dale-Chall (Dale and Chall, 1948) Fog (Gunning, 1968) and Flesch (Kincaid et al., 1975) involved other factors as number of characters, the count of hard and complex words as well as the number of syllables in each word.

William H. DuBay (2004, p. 38) states that readability, according to computer programs, determines and evaluates any text in terms of easiness or difficulty of the author's writing style. This feature started in different schools back to the 70^s where scholars started reading test to assess a wider variety of reading skills. The reading test begins to measure the suitable curricula for children. They establish different features as explicit and implicit meaning of the text to evaluate the material and to recognize it into other frames of references. One among these frames encompasses the difficulty sense of a text. This feature was used to assess the level of difficulty of books by applying measures of readability into the teaching process. (ibid: 113). Writers refashion their text to adjust readability levels of their targeted readers especially if they were children. The stories were attractively printed to incorporate the various educational levels for a real purpose. This led to find a staff with advanced qualifications in reading to

Computer Programming and Readability Scoring Tests between Arabic and

find what suitable for those whom they are targeting to read (ibid: 218-223). It also enables students to select material that are suitable to their levels. It saves them time and frustration (ibid: 305). The difficulty level of reading materials usually is measured by the familiarity of the words and the length and complexity of the sentences used (ibid: 592).

Calculations of syllables, words and sentences are important to evaluate the readability of any text. The readability tests involve also the length, the grammar, and the language that the author used which affect the level or degree of the readability score. These tests are computer- calculated indexes that tell you roughly the level of education that readers need to be able to understand the text easily (Gillard, 2019). Readability formulas “focus on the characteristics of the words themselves and their appearance in sentences and paragraphs” (Fisher, Frey, & Lapp, 2012, p. 21), rather than on the textual meaning or content. Naomi Watkins and Jonathan Ostenson (2015, p. 284) state that words and sentence length and cohesiveness are the main factors to evaluate readability formulas. Computer programming software are typically measures these factors. For example, Fry (2002, p.286) provides a simple text formula readability score. Other software formulas evaluate text and readers which help instructors to evaluate students’ readabilities levels. Readability formulas are assigned grade level or some other numerical designation to a book. These formulas are also applied in prose including laws, newspaper articles, test passages, military manuals, and advertising. Naomi Watkins and Jonathan Ostenson (2015, p. 284) believe that readers or authors may use different methods that compile different databases to examine the readability of any text level in terms of easiness or difficultness. Fisher, Frey, & Lapp (2012) and Mesmer (2008) believe that the numerical values pay no attention to other factors such as content and genre. This might not be suitable for early-stage readers and texts. Naomi Watkins and Jonathan Ostenson (2015, p. 284) add that these databases have been beneficial for moneymakers and enterprises that used these formulas to develop publishers’ works. A popular text that is easy to be read by readers according to this readability scores’ formulas were favorable by these enterprises. The purpose of the text, the quality of the writing, and the text’s applications are the main factors help for a better influence for these enterprises (ibid: 256). Goals and needs, and readability of potential texts are crucial for context. These factors would be effective decisions to select what is best for readers’ abilities, interests, and needs (ibid: 263-264).

These factors might be problematic in the translation process especially for those translators who are not aware of these databases. Understanding readability levels, making sense of qualitative mechanisms for evaluating texts, and recognizing the role that motivates reading are also crucial for the translation

process. These critical standards must be taken into translators' consideration to translate any text, since each proposed ratio of readability feature has specific intended meaning by the author. Understanding these ratios will empower those translators to make the right translation equivalents to the source text. As a result, this study comes to find out whether these calculations were taken into the translator's mind in translating the religious text (*Al-Fatihah*).

Readability Test Tools

This paper uses different readability test tools. There are different tests' tools are used to measure the readability feature of any text such as (i) [Flesch Kincaid Reading Ease](#); (ii) [Flesch Kincaid Grade Level](#); (iii) [Gunning Fog Score](#); (iv) [Coleman Liau Index](#); (v) [Automated Readability Index \(ARI\)](#); and (vi) [SMOG Index](#). These formulas are analytical way to predict readability of a written material. Some formulas are popular than others and each of them has its function dedicated to calculating and detecting elements of the sentence in order to get the text level of score (Kondru, 2006). Kirkwood and Wolfe (1980) uses formula measure vocabulary load and sentence length.

The most popular formula is Flesch formulas which consists two divisions. The first one is *Flesch Reading Ease Readability Tests* and the second is *Flesch-Kincaid grade-level test Rudolph Flesch*. Computer programming has made these formulas easier to be used as in Microsoft Office Word. It provides the readability level of any text after checking spelling and grammar. The average number of syllables per word and word per sentence is counted. *Flesch Reading Ease Readability Tests* are 100-point formula's scale. The score indicates the easiness or the difficultness of the text. The higher score indicates easier understanding of a text. The standard score goes between 60-70 scale points. These tests use the same core metrics and they work as the following metrics are presented (Rudolph Flesch, 1948):

1. **A. Flesch-Kincaid reading ease formula:** $206.835 - 1.015 \times (\text{words/sentences}) - 84.6 \times (\text{syllables/words})$.

B. Flesch-Kincaid grade level formula: $0.39 \times (\text{words/sentences}) + 11.8 \times (\text{syllables/words}) - 15.59$.

The core metrics calculates the word length and sentence length. But they correlate inversely. If you receive a high score on the reading ease test, you should receive a lower grade level score.

2. The second common index is *the Gunning fog formula*. This test starts by 1940s by Robert Gunning. It was dedicated to reduce the "fog" in newspapers and business writing. It develops the technique of clear writing by Fog Index. The formula is one of the most reliable and simplest to apply as follows (Grade level= $0.4 \times ((\text{average sentence length}) + (\text{percentage of Hard Words}))$).

Computer Programming and Readability Scoring Tests between Arabic and

3. The third index is the *Coleman-Liau Index*. This formula measures the difficulty of reading any text. It helps students to read and understand the content correctly. This formula uses the numbers of characters in the words to calculate the readability score ("Coleman-Liau Index," 2008) as follows (***Coleman Liau Index formula***: $5.89 \times (\text{characters/words}) - 0.3 \times (\text{sentences/words}) - 15.8$).
4. *The Automated Readability Index (ARI)* measures how easily a text is understood. This tool estimates the level of American grade required to understand text from the text. It represents the difficulty of the word (the number of characters per word) and the difficulty of the sentence (the number of words per sentence). *The Automated Readability Index formula*: $4.71 \times (\text{characters/words}) + 0.5 \times (\text{words/sentences}) - 21.43$. This formula includes two factors. One is related to the structure of the sentence and how many words per sentence. The other one is based on the number of the syllables per word.
5. *SMOG readability formula* was invented in 1969 by McLaughlin. This tool is based on the interaction between the text and class of readers in addition to some important features such as former knowledge, reading skills, and motivation. This formula counts words of more than two syllables in 10 sentence samples. It estimates the count's square root (Rudolph Flesch, 1948, p.639).
These above formulas (1-6) are all algorithms that assess the ease and understanding of readability to any text. "The authors of these formulas brought the issue of readability to public attention. They stimulated new consumer demands for documents in plain language. Finally, they stimulated new studies, not only on how to improve the formulas, but also on the other factors affecting reading success" Zamanian (2012). Readability and translation are significantly related. The different readabilities between the source text and the translated text may affect the quality of the original text and what demands are taking into the author or the enterprises considerations. Changing the words, the sentence structure, syntax, and the meaning is crucial in interpreting the original text into another language (DuBay, 2004, p.25). Accordingly, this study investigates the readability into find out whether these calculations were taken into the translator's mind in translating the religious text *Surat Al-Fatihah* from the holy Quraan.

Readability and Translation

Every translator has a specific style that is different from one another. Translating a text requires knowledge of the author's style including the structural level of the text and every single data that might be helpful in the translation process (Bani Abdo and Abu-Hammad, 2019). Mary Ansell (2000, p.25) believes that "the grammar of a language is an analysis of the various function performed by the words of the language, as they are used by native speakers and writers". Sentences are composed grammatically of separate units to form the biggest contrastive meaningful unit in any language. Bani Abdo

(2017) suggests to take the author's intention and purpose of writing into the translator's mind. Nord (2018), as well, states that translation is being faithful to the source text. Adding, House (1981) expresses the 'covert' sense in producing a similar equivalence in the target language as in the source text. Park (2009) expresses that translation needs to transfer the spirit and the taste of the original text. Languages are different in terms of words, expressions, and style of writing that denotes things and put them in a distinct category of thought (Bani Abdo and Awwad, 2019). Writing style is used into different kinds of writings and purposes. Translation must keep the intended writing style and purposes (Bani Abdo and Abu Faraj, 2019). Dickins and Watson (1999) also state that Arabic language is associated with specific cultural and norms that is different from any other languages. Oualif (2017) believe that cultures and languages are interconnected in order for a translator to be able to understand and interpret the text. Delisle (1988, p.74) states that readers can easily distinguish between the translators from their own style in translation. The techniques that authors and translators use different words, sentence structures, functions, and styles that may affect the text weights. Readability tests, into the translation field, provide readers with possibilities of discovering the differences between the original version and the translated one. Consequently, investigating readability into the translation process is fulfilling these scholars' views and trying to keep the translated text readability at the same level as the original text.

Readability and sentence structure building in English and Arabic

The structure of sentences in English follow certain regularities in terms of where words may occur (their distribution, in linguistic terminology) and how words and phrases may conjoin with each other. There are main types of English sentences (i) simple and (ii) complex sentences. These types play major role in style and understandability. On the other hand, Abed Alateef (2003) states that grammarians in Arabic language classify sentences in terms of its building methods, clarify the relationship between its elements, determine the function of each element, and finally determine the types of sentences. Maihobi (2010, p. 13) classifies Arabic sentences into nominal sentences and verbal ones. Therefore, Translating from Arabic into English, the word order may be changed due to some causes specially when there are no corresponding words, changing the word order and punctuation marks differences through translation process. These changes sometimes might not apply the translating of Quraan where translators are restricted to the source text rather than the target text.

Al-Fātiḥah

This study investigates Al-Fātiḥah (Arabic: *الْفَاتِحَة*) (The Opener of the Book) is the first chapter (sūrah) of the Quraan. It includes seven verses (āyāt). This chapter is recited essential in every Islamic prayer cycle (rak'ah).

Computer Programming and Readability Scoring Tests between Arabic and

The target text (translation) is provided by the well-known translator- Yusuf Ali, 1934. The following table (1) provides the ST, transliteration Arabic-Latin, and TT.

Table 1. The selected data

Arabic Text	The Source Text transliteration Arabic-Latin	Translator Translation: Yusuf Ali,1934
1. بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ	1. (Bismillāhi r-raḥmāni r-raḥīm)	1. In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate
2. الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ	2. (Al ḥamdu lillāhi rabbi l-’ālamīn)	2. Praise belongs to God, the Lord of all Being,
3. الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ	3. (Ar raḥmāni r-raḥīm)	3. the All-merciful, the All-compassionate,
4. مَالِكِ يَوْمِ الدِّينِ	4. (Māliki yawmi d-dīn)	4. the Master of the Day of Doom.
5. إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَإِيَّاكَ نَسْتَعِينُ	5. (Iyyāka na’budu wa iyyāka nasta’īn)	5. Thee only we serve; to Thee alone we pray for succour.
6. اهْدِنَا الصِّرَاطَ الْمُسْتَقِيمَ	6. (Ihdinā ṣ-ṣirāṭ al-mustaqīm)	6. Guide us in the straight path,
7. صِرَاطَ الَّذِينَ أَنْعَمْتَ عَلَيْهِمْ غَيْرِ الْمَغْضُوبِ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا الضَّالِّينَ	7. (Ṣirāṭ al lazi na an’amta ‘alayhim, ḡayril maḡḏūbi ‘alayhim walāḏ ḏāllīn)	7. the path of those whom Thou hast blessed, not of those against whom Thou art wrathful, nor of those who are astray.

Method

Background of the study

Translating readability style of a literary text is not an easy job and most translators are not familiar with such technique. This computer programming software is used for different purposes and the main feature measures the easiness compare to complexity of a text. The different writing styles, purpose, author’s intention, structural level is crucial in the translation process (Bani Abdo and Abu-Hammad, 2019). Taking into account the author’s intentions and purposes is one of main parts to translate a text from language into another Bani Abdo (2017). House (1981) also expresses the ‘covert’ sense in producing a similar equivalence in the target language as in the source text. Nord (2018), as well, asserts the faithfulness definition in translation. Park (2009) also asserts the needs to render the spirit and the writing taste of the original text into the translated ones. Delisle (1988, p.74) emphasizes the techniques that authors and translators use that may create differences between the source text and the target text. As a result measuring readability into the translation field may provide readers with possibilities of discovering the differences between the original text and the translated one. Therefore, this study investigates the

readability style between the source text compares to the target text and how it may affect the translation purposes as the source text does.

The Collected Data Sample and Procedures

The source data is collected from the first chapter of Quraan (*Al-Fātiḥah*) and its equivalent in English. Different tools' formulas are used to measure the readability of the source text and the translated text. The followings are the tools used to measure the different readabilities levels between the two texts for different readers.

1. A). Flesch Kincaid Reading Ease uses core metrics: word length and sentence length. If you receive a high score on the reading ease test, you should receive a lower grade level score (Flesch and Kincaid, 1975).
B). Flesch Kincaid Grade Level uses core metrics: word length and sentence length (Flesch and Kincaid, 1975).
2. Gunning Fog Score uses a metric of short sentences compare to long ones. The score of 7 or 8 is ideal, and anything higher than 12 is too complex for most people to read. (Robert Gunning, 1940).
3. SMOG Index estimates the years of education a person needs to comprehend a piece of writing, and it was created as an improvement of other readability formulas (Harry McLaughlin, 1969).
4. Coleman Liau Index calculates writing samples instead of manually coding the text. Unlike syllable-based readability indicators, the Coleman Liau Index does not require users to take into account the syllable-counts in the text. Therefore, passages can easily be scanned into a word processor to calculate the Coleman Liau Index. According to Coleman and Liau, word length in letters is a better predictor of readability than word length in syllables. (Coleman and Liau,1975)
5. Automated Readability Index takes into account characters per word instead of syllables per word. This is because the number of characters is more accurately interpreted by computer programs.
6. As the Arabic text cannot be interpreted by the previous formulas, the researcher uses a readability test based on (Al-Tamimi et al. 2014). They developed a different formula to measure the readability features of Arabic texts as the following:
 1. Number of characters in text.
 2. Number of words in text.
 3. Number of sentences in text.
 4. Number of difficult words in text. It means words consisting of more than six letters after removing “ل” from the beginning of the word, as suggested in.
 5. Average sentence length: This feature is one of the basic lexical features and is used by most of readability formulas. This feature is calculated as follows:
Average sentence length = number of words in text / number of sentence in text.

Computer Programming and Readability Scoring Tests between Arabic and

6. Average word length: This feature is calculated as follows: average word length = number of letters in a text / number of words in a text.

7. Average number of difficult words: This feature is calculated as follows: average number of difficult words = numbers of difficult words in text / number of words in text.

Since these mentioned formulas are not applicable for Arabic language and most of the related Arabic formulas such as LIX, ARI and Al-Heeti's formulas are hard to be applied for Arabic language; therefore, the researcher will use the transliteration of the Arabic- Latin along with the Arabic text in order to use the same formulas above, and facilitate the comparison.

These tools measure the readability of any text in a general way for general readers. They are used as an automatic checker to calculate the number of sentences, words, syllables, and characters in any text. These numbers are applied into the five formulas as mentioned above. These formulas in turn will yield the reading level and grade level of the texts and determine readers' ability of the text.

The two texts (ST and TT) will be tested within these formulas. Then, formulas will be given percentages that will be discussed then by the researcher to check whether the two texts are different from each others in terms of the readability feature.

Data Analysis and Results

The following tables (2 and 3) indicate the readability of the ST *Al-Fātiḥah* using the following formulas: (i) Flesch Kincaid Reading Ease; (ii) Flesch Kincaid Grade Level; (iii) Gunning Fog Score; (iv) SMOG Index; (v) Coleman; (vi) Liau Index; (vii) Automated Readability Index; and (viii) Linsear Write Formula.

Table (2): Readability statistics for the Arabic text (ST)

Word Count	Scores
Page	1
Words	29
Characters (no spaces)	272
Characters (with spaces)	301
Paragraphs	2
Lines	3

Table (3): Readability statistics for Arabic – Latin (Transliteration) and TT (English)

Counts	Total results Readability Statistics for Arabic – Latin Transliteration	TT Readability Statistics
Words	33	68
Characters	207	305

Paragraphs	2	2
Sentences	7	4
Averages		
Sentence per Paragraph	3.5	2.0
Words per Sentence	4.7	17.0
Character per Word	5.9	4.2
Readability		
Passive Sentences	0%	0%
Flesch Reading Ease	40.5	83.5
Flesch Kincaid Grade Level	8.7	4.9

The main results of table (3) can be explained as the following:

- Flesch Kincaid Reading Ease
Based on a 0-100 scale, a high score means the text is easier to read. Low scores suggest the text is complicated to understand. $206.835 - 1.015 \times (\text{words/sentences}) - 84.6 \times (\text{syllables/words})$. A value between 60 and 80 should be easy for a 12 to 15 year old to understand.
- The results show that the Flesch Reading Ease for the ST (Arabic- Latin) scores low percentage of (40.5) compared to 83.5 in the TT. This indicates that the source text (ST) is must easier for readers to read than the target text (TT) is.

Flesch Reading Ease	40.5	83.5
Flesch Kincaid Grade Level	8.7	4.9

Through using 'Text Readability Consensus Calculator, the user gets seven popular readability formulas in order to calculate the average grade level, reading age, and text difficulty of your sample text. By copying pasting the source text - Arabic (ST), the source text (Arabic –Latin) (ST), target text (TT), and the following results have been attained:

Table (4): Readability scores' indications for the ST (Arabic version)

The Tools Used	Scores	Indications
Flesch Kincaid Reading Ease	83.8	Easy to read.
Flesch Kincaid Grade Level	11	Grade level: Eleventh Grade.
Gunning Fog Score	15.1	Hard to read.
SMOG Index	1.8	Grade level: Second Grade
Coleman Liau Index	-18	No indication
Automated Readability Index	-2.5	Grade level: 3-5 yrs. old (Preschool)
Linsear Write Formula	18.9	Grade level: College Graduate and above

Computer Programming and Readability Scoring Tests between Arabic and

Table (5): Readability scores' indications for the ST (Arabic- Latin / Transliteration version)

The Tools Used	Scores	Indications
Flesch Kincaid Reading Ease	94	Very easy to read.
Flesch Kincaid Grade Level	2	Grade level: second Grade.
Gunning Fog Score	4	easy to read
SMOG Index	2	Grade level: Second Grade
Coleman Liau Index	-6	No indication
Automated Readability Index	-7	Grade level: 3-5 yrs. old (Preschool)
Linsear Write Formula	4	Grade level: Fourth Grade

Table (6): Readability scores' indications for the TT (English)

The Tools Used	Scores	Indications
Flesch Kincaid Reading Ease	81.5	Easy to read.
Flesch Kincaid Grade Level	6.2	Grade level: Sixth Grade.
Gunning Fog Score	8.1	Fairly easy to read
SMOG Index	6	Grade level: Sixth Grade
Coleman Liau Index	7	Grade level: Seventh Grade
Automated Readability Index	6.8	Grade level: 11-13 yrs. old (Sixth and Seventh graders)
Linsear Write Formula	8.8	Grade level: Ninth Grade.

The tables' (4, 5, and 6) results indicate that that source text (ST- Arabic) is very easy to read and write at young age; whereas, the target text's (TT- English) scores and results indicate that the readability is much higher than of the ST of both versions (Arabic and transliteration).

Conclusion

The use of the computer programming for the readability tests in the translating process, may lead translators to a better understanding in the translation field. As a result, this study exploits different formulas of computer software programs such as (i) Flesch Kincaid Reading Ease; (ii) Flesch Kincaid Grade Level; (iii) Gunning Fog Score; (iv) SMOG Index; (v) Coleman Liau Index; and (vi) Automated Readability Index. These formulas measure the readability easiness for readers of the different texts' types. In this study, a script (*Surat Al-Fātiḥah*) of the holy text – Quraan is used to find out whether the ST readability scores are different from the ones in the TT. The study concludes that these scores are different and varies depending on what formula the researcher may use. The easiness of the ST (*Al-Fātiḥah*) turns to be a bit difficult for the target readers more than the

source ones. The translator has changed the readability feature slightly, where it may lead to loss of meaning to some extent. Unawareness of this software may increase or decrease the complexity of the text. The final result of this study is that the original text, after its translation into English, decreased in its readability range. Which mean the original text is easier to understand than the translated one.

References

- Abd alateef, M. H. (2003). Building Arabic Sentences. Cairo: Dar Al Ghareeb.
- Al-Tamimi, A.-K., Jaradat, M., Aljarrah, N., & Ghanim, S. (2014). AARI: Automatic Arabic Readability Index. *The International Arab Journal of Information Technology*, 11(4). Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2108/606f5fd2daa9607df780d023efbc801ccbe3.pdf>
- Ansell, M. (2000). Free English Grammar. P25.
- Bani Abdo, I. (2017). *Stylistic issues in two Arabic translations of Hemingway's A farewell to arms*. Noor Publishing.
- Bani Abdo, I., & Abu-Faraj, B. (2019). The Effects of Canonity and the Authorial Weight in Translating Dickens' Oliver Twist into Arabic Language. *Journal of Social Sciences (COES&RJ-JSS)*, 8(4), 788–804. doi: 10.25255/jss.2019.8.4.788.804.
- Bani Abdo, I., & Abu-Hammad, I. (2019). Stylistics Issues in Translating Metaphors of Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice. *Merit Research Journal of Education and Review*, 7(3), 19–25. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.2616829. Available online <http://meritresearchjournals.org/asss/index.htm>.
- Bani Abdo, I., & Awwad, M. (2019). Effectiveness of Translating English Technical and Scientific Terms by Arabicization Strategy in Al-Oloom LI-Omoom Magazine and Syrian Researchers Network on Reader's Understanding. *International Journal of Comparative Literature and Translation Studies*, 7(2), 39-48. doi: 10.7575/aiac.ijclts.v.7n.2p.39.
- Bani Abdo, I., & Yaseen, B. S. (2019). Translating Equivalence of Gibran Khalil's Style in TT: English into Arabic. *Merit Research Journal of Education and Review*, 7(3), 11–18. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.2616835. Available online <http://meritresearchjournals.org/asss/index.htm>.

Computer Programming and Readability Scoring Tests between Arabic and

Bani Abdo, I., & Yaseen, S. (2019). A Cultural Contrastive Translation Study of Omission in Gibran's the Broken Wings. *Journal of Social Sciences (COES&RJ-JSS)*, 8(4), 805–816. doi: 10.25255/jss.2019.8.4.805.816.

Coleman, Meri; and Liau, T. L. (1975); *A computer readability formula designed for machine scoring*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 60, pp. 283–284.

Coleman-Liau Index (2008). Retrieved May 6, 2008, from UsingEnglish.com: www.usingenglish.com/glossary/coleman-liau-index.html

Dickins, J. and Watson, J.C.E. 1999. *Aural Arabic texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DuBay, W. H. (2004). *The Principles of Readability*. S.I.: Distributed by ERIC Clearinghouse.

DuBay, W. H. 2006. *Smart language: Readers, Readability, and the Grading of Text*. Costa Mesa: Impact Information.

Flesch, R. (1948). A new readability yardstick. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 32, 221-233.

Fry, E. 2002. Readability Versus Leveling. *The Reading Teacher* 56 (3), 286-291.
Gilliland, J. 1972. *Readability*. London: University of London Press Ltd.

Gillard, D. (2019). *Bullock Report (1975)*. Retrieved from Educationengland.org.uk website: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/bullock/bullock1975.html>

Gunning, R. (1952). *The technique of clear writing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gunning, Robert (1952). *The Technique of Clear Writing*. McGraw-Hill.

House, J. 1981. *A model for translation quality assessment*. 2nd ed. Narr: Tu"bingen.

Kincaid, J.P., Fishburne, R.P., Rogers, R.L., & Chissom, B.S. (1975). Derivation of new readability formulas (automated readability index, fog count, and flesch reading ease formula) for Navy enlisted personnel. Research Branch Report 8–75. Chief of Naval.

Kirkwood, K. J., & Wolfe, R. G. (1980). Matching students and reading materials: A cloze-procedure method for assessing the reading ability of students and the readability of textual materials. Toronto: Ontario Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction in Service No. ED 195 928)

Kondur, J. (2006). Using part of speech structure of text in the prediction of its readability. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Texas, Arlington, U.S. Retrieved November 13, 2008, from <http://proquest.umi.com/pdqweb?did=1216761731&sid=1&Fmt=2&clientId=46449&PQT=309&VName=PQD>

Lively, B. A., & Pressey, S. L. (1923). A method for measuring the vocabulary burden of textbooks. *Educational Administration and Supervision Including Teacher Training*, 9, 389-398.

Maihobi, W. (2010). Wholesale Arabic Grammar and Contemporary Linguistics,13-13. Retrieved 2010, from <http://mohamedrabeea.net/library/pdf/6f2e002f-9e58-42d8-a780-e79f4cf48198.pdf>

McLaughlin, G. H. (1969). SMOG grading: A new readability formula. *Journal of Reading*, 12(8), 639-646.

McLaughlin, G. Harry (May 1969). "[SMOG Grading — a New Readability Formula](#)" (PDF). *Journal of Reading*. 12 (8): 639–646. Retrieved 2018-04-26.

Newmark, P.(1988). *Textbook or translation*. London: printing Hall International.

Oxford English Dictionary Online. . [Accessed on 27 April 2010.] Readability Test Tool. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.webpagefx.com/tools/readable/Technical Training: Naval Air Station Memphis>.

Zamanian, M., & Heydari, P. (2012). Readability of Texts: State of the Art. Theory and Practice in Language Studies,2(1). doi:10.4304/tpls.2.1.43-53.