Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue[1]

Vanda Obdržálková
Charles University, Czech Republic
vanda.kuklova@seznam.cz

Abstract:

In his much-quoted article titled, *Translation as Decision Process*, written in 1967, Jiří Levý describes the process of translation as a sequence of decisions by which the translator chooses from the available alternatives, guided by definitional instructions that define the paradigm and selective instructions that narrow the number of choices. The criteria applied in the process at each individual stage are semantic, rhythmical, stylistic amongst others. Although Levý presents this theory using lexical examples from literary texts, our paper will attempt to apply the model to non-literary texts, also covering higher levels of text construction. In a case study comparing a set of translations both to and from English carried out by professional translators and students whose mother tongue is Czech, we will attempt to propose a typology of instructions that have led to the final results, and find out whether there are any differences in the criteria intervening in the decision-making process depending on the direction of the translation and the level of expertise.

Keywords: translation as a decision-making process, directionality in translation, L2 translation, non-literary texts.

Traducción como proceso de decisiones: una aplicación del modelo propuesto por Jiří Levý a la traducción directa e inversa

Resumen:

En su conocido estudio *Translation as Decision Process* publicado en 1967, Jiří Levý describe el proceso de traducción como una secuencia de decisiones, mediante las cuales el traductor escoge de las alternativas que tiene disponibles. El proceso está dirigido por dos tipos de instrucciones: las delimitativas, que definen el paradigma, y las selectivas, que reducen el número de opciones. En cada fase del proceso, el traductor se rige por criterios semánticos, formales, estilísticos y otros. Mientras que Levý explica su teoría utilizando ejemplos del plano léxico tomados de textos literarios, el presente artículo intenta aplicar el modelo a la traducción de textos no-literarios, teniendo en cuenta también los niveles más elevados de la estructuración del texto. En un estudio de casos vamos a analizar traducciones del y al inglés efectuadas por traductores profesionales y estudiantes cuya lengua materna es el checo, con el objetivo de proponer una tipología de instrucciones que han

---

307

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

llevado a los resultados finales e identificar si los criterios que intervienen en el proceso están influidos por la dirección de la traducción y por el nivel de experiencia del traductor.

Palabras clave: traducción como proceso de decisiones, dirección de la traducción, traducción inversa, textos no-literarios.

La traduction comme un processus de prise de décision : une application du modèle proposé par Jiří Levý à la traduction directe et inverse

Résumé :
Dans l'ouvrage la plus connue de Jiří Levý, *Translation as Decision Process* (1967), l'auteur décrit le processus de traduction comme une séquence de décisions, parmi lesquelles le traducteur choisit les options disponibles. Ce processus entraîne deux types d'instructions : les définitionnelles, qui produisent un paradigme et les sélectives, qui réduisent le nombre d'options. À chaque étape du processus, le traducteur est régi par des critères sémantiques, formels, stylistiques, entre autres. Bien que Levý explique sa théorie à l'aide d'exemples au niveau du lexique de textes littéraires, cet article tente d'appliquer ce modèle à la traduction de textes non littéraires, en prenant en considération les niveaux les plus élevés de la structure du texte. À partir d'une étude de cas, on analysera les traductions de et vers l'anglais réalisées par des traducteurs professionnels et des étudiants dont la langue maternelle est le tchèque. Tout cela avec le but de proposer une typologie d'instructions conduisant à des résultats définitifs et de déterminer si les critères impliqués dans le processus sont influencés par la direction de la traduction et le niveau d'expérience du traducteur.

Mots clés : traduction comme processus de prise de décisions, direction de la traduction, traduction inverse, textes non littéraires.

1. Introduction

The topic of the present article are the decision-making processes in translations of non-literary texts produced by native speakers of Czech from English into Czech and vice versa. The analysis uses data that were collected within the first part of a research project investigating translating into a non-mother tongue that is being conducted at the Department of Translation Studies of the Charles University, Czech Republic.

In terms of theoretical concepts, the analysis draws on the ideas presented by Jiří Levý, specifically on his article titled "Translation as Decision Process" published in 1967, one of our objectives being to apply the proposed model of translation process in a real-life situation and to see how its individual concepts and elements are influenced by various factors, such as type of translation problem, text function, direction of the translation and expertise of the translator.

Levý defines translation as a communication process in terms of its goal and as a decision process in terms of the translator's working situation, which forces the translator to make steps or moves, similarly as in a game, which consist in choosing among a certain number of alternatives. In this respect, Levý (1967, p. 1171) argues that the number of alternatives "is very often exactly definable".

There are several factors/elements that guide each step. First of them is the situation, or "translation problem", which is the term we will be using in this paper as well. When

308

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

looking for a solution, the translator is guided by an instruction I (definitional instruction), which defines the class of possible alternatives or paradigm. Finally, the translator has to choose from these alternatives, being guided by an instruction (selective instruction), which is derived from the context. In Levý's opinion, each decision pre-determines the choice made in the subsequent moves. Therefore, he compares the translation process to a game with complete information and believes that it can be analysed applying the methods of game theory. When applying the model to levels higher than lexical units, the definitional instruction is more complex and we are to deal with a syntax of instructions. In another of his works, Levý (see in Králová & Cuenca Drouhard, 2013) sees translation as a process that consists of three stages —understanding, interpretation and reformulation in the target language, and therefore also individual decision-making steps can be divided into those which take place when choosing between the possible interpretations of the meaning of the respective part of the source text, and those related to the way how this meaning is expressed in the target language.

In the last part of his article, Levý (1967, p. 1179) points out at the fact that the actual translation work is guided by factors that are highly pragmatic and introduces the concept of "minimax strategy", which reflects the fact the translator decides for a solution that yields maximum effect with a minimum effort.

It is obvious that the model outlined above allows us to look at translation as problem-solving, an approach that was elaborated on later from different perspectives, including the psychological aspects of the translation process, which are not addressed in Levý's work in much detail, although they are implied in the "minimax principle" Such approach has been suggested for instance by Hervey and Higgins (1992). Focus on decision-making is the starting point of various research projects focused on different aspects of the translation process, such as that conducted Tirkkonen-Condit (1997), or the work of Englund Dimitrova (2005), who uses an analysis of translator decision making to investigate the phenomenon of explicitation in translations carried out by persons with different levels of expertise. Chesterman (2000, p. 89-90) points out that "translation problems" or "units of attention" can be in fact viewed as starting points for translation strategies.

This paper presents and discusses various aspects relevant to translators' decision-making in a real-life situation using preliminary findings of a project investigating the phenomenon of translation into non-mother tongues compared to translation in the opposite direction. Throughout this paper we will be using the abbreviations L1 for the translator's "first language", i.e. the language most readily available to the translator (usually the translator's mother tongue, but not necessarily), and L2 for the "second language", i.e. language that has been mastered to a relatively high level of competence (C1 or higher according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages), and from and into which the translator is either already working, or might be asked to work, in the course of their professional translation career. These terms have been adopted from N. Pavlović, author of several studies on directionality in translation

309

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

focusing on the situation in Croatia, who also provides comprehensive reasoning for its use (Pavlović, 2007, 2010).

2. Methods and materials

2.1. Translators

In the first part of the research project, a total of 12 participants were asked to take part in a translation experiment consisting in translating two texts under specified conditions. The participants were divided in two groups —one consisted of six students of the Translation Studies Department of the Charles University who were in the second year of their MA studies with specialisation in translation between Czech and English at the time of the experiment. The second group consisted of six professional translators, i.e. persons who earn their living as translators and received their degree from the Translation Studies Department of the Charles University in the period between 2004 and 2007. The mother tongue of all the participants was Czech and English was one of their working/study languages.

2.2. Texts

The participants were asked to translate two comparable texts, one from English into Czech and one from Czech into English, each containing approximately 1800 characters. The texts were taken from websites of companies (a British one and a Czech one) specialized in kitchen furniture design and manufacturing. As we wanted to simulate a real-life situation, we used authentic texts produced and used by the companies. Both of them share similar characteristics in terms of content, style and function. As for the style, it is obvious that neither of the texts was produced by a professional PR specialist or copywriter as they both contain certain stylistic and syntactic shortcomings (sentences and sequences with impaired cohesion, punctuation and spelling errors). It was therefore one of the translators' tasks to deal with these defects. Both texts contain elements related to their function —mainly lexical means and pieces of information conveying positive evaluation of the companies and their services. Another important part of the content was terminology related to kitchen manufacturing industry, i.e. lexical units designating the furniture and its parts, materials used, types of finish, etc. Although the theme in itself is not culture-specific, both texts have certain characteristics that are related to the cultural environment in which they were created and published.

2.3. Experiment

The twelve translators whose work is subject to analysis in this article produced the translations in the first half of 2016. The translators were asked to translate the texts in a single three-hour session, having a maximum of 90 minutes to translate each one (while being allowed to return their completed translation earlier if they wished). Although we wanted to simulate a real-life translation assignment, we set up a time

310

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

limit to make the translations better comparable and also to reflect the economic aspect that is relevant for professional translators. At the beginning of the session, a member of the investigation team sent to the translator by e-mail the text to be translated from English into Czech. When the translator returned the completed translation, he/she was sent the second text to be translated into English. The participants worked in their usual environment using their own computers, dictionaries, online resources, etc. They communicated with the investigation team members by e-mail (and had their phone numbers in case of unexpected events). They were not allowed to communicate with persons other than the research team member. The translation brief was the following: "Translate the following text from the company's web page to be published as an English/Czech version of the website".

The participants were also asked to complete two questionnaires —one before producing the translations and one after handing them in. The first questionnaire contained questions about the participants' background, professional experience and attitudes towards translation into Czech vs. into non-mother tongues. The post-translation questionnaire included questions related specifically to the translation assignment. It contained questions about their methods of work, problems encountered during the translation process and strategies used to find a solution.

2.4. Analysis

For the purposes of this article, we first used the questionnaires to find out about the problems identified by our translators during the translation process. In question 4 they were asked to specify what aspects of the translation they found most difficult in each direction. In question 5 they were to identify three most difficult spots/segments in the texts and describe how they reached the solution. Based on the replies to question 5, we have selected the most frequent "translation problems", i.e. difficult expressions and portions of text, encountered by the translators in both texts, and analysed the solutions used in the translations. Our case study therefore combines data acquired in questionnaires with analysis of textual material.

3. Findings

3.1. Difficult aspects encountered by the translators

First, we will focus on the replies given to question 4 of our post-translation questionnaire, formulated as follows: "Specify the most difficult aspects of the translation (understanding the original, morphology, syntax, lexicology, terminology, style, achieving idiomatic language, pragmatic aspects…)". The question was basically an open one, but included possibilities to choose from and the participants were free to add any other aspect. Also, they were not limited in terms of the number of aspects mentioned. The aspects that were mentioned by our translators at least once are the following: style (including the effort to achieve a result that is natural and idiomatic),

311

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

terminology, syntax, understanding (in general), pragmatic aspects (which involve issues related with the target text reader, under which we also include text type conventions), cultural aspects, adherence to function, translation method (literal vs. free translation) and poor quality of the original. In the following table, we summarise the frequency of individual aspects mentioned by the students vs. professionals in the translations in both directions, indicating the number of participants who mentioned the given aspect and the percentage represented by each problem out of the total number of replies in the given category.

	Translation into L1			Translation into L2		
	Students	Professional	Total	Students	Professional	Total
Style	4 (33.3%)	4 (25.0%)	8 (28.6%)	4 (30.8%)	7 (41.2%)	11 (36.7%)
Terminology and lexical aspects	3 (25.0%)	5 (31.3%)	8 (28.6%)	4 (30.8%)	2 (11.8%)	6 (20%)
Syntax	2 (16.7%)	1 (6.3%)	3 (10.7%)	1 (7.7%)	1 (5.9%)	2 (6.7%)
Understanding the source text	2 (16.7%)	1 (6.3%)	3 (10.7%)	1 (7.7%)	1 (5.9%)	2 (6.7%)
Pragmatic aspects	1 (8.3%)	2 (12.5%)	3 (10.7%)	3 (23.1%)	3 (17.6%)	6 (20%)
Cultural differences	0	1 (6.3%)	1 (3.6%)	0	1 (5.9%)	1 (3.3%)
Function	0	1 (6.3%)	1 (3.6%)	0	1 (5.9%)	1 (3.3%)
Method (literal vs. free translation)	0	1 (6.3%)	1(3.6%)	0	0	0
Quality	0	0	0	0	1 (5.9%)	1 (3.3%)
Total	12 (100%)	16 (100%)	28 (100%)	13 (100%)	17 (100%)	30 (100%)

Table 1: Categories of difficult aspects of the translations encountered by the translators

First, it should be pointed out that the table only serves as an illustration of how translators perceived the texts and their translation work in general terms from a personal point of view. The categories have not been defined and may overlap to a certain extent —for example, some participants may have included certain pragmatic factors under the category of style. In fact, those who chose to provide a more detailed answer (rather than just selecting one or more of the options offered in the parenthesis), frequently mentioned the difference between Czech and English/British advertising style in terms of text conventions, general tone and degree of expressiveness and even the choice of information provided, i.e. factors that are both stylistic and pragmatic. We nevertheless preferred to keep the two categories separated to reflect the answers given by our participants. The translators' judgment in this respect may be highly subjective. Most of the replies do not reflect whether the given aspect posed problems in the interpretation or reformulation phase, though a total of five replies (for both directions in total) mention interpretation or understanding the source text as a separate difficult aspect. We nevertheless believe that the data shown provide certain insight into the translators' approach to their task and reveal what type of instructions come into play in translation of this particular text type.

Overall, the results show that there are no striking differences between the two directions of translation. The data indicate that style and terminology were perceived as the most difficult aspects our participants had to deal with in both directions. The issue of style is associated with the translators' concern about producing a naturally sounding text. Achieving this objective was perceived as somewhat more difficult in L2 translation (36.7% of all replies) vs. L1 (28.6% of all replies). On the other hand, terminology and lexical issues were perceived as a more challenging aspect when translating into L1 (28.6% of all replies) vs. L2 (20% of all replies). The only major difference between the two directions of translation is that our participants were more aware of and concerned about pragmatic aspects when translating into their non-mother tongue (6 mentions, 20%) than when translating into L1 (3 mentions, 10.7%). Syntax was mentioned three times (10.7%) for L1 translation and twice (6.7%) for L2 translation. As we have already mentioned, understanding or interpretation as a separate difficulty was mentioned five times in total, three times for translation into L1 (10.7%) and twice (6.7%) for the other direction. This result may be related to the fact that both texts contained passages that were not very well written, which was also reflected by one of the translators who mentioned poor quality of the original as one of the difficult aspects of the translation from Czech into English (but not for the other direction). One person mentioned cultural aspects (for both directions), one mentioned adhering to the function (in both directions) —these two aspects are included as separate categories, although they are closely related to the pragmatic level of the text. One participant found it difficult to decide about what translation method to apply in terms literalness vs. freeness (reflecting the dilemma between making text sound like an authentic advertising text and not making too many shifts in meaning).

When comparing the data acquired from students vs. professionals, the table shows that professional translators gave a higher total number of replies and show more differences in their view of the two directions of translation: When translating into L1, they were most concerned about terminology (31.3% of all their replies for this direction), while when translating L2, they thought that style was the most challenging aspect (41.2%). For students, style (33.3% mentions) was the major difficulty in L1 translation, followed by terminology (25%), while in L2 translation both these areas were perceived as equally challenging (30.8% both). Another difference associated with the participants' expertise might be seen in that professionals more often mention aspects associated with higher levels of text construction and overall translation strategy (TT function and translation method, ST quality).

3.2. Points of attention in the translated texts

While in question number 4, our translators were asked to specify any difficult aspects they had to deal with in general, in question 5 they were asked to indicate specific translation problems, i.e. points of attention in the text. The question in the questionnaire was formulated as follows: "Specify three parts of the text that were most

313

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

difficult for you to translate and explain the reason. How did you find the solution?" The question was an open one and the answer was entirely left up to the translators.

For the translation done into L1, we have a total of 33 answers, as one of the participants felt that there were no difficult parts at all. One of the translators mentioned only one specific part of the text, her other two replies referred to general aspects that we asked about in the previous question (namely syntax and localisation). That means that our participants gave a total of 31 replies identifying specific portions of the original. As several "points of attention" were mentioned more than once, we have a total of fourteen different parts (both individual expressions and larger structures) of the English original that were identified as the most difficult. Five of them were mentioned by more than one translator and the other nine had one occurrence each.

When asked about the most challenging parts of the translation into L2, our participants again gave a total of 33 answers (one did not mention any specific translation problem), of which, similarly as in L2 translation, 31 refer to concrete expressions and segments of text and two to general problems (poor quality of the text, making the result sound natural), which were covered in the previous section. Several parts were mentioned repeatedly, so we have a total of twelve different portions of text that required major effort.

Based on the replies to the question "why did you find the given part difficult", we have divided the individual points of attention into the categories that we have already used in section 3.1.1 above, i.e. the category terminology and lexical units includes problems for which these aspects are explicitly mentioned and where the main difficulty resides in the meaning of a lexical unit or expression. Style includes problems that were associated with register, degree of formality and the effort to achieve a smooth and "naturally sounding" results. The category of syntactic problems features parts where participants mention (usually too complex) sentence structure, reformulation and similar things. Pragmatic aspects include everything associated with sociocultural conventions, expectations of the readers, etc. Understanding represents an extra crosscut category in this case and covers replies like "interpreting the syntax" (in this case the problem would be categorised as a syntactic one and also included under "understanding"). The following table indicates how many times segments of the given category were mentioned and what percentage they represent out of the total number of answers.

	Into L1			Into L2		
	Students	Professional	Total	Students	Professional	Total
Style	3 (16.7%)	4 (30.8%)	7 (22.6%)	2 (11.1%)	0	2 (6.5%)
Terminology and lexical aspects	6 (33.3%)	5 (38.5%)	11 (35.5%)	10 (55.6%)	5 (38.5 %)	15 (48.4%)
Syntax	9 (50%)	1 (7.7%)	10 (32.3%)	5 (27.8%)	1 (7.7%)	6 (19.4%)
Pragmatic aspects	0	3 (23.1 %)	3 (9.7%)	1 (5.6%)	7 (53.8%)	8 (25.8%)
Total	18 (100%)	13 (100%)	31 (100%)	18 (100%)	13 (100%)	31 (100%)
Understanding the source text	9 (50%)	2 (15.4%)	10 (32.3%)	5 (27.8%)	1 (7.7%)	6 (19.4%)

Table 2: Categories of translation problems identified by the translators

The numbers summarised in the table show that the categories of difficult segments as identified by the participants in the experiment differ from the overall difficult aspects summarised in Table 1 in several ways. Overall, the most frequently mentioned problems were terminological and lexical in both directions (35.5% of the translation problems identified in L1 translation and 48.4% of those found in L2 translation). The second most frequently mentioned category was syntax (32.3%) for translation into L1 and pragmatic aspects for translation into L2 (25.8%). Stylistic problems represented 22.5% of all points of attention mentioned in L1 translation and only 6.5% of those mentioned in L2 translation, which is in a rather sharp contrast with the previous question, where style was considered the major difficulty of the translation in both directions, and specifically in L2 translation. This discrepancy may have several explanations. First, the two questions were formulated in a different way and reflect a different view of the translated texts (general feeling vs. specific points of attention). In the second one the number of difficult segments that each participant was to mention was limited to three. It is also very likely that translators perceive style as something that they have to bear in mind throughout the text, but only few specific translation problems are of purely stylistic nature. This is associated with the fact that many of the points of attention actually fall in several categories at the same time and the respondents only describe the essence of the problem (and there are several cases when the same segment was classified differently by the individual translators). Also, there may be certain inconsistencies and overlaps in the terms used in the answers to both questions.

However, the most interesting finding of this part of our questionnaire are the differences between professional translators and students. Specifically, the numbers show that while terminological and lexical problems were important for both groups and both directions, syntactic problems were more often mentioned by students, specifically in translation into their L1 (50% of all points of attention vs. 27.8% of those identified in the translation into L2), while professionals more frequently mentioned problems associated with the pragmatic level of the text construction, specifically in the translation into L2, where 53.8% of all segments mentioned by professionals fall in this category (vs. 23.1% for L1 translation). This tendency was obvious in the replies to the previous question as well. The separate category "understanding the source text"

315

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

shows that decoding of specific text segments was more difficult for students than for professionals, especially in L1 translation, where 50% of all difficult spots identified by the students involved a comprehension problem. In the translation into L2, comprehension difficulties were encountered in 27.8% of all points of attention mentioned by students. For professional translators, understanding the source text was only a minor problem, mentioned three times in total (twice for L1 translation and once for L2 translation).

3.3. Problem analysis

3.3.1. Translation problems identified in the translation into Czech

In this part, the solutions of difficult segments that were mentioned more than once were analysed in all twelve translations. We focus on how different categories of problems are reflected and processed by the two groups of translators.

Problem 1: "Many of our kitchen ranges are available in block colour doors, both matt and high gloss, smooth wood grain, textured woodgrain and gloss woodgrain as well as solid wood doors." Mentioned seven times, five times by students and twice by professionals. The problem consisted mainly in finding a correct equivalent for the terminology, specifically "woodgrain" and "block colour", one participant found it difficult to interpret the entire structure.

Going back to Levý's model of decision-making, the first instruction that guides the translator in this context is to describe to the target reader in a comprehensible way what the company is offering. Our analysis suggests that in this particular case, most effort was required in the phase of interpretation. When trying to formulate a paradigm of possible solutions, many of our translators (in fact all who commented on this particular segment) said they searched in parallel texts, in Google images, etc. Now the model assumes that the translators should follow a second instruction that helps them choose the appropriate interpretation and finally an adequate solution in the target language. In this case we can say that the most important element here was the context (what can be expected in this type of furniture in general) and also the co-text (other elements of the sentence that help define the meaning of the neighbouring elements).

For the term "block colour", we find basically six different solutions in terms of meaning, of which two can be seen as appropriate for the given context as they express the idea of blocks of a single colour (used by four translators in total, one student and three professionals). The other solutions convey meanings that do not correspond to the original, suggesting that the doors come in bright colours, vivid colours, multicolour combinations or that they are just colourful. Levý believes that the sum of final solutions offered by different translators in fact reflect the paradigm (not necessary complete) of possible options. This assumption can be applied to our solutions to a certain extent,

316

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

however, it is obvious that some of the options our translators worked with do not belong in the paradigm at all.

As for "woodgrain", we have eight different solutions, five of which express the idea of the original (used by six translators, three students and three professionals). Five translators decided for an option that is too general, translating "woodgrain" as simply "wood" (three students and two professionals), which suggests that the doors are made entirely of wood, while the original only refers to the surface. On the other hand, two persons chose an "equivalent" that is too specific. We may say that the choice of solutions that are not entirely adequate to the original resulted from an insufficient analysis of the context.

The above description of possible paradigms and choices refers basically to the semantic part of the problem. Obviously, the translators also had to choose how to incorporate the solution in the text syntactically, which further increases the number of possible options.

Problem 2: "We also offer a bespoke colour matching service, available in some of the most popular colour choices…" Mentioned six times, four times by students, twice by professionals. Again, this part was seen as problematic because of the terminology, specifically the expression "bespoke colour matching service" —the translators generally found it difficult to figure out what exactly it is. The decision-making mechanism underlying the search for a solution was similar as in the previous case, however, here the interpretation of the meaning involves also the syntactic aspect. Our participants again reported that they relied on parallel texts and pictures to interpret the meaning correctly. As the expression consists of four words and there is no direct Czech equivalent having the same structure (as Czech does not allow to use this type of premodification), the translators operated with a wider range of options (as they had to work with each element of the expression) and some of them chose to use an explication. Therefore, we have twelve different options, of which three are synonymous in their meaning and differ only slightly in their structure. The remaining solutions are quite varied in terms of their syntactic structure and also semantically, especially in terms of the degree of specificity. In total, seven of the options offered (three provided by students and four by professionals) more or less express the idea of the original. As for the strategies used (for example when looking at the degree of literalness vs. freeness, explicitation, etc.), there are no significant differences between students and professionals as separate groups; the variety of solutions arises rather from the individual approach of each translator.

Problem 3: "We have an extensive selection of kitchen ranges to choose from including ultra-modern contemporary kitchens, Italian kitchen and door selections from high gloss to quality solid woodt [*sic*] traditional kitchens." Mentioned four times, three times by students, once by professionals. This portion of text was perceived as challenging due to its very complex syntactic structure and deficient coherence, which makes it difficult to

317

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

reformulate in the target language while maintaining the meaning. Compared to the previous ones, the problem affects a much larger structure and reaching the final solution required several lower-grade decisions. Keeping the terminology and other elements aside, we will focus only on how the translators addressed the problem of coherence, which is impaired because the sentence includes an enumeration which mixes two elements — kitchens and kitchen doors. In the translations we received, five people (four students and one professional) actually decided to keep the members of the enumeration in the same order as in the original, without "correcting" the sentence structure. The remaining seven (two students and five professionals) separated the two ideas —either within a single sentence, or dividing the construction into two or three sentences. We can see that professional translators were more willing to make major changes to the structure. Analysing this particular translation problem, it probably does not make much sense trying to identify a paradigm of possible choices as the number of options on the sentence level is virtually almost infinite. With certain licence, we might perhaps think of a range of different techniques or syntactic shifts our translators had to choose from, like changing the order of individual elements, separating the sentence into two or three, etc.

Problem 4: "Polaris Kitchens is a family run business with a passion for design…." Mentioned by three persons (one student and two professionals). The difficulty resides in the expression "with a passion". Those who mentioned this segment among translation problems felt that a literal translation of "passion" would sound too expressive and exaggerated in Czech. Of course, subjective factors and individual taste also play a role. One of the translators reported that she deliberately used the direct Czech equivalent for "passion", as she wanted to make the translation stand out among Czech advertising texts.

Looking at the solutions, we can see that four persons (two students and two professionals) chose a literal Czech translation of "passion" (*vášeň*), three (one student and two professionals) used a solution that corresponds to the English word "enthusiasm" (*nadšení*), probably because they felt that passion does not fit in the context. One student used an expression that is synonymous with enthusiasm but more expressive (*zápal*). The remaining four translators (two students and two professionals) felt that they needed to reduce the degree of expressiveness to make the result more acceptable for the Czech reader and chose a more neutral solution, replacing the substantive with an adjective or verb, offering solutions like "a company focused on design", "company that accentuates design", etc. Overall, five of our translators (three students and two professionals) decided to keep the structure of the original ("a company with something"), while the remaining seven (three students and four professionals) preferred a less condensed structure. The results show that the different approaches are distributed quite evenly between students and professionals and the instructions that were decisive for the final decision are of stylistic and pragmatic nature.

Problem 5: "Polaris Kitchens". Mentioned by two professional translators who were not sure whether to keep the word "Kitchens" (which forms part of the company's

318

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

name) in English or translate it into Czech or leave it out. Both of them provided a rather thorough analysis of the problem, involving both morphosyntactic aspects (as the name in its English version or cannot be declined, which was reflected by the first translator) and pragmatic aspects (reflected by the second translator, who thinks that it might be important for the Czech reader to know directly what type of industry the text refers to, but at the end decides for Polaris only). Here the set of available options is given and limited — "Polaris Kitchens", *"Kuchyně Polaris"* (Czech version of the name), *"Polaris Kuchyně"* (Czech version with English word order) or "Polaris" only. With the options where declination is impossible, the Czech word for "company" can be inserted to overcome this difficulty. Another option is to leave out the name and replace it with "our company" or "company", or just "we". This makes up a total of eight tentative solutions. However, one might argue that there is a general rule that in this text type, the company's name must be kept in its original version. If we accept this (and we probably should), then this instruction overrides some of the previous considerations. As the company's name appears three times in the text, it is also possible to use a combination of these options. The decision-making here also involves the question whether the number of occurrences of the entire name depends on the conventions that apply in the given "advertising culture", or whether it is an imperative to keep it all three times because the client put it this way. This issue is also reflected in the translators' comments, as one of them points out that in a real-life situation, she would consult this issue with the client.

As for the solutions, all our translators respected the general convention and used the full English names, expect for two. Five (three students and two professionals) of them did not mind using the name three times, three alternated it with a more general "we" and two with "our company". One professional translator left the word "Kitchens" out and one student translated it into Czech and then used this solution consistently. In this particular case, students show a stronger tendency to transfer the company's name without modifications or additions, which suggests that they probably do not consider this element a translation problem at all.

To summarise this section, we can say that each of the problems described above was addressed in a different way, depending on its type, which indicates that the instructions for the final choice depend on particular situation and include semantic, stylistic, pragmatic and also subjective criteria. As for terminology, we should note that both students and professional translators rely on parallel texts and internet resources, however, we can observe certain deficiencies in their work with the actual context. Though we can say that both students and professionals come with quite a wide range of solutions for each problem, professional translators are generally more willing to make major interventions in the text structure and their solutions seem to reflect that they work with higher units of text structure and approach the text from a wider perspective.

319

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

3.3.2. Translation problems identified in the translation into English

Like in the previous section, we will focus on the five translation problems that were mentioned more than once by our participants and analyse the solutions in detail. The segments are quoted in Czech with a literal translation into English provided in brackets (translated by the author of this article).

Problem 1: *Navštívíte-li jedno z našich studií, budete jednat s odborníkem, který Vám pomůže zrealizovat Vaše představy a který k tomu má díky přímé vazbě na vlastní firemní výrobu nejlepší nástroj.* [If you visit one of our showrooms, you will meet a professional who will help you carry out your ideas and who has the best tool to do this because he has a direct relation to the company's manufacturing.] Mentioned seven times, by all six students and one professional translator. Most of those who commented on this problem said that they had to make effort to interpret the exact meaning (referring mainly to the word "tool") and find a way to express the idea correctly. When asked how they looked for the solution, the translators mentioned the following techniques: "simplification", "explication", "loosening the sentence structure", "reformulation" and "interpretation".

Again, as the problem covers a longer segment, we may say that the process involves many smaller sub-decisions. First we may look at the results from the perspective of syntax. As we can see in the literal translation provided above, the original actually starts with a conditional clause ("If you visit…"*).* Seven of our translators (four students and three professionals) kept this structure, while the remaining five use other types of sentence, or replace the conditional with an adverbial ("in our showrooms…") or transform it into a subject ("Paying a visit to one of our showrooms means…"). Two translators (one student and one professional) divided the sentence in two.

As for the part "who has the best tool", which in this case is obviously understood in the abstract sense, we have nine different solutions. Two persons decided to omit this part, two persons use the dictionary equivalent ("tool"), three transform it into an adjective ("who are well-suited…"), three use the same structure with the verb "to have", replacing "tool" with another substantive ("know-how", "solutions", "support") and two replace this construction with the connective "thanks". The different strategies leading to solution are distributed evenly among students and professionals, only omission was used exclusively by students.

Problem 2: *Vyrábíme kuchyně z lamina a masivu a kuchyně lakované, dýhované a foliované.* [We manufacture kitchens made of MFC and solid wood and kitchens with varnished, veneer and foil finish.] Mentioned six times (by three students and three professionals). All participants who mentioned this part of the text see the problem in the terminology. If we translate this into an instruction, they looked for a term that precisely describes the company's products and that is normally used in the given community. The main criterion is of course semantic. When asked about their method of work, all mention

320

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

research in dictionaries, parallel texts, Google, etc., several of them pointing out that looking the term up in a dictionary is often not enough.

The sentence contains five terms, each of them requiring a different approach. For *lamino* [laminated chipboard, MFC], we have seven different solutions ("laminate" 5x, "laminated wood" 2x, "particleboard" 1x, "laminated particle boards" 1x, "woodgrain" 1x, "MFC" 1x and "laminated kitchen" 1x). The Czech term *masiv* [solid wood] was translated as "solid wood" by all translators except for one who uses "massive wood". For *lakované* [varnished], we have four possibilities in terms of semantics ("varnished", "gloss", "lacquered", "paint"), which are used in eleven different combinations (e.g. "gloss doors" vs. "gloss finish" vs. "gloss kitchens"). Only two students chose to use "kitchens", others preferred to explain that the characteristics refers more to doors or finishing. The term *dýhované* [veneer] was translated either as "veneer" (10x) or "woodgrain" (2x), again in different combinations, which indicates that most translators used the equivalent available in the dictionary. For the term *foliované* [literally: "foiled", meaning "with foil/plastic film finish"], nine translators use "foil" or "foiled" or "thermfoil", one uses "plastic film", one "plastic finish", one student has omitted the term. Although in this article we do not primarily focus on translation quality, it is obvious that some of the proposed solutions do not have the same meaning as the original (e.g. "paint" used by two professionals instead of "varnish"). Other defective solutions arise from insufficient analysis leading to combinations of words that result in a shift of meaning (e.g. "foil kitchen" instead of "foil finish").

Problem 3: *Montáže provádí sehraná dvou až tříčlenná parta montážníků, kteří Vás slušně pozdraví, přezují se, zakryjí si podlahu v místě montáže a pustí se do práce.* [The installation is done by a team of two to three men, who will greet you politely, change their shoes and cover the floor at the site of installation and set to work.] This segment was mentioned among the points of attention by five persons (all professionals). It involves a pragmatic problem closely related to habits and social norms. The translators who comment on this sentence point out that a literal translation could sound ridiculous and might not be interpreted correctly by the target readers, as it would suggest that politeness and cleanliness are something special, while the target audience would take it for granted. The sentence also refers to the Czech habit of removing one's outdoor shoes when at home, which might not be understood by readers from other cultures.

In this case, all students provide an almost literal translation of this segment, maintaining all three semantic elements discussed above (politeness, changing shoes and cleanliness). The same approach was used by two professional translators. The remaining four professionals simplified the sentence, leaving out the information about shoe-changing. One of them also omitted the greeting part and the other two replaced this with a more general characteristics ("men who are polite and nice", "know their manners").

Problem 4: *Realizace* [implementation or production process], appears twice in the text, once in the expression "all steps connected with the production process", once in "result

321

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

of the production process". Mentioned by three participants, two students and one professional. This is essentially a lexical problem, the translators are aware that the Czech word is typical of texts produced in the field of design and architecture in general, and the "direct" English equivalent ("realization") is perceived as a kind of false friend, so the translators tend to avoid it, some of them perhaps unconsciously. This effort not to calque the Czech word can be seen as a specific selective instruction.

The set of solutions offered by our translators includes the substantives "process" (6x), "project" (4x), "implementation" (3x), "realization" (perhaps surprisingly used by a translator who admits that she hesitated to use the first equivalent found in the dictionary, but decided to stick to it as she did not have time to search further), "installation" (1x), "contract" (1x), "order" (1x), "business" (1x). One person uses "making" and one reformulated the phrase with a verbal construction —"put into practice". For the second occurrence, two translators (one student and one professional) decided to omit the term, putting just "best results". We again see that the tentative solutions differ in terms of their specificity and the "selective instruction" involved stylistic criteria, i.e. the translators needed to have a solution that is natural and idiomatic. It is also probable that the solutions reflect the translators' personal experience. We can see that the most frequent solutions are also the most general ones, which is most probably associated with the phenomenon that Levý describes as "minimax strategy". The range of solutions offered by students contained less elements than that offered by professionals.

Problem 5: *…většinou však vyrábíme nábytek střední a vyšší třídy.* […we manufacture mostly mid to upper end furniture.] Mentioned by two students. This problem again involves search for an appropriate equivalent at the lexical level. Both translators who commented on this segment talked about looking for an "idiomatic equivalent" suitable an advertising text, mentioning research in parallel texts as one of their working methods. The criteria relevant for the selective instruction are therefore semantic and also stylistic.

The key element of the expression is the word *třída* whose first dictionary equivalent is "class". However, the combinations "middle class" and "upper class" are used to denote social classes rather than categories of products or market segments. Despite that, our translators used "class" six times (four students and two professionals) in different combinations, such as "medium and higher class", "middle and high class", etc. One of the students chose to change the entire expression to "first-class", which led to a shift in meaning. Three persons (one student and two professionals) use a combination which includes the word "quality", which is inappropriate for the context. Three persons (one student and two professionals) use "middle to high end" or other similar combinations, probably the most appropriate of the proposed solutions.

Similarly as in L1 translation, we have seen that the formulation of sets of tentative choices depends on each specific problem. At the lexical level, we can see that for various

322

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

terms the sets of semantic choices are really limited, probably in cases where plausible solutions could be found in the dictionary. Problems 4 and 5 involve more general lexical units, though closely associated with the given field; here the difficult part seems to be the availability of an acceptable equivalent rather than decoding of the meaning, however, same as in L1 translation, we have again seen deficient solutions arising from insufficient analysis of the context. Similarly as in L1 translation, professional translators have shown a tendency to be guided by criteria associated with higher text levels, which is particularly reflected in their solutions to Problem 3.

4. Conclusion and discussion

Our paper shows one of possible ways of looking at translation in terms of decision-making, combining an analysis of questionnaire replies to process-oriented questions with translation analysis. When applied to our experiment, Levý's model turns out to be somewhat idealistic; nonetheless it certainly pinpoints the essential structure of the translation process. To make it applicable in a real-life situation, we focus on "translation problems" as points of departure and leave the identification of translation problems (difficult segments of the texts) up to the translators. These segments differ in their size (from words to sentences) and fall into different categories in terms of the essence of the problem they involve (terminology and lexical, syntax, style and pragmatic aspects). Our results indicate that these categories are closely related to the text function (for example specific terminology of the given field, certain lexical and other elements typical of the advertising style in both studied languages) and are decisive for the formulation of instructions that lead to the final result.

The idea of paradigm understood as a set of tentative solutions from which the translator chooses seems to be a highly theoretical one and of course one must ask to what extent a paradigm is consciously present in the translators' mind. As we can see above, the translation problems perceived by the translators involve different textual levels, which is reflected in the complexity of the paradigm of solutions. While in the case of terminological elements, the situation is (or at least should be) pretty simple, for problems that involve higher levels of text construction, such as syntax or pragmatic aspects (including the question how to handle certain pieces of information), we can hardly speak of a "set" of options as the number of possibilities is virtually infinite. A very specific phenomenon is the strategy referred to as "omission", i.e. leaving out certain part of the source text content, which has been employed by our translators several times, in certain cases probably by mistake. It seems that in this particular text type, omitting terminological elements and lexical units whose essential function is informative can be regarded as a translation error, and therefore omission should probably not be included in the paradigm of tentative solutions, while in other cases, mainly at the pragmatic level, it may be, and quite often really is, one of the options.

For terminological units, which are among the problems that were most frequently mentioned by our translators, the paradigm of solutions theoretically should be very

323

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

small, often including a single element only that is precisely defined by the definitional instruction (and in such case, no further selective instructions would be necessary). However, the results show that the issue is not that simple. We have to accept the fact that the sets of solutions offered by our translators for individual terminological units sometimes include elements that do not actually belong to the initial paradigm as they do not comply with the definition, or options that should be automatically ruled out as they do not fit in the context. This is of course associated with the fact that when translating very specific terminology, our translators often relied on parallel texts and pictures and when making the final solution they often either did not analyse the material sufficiently, did not work with all the options, or neglected the clues given by the context. In terminological units consisting of several words, the syntactic structure plays an important role and increases the number of tentative solutions.

Other problems on the lexical level are generally closely associated with stylistic and pragmatic criteria and the paradigm of options tends to be wider. If we include options that are based on rephrasing and transpositions of different kinds (i.e. translating a noun with a verbal structure), the number of possible choices increases even more and it is virtually impossible for a translator to operate with all of them. The more probable scenario is that the translators handle a smaller amount of options which they have available in their memories, dictionaries and sometimes also parallel texts, which, as we have seen in the translators' comments, are frequently used also to look for collocations, idiomatic expressions, etc. Such approach would be consistent with the "minimax principle". It should be also noted that the search for an appropriate equivalent involves certain amount of guesswork, as has been admitted by one of our respondents, who mentions guessing as one of his "working methods". The number of tentative options and the amount of guesswork involved when choosing the final solutions are very probably associated with the time constraints imposed, as several translators mentioned that they would have done a more thorough research if they had had more time.

When we compare various aspects of translation into L1 and L2, our results suggest that the differences are not too significant. Our respondents generally encountered similar difficulties and categories of translation problems in both directions, although we have found certain differences in the percentages. Similar findings have been presented in several previous research works, though using different methodologies. For instance T. Pavlović, who analysed L1 and L2 translation in the Bosnian context, came to the conclusion that "there is a certain level of similarity between these two directions of translation. In L1 and L2 translation of general texts, novice translators encounter similar types and similar number of problems in terms of the basic division of categories." (T. Pavlović, 2013, p. 163) Similarly, N. Pavlović, who examined Croatian novice translators' decision-making in video- and audio-recorded collaborative (group) translation processes, concludes that "the two directions show remarkable similarities when it comes to distribution of arguments belonging to different categories (N. Pavlović, 2010, p. 79).

324

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

The major difference between the two directions of translation has been recorded in the category "understanding the source text", as comprehension problems are more frequently encountered in the translation into L1, specifically by students. At first sight, this seems to confirm the assumption sustained by various authors, such as Campbell (1998, p. 58), that in translating from a second language, the main difficulty is in comprehending the source text, while in translating into a second language, "comprehension of the source text is the easier aspect; the real difficulty is in producing a target text in a language in which composition does not come naturally." However, our findings indicate that translators encountered certain amount of comprehension difficulties in the source text written in their mother tongue as well, which seems to be related to their level of expertise and quality of the text.

Another category where we have found a constant difference between the two directions is that of pragmatic aspects, which were mentioned more frequently in L2 translation. This is also one of the categories reflecting a major difference between students and professionals, as it is more frequently mentioned by professionals, specifically when we focus on specific translation problems. Our results therefore seem to be in line with the findings of previous studies focused on comparison of subjects with different levels of expertise, where professional translators were more conscious of textual features, global strategies and the communicative purpose of the translated text (Jääskeläinen, 1999; Künzli, 2003; Tirkkonen-Condit, 1997). On the other hand, the points of attention most frequently mentioned by students suggest that they focus on the lower levels of the text build-up, such as lexical elements and syntax.

These tendencies are reflected also in the analysis of selected problem solutions, which shows that although we can find fairly similar ranges of solutions and strategies in both groups and both directions of translation, professionals are generally more willing to make major changes to the text structure (transforming sentences, justified omissions) and their decisions are more influenced by pragmatic and functional aspects.

As we are aware that the findings presented here were formulated using a limited set of preliminary data, we have underlined only the most obvious tendencies, without focusing on minor details. We nevertheless believe that we have placed Levý's model in a new perspective and our conclusions outline the essential elements of decision-making and problem-solving in both directions of translation of a specific type of texts.

325

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

References

Campbell, S. (1998). *Translation into the Second Language*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Chesterman, A. (2000). *Memes of translation: the spread of ideas in translation theory*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Englund Dimitrova, B. (2005). *Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hervey, S. and Higgins I. (1992). *Thinking Translation. A course in translation method: French-English.* London: Routledge

Jääskeläinen, R. (1999). *Tapping the process: An Explorative Study of the Cognitive and Affective Factors Involved in Translating*. Joensuu: Joensuun Yliopisto.

Králová, J. & Cuenca Drouhard, M. J. (Eds.). (2013). *Jiří Levý: una concepción (re)descubierta*. Monográficos de la revista Herméneus. Soria: Vertere.

Künzli, Alexander (2003). *Quelques stratégies et principes en traduction technique françaisallemand et français-suédois. (diss.)* Stockholm: Stockholms universitet, Institutionen för franska och italienska. Retrieved from http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:198303/FULLTEXT01.pdf.

Levý, J. (1967). Translation as a decision process. In *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, *vol. 2 (pp 1171-1182).* The Hague: Mouton.

Pavlović, N. (2007). Directionality in translation and interpreting practice. Report on a questionnaire survey in Croatia. *Forum, 5*(2), pp. 79-99.

Pavlović, N. (2010). What were they thinking?! Students' decision making in L1 and L2 translation processes. *Hermes, Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 44, pp. 63-87. Retrieved from http://download2.hermes.asb.dk/archive/download/Hermes-44-pavlovic.pdf.

Pavlović, T. (2013). Exploring directionality in translation studies. *ExELL: Explorations in English Language & Linguistics, 1*(2), pp. 149-165.

Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (1997). Who Verbalizes What: A Linguistic Analysis of TAP Texts. *Target, 9*(1), pp. 69-84.

326

Obdržálková, V. / Translation as a decision-making process: an application of the model proposed by Jiří Levý to translation into a non-mother tongue

Appendix: Source texts

Text 1: L1 translation (English-Czech)

Polaris Kitchens is a family run business with a passion for design, quality and excellent customer service.

The team has over 50 years experience in the kitchen industry both locally and in London and has drawn on this experience to come up with a truly customer focused business model. We work with some of the best suppliers in the industry as well as a number of high quality local suppliers, stonemasons and tradesmen and can bring you an extensive range of kitchen styles, granite and quartz, appliances and state of the art technology.

Every member of our team, as well as the suppliers we choose to work with, have been chosen for the quality of their skills, workmanship and experience in their profession. Polaris Kitchens aims to provide an industry leading experience for all of its clients.

Polaris Kitchens do not rely on pushy sales people, our customers recommend our services.

We provide a design-led service and appreciate that our clients want to have a kitchen that suits their personal lifestyle, family and personality. Many of our clients are recommendations from previous happy customers.

We believe that this kind of recommendation speaks for itself.

We have an extensive selection of kitchen ranges to choose from including ultra-modern contemporary kitchens, Italian kitchen and door selections from high gloss to quality solid woodt traditional kitchens.

Many of our kitchen ranges are available in block colour doors, both matt and high gloss, smooth woodgrain, textured woodgrain and gloss woodgrain as well as solid wood doors. We also offer a bespoke colour matching service, available in some of the most popular colour choices as well as the option to have any colour matched for a totally unique look.

Many of our ranges can be made to measure for a truely bespoke kitchen design.

Retrieved from http://www.theperfectkitchen.co.uk/

Text 2: L2 translation (Czech-English)

Jsme český výrobce kuchyní z Prahy s tradicí od roku 2002. Denně projektujeme, vyrábíme a montujeme přibližně tři kuchyně. Navštívíte-li jedno z našich studií, budete jednat s odborníkem, který Vám pomůže zrealizovat Vaše představy a který k tomu má díky přímé vazbě na vlastní firemní výrobu nejlepší nástroj. Snažíme se, aby naši prodejci pouze neskládali jednotlivé skříňky, ale aby dokázali klientům poradit a vymyslet kuchyň tak, aby pro ně byla práce v kuchyni radostí. Pojem „kuchyně na míru" u nás znamená, že klient volně kombinuje materiály a dekory dle svých představ. Udržet vysoký standard poskytovaných služeb při rozmanitosti zakázek je někdy dost složité.

O tom, že se nám to snad daří nejlépe vypovídá vysoký podíl klientů přicházejících na základě kladných referencí.

Vyrábíme kuchyně z lamina a masivu a kuchyně lakované, dýhované a foliované. Vhodným výběrem materiálu dokážeme velmi dobře konkurovat prodejcům levných kuchyní, většinou však vyrábíme nábytek střední a vyšší třídy. Náš nábytek je vždy vyrobený z kvalitního materiálu a zpracovaný špičkovou technologií, a proto můžeme zaručit jeho vysokou trvanlivost a užitnou hodnotu. Pro dosažení co nejlepšího výsledku je rozhodující bezvadně fungující tým, který zajistí veškeré úkony spojené s realizací. Proto veškeré úkony provádějí pouze zaměstnanci firmy a navíc celý proces hlídá firemní software. Vedle kuchyňského nábytku naše společnost vyrábí také polymerní pracovní desky a v případě zájmu klientů i vestavné skříně a ostatní nábytek.

Kvalitně provedená montáž je bezpodmínečnou podmínkou dobrého výsledku celé realizace. Proto se nespoléháme na externí pracovníky. Montáže provádí sehraná dvou až tříčlenná parta montážníků, kteří Vás slušně pozdraví, přezují se, zakryjí si podlahu v místě montáže a pustí se do práce.

Retrieved from http://www.kuchyne-katalpa.cz/