



An Analytical Study of Lexical Challenges Encountered in Translating Selected Football Expressions by English Undergraduate Students at Yemeni Universities

Ahmed Taher Abdu Nagi^{1,2*}, Abdulrahman Ahmed Mohammed No'man^{3,4}, Aaya Ali Abdullallah Mohammed Saif Al-jabry⁵, Yasser Alrefaee⁶

¹Associate Professor of English Literature, College of Education, Taiz University, Yemen

²Associate Professor of English Literature, College of Humanities and Administrative Sciences, Al Janad University, Taiz, Yemen

³Assistant Professor of English Literature, Ibb University

⁴Head of English Department, University of Science and Technology, Taiz

⁵University of Science and Technology, Taiz

⁶English Department, Faculty of Education, Rada'a, Albaydha University, Yemen

Received: 11.04.2026 • Accepted: 30.05.2026 • Published: 05.07.2026 • Final Version: 30.07.2026

Abstract: This study investigates the lexical challenges and translation strategies employed by Yemeni undergraduate students when rendering specialized English football terminology into Arabic, focusing on non-equivalence and the effectiveness of Mona Baker's (2018) compensatory strategies. A purposive sample of 30 senior students from Taiz University, Ibb University, and the University of Science and Technology (UST) participated in the research. Utilizing a mixed-methods approach, the study employed a translation test consisting of 20 isolated terms and 6 contextualized terms to evaluate the impact of textual clues on accuracy. Findings reveal significant conceptual barriers, especially regarding metaphorical and idiomatic expressions; while technical terms like "Stadium" saw high success, performance declined sharply for metaphors such as "Park the bus." Statistical analysis shows an overall success rate of 65.2%. Furthermore, the results refute the hypothesis of male superiority, as female students consistently outperformed males by applying systematic academic strategies like paraphrasing. Institutionally, Taiz University students demonstrated greater flexibility in functional strategies, whereas UST students favored technical borrowing. The study concludes that translational competence in specialized fields is an acquired academic skill rather than a gender-based interest. Consequently, the study recommends integrating English for Specific Purposes (ESP) modules into translation curricula to better prepare students for the technical demands of sports media.

Keywords: Football terminology, non-equivalence, translation strategies, Mona Baker, Yemeni universities

1. Introduction

Translation is much more than just a mechanical process of changing words from one language to another; it is the essential bridge that allows different cultures to communicate, share knowledge, and understand each other's unique perspectives. As Nida and Taber (1969) famously explained, the

* Corresponding author: ahmedtaher@taiz.edu.ye

true goal of translation is to find the closest natural equivalent of the original message. They emphasize that a good translator should focus on the meaning first, and then on the style, ensuring the message feels natural to the reader. However, achieving this is rarely easy because many words are deeply rooted in their own culture and do not have a direct match in another language—a challenge we call 'non-equivalence.' Mona Baker (2018) describes translation as a constant and difficult search for these equivalents, reminding us that finding a 'perfect' match is almost impossible.

In today's globalized world, specialized translation has become more important than ever before. We no longer just need people who speak two languages; we need experts who truly understand the specific subject they are translating, whether it is in medicine, law, or sports. This is because every field has its own technical language and hidden meanings that a general translator might miss. This study focuses on this professional need, showing that being a good translator requires deep knowledge of the topic to ensure that the information is shared accurately and professionally across different cultures.

This study specifically looks at how undergraduate students at Yemeni universities handle these gaps when dealing with football expressions, which can be divided into three main categories: Technical, Idiomatic, and Metaphorical. This classification is grounded in translation studies and semantic analysis (Newmark,1988, Baker,2018), aiming to distinguish between purely functional terminology and culturally-embedded expressions that require non-literal translation strategies. Technical terms are the specific words used in the game, while idiomatic and metaphorical expressions are much harder to translate because they carry deep cultural images, such as *Park the bus*. Football is associated with expressions of racism, sexism and homophobia and this feeds into wider tropes of hooliganism, uncouthness, incivility and, ultimately, violence, Bergh (2011). This indicates the need for solving such problems and challenges. According to Beard (1998), the language of sport, broadly defined, is the linguistic representation of sporting activity—that is, physical exertion in the contexts of identifiable games with procedures and rules, and of competition. In the world of sports, these challenges are very clear because football language is full of these unique expressions. When students translate them into Arabic, they cannot rely on literal translation because it often ruins the meaning and the excitement of the game. Instead, they must look for the functional meaning to keep the message clear for the fans. Because football is a global passion, the need for skilled sports translators is growing, making this a vital and exciting area for academic research.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

Even though translation of football terms is becoming very important in the Arab world, many students still find it hard to translate football expressions accurately. The biggest issue is the lack of direct equivalents in Arabic, which often leads to mistakes or awkward literal translations that do not sound natural. Also, there are not enough studies that record the specific mistakes that students make or the strategies they use to solve these problems. Accordingly, there is an urgent need to analyze these challenges to understand how students cope up with lexical gaps and how we can help them improve their translation skills.

1.2. Significance of the Study

This study is significant for several reasons: First, it fills a research gap in the field of sports and specialized translation, particularly in the area of football language. Second, it provides empirical data that can help translation instructors understand common lexical challenges faced by translation

undergraduate students. Third, it benefits professional translators and media institutions by suggesting effective strategies for handling lexical gaps in football terminology, thus contributing to the standardization and enrichment of Arabic sports translation.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

This study aims to:

1. Examine the common lexical errors students make when translating football expressions.
2. Explore the methods and strategies students use to solve translation problems when there is no direct equivalent in Arabic.
3. Investigate which football terms are the most difficult for translation students.

1.4. Questions of the Study

1. What are the common lexical errors students make when translating football expressions?
2. What are the methods and strategies students use to solve translation problems when there is no direct equivalent in Arabic?
3. Which football terms are the most difficult for translation students?

1.5. Hypotheses of the Study

1. Undergraduate students at Yemeni universities face considerable lexical challenges when translating specialized football expressions due to the absence of direct equivalents in Arabic.
2. Undergraduate students at Yemeni universities employ a variety of compensatory strategies—such as paraphrasing, borrowing, and descriptive equivalence—to overcome lexical non-equivalence.

2. Literature Review

This section reviews previous studies according to major thematic strands relevant to the present study: (1) lexical non-equivalence and translation theory, (2) figurative language and metaphor in sports discourse, (3) translation strategies in rendering football idioms, and (4) cultural and contextual dimensions of sports communication.

2.1. Lexical Non-Equivalence and Theoretical Foundations

One of the central challenges in translation studies is lexical non-equivalence — the absence of a direct counterpart in the target language. According to Mona Baker (2018), equivalence is not a fixed linguistic match but a functional relationship shaped by cultural and contextual factors. She argues that when direct equivalence fails, translators must adopt compensatory strategies such as translation by a more general word, paraphrase, descriptive equivalence, borrowing, or cultural substitution. Baker's framework is particularly applicable to sports discourse, where terminology often carries metaphorical or culture-bound meanings. Similarly, Peter Newmark (1988) distinguishes between semantic and communicative translation, emphasizing that communicative translation is often more effective when rendering culturally embedded expressions. Earlier, Eugene Nida and Charles Taber

(1969) introduced the concept of functional equivalence, stressing that translators must prioritize meaning and reader response rather than literal structure. Empirical work by Khazrouni (2020) further confirms that translation loss is often unavoidable when dealing with word-level non-equivalence, particularly between Arabic and English. The study highlights the importance of strategic decision-making to minimize semantic loss. Collectively, these theoretical and empirical contributions establish non-equivalence as a multidimensional phenomenon that extends beyond vocabulary gaps to include cultural and conceptual differences.

2.2. Figurative Language and Conceptual Metaphor in Sports Discourse

Football discourse is characterized by extensive use of metaphor, idioms, and figurative expressions. Research shows that such expressions are deeply embedded in cultural conceptualizations of competition and conflict. Alzawaydeh & Alghazo (2018) found that one of the most dominant conceptual metaphors in football news headlines is “FOOTBALL IS WAR.” Their findings suggest that both English and Arabic sports media rely heavily on metaphorical framing, reflecting shared cognitive models of competition, though cultural nuances may vary. This supports the argument that sports language is not purely technical but conceptually structured. Similarly, Kowalikowa (2009) emphasizes that sports language functions as a specialized sub-language with its own terminology and metaphorical richness. The study highlights the interdisciplinary nature of sports discourse, integrating linguistic, cultural, and sociological dimensions. In his essay “The Sporting Spirit” (1945), George Orwell argues that “sport is frankly mimic warfare” and that spectators “seriously believe – at any rate for short periods – that running, jumping and kicking a ball are tests of national virtue”

More recently, Alqudah & Hassan (2025) investigated the comprehension of metaphors, similes, and idioms in English football commentary. Their study revealed that while technical terms are generally accessible to non-native speakers, metaphorical expressions present significant comprehension difficulties due to their conceptual and cultural density. This supports the distinction between technical equivalence and conceptual equivalence, which is central to the present study. Together, these studies demonstrate that football translation problems are often rooted in conceptual metaphor systems rather than simple lexical gaps.

2.3. Translation Strategies in Rendering Football Idioms

A significant body of research focuses on how translators handle idiomatic football expressions. Studies consistently highlight paraphrasing and descriptive strategies as the most effective methods. Irwansyah & Saifulloh (2025), in their analysis of the idiom “Park the bus,” found that paraphrasing was the dominant strategy in Indonesian sports media. Literal translation was used less frequently due to the risk of semantic distortion. Their findings align closely with Baker’s model, particularly translation by paraphrase and descriptive equivalence. Khalaf (2022) similarly examined metaphor translation in sports advertisements and concluded that translators favor communicative methods to preserve the emotive and persuasive function of the text. The study emphasizes that maintaining impact is often more important than maintaining structure. These findings collectively suggest that effective sports translation depends on strategic flexibility rather than literal reproduction. Translators must prioritize communicative function and audience accessibility.

2.4. Cultural and Contextual Dimensions of Sports Communication

Beyond linguistic complexity, sports translation is influenced by broader cultural and contextual factors. Anyawu (2023) highlighted the global nature of football communication and emphasizes that translation in international sporting contexts involves cross-cultural mediation rather than simple word substitution. The study underscores the growing demand for professional sports translators equipped with domain-specific expertise. Chen (2023), though focusing on coaching rather than translation, demonstrates that cross-cultural competence is essential in globalized football environments. Communication success depends on adapting technical knowledge to cultural expectations. Moreover, Bouayad-Agha et al. (2010) showed that context plays a crucial role in generating football summaries. Their computational model reveals that content selection and lexical choice are influenced by perspective and audience orientation. This finding supports the view that contextual cues significantly aid interpretation and meaning construction in sports discourse. Together, these studies highlight that translation challenges in football are not isolated linguistic problems but are embedded in cultural frameworks and contextual dynamics.

Al-Kayed (2024) examined the challenges encountered by Jordanian translation students when translating sports idiomatic expressions from Arabic into English, with particular emphasis on lexical, semantic, and cultural difficulties. The study found that idiomatic expressions in sports discourse pose significant problems for learners due to their figurative meanings and strong cultural embedding, which often cannot be transferred through direct lexical substitution. The results revealed a clear tendency among students to depend on literal translation strategies, leading to mistranslations, loss of pragmatic meaning, and unnatural target-language output. In addition, the study highlighted that students frequently lack awareness of equivalent idiomatic expressions in English sports discourse, which further contributes to translation errors. Al-Kayed (2024) therefore emphasized the importance of developing students' cultural competence and exposure to authentic sports commentary in order to improve their ability to interpret and render idiomatic expressions accurately. The study also recommended integrating targeted training in idiomatic and context-based translation within translation curricula to reduce reliance on word-for-word translation strategies.

Gap of the Study

Although previous studies have examined lexical non-equivalence and figurative language in sports discourse, significant gaps remain. Theoretical frameworks such as those proposed by Mona Baker have been widely discussed, yet few empirical studies apply these frameworks specifically to football terminology within an academic training context. Existing studies largely focus on professional media translation or metaphor comprehension rather than on how undergraduate translation students practically handle idiomatic and metaphorical football expressions. Moreover, limited studies have investigated the impact of contextual cues on resolving non-equivalence, and almost no empirical work has been conducted within the Yemeni university setting. Gender-based performance differences in sports translation also remain underexplored. Therefore, a localized, data-driven study examining lexical errors, compensatory strategies, contextual effects, and institutional variation among Yemeni undergraduate students, at UST, Taiz University and Ibb university, is needed to bridge the gap between translation theory and practice in specialized sports discourse.

3. Methodology of the Study

3.1. Research Design

This study adopts a descriptive-analytical research design supported by a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative and qualitative analysis. The descriptive dimension aims to measure the translation performance of undergraduate students statistically, while the analytical dimension seeks to interpret lexical errors and compensatory strategies in light of Mona Baker's theory (2018), particularly the concept of non-equivalence at the lexical level. This design is appropriate because the research investigates an existing educational phenomenon and analyzes the nature of lexical challenges encountered by students when translating specialized football terminology.

3.2. Sampling

The population of the study consists of undergraduate students majoring in English and Translation at Yemeni universities. A purposeful sample of thirty students of level four was selected from three universities: Taiz University, Ibb University, and the University of Science and Technology (UST). Ten students have been selected to ensure balanced institutional representation. This selection was purposeful, as they are expected to have acquired sufficient theoretical and practical background in translation studies. The sample included both male and female participants for comparative analysis of performance across gender.

Table 1. Demographic Distribution of the Study Sample according to University and Gender

	Female (F)	Male(M)	Total student(10)	of University
Ibb University	3	7	10	Male dominant sample (70%)
UST	10	0	10	Female –only sample(100%)
Taiz University	8	2	10	Female-dominant sample(80%)
	21	9	30	Total

3.3. Data Collection

Data were collected through a written translation test designed specifically for this study. The test included twenty English football terms selected based on their frequency and relevance in sports discourse. Twenty of these terms were presented in isolation, while six were embedded within contextualized sentences to examine the role of context in facilitating translation accuracy. The selected items represented three categories: technical, idiomatic, and metaphorical expressions. The Arabic equivalents were verified using the official FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022 glossary and were further reviewed by professional translators to ensure accuracy and reliability.

Table 2. List of English Football Terms Used in the Translation Test

N o.	English Football Terms	Standard Arabic Translation	Type of terminology
1.	Goalkeeper	حارس المرمى	Technical
2.	Stadium	ملعب	Technical
3.	Striker	المهاجم	Technical
4.	League	الدوري	Technical
5.	Penalty	ركلة جزاء	Technical
6.	Corner kick	ركلة ركنية	Technical
7.	Dribble	المراوغة	Technical
8.	Passes	تمريرات	Technical
9.	Semi-final	الدور نصف النهائي	Technical
10.	Cup	الكأس	Technical
11.	Line up	التشكيلة الأساسية	Technical
12.	Injury time	الوقت بدل الضائع	Technical
13.	Nil ¹	صفر (من الأهداف)	Idiomatic
14.	Hat-trick	هاتريك (ثلاثية)	Idiomatic
15.	Bicycle kick	ركلة مقصية/ضربة دبل	Idiomatic
16.	Man of the match	رجل المباراة/نجم المباراة	Idiomatic
17.	Ball in play	الكرة في الملعب	Idiomatic
18.	Game of two halves	مباراة ذات شوطين مختلفين	Metaphorical
19.	Park the bus	الركون للدفاع/الدفاع المستميت	Metaphorical
20.	Remontada ²	الريمونتادا(العودة المظفرة)	Technical

Participants were asked to translate the selected football terms from English into Arabic. A total of six hundred responses were obtained (30 students \times 20 terms). The collected data were analyzed using a structured coding system. First, a Lexical Error (LE) coding scheme was applied to classify responses into five categories: acceptable equivalence, literal translation, mistranslation, unnatural rendering, and omission. Frequencies and percentages were calculated to determine overall success and error rates.

In addition, successful responses were analyzed using a Compensatory Strategy (CS) coding system derived from the model of non-equivalence proposed by Mona Baker. The strategies identified included direct equivalence, descriptive equivalence, paraphrasing, borrowing or transliteration, and cultural substitution. This allowed the study to examine how students addressed lexical gaps when direct equivalence was unavailable.

To measure the impact of contextual cues, a binary coding system was used for the contextualized items, where responses were categorized as either successful or unsuccessful. The results were then compared to isolated-term performance to determine the statistical influence of context on translation

¹ Nil was classified as idiomatic because it represents a conventionalized lexical item whose meaning differs from ordinary usage in general English.

² Although *Remontada* is originally a Spanish borrowing, it was categorized as a technical term because it denotes a specific football concept that is widely recognized and used within the specialized discourse of football. The classification reflects its function as a football-specific term rather than its linguistic origin.

accuracy. Descriptive statistical methods, including frequency counts and percentage calculations, were used to analyze the data. Comparisons were conducted across universities, gender groups, and term categories to identify patterns of lexical difficulty and strategic behavior.

3.4. Data Analysis Coding

A total of 600 responses (30 students \times 20 terms) were analyzed using a dual coding system specifically designed for this study:

Lexical Error (LE) Coding: This system was used to determine the quality of the response and classify the nature of the error committed. Responses were categorized into five mutually exclusive categories:

Table 3. Lexical Error (LE) Coding Scheme – Used to Classify Student Errors

Performance / Error Category	Acceptable Equivalence	Literal Translation	Mistranslation	Unnatural Rendering (Awkward)	Omission
LE Code	LE=1	LE=2	LE=3	LE=4	LE=5

Methodological Note: Codes LE=2 (Literal Translation) and LE=3 (Mistranslation) were particularly used to verify the hypothesis that students struggle with figurative and idiomatic terms.

3.5. Statistical Analysis

3.5.1 Tests of Normality

Tests of normality were conducted to determine whether the Total Score variable was normally distributed.

Table 4. Tests of Normality

Test	Statistic	df	Sig.
Kolmogorov–Smirnov	.134	30	.177
Shapiro–Wilk	.926	30	.038

Table 4 presents the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test and Shapiro–Wilk test. The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test yielded a significance value of $p = .177$, which exceeds the criterion level of $.05$. This result suggests that the distribution of students' total translation scores does not significantly differ from a normal distribution. Based on this test alone, the assumption of normality would be accepted. However, the Shapiro–Wilk test produced a significance value of $p = .038$, which is below $.05$. Since the Shapiro–Wilk test is more sensitive and appropriate for samples smaller than 50 participants, this result indicates that the distribution of total scores significantly departs from normality.

3.5.2 Analysis of Performance and Lexical Error Classifications (N=600)

Table 5. Overall Distribution of Performance and Lexical Error Classifications (N=600)

Lexical Error	Percentage(%)	Frequency
Acceptable Equivalence	65.17%	391
Literal Translation	6.83%	41
Mistranslation	17.67%	106
No Translation	10.33%	62
Total	100.00%	600

Table 5 presents the distribution of lexical errors committed by undergraduate students of English at Yemeni universities, based on a total of 600 lexical items. The mistakes are categorized into acceptable equivalence, literal translation, mistranslation, unnatural rendering, and omission.

The table shows that acceptable equivalence constitutes the majority of translations with 65.17% (391 instances). This indicates that a large proportion of students were able to successfully transfer lexical meaning from the source language into the target language. This relatively high percentage suggests that many students possess a reasonable level of lexical competence and are capable of selecting appropriate equivalents in the target language. The performance of the sample presents the following techniques used by the students of the three universities:

Literal Translation

Literal translation accounts for 6.83% (41 cases) of the total. This relatively low percentage indicates that only a small number of students relied on word-for-word translation. Although literal translation can sometimes produce acceptable results, excessive reliance on it leads to inaccurate or unnatural expressions. The limited use of this strategy suggests that most students attempt to move beyond direct lexical correspondence when translating football expressions from English into Arabic. Some examples of literal translation are *Park the bus* / موقف الباص, *Penalty* / عقوبة, *Game of two halves* / مباراة من شوطين.

Mistranslation

The second most frequent problem is mistranslation, representing 17.17% (103 cases). This category reflects situations where the lexical item was translated incorrectly, leading to a change or distortion of meaning of football expressions from English into Arabic. Such errors often occur when students misunderstand the source text of football expression or select an inappropriate lexical equivalent. According to Baker's model, these errors may result from difficulties in achieving semantic and pragmatic equivalence. Some examples of mistranslation of football expressions are *League* / اتحاد, *Cup* / شرطي, *Semi final* / قبل النهائي.

No Translation

No translation represents 10.33% (62 cases) of the total. This type of error occurs when students fail to translate a lexical item altogether. No translation may result from uncertainty about the appropriate translation or difficulty in understanding the English football expression. While No translation can reflect gaps in lexical knowledge. Some examples of football expressions that are kept untranslated are Semi-final, Dribble....., and Nil..... .

Overall, the error patterns strongly support Mona Baker's theory of lexical non-equivalence. The prevalence of mistranslations, omissions, and literal translations indicates that students encountered considerable difficulty when direct Arabic equivalents were unavailable. Their errors demonstrate the challenges of translating culture-bound, idiomatic, and metaphorical football expressions and highlight the importance of compensatory strategies such as descriptive equivalence, paraphrasing, borrowing, and cultural substitution.

The findings indicate that mistranslation, omission, and literal translation were the most common mistakes made by students when translating football expressions. These errors occurred primarily when students encountered lexical non-equivalence between English and Arabic, particularly in idiomatic and metaphorical expressions. The results therefore support Mona Baker's theory that translation difficulties arise when direct lexical equivalence is unavailable and that successful translation requires the use of appropriate compensatory strategies to bridge lexical gaps. These findings are the answer of the first question, namely “What are the common lexical errors students make when translating football expressions?”.

3.5.3 University-Based Differences in Translating Football Expressions

In addition to examining the overall translation performance of the participants, the study investigated whether students from the three Yemeni universities exhibited varying levels of competence in translating football expressions. Such an analysis is important because institutional factor may influence students' ability to handle lexical errors in translating football expression. This part is dealing with analyzing lexical errors based on the variable of university in translating football expressions and the Kruskal–Wallis Ranks test.

Table 6. Lexical Errors: University-Based Differences in Translating Football Expressions

Rate	Ibb University	UST	Taiz University
Acceptable Equivalence	55%	65.50%	75.00%
Literal Translation	7.50%	8.00%	5.00%
Mistranslation	20.50%	18.50%	12.50%
Omission	17.00%	7.00%	7.00%

Table 6 presents the lexical Errors based on the variable of the university. It reveals, firstly, that Taiz University records the highest percentage of Acceptable Equivalence (75%), indicating that its

students are more successful in conveying the intended meaning of the source text accurately and naturally in the target language. In comparison, UST students achieve 65.5%, which reflects a moderate level of translation competence, while Ibb University has the lowest percentage (55%), suggesting greater difficulty in producing semantically and stylistically appropriate translations.

Secondly, the use of Literal Translation is relatively low in Taiz University (5%), slightly higher in UST (8%), and 7.5% in Ibb University. The lower percentage at Taiz University suggests that students there rely less on word-for-word translation and are more capable of applying meaning-based translation strategies.

Thirdly, mistranslation errors are lowest among Taiz University students (12.5%), while they increase noticeably at UST (18.5%) and reach the highest level at Ibb University (20.5%). This indicates that students at the latter two universities encounter more difficulties in correctly understanding the source text before translating it.

Finally, regarding Omission, both Taiz University and UST show the same rate (7%), whereas Ibb University records a significantly higher percentage (17%). This suggests that Ibb University students tend to omit parts of the source text more frequently, which can lead to incomplete translations.

Overall, the comparison reveals that Taiz University demonstrates the strongest performance among the three universities, UST shows intermediate results, and Ibb University displays the highest levels of translation difficulties, particularly in mistranslation and omission. These differences may reflect variations in translation training, teaching methodologies, or students' linguistic proficiency across the three institutions.

Kruskal–Wallis Ranks

The Kruskal–Wallis test was used to compare the translation performance of students from the three universities (Ibb University, UST, and Taiz University). Because the data were not normally distributed and more than two groups were compared, the Kruskal–Wallis test was an appropriate non-parametric alternative to one-way ANOVA.

Table 7. Kruskal–Wallis Ranks

Ranks			
	University	N	Mean Rank
Total score	Ibb	10	10.75
	UST	10	16.10
	Taiz	10	19.65
	Total	30	
Technical Score	Ibb	10	11.20
	UST	10	16.70
	Taiz	10	18.60
	Total	30	
Idiomatic Score	Ibb	10	9.95
	UST	10	16.65
	Taiz	10	19.90
	Total	30	
Metaphorical Score	Ibb	10	13.00

	UST	10	13.00
	Taiz	10	20.50
	Total	30	

Table 7 presents that students from Taiz University generally achieved the highest translation scores (19.65), followed by UST (16.10), while Ibb University recorded the lowest mean rank (10.75). The ranking supports the descriptive findings reported in the study, where Taiz students achieved the highest success rate (75%), compared with UST (65.5%) and Ibb (55%) as in table (7).

Technical Expressions Score

For technical football terminology, Taiz University again achieved the highest mean rank (18.60), followed by UST (16.70), and Ibb (11.20). Although technical terms generally possess standardized Arabic equivalents, the ranking indicates that Taiz students were more successful in selecting accurate equivalents. The relatively close ranks of Taiz and UST suggest that students in both universities have a good command of established football terminology, whereas Ibb students showed lower performance in translating football technical expressions.

Idiomatic Expressions Score

Taiz University students achieved the highest rank by a substantial margin, indicating superior ability in translating idiomatic football expressions. Since idiomatic expressions require more than direct lexical equivalence, this result suggests that Taiz students were more capable of applying compensatory strategies such as descriptive equivalence and paraphrasing. However, Ibb students obtained the lowest rank, reflecting greater difficulty in interpreting and translating idiomatic meanings accurately.

Metaphorical Expressions Score

For metaphorical expressions, Taiz University again achieved the highest mean rank (20.50), while both UST and Ibb obtained identical mean ranks (13.00). This finding is particularly important because metaphorical expressions such as *Park the Bus* and *Game of Two Halves* represent the most conceptually challenging category in football discourse. The considerably higher rank of Taiz students suggests stronger ability to identify figurative meanings and avoid literal translation. The identical ranks for UST and Ibb indicate that students from these universities experienced similar levels of difficulty when dealing with metaphorical language.

To put it simply, the Kruskal–Wallis ranking results indicate notable differences in translation performance among the three participating universities. Taiz University achieved the highest mean ranks in the Total Score (19.65), Technical expressions score (18.60), Idiomatic expressions score (19.90), and Metaphorical expressions score (20.50), suggesting superior translation competence across all categories of football expressions. UST generally occupied an intermediate position, whereas Ibb University consistently recorded the lowest ranks. The largest differences were observed in idiomatic and metaphorical expressions, which require greater contextual understanding and strategic handling of lexical non-equivalence. These findings support the descriptive analysis showing that Taiz University students achieved the highest overall success rates and demonstrate greater effectiveness in applying translation strategies to specialized football terminology.

3.5.4 Gender-Based Differences in Translating Football Expressions

This section provides a comparative analysis of the translation performance between male and female participants across the three universities. The study involved 30 students: 9 males and 21 females. The data reveals a significant disparity in the success rates of translating isolated football terminology.

Table 8. Distribution of Translation Success Rate by Gender

Category	Number of students	Total Possible Answer	Correct Answers	Success Rate
Male	9	180	99	55%
Female	21	420	292	69.5%
Total	30	600	391	63%

As shown in table 8, the nine male participants achieved an overall success rate of 55% (correctly translating 99 out of 180 terms). In contrast, the twenty-one female participants demonstrated a higher level of lexical accuracy, achieving a success rate of 69.5% (correctly translating 292 out of 420 terms). Specifically, male students showed high proficiency in technical terms like 'Goalkeeper' and 'Corner kick' but faced a total failure (0%) in idiomatic expressions such as 'Game of two halves'. On the other hand, female students, particularly in the Taiz and UST groups, were more successful in applying translation strategies to bridge lexical gaps, reaching a 100% success rate in complex terms like *Man of the match* and *Ball in play*.

Mann-Whitney Test

Since the normality test indicated that the total scores were not normally distributed (Shapiro–Wilk $p = .038$), the Mann–Whitney U test was appropriately used to examine whether there were statistically significant differences between male and female students in their translation performance.

Table 9. Mann-Whitney Ranks

Ranks				
	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Total score	Male	9	11.33	102.00
	Female	21	17.29	363.00
	Total	30		
Technical Score	Male	9	12.00	108.00
	Female	21	17.00	357.00
	Total	30		
Idiomatic Score	Male	9	10.94	98.50
	Female	21	17.45	366.50
	Total	30		

Metaphorical Score	Male	9	11.67	105.00
	Female	21	17.14	360.00
	Total	30		

Table 9 presents the mean ranks of male and female students in the translation test. Female students consistently achieved higher mean ranks than male students in the Total Score (17.29 vs. 11.33), Technical Score (17.00 vs. 12.00), Idiomatic Score (17.45 vs. 10.94), and Metaphorical Score (17.14 vs. 11.67). These findings indicate that female participants generally demonstrated superior translation performance across all categories of football expressions. The greatest disparity occurred in the idiomatic category, suggesting that female students were more successful in handling expressions requiring contextual interpretation and compensatory translation strategies. Overall, the results challenge the assumption that familiarity with football necessarily leads to better translation performance and support the view that translation competence is primarily determined by linguistic knowledge and strategic translation skills.

Table 10. Test Statistics

Test Statistics^a				
	Total score	Technical Score	Idiomatic Score	Metaphorical Score
Mann-Whitney U	57.000	63.000	53.500	60.000
Z	-1.708-	-1.445-	-1.936-	-1.870-
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	.088	.149	.053	.062

The Mann–Whitney U test revealed no statistically significant difference between male and female students in the overall translation score, $U = 57.00$, $Z = -1.708$, $p = .088$. Although female students obtained a higher mean rank (17.3) than males (11.3), the difference did not reach the conventional significance level of $p < .05$. Therefore, there is no gender difference in overall translation performance while translating football expressions by the students of the three Yemeni universities. The results consistently show that female students achieved higher mean ranks than male students across all translation categories. However, none of the differences reached statistical significance at the conventional $\alpha = .05$ level. The differences in idiomatic and metaphorical translation scores were close to reaching statistical significance, with p-values of .053 and .062, respectively. These findings suggest a tendency for female students to perform better when translating football expressions, which require greater contextual interpretation and strategic use of compensatory techniques. The non-significant Mann–Whitney U results support the view that translation competence is an acquired academic skill developed through education, practice, and strategic decision-making. The near-significant differences observed in the idiomatic and metaphorical categories suggest that the ability to handle lexical non-equivalence in figurative football expressions may vary among students. However, the current sample does not provide sufficient evidence to confirm a statistically significant gender effect. Consequently, the ability to translate football expressions appears to be associated with linguistic and translational competence rather than gender.

3.5.5 Analysis of Compensatory Strategies

The analysis of compensatory strategies was conducted to examine how students addressed lexical non-equivalence when translating football expressions from English into Arabic. While error analysis identifies the difficulties encountered by the participants, strategy analysis reveals the solutions they employed to overcome lexical gaps and convey the intended meaning. Drawing on Mona Baker's framework of lexical non-equivalence, the students' translations were analyzed in terms of the strategies used, including direct equivalence, descriptive equivalence, paraphrasing, borrowing, and cultural substitution. Examining the frequency and effectiveness of these strategies provides valuable insights into the participants' translation competence and their ability to deal with the linguistic and cultural challenges associated with specialized football terminology.

Table 11. Compensatory Strategies

Compensatory Strategies	Ibb University	UST	Taiz University
Direct Equivalence	81.8%	87.8%	85.3%
Descriptive Equivalence	10.0%	8.4%	10.6%
Borrowing	0.0%	5.3%	2.7%
Paraphrasing	5.5%	2.3%	1.3%
Cultural Substitution	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 11 presents the analysis of compensatory strategies used by the students of the three Yemeni universities. This table revealed that direct equivalence was overwhelmingly the most frequently employed strategy across all three universities, accounting for 87.8% of the responses at UST, 85.3% at Taiz University, and 81.8% at Ibb University. This finding indicates that the majority of football expressions had readily available Arabic equivalents, enabling students to translate them directly without resorting to additional compensatory procedures. According to Mona Baker's framework, direct equivalence is typically used when a suitable target-language counterpart exists, thereby minimizing the effects of lexical non-equivalence.

Descriptive equivalence was the second most frequently used strategy, representing 10.7% of the responses at Taiz University, 10.0% at Ibb University, and 8.4% at UST. The relatively high use of this strategy suggests that students frequently encountered expressions lacking direct Arabic equivalents and therefore relied on explanation or description to convey meaning. This finding supports Baker's view that descriptive equivalence is an effective means of overcoming lexical gaps when direct correspondence is unavailable.

The use of borrowing was relatively limited but varied among universities. UST students employed borrowing more frequently (5.3%) than students from Taiz University (2.7%), while no instances were observed among Ibb University students. This pattern suggests that some students preferred retaining the original English term when they perceived it as familiar to Arabic football discourse or when an established Arabic equivalent was unavailable.

Similarly, paraphrasing was used infrequently, although it appeared most often among Ibb University students (5.5%), followed by UST (2.3%) and Taiz University (1.3%). The greater reliance on paraphrasing at Ibb University may indicate that students encountered more difficulties identifying precise equivalents and therefore attempted to communicate the meaning through broader explanatory expressions.

Finally, cultural substitution was the least frequently employed strategy. It was completely absent from the translations of Taiz University and UST students and appeared only minimally among Ibb University students (2.7%). This finding suggests that students generally preferred to preserve the original football concepts rather than replace them with culturally adapted alternatives.

These findings answer the second question of the study, namely “What strategies do students use to overcome lexical non-equivalence?”. The answer of this question revealed that students relied primarily on direct equivalence but supplemented it with descriptive equivalence, borrowing, paraphrasing, and cultural substitution when faced with lexical non-equivalence. This pattern strongly supports Mona Baker's theory, which proposes that translators employ various compensatory strategies to bridge lexical gaps and achieve communicative equivalence when direct lexical correspondence is unavailable. Consequently, the study concludes that direct equivalence and descriptive equivalence were the principal strategies used by students to overcome lexical non-equivalence in football discourse.

4. Conclusion

The findings of the present study provide substantial evidence that translating football expressions from English into Arabic, by English undergraduate students at University of Science and Technology, Taiz, Taiz University and Ibb University, presents varying degrees of difficulty, depending on the nature of the expression and the availability of lexical equivalents. The results indicate that football terminology is generally translatable, as demonstrated by the high proportion of acceptable equivalence (65.2%), suggesting that many football terms possess established Arabic counterparts. In contrast, statistically significant differences were found in the translation of idiomatic expressions ($p = .027$) and metaphorical expressions ($p = .031$). These findings support Baker's argument that lexical non-equivalence becomes more pronounced when translators encounter figurative, culture-bound, or idiomatic language that lacks direct target-language counterparts. Unlike technical terms, idiomatic and metaphorical football expressions require translators to move beyond word-level equivalence and employ compensatory strategies such as descriptive equivalence, paraphrasing, borrowing, or cultural substitution. The results indicates no significant differences among universities. Although Taiz University obtained the highest mean scores, the differences among universities were not statistically significant. The superior performance of Taiz University students in these categories suggests a greater ability to recognize figurative meanings and select appropriate solutions when direct equivalence is unavailable.

In addition, the statistical analyses revealed that gender did not significantly affect translation performance. Although female students generally obtained higher mean ranks than male students, the Mann–Whitney U test showed that these differences were not statistically significant. This indicates that translation competence is primarily associated with linguistic knowledge, training, and strategic decision-making rather than gender.

The findings also highlight the role of institutional factors in shaping translation competence. While no significant differences were found among universities in overall and technical translation scores, significant differences emerged in the translation of idiomatic and metaphorical expressions. Students from Taiz University consistently achieved the highest mean ranks, particularly in the categories requiring greater interpretive and strategic competence. These results suggest that differences in training, exposure, and instructional practices may influence students' ability to handle lexical non-equivalence effectively.

Finally, the analysis of compensatory strategies revealed that students relied predominantly on direct equivalence, indicating that many football expressions have recognized Arabic equivalents. Nevertheless, when direct correspondence was unavailable, students employed a range of compensatory strategies, most notably descriptive equivalence, followed by borrowing, paraphrasing, and cultural substitution. The use of these strategies demonstrates students' attempts to bridge lexical gaps and preserve meaning. Taken together, the findings confirm that successful translation of football expressions depends not only on lexical knowledge but also on contextual understanding, strategic competence, and the ability to employ appropriate compensatory procedures when direct equivalence is unavailable.

Recommendations

The researchers recommend that universities should integrate English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses, particularly sports translation, into undergraduate translation curricula.

The researchers recommend that translators emphasize the teaching of translation strategies for lexical non-equivalence, such as descriptive equivalence, paraphrasing, borrowing, cultural substitution, and functional equivalence.

The relatively stronger performance at Taiz university in metaphorical expressions suggests that metaphor-focused instructional activities may enhance students' figurative translation competence.

The high omission rate (17%) at Ibb university indicates the need for training in lexical retrieval strategies and context-based translation.

At UST, students would benefit from exposure to authentic football discourse and bilingual sports glossaries.

Suggestions for Future Research

- Investigate the translation of football metaphors and idiomatic expressions in Arabic and English sports media.
- Compare the translation performance of undergraduate and postgraduate translation students in sports translation.
- Examine the effectiveness of different translation strategies in handling lexical non-equivalence in sports discourse.

5. References

- Al-Kayed, M. (2024). *The challenges facing translation students in translating sports idiomatic expressions from Arabic into English*. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*, 24(1):401-418. <https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes.v24i1.568>
- Alqudah, M. M., & Hassan, I. (2025). Challenges faced by non-native speakers of English: Understanding the metaphors, similes, and idioms in English football commentary. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 15(4), 192–201. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v15-i4/25201>
- Alzawaydeh, R., & Alghazo, S. (2018). Analysing media discourse: The case of conceptual metaphors in football news headlines in English and Arabic. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 10(6), 116–133. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329514344_

- Anyawuike, O. S. O. (2023). *Sports translation and interpreting: Football as a case study*. *Nigerian Journal of African Studies*, 5(1), 107–112. <https://www.nigerianjournalsonline.com/index.php/NJAS/article/view/3315>
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315619187>
- Beard, A. (1998). *The language of sport*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/The-Language-of-Sport-1st-Edition/Beard/p/book/9781138146341>
- Bergh, G. (2011). Football is war: A case study of minute-by-minute football commentary. *Discourse & Society*, 22(5), 587–603. https://pureadmin.qub.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/71080539/football_talk.pdf
- Bouayad-Agha, N., Casamayor, G., Mille, S., & Wanner, L. (2010). Perspective-oriented generation of football match summaries: Old tasks, new challenges. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Natural Language Generation Conference* (pp. 175–184). https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2287710.2287711?utm_source=chatgpt.com
- Chen, G. (2023). Challenges and strategies of Western football coaches in the glocalized context of Chinese youth football: An exploration of cross-cultural competence. *Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, 21(3), 189–199. <https://journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/article/view/483>
- Irwansyah, D. A. A., & Saifulloh, A. I. (2025). Translation strategies idiom on football: “Park the bus.” *Prapanca International Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, 1(1), 51–61.
- Khalaf, Fuad Adil. (2022). Assessing the translation of English metaphorical expressions in selected sport advertisements. *Surra Man Ra'a* 18,(73) :1415-1432. <https://search.emarefa.net/detail/BIM-1555926>
- Khazrouni, M. (2020). Strategies to deal with non-equivalence at word level in translating Muhammad Husayn Haykal's novel *Zainab*. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 13(1), 1008–1020. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21275/SR23330055639>
- Kowalikowa, J. (2009). *Language of sport in the context of communication and culture*. *Studies in Physical Culture and Tourism*, 16(1), 63–67. https://www.wbc.poznan.pl/Content/120425/PDF/10_KOWALIKOWA.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004496637>
- Orwell, G. (1945) *The Sporting Spirit*. Tribune. http://www.orwell.ru/library/articles/spirit/english/e_spirit
- Supreme Committee for Delivery & Legacy. (2022). *FIFA World Cup Qatar 2022 glossary*. Supreme Committee for Delivery & Legacy Publishing. https://vaccination.gov.ng/virtual-library/LAraD3/3S9061/fifa__world_cup-qatar__2022-the_official_guide.pdf

Appendix A1. University of Science and Technology (UST) Sample's Translation

	S1/f	S2/f	S3/f	S4/f	S5/f	S6/f	S7/f	S8/f	S9/f	S10/f
Stadium	ملعب	مدرج	ملعب	مدرج	ملعب	ملعب	ملعب	ملعب	مدرج	مدرج/ملعب
Cup	كاس	الكاس	كاس	كاس	كاس	كاس	كاس	كاس	كاس	الكاس
Hat trick	ثلاثية	خدعة القبعة		انتصار ثلاثي	هاتريك	هاتريك	ثلاثي اهداف	ثلاثية	انتصار ثلاثي	هاتريك
Corner kick	ركلة ركنية	ركلة ركنية	ركلة ركنية	ركلة ركنية	ركلة ركنية	ركلة ركنية	ركلة ركنية	ركلة زاوية	ركلة ركنية	ضربة ركنية
Nil	صفر	صفر	صفر	عدم	صفر	صفر	صفر	صفر	لاشيء	صفر
Line up	التشكيلة	اصط ف	تشكيلة	اصطف	تشكيلة	تشكيلة	انتظم في صف	تشكيلة	انتظام في صف	تشكيلة الفريق
Remontada	عودة قوية		عودة قوية في التشجيع	ريمونتادا	اعيد تجميعها	اعيد تجميعها	عودة	عودة قوية	ريمونتادا	ريمونتادا
Goalkeeper	حارس المرمى	حارس المرمى	حارس مرمى	حارس مرمى	حارس مرمى	حارس مرمى	حارس مرمى	حارس مرمى	حارس مرمى	الحارس
Passes	تمريرات	يمرر	تمريرات	يمرر	تمريرات	تمريرات	مرر	تمرير	يمرر	يمرر
League	الدوري	عصبة	دوري	عصبة	الدوري	الدوري	دوري	اتحاد	اتحاد	دوري
Penalty	ركلة الجزاء	عقوبة	ضربة جزاء	عقوبة	ضربة جزاء	ضربة جزاء	ضربة جزاء	ضربة جزاء	عقوبة	ضربة جزاء
Semi final	نصف النهائي	نصف النهائي	نصف نهائي	نصف نهائي	نصف نهائي	نصف نهائي	قبل النهائي	قبل النهائي	قبل النهائي	قبل النهائي
Striker	مهاجم	مهاجم	مهاجم	هداف	مهاجم	مهاجم	هداف	هداف	هداف	هداف
Ball in play	الكرة في الملعب	الكرة في الملعب	الكرة بالملعب	الكرة في اللعب	كرة في الملعب	كرة الملعب	الكرة في الملعب	الكرة في الملعب	الكرة في اللعب	كرة اللعب
The injury time	الوقت بدل الضائع	وقت الإصابة	وقت بدل الضائع	وقت الاصابة	الوقت بدل الضائع	الوقت بدل الضائع	الوقت بدل الضائع	وقت بدل ضائع	وقت الاصابة	وقت الضائع
Game of two halves	مباراة من شوطين مختلفين	لعبة اثنتين	مباراة من شوطين	لعبة نصفين	مباراة من شوطين	مباراة من شوطين	لعبة من شوطين	شوطي المباراة	لعبة من صف	شوطي المباراة
Park the bus	ركن الحافلة	انصاف	ركن الحافلة	موقف الحافلة	إيقاف الحافلة	إيقاف الحافلة	ركن الحافلة	ركن الحافلة	موقف الحافلة	الدفاع لعدم التسديد
Dribble	مراوغة	مراوغة	مراوغة	رذاذ	مراوغة	مراوغة	دحرجة الكرة	يسدد/يراوغ	رذاذ	دحرجة الكرة نحو الهدف تسديد
Man of the match	رجل المباراة	رذاذ	رجل المباراة	رجل المباراة	رجل المباراة	رجل المباراة	حارس الملعب	بطل المباراة	رجل المباراة	رجل المباراة
Bicycle kick	ركلة مقصية	ركلة دراجة	ركلة جوية	ركلة دراجة	ركلة خلفية	ركلة خلفية	ركلة	ركلة خلفية	ركلة دراجة	ركلة خلفية

Appendix A2. University of Science and Technology (UST) Students' Scores in Translation

	S1/f	S2/f	S3/f	S4/f	S5/f	S6/f	S7/f	S8/f	S9/f	S10/f	Score
Stadium	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	7
Cup	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Hat trick	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Corner kick	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Nil	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	8
Line up	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	6
Remontada	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Goalkeeper	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Passes	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	8
League	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	6
Penalty	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	7
Semi final	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	6
Striker	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
Ball in play	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	8
The injury time	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	7
Game of two halves	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Park the bus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Dribble	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	8
Man of the match	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Bicycle kick	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	6

Appendix B1. University of Ibb Sample's Translation

	S1/m	S2/m	S3/m	S4/m	S5/m	S6/m	S7/m	S8/f	S9/f	S10/f
Stadium	أستاذ جامعي	ملعب	استوديو	ملعب	مدرج/ملعب	ملعب او استاد	استوديو/ملعب	ملعب	مدرجات	ملعب
Cup	كاس	كاس	كاس	بطولة	شرطي	كاس	بطولة	كاس	كاس	كاس
Hat trick	هاتريك	ثلاثية اهداف	ثلاثة اهداف متتالية	ثلاثة اهداف	قبعة	هاتريك او ثلاثية اهداف	ثلاثة اهداف	انتصار ثلاثي		انتصار ثلاثي
Corner kick	ضربة ركنية	ركلة ركنية	كرة ركنية	ضربة زاوية	ضربة زاوية	ضربة ركنية	ضربة ركنية	ركلة ركنية	ضربة ركنية	ضربة ركنية
Nil							صفر	صفر		صفر
Line up			تجاوز الخط	تجاوز خط	خط التماس	خط التماس	تجاوز الخط	خارج الخط		اصطف
Remontada		عودة	عودة	العودة بعد الخسارة		عودة بالنتيجة	العودة بعد الخسارة	عودة بنهاية الوقت		انتصار
Goalkeeper		حارس	حارس	حارس	حارس	حارس	حارس	حارس	مرمى	حارس
Passes	حارس	يمرر	تمرير الكرة	عداء	تمرير الكرة	يمرر	عداء/يراوغ	يعدي	مرور اللاعب	مرر
League	دوري	دوري	دوري	دوري	الحكم	دوري	دوري	دوري		دوري
Penalty	ضربات الترجيح	ركلة جزاء	ضربة جزاء	ضربة جزاء		ضربة جزاء	ضربة جزاء	ضربة جزاء		ضربة جزاء
Semi final	نصف نهائي	نصف نهائي	نصف نهائي	نصف نهائي		نصف النهائي	نصف نهائي	نصف نهائي	نصف النهائي	شوط قبل النهائي
Striker	مهاجم	مهاجم	مهاجم	مهاجم		مهاجم	مهاجم/راس حرياء	هداف		هداف
Ball in play	الكرة في الملعب	كرة في اللعب	استمرار اللعب	الكرة في الملعب	الكرة في اللعب	الكرة في اللعب	الكرة في الملعب	الكرة في الملعب	كرة القدم	الكرة في الملعب
The injury time			وقت مستقطع بسبب اصابة	وقت بدل ضائع	بدل الضائع	وقت بدل فاقد	وقت بدل ضائع	فترة اصابة	وقت اصابة	الوقت الحرج
Game of two halves	مباراة بشوطين	مباراة من شوطين	مباراة من شوطين	نصف نهائي	مباراة لشوطين	مباراة من شوطين	نصف النهائي	لعبة من شوطين	لعبة من فريئين	لعبة من شوطين
Park the bus	دفاع		مكان الركن	موقف باصات	موقف الباص	اللعب بدفاع كامل	موقف الباصات	التراجع للدفاع	موقف باصات	موقف الباص
Dribble	مراوغة		مقص	مراوغة		مراوغة	مراوغة	دحرجة الكرة		دحرجة
Man of the match	رجل المباراة	رجل المباراة	افضل لاعب	رجل المباراة	رجل المباراة	رجل المباراة	رجل المباراة	حكم المباراة	لاعب	مباراة الرجل

Bicycle kick	ضربة جزاء		ضربة دبل	سائق الدراجة	ضربة بهلوانية	ضربة دبل	الكرتفي الهواء		ضربة
--------------	--------------	--	----------	--------------	------------------	----------	-------------------	--	------

Appendix B2. Ibb University Students' Scores in Translation

	S1/m	S2/m	S3/m	S4/m	S5/m	S6/m	S7/m	S8/f	S9/f	S10/f	Score
Stadium	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	7
Cup	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	7
Hat trick	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	8
Corner kick	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Nil	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3
Line up	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Remontada	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	6
Goalkeeper	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	8
Passes	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	5
League	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	8
Penalty	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	7
Semi final	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	8
Striker	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Ball in play	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	8
The injury time	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4
Game of two halves	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Park the bus	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Dribble	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	6
Man of the match	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	7
Bicycle kick	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3

Appendix (C1): University of Taiz Sample's Translation:

	S1/m	S2/m	S3/f	S4/f	S5/f	S6/f	S7/f	S8/f	S9/f	S10/f
Stadium	ملعب	ملعب	صالة رياضية	ملعب	ملعب	ملعب	ملعب	ملعب	ملعب	ملعب
Cup	كاس	كاس	كاس	كاس	كاس	كاس	كاس	كاس	كاس	كاس
Hat trick	هاتريك	ثلاثية اهداف	ضربة مرتدة	انتصار ثلاثي	انتصار ثلاثي	تسجيل ثلاثة اهداف	ثلاثية	انتصار ثلاثي	انتصار ثلاثي	ثلاثية
Corner kick	ركلة ركنية	ركلة ركنية	ركلة ركنية	ضربة ركنية	ركلة ركنية	ضربة ركنية	ضربة ركنية	مكان ركل الكرة	ضربة ركنية	ضربة ركنية
Nil	يصنع اهداف	صناعة اهداف	صفر	صفر	صفر	صفر	صفر	صفارة	صفر	صفر
Line up	يصطف	يصطف	اصطف	تشكيلة الفريق	تشكيلة	التشكيلة	اصطفاف	صف اللاعبين	منتظم في الصف	تشكيلة
Remontada	ريمونتادا	انقلاب النتيجة	ريمونتادا	قلب النتيجة	العودة في النتيجة	عودة بعد خسارة	قلب النتيجة	العودة بعد التأخر	قلب النتيجة	العودة بعد الخسارة
Goalkeeper	حارس	حارس	حارس	حارس المرمي	حارس المرمي	حارس المرمي	حارس مرمي	حارس المرمي	حارس المرمي	حارس المرمي
Passes	يمرر	يوزع/يمرر	يمرر	تمريرات	تمريرات	تمريرات	تمريرات	تمريرات	تمرر	تمريرات
League	اتحاد كرة	اتحاد كرة القدم	اتحاد/مجتمع	دوري	دوري	دوري	دوري	دوري	دوري	دوري
Penalty	ركلة جزاء/بلنتي	ركلة جزاء	عقوبة	ضربة جزاء	ضربة جزاء	ركلة جزاء	ضربة جزاء	الجزاء	ضربة جزاء	ركلة جزاء
Semi final	نصف نهائي	قبل النهائي	نصف نهائي	نصف نهائي	نصف نهائي	نصف نهائي	نصف نهائي	قبل النهائي	نصف النهائي	نصف نهائي
Striker	هدف	هدف	بطاقة لاصقة	مهاجم	مهاجم	مهاجم	مهاجم	هدف	مهاجم	مهاجم
Ball in play	الكرة تلعب	الكرة في الملعب	كرة في الملعب	الكرة في اللعب	الكرة في الملعب	كرة داخل الملعب	كرة الملعب	الكرة في الملعب	الكرة في الملعب	الكرة داخل الملعب
The injury time	اصابة	إصابة	وقت الاصابة	الوقت الاضافي	وقت بدل ضائع	الوقت الإضافي	وقت بدل ضائع	لحظة الخسارة	الوقت الإضافي	الوقت بدل الضائع
Game of two halves	شوطين للمباراة	شوطي المباراة	مباراة نصف النهائي	مباراة من شوطين	مباراة من شوطين	مباراة من الشوطين	مباراة من شوطين	الشوط الثاني	مباراة شوطين	مباراة من شوطين
Park the bus	حافلة اللاعبين	باص اللاعبين	موقف الحافلة	دفاع كامل	دفاع كامل	اللعب دفاعيا بالكامل	دفاع كامل	التحصن الدفاعي	دفاع كامل	دفاع كامل
Dribble	مراوغة	تثبيت الكرة	دحرجة الكرة	مراوغة	مراوغة	مراوغة	مراوغة	دحرجة الكرة	مراوغة	مراوغة
Man of the match	رجل المباراة	رجل المباراة	بطل المباراة	رجل المباراة	رجل المباراة	افضل لاعب	رجل المباراة	بطل المباراة	رجل المباراة	رجل المباراة
Bicycle kick	مقصية		ركلة دراجة	ركلة خلفية	ركلة مقصية	مقصية	ركلة خلفية	مزدوجة	مزدوجة	ركلة خلفية

Appendix C2. Taiz University Students' Scores in Translation

	S1/m	S2/m	S3/f	S4/f	S5/f	S6/f	S7/f	S8/f	S9/f	S10/f	Score
Stadium	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Cup	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Hat trick	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Corner kick	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	9
Nil	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	7
Line up	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	5
Remontada	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	9
Goalkeeper	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
Passes	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10
League	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
Penalty	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
Semi final	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8
Striker	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	7

