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Abstract: Dubbing is the most prevalent method used to make foreign-language films available to visual media of countries. The dialogues that actors use in the films are the main factors for understanding the main purpose of the directors in any genre. Orientation toward the function of the source text can be realized in the target text through the correct and appropriate translation of the speech acts. It causes dubbing for a film from other countries with different cultures to be more comprehensive and enables people to perceive the main points of directors’ idea. This study examined the influence of English to Persian translation of the films on the communicative preferences in the target language. The corpora of the study are films with different genres with their dubbed versions. Searle’s (1979) categorization of illocutionary acts was examined and attempted to investigate the influences of the target language in establishing the communicative preferences. The dialogues of the movies dubbed in IRIB were transformed to written texts. Then by comparing the source and the target corpora based on the study’s theoretical framework the mismatchings between the two languages were examined and analyzed. The results showed that although the correspondence percentage between the main dialogues and the dubbed versions was high, there were some key sentences that were changed in meaning and had affected the film’s intended purpose.
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I. Introduction

The best-known and the most widespread forms of audiovisual translation are dubbing and subtitling. Dubbing is one of the translation methods which make use of the acoustic channeling screen translation. It involves the replacement of the original speech by a voice track which attempts to follow as closely as possible the timing, phrasing and lip movements of the original dialogue (Gonzalez, 2009, P.13).

According to Chiaro (2009, P. 97), “dubbing is often condemned for spoiling the original soundtrack and denying audiences the opportunity of hearing the voices of the original actors”. Moreover, when a film in dubbed version is compared with its original version, there are some discrepancies and this problem is raised due to a number of factors including cultural differences, red lines in the target language society, censoring scenes or incorrect translation.

The dialogue of a dubbed film is always the result of a three-staged translation and editing processes. At the first stage, the rough translation, the text is translated from source language (SL) to target language (TL) mostly word by word. This is certainly one of the major trouble spots as the rough translation serves as the basis for the later stages. At the second stage, the dubbing author makes the necessary changes in order to achieve a high degree of lip-sync as well as gesture-sync. At the third stage, the actual recording, the dubbing author, or the technicians might cause further changes. The rough translation usually influences the dubbed version on various levels; thus, mistakes of rough translations might still be present in the final dubbed version (Herbst, 1994).

II. Review of the Related Literature

Discourse Analysis and Translation

Carter (1982, p.184) defines discourse as “the organization of connected text beyond the level of the sentence”. It is “a unit of linguistic performance which stands complete in itself” (Chapman, 2009, p.100).

Speaking about translation with reference to discourse analysis has a very strong tradition both in the discipline of translation studies itself and translator training. Interpretation is not supposed to take place from the micro level of the word (bottom-up processing) but from the macro structure of the text to the micro unit of the
word (top down processing). Orientation towards the function of the target text prevails prescriptions concerning the target text by relating it to the source text, and translations are regarded as concrete assignments serving specific functions.

According to Munday (2009, P.228), “In attempting to express themselves, people do not only produce sentences that are well formed, they perform actions via utterances that are intended to achieve specific purposes. Given this, all the dialogues of movies, which are sentences plus actions, can be considered as speech acts.

A great deal can be said in the study of language without studying speech act, but any such purely formal theory is necessarily incomplete (Searle, 1977, P.17).

Based on Searle (1979, P.30), ‘not all cases of meaning are simple – those cases that speaker’s utterances mean exactly what he says. In hints, insinuations, irony and metaphor, to mention a few examples, the speaker’s utterance meaning and sentence meaning come apart in various ways. One important class of such cases, according to Searle (1979), is that in which the speaker utters a sentence, means what he says, but also means something more. The illocutionary force of an utterance is said to have the particular use of an expression on a specific occasion. It needs to be differentiated from its propositional content; the semantic information that an utterance contains (House, 1997, P.22).

Unfortunately, recent researches done by Iranian academia, particularly translation studies’ masters have not been seriously engaged in Multimedia Translation issues; there is lack of such topic in this field. Among the few studies done, JatiHandayani (2012)’s research can be mentioned. She studied speech acts in “Body of Lies” film. She analyzed the collected data considering different types of speech acts like directness, literalness. The results of the study revealed discrepancies in the conveyed message of the film mostly because of the different context of the speech acts.

III. Method

This study was about to run a qualitative inquiry into three well-known Hollywood movies by Stanley Kubrick translated and dubbed into Persian by IRIB (Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting) based on Searle’s categorization of speech acts. There was a focus on the actors’ sayings, which produced a special effect whenever a talk exchange was held between the participants. The main concern of the study was focusing on the communicative functions. This function would probably be pointed at by most language users without major consideration. According to Searl (1979) Requesting, apologizing, informing, ordering as well as promising and refusing are all reasons for communicating our ideas.

In the present research, the communicative preferences are synonym to communicating functions and are considered operationally as the speech acts in film’s dialogues, which contain requesting, apologizing, ordering, promising, informing, and refusing. Accordingly, Searle (1979)’s categorization of illocutionary acts in five macro classes: a) representative b) directive c) commissive d) expressive e) declarative was the theoretical framework to compare and analyze the process through which the speakers (actors) intended meaning in the utterances that were translated into the dubbed version. The result of the study would cause some variation in the translation studies curriculum as well as in the policy of the Iranian cinematic and audiovisual studios when it comes down to the translation of audiovisual products like feature films.

Research Questions

To be more specific on the way to which the study is about to investigate communicative preferences, the following research questions were raised:
Q1: what is the frequency of the macro classes of the illocutionary acts in dubbed corpus of the study based on Searle’s (1979) categorization?
Q2: what is the impact of the English to Persian translations of illocutionary acts on Persian communicative preferences?

3.1 Corpora

The corpora of the study were three films of Hollywood director Stanley Kubrick. These films are as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movie title in English</th>
<th>Movie title in Persian</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Year of production</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Running time</th>
<th>Dubbing department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Strangelove</td>
<td>دکتر استرجنلوا</td>
<td>Comedy</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Stanley Kubrick</td>
<td>95 min</td>
<td>IRIB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2 Procedure
This part is an attempt to clarify the route through which the data were used for analysis. At first, the whole dialogues of the movies in source language have been extracted and converted into the written form. Inasmuch as Searle’s (1979) Categories of Illocutionary Act of the movie are the main concerns of this study, they were identified within speech acts. In other words, dialogues were examined that any of them can be marked as illocutionary acts of Searle’s category. In the next stage, the whole dialogues of the movies that were being dubbed in IRIB have been transformed to written text. Finally, the dubbed illocutionary speech acts according to Searle’s category came under analysis and the Persian communicative preferences were examined by comparing the texts in two language.

### 3.3 Data analysis & Discussion
**3.3.1 Results**
There are various types of results based on the recognition of Searle’s illocutionary category. At first, there is a comparison between numbers of words between the two versions of data. Table 3.1 indicates the number of words representing speech acts in the source and the target corpora.

**Table 3.1 words in the source and the target corpora**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Movie Title</th>
<th>Words in English version</th>
<th>Words in dubbed version (Persian translation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dr. Strangelove</td>
<td>10577 words</td>
<td>9225 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Shining</td>
<td>9364 words</td>
<td>6285 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Full Metal Jacket</td>
<td>10236 words</td>
<td>8524 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.3.2 Searle’s illocutionary acts**

1. Representative: It commits the speaker to the truth of the statements such as: assert, affirm, deny, assure, argue, ...
2. Directive: Is attempt that is done by the speaker to get the hearer to do something; the speaker wants to achieve a future situation in which the word will match his words such as: request, urge, tell, require, demand, ...
3. Commisive: like directives is concerned with modifying the world to match the words, but the point is to commit the speaker himself to acting and involves intention in the future such as: commit, promise, threaten, vow, pledge, ...
4. Expressive: is the function of expressing or to make understand to the hearer what the speaker’s psychology is. It express various psychological states such as: apologize, thank, condole, congratulate, protest, ...
5. Declaration: is illocution whose successful performance brings about the correspondence between the proportional content and reality. Those kinds of speech acts that change the world through their utterances such as: declare, resign, appoint, approve, ...

*Example for film: The Shining*

● WENDY: It's really pretty outside. How about taking me for a walk after you've finished your breakfast?
JACK: Oh I suppose I ought try to do some writing first.

ٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍ_
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*Example for film: Dr.Strangelove*

- **Bombardier:** Major Kong is it possible that this is some kind of loyalty test. You know, give the go code and then recall to see who would actually go?
  Kong: Ain't nobody ever got the go code yet. And old Ripper wouldn't be giving us plan R unless them Russkies had already clobbered Washington and a lot of other towns with a sneak attack.
  Bombardier: Yes, sir.

  نفر بمب افکن: سرکرد کان امکان داره این یه نوع آزمایش باشه. شاید بیکران
  بیماری آی ما از پاپاکه نابیسه مي گيرم يا نه. 
  کانگ: ولی نا حالا هیچکس از این شویی ها نکرده. ضمنا جزء محاصله که دستور اجرای
  نقشه؛ آر را صادر کنی اینکه واشکنی یا شهروعي دیگه ما دم معرض خطر حمله
  باشه
  نفر بمب افکن: بله قربان

- **Strangelove:** sir! I have a plan. Heh. Mein Fuhrer, I can walk!

- **Kong:** Stay on the bomb run, Ace. I'm going down below to see what I can do.
  Copilot: Roger.

  کانگ: همين سيير رو ادامه بدين من خودم برم پيديم چه کار مييون کن
  کمک خليان: بله

- **Ripper:** Mandrake! Come here!
  Mandrake: You calling me, Jack?
  Ripper: Just come over here and help me with this belt.
  Mandrake: I Ah..., I haven't had very much experience, you know, with those sort of machines, Jack. I only ever pressed a button in my old Spitfire.

  رپر: مانریک بيا اينجا
  مانریک: یک درمانی رو از بازی اونجا؟
  رپر: میخواهم برای نگه داشتن قطار فشنگ کمک کنی.
  مانریک: من، میدونی من هيه تجربه ای در به کار بردن اینچیان ماشين ها ندارم.
  بلد نيستم ماهي اين دستگاه ها رو چکنوم.

- **Ripper:** Mandrake, in the name of Her Majesty and the Continental Congress come here and feed me this belt, boy!
  Mandrake: Jack, I'd love to come. But, what's happened, you see, is the string in my legs gone.
  Ripper: The what?
  Mandrake: The string. I never told you, but, you see, I've got a gammy leg. Oh dear. Gone. Shot off.
  Ripper: Mandrake, come over here. The Red Coats are coming. Come on!

  رپر: به نام ملکه انگلستان و کنگره بین قاره ها بيا اينجا کمک کن... 
  مانریک: جک خيلي دلم ميخواهد كه بياي ولي باور کن كه بهام قدرت حرکت کردن
  ندار. انته تا حالا اینچه بهت نگفتيم بیوم اما اتفاقی برای یاهم افتاده كه
  گاهي به کلي از کار کمک می‌كن. 
  رپر: مانریک، زودبایش بيا اينجا بهت احتياج دارم، بجي. (کت قربان دارن ميان)

- **Kong:** Goldie, how many times have I told you guys that I don't want no horsin’ around on the airplane?
  Goldie: I'm not horsin’ around, sir, that's how it decodes.

  کانگ: جودي، چند دفعه بهتنهای قفتم تا هواییما ليست اسب های برندی رو مطالعه
  نکنی؟
  جودی: من اینکار رو نکردم قربان رمز اینو میگه.

- **Kong:** Well I've been to one world fair a picnic and a rodeo and that's the stupidest thing I ever heard come over a set of earphones. You sure you got today's code?
  Goldie: Yes, sir, it is.
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(2) کانگ: در تمام مدتی که کنترل هواپیما رو در دست داشتم این احکامه نرین
چیزی که می شنوی، مطمئنی وقته قمزم امروز چون؟
جوی: بله قربان خودم.

*Example for film: Full Metal Jacket

● JOKER: I don't think Leonard can hack it anymore. I think Leonard's a Section Eight.
COWBOY: It don't surprise me.
JOKER: I want to slip my tube steak into your sister. What'll you take in trade?
COWBOY: What have you got?

جکو: فکر نکنم دوره و یکمه به آخر برسته به نظرم اون یک آدده به مرش.
کابوی: من که تعجب نمیکنم.
جکو: کاش یار و مادرش اینجا بوده و باهام حرف میزن. تو فکر میکن متأثیری
داست؟
کابوی: آه فکر میکنم.

● ANIMAL MOTHER: Doc Jay and Eightball are wasted! There's only one sniper, nothing else. Move up the squad! You're clear up to here! Come on!
COWBOY: Son-of-a-bitch. Okay, listen up! No-Doze, Stutten, Donlon, Rock--you
Come with me, we'll take a look! The rest of you stay put and cover our ass! We may be coming back in a big hurry.

امیمال مادر: اون دو تا نورد، قبل از اینکه اون شیک کنه، از همون طرف جوجه رو
بیار این وی همکارانی؟
کابوی: دفع کیار افتاده. خیله خوب گوش کنین، هیچکس حق نداره بی خبر کاری بکنه،
شما چنند نفر با از مباشین. بقیه همیجاییم و مراقبه اوضع، شاید مجبور بشیم
با مجهل فرار کنیم.

● HARTMAN: I'll bet you're the kind of guy that would fuck a person in the ass and not even have the goddam common courtesy to give him a reach- around! I'll be watching you!

مارتمن: تو جهنمی که به دنیا اومدی همه نوع آغاز پیدا کردی. حوادث باشه اکر
کچکرین غلتی بکی به گوش میرسه، اونوقت من میدونم و تو.

● HARTMAN: Bullshit! I can't hear you!
PYLE: Sir, yes, sir!
HARTMAN: Bullshit! I still can't hear you! Sound off like you got a pair!
PYLE: Sir, yes, sir!

مارتمن: صادئونواخیمون بلندتر بگو
پایل: خویم قربان
مارتمن: لانگته یک به زحمت حرفاتو مینهم مله بک سک واق بژن
پایل: خویم قربان.

● HARTMAN: How tall are you, Private?
COWBOY: Sir, five foot nine, sir!

مارتمن: اسم این کار رو چی میذاری؟
کابوی: قربان انجام وظیفه قربان.

● HARTMAN: Five foot nine? I didn't know they stacked shit that high! You trying to squeeze an inch in on me somewhere, huh?
COWBOY: Sir, no, sir.

مارتمن: هیچکس تا حالا همچین جفتی بهم نگفته بود چاپلوز، داری تملق میکی,
میخواه ازم سوء استفاده کنی؟
کابوی: نه قربان.

● TOUCHDOWN: Well, if you people came looking for a story, this is your lucky day. We got Condition Red and we're definitely expecting rain.
JOKER: Outstanding, sir. We taking care of business.

تاچدوان: شماها اومدن اینجا گزارش تنهه کنی؟ فکر میکن خوشتوننیادی، چون
شرايط اونقدر خرابه که مرحله ممکن بهمین حمله بهم.
جوکر: ما برای انجام کارمون هر شرایطی رو تحمل میکنیم.

● T.H.E. ROCK: You're going home now.
CRAZY EARL: Semper fi.
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DONLON: We're mean marines, sir.
EIGHTBALL: Go easy, bros.
ANIMAL MOTHER: Better you than me.

RAFTERMAN: JOKER we're gonna have to put you up for the Congressional Medal of Ugly!

3.3.3 Statistical analysis based on Searle’s illocutionary acts
This part contains statistics analysis of data based on Searle’s categorization

Table 3.2. Searle’s categorization statistics in film “Shining”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Commissive</th>
<th>Expressive</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspond No.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3. Searle’s Category statistics in film: “Shining”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Commissive</th>
<th>Expressive</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4. Searle’s categorization statistics in film “Dr. Strangelove”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Commissive</th>
<th>Expressive</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 3.5. Searle’s Categorization statistics in film: “Dr. Strangelove”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correspond No.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6. Searle’s categorization statistics in film “The Full Metal Jacket”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Commissive</th>
<th>Expressive</th>
<th>Declarative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Correspond No. | 7 | 24 | 3 | 2 | 40 |
| Fr. | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Pr. | 57 | 14 | 14 | 17 | 100 |

Table 3.6 Searle’s Category statistics in film: “The Full Metal Jacket”

IV. Discussion

Austin had taken all illocutionary acts to be differentiated and defined according to conventional roles they were playing: in the absence of conventions to determine these roles, performances of these acts would be strictly impossible. Warnock (1973) and Searle (1989) sided with Austin, claiming that the difference between speech acts is only that the former invoke merely linguistic conventions while the latter invoke wider social conventions. All seem to agree, however, that despite some borderline cases, there is a fundamental difference between the kinds.

The present study is conducted to see if the ultimate meanings of actor’s dialogues are carried through the dubbed versions. Then a set of findings in translation have been employed to lay great emphasis on those dialogues delivering speech acts based on Searle’s categorization (1979) and considering the challenges of dubbing process. The study indicated that speech acts were incorrectly used or changed considering the meaning.
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in the target language. There might be some reasons for incorrect dubbed version such as Persian religious and cultural considerations. The findings also demonstrated that although the percentage of correspondence between main dialogues and dubbed versions is high, some sentences were totally changed in meaning and effect based on Persian communicative preferences and led to viewer’s erroneous understanding.

On the other hand, Strawson (1964) claims that there is a large class of illocutionary acts that are differentiated not by reference to conventional roles of any sort, but by reference to the purpose of the speaker in speaking. Strawson claimed that contrary to Austin’s views, only speech acts are “essentially conventional and illocutionary acts are completed when the hearer recognizes that the speaker has a certain kind of intention in speaking.” Schiffer (1972), Bach & Harnish (1979) and Recanati (1987) agreed with Strawson in that speech acts are defined according to certain kinds of Gricean intentions expressed by speakers.

V. Conclusion and Implications

5.1 Conclusion

Simply, an explanation of meaning about speech act is an action showed through utterances. One can tell whether a statement, if viewed as an act is successful or not with reference to the speaker’s intention and to decide whether the statement is true or false. In sociolinguistic studies context is a key concept for understanding the nature of communication in general. The communicative preferences included in speech acts play a crucial role in conveying intentions and social interactions. Some Iranian film translators do not follow the track of the intended meaning of the source text in translating the speech acts and perform based on their communicative preferences which leads to the lack of correspondence between the original text and the dubbed ones.

5.2 Implications

The result of the study implied remarks that can be applicable for film translator in IRIB. Translators are required to produce what Munday (2009) calls the “ultimate effect” or speaker’s intended meaning as it was in the original text. Translators should attach importance to the fidelity to the intended meaning of the cast who produced the work, the movie pretty much the same way as to the accessibility of original dialogues for Persian viewer (target language). However, this research attempted to raise alertness on the issues concerning film translation, dubbing profession before translators achieve it through years of experience and practice as their professions.
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