Translation Evaluation in Educational Settings for Training Purposes

Masoud Sharififar. Ph. D. [1]
Mina Zand Rahimi[2]

Abstract

The following article describes different methods and techniques used in educational settings for translation evaluation. Translation evaluation is the placing of value on a translation i.e. awarding a mark, even if only a binary pass/fail one. In the present study, different features of the texts chosen for evaluation were firstly considered and then scoring the text based on their difficulty was discussed. For translator teachers and evaluators a key problem is assessing the difficulty of source texts used in tests and examinations. Thus, the significance of corpus as a large collection of texts in electronic format which can be a useful performance-enhancing tool in translating and evaluating was described.

Key words: translation evaluation, binary pass/fail, corpus

1. Assistant Professor, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Email: M.sharifi@uk.ac.ir
2 . M. A in Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman

Introduction

As Frarahzad (1993) mentions the objectives of the course determine the objectives of the test and the objective of translation courses is to train would-be translators who translate efficiently at both communicative and semantic levels appropriate to various text types. To achieve this goal, she introduces some factors such as: acquainting trainees with theory and practice, techniques for discovering meaning and using dictionary appropriately. Most translator teachers try to evaluate the student's translation competence which as Waddington (2001:313) says in his article consists of the ability to understand and transfer the content of the source text and the ability to express this content in the target language. Orozco and Albir (2002:376) also propose four definitions of translation competence based on Bell, Albeir, Wills, and PACTE research group which are the following: 1. the knowledge and skills the translator must possess in order to carry out a translation. 2. the ability of knowing how to translate 3. An interlingual supercompetence based on a comprehensive knowledge of the respective SL and TL, and 4. The underlying system of knowledge and skills needed to be able to translate.

Orozco and Albir (2002:377) also suggest a definition for translation competence acquisition according to PACTE research group which considers that it is a dynamic process of building new knowledge on the basis of the old, as it takes place through a process of developing and restructuring the sub-competencies of the TC. This process requires development from novice knowledge to expert knowledge. Waddington (2001:313) quoted from FBI that translation competence should be divided into two different skills: Accuracy, which is the degree of accuracy with which the translator transfers the content from the source to the target text; and expression which refers to the quality of the translator's expression of this content in the target language. He adds that accuracy appears to the more valid measure of translation ability.

Orozco and Albair (2002:380) proposed that the general knowledge of translation or notions of translation determine the student's whole process of translation, since, depending on the students' ideas about translation, they will have a particular purpose for a particular translation task and this will determine their solution of translation problems throughout the process of translation.

Translation evaluation

McAlester(:231) suggests a definition for Translation evaluation which is the placing of value on a translation i.e. awarding a mark, even if only a binary pass/fail one. He also uses other words such as translation criticism, translation analysis and also translation assessment. Translation criticism implies value judgment and analysis is taken to a descriptive study of the process of creating a target text out of a source text without value judgment. Assessment for him is a cover term for the other three procedures. Bowker (2000:183) says that evaluation is one of the most problematic areas of translation and the primary difficulty in translation evaluation is its subjective nature and lack of universally applicable criteria based on which translation may be assessed.

Farahzad (1992:271) believes that critics judge translations in terms of personal taste but this subjective approach cannot be used by a teacher of translation who has to evaluate student's work. She also adds that assessment can be done only when the goals of instruction are clear to the teachers and they know how to assist the students in achieving them. Schaffner (2004:4) said that each assessor have specific aim, depending on the factors of the assessment context, and agreement is not easily achieved by applying different assessment criteria.

A target text can be evaluated for different purposes. Adab (2000:215-216) in his article "Evaluating Translation Competence" proposes some purposes of target text evaluation such as: to evaluate language competence; to determine levels of intercultural awareness; to identify levels and types of translation competence. He believes that knowing the reason of evaluation and criterion of evaluation can help to achieve these purposes. Saniz (:138) says that students should know the evaluation system teachers use to evaluate their translation and evaluator must be consistent in its use. They have the right to know who is responsible for it and who they have to address for further questions. Accuracy and appropriateness must be evaluated depending on the teacher's aim for that translation passage. A mistake can be considered minor or serious based on that aim.

Orozco and Albir (2002:390) conclude that student's progress must be measured in order to learn more about the way they learn to translate. Any teacher can analyze the effects of any teaching method

and then compare different methods over a period of years to discover the advantages and disadvantages of each method. As Orozco and Albir (2002:386) suggests, there are three elements influencing the results of every assessment which are the assessor, the centre where the subject study and also the language combination of every student.

What is a good translation?

Schaffner (2004:2) believes that a good translation is no longer a correct rendering of the ST, in the sense of reproducing the ST meanings of micro-level units. It is rather a TT which effectively fulfils its intended role in the target culture. Instead of good, some translation scrollbars prefer to speak of adequate or of functionally appropriate translations. Farahzad (2003:41) suggests that an efficient translation will be the one which conveys the same linguistic meaning, recalls, forms the same concept and creates the same image in the mind of the reader. Riazi (2002:1) believe that in good translation what is changed is the form and code and what should remain unchanged is the meaning and message.

Bowker (2000:184) proposes that in order to have a good translation, translators must have at least the following skills: a good knowledge of the source language , and excellent mastery of the target language, and an understanding of the subject field. It is suggested in Riazi (2002:2) translators should meet three requirements, namely; familiarity with the source language, the target language and the subject matter. Mcalester suggests that all that is required of a translator may be competent translation which can be passed to a native speaker editor for polishing.

It is often assumed that native speakers possess an excellent command of their native language, it is not reasonable to assume that native speakers are necessarily will versed in the myriad of languages for special purpose that translators encounter on a regular basis.

Different features of the texts chosen for evaluation

Points for constructing a valid test as suggested by Farahzad (1992: 272-275)

1. Use contrastive analysis to design precisely different items which cause difficulties like: a) syntax interference b) mismatched lexicon items c) lack of equivalent.

2. Don't limit the text to one or more paragraphs, include various aspects.

3. Provide brief and unambiguous instructions.

4. Use both limited-response tests (including delicate points) and free-response ones (which test how much students can treat a text as a piece of discourse and translate it adequately).

Limited response items are of three types: 1) multiple-choice (for theoretical points) 2) error-recognition (spot and correct) 3) introducing target equivalent for source. It has some vices and virtues which are as follows: 1. Multiple choice limits performance and creativity, students may conclude that no choice is correct and prefer to write their own translation.

1. Examines delicate points 2. is corrected easily.

This text must be 1. Be authentic because adapted and translational texts may be oversimplified or vague. 2. Match linguistic competence in both languages plus knowledge of theory. 3. be brief enough so focuses on one point per item, this a) prevents examinees' confusion b) facilitates scoring. Items must not a) confuses the students b) time-consuming for teacher

Varieties of Limited response item types are as follows:

1) Sentence followed by equivalents with either meaning or grammar error
2) Source text followed by two equivalents
3) 100-150 word source text followed by target text full of errors (number of errors must be specified (5-10) because students may come up with an unpredictable errors which makes scoring difficult).
4) Students are required to provide equivalent for a series of source words and collocations in view of monolingual dictionary definitions.

Controlled free-response means different for translation tests vs. writing tests. When asked to translate, students' choice of words etc are bound to source which controls their response, but they are free to select equivalents. Controlled free is an integrated test examining several components at once.

Varieties of controlled free-response item types are as follows:

1) Sentence containing meaning subtlety.
2) Text with gram subtlety which if overlooked will yield translations.

3) 80-100 word text with words of specific dictionary labels (this checks sensitivity to language in source and target texts)
4) 200 word text which entails treatment as a coherent whole rather than a string of disconnected sentences. Characteristics of source text are:
1) authentic,
2) self-contained (requires no knowledge of precise linguistic context)
3) Matches level of ST, TT command and tr. theory. (for early stages descriptive sentences and simple meaning and structure should be used, for this allows focus on tr. subtleties rather than on hidden meaning. thus literary/technical texts, news and propaganda are excluded)
4) Should not assess students' memory. Therefore the text should be different from those of class works.
5) Brief info on text should be provided: title, author, date so students know the text type.

Different models of evaluation

The methods used for the evaluation should be reliable, valid, objective and practical. As McAlester says most approaches for translation evaluation depend on the concept of error and no case is concerning the amount and gravity of errors that can be tolerated for translation to be considered adequate. He also talks about different practices of accreditation in various countries and institutions. In some countries it is by recommendation and approval of the professional body on the basis of work done, in others by examination or university training. Such university training requires should be capable of evaluating the work of the students in a way that would have predictive value based on their potential professional competence. The nature of university teaching permits evaluation of a student's work over a longer period, and it is not necessary to rely only on final examinations, although many university systems do that.

There are different models and traditions of evaluation proposed by different scholars which is quoted in McAlester's article. For example the German tradition from Koller, Wilss and Nord has tended to work on explicit, atomistic, and microtextual level. There is a strong comparison between St and TT. House model is based on ST TT comparison. The crucial assumption in most of these approaches is the

factor that the "ST is taken as the functional standard against which mismatches in the TT are regarded as evidence of inadequacy". Nord look at a text as a whole whose functions and effects must be regarded as the crucial criteria for translation criticism and according to her, assessment is a matter grading errors and she suggests a hierarchy of errors dependent on the text function with extratextual errors being given more weight than intratextual but her approach is not practical. She also equate adequacy with perfection whereas she doesn't indicate that there may be some level of adequacy that is acceptable without being complete. Anglophone traditions have been less analytical and explicit. They believe that there is no objective evaluation of translations. The approaches tend to be more synthetic holistic and less oriented towards a direct comparison of the TT with the ST. They also underline the position of the evaluator herself.

As we see most of the above approaches for translation evaluation depend heavily on the concept of error but no case is concerning the amount and gravity of errors.

Campbell and Hale (1999) believe: "holistic marking of a text is the only way of dealing with the redistribution of meaning that occurs when a message is recast in a different grammatical and lexical guise; it is after all a text that is being translated and not a string of discrete words and phrases."

Waddington (2001) in his articles describes four methods of assessment which are as follows: method A is based on error analysis and mistakes are grouped under inappropriate renderings which affect understanding of the ST, expression in the TT, and the transmission of either the main or secondary functions of ST. in the case of translation exam where this method was used, the sum of the negative points was subtracted from a total of 110 and then divided by 11 to reach a mark from 1 to 10. Method B is also based on error analysis and takes into account the negative effect of errors on the overall quality of the translations. The corrector here determines whether the error is a language error or a translation error. Translation errors will be more penalized. The marking here is the same as the first method. Method C is a holistic method. The scale here is unitary and treats the translation competence as whole. Method D consists of combining error analysis method B and holistic method C.

Self assessment

Another method of evaluation is self assessment. "It is a process that enables students to assess their own performance and greatly facilitates their acquisition of increased responsibility for their learning and performance."(Robinson, 2006:1). This evaluation is based on this term that "if you give a man a fish, you feed him for a day. If you teach him how to fish, you feed him for a lifetime." Student need to be made aware of all ways and strategies of learning and to derive benefit from their experience in the learning process. Saniz (134-135) quoted from Brundage and Mackeracher some principles which show the need for student centered approach to learning. They are as the following:

1. Adults learn best when they are involved in learning objectives.
2. They react to experience as he perceives it.
3. They are concerned with whether they are changing in the direction of their own idealized self concept.
4. They don't learn when they are over stimulated.
5. They learn best when they learn how to learn.

She (ibid,138-140) says that if student cannot correct their own mistakes then they are unable to do so, they may have to resort to their classmates, so here peer work and correction prove invaluable tools. If their classmate cannot correct their mistakes, they may resort to dictionaries and if this is also not satisfactory, they may resort to their teachers. If they find they have been able to correct most of their mistakes on their own, this may show that they are not meticulous enough but if their classmate can correct their papers, it means that they are below the average and if the teacher corrects their papers, it means the particular text is beyond the student's level. Self-assessment provides develops both critical self-awareness of what it is to be a learner and skills in learning how to learn. She (ibid: 141) says: "if teachers do not think of their students, they creates selfish professionals in the future, who have never been given the chance of developing their own opinion about their work and who are unable to judge whether their work is accurate and appropriate because nobody ever made them think about it when they were studying at university."

Robinson (2006:136) concludes that self assessment in translator training is a logical component of any course designed to prepare

translators for the professional marketplace. He (ibid: 124) suggests the e-learning model which most important innovation is the use of student self and peer assessment and tutor moderation as pillars of the assessment procedure. This procedure involves five stages: students complete a translation task and turn in their target text; they are given access to a published translation; they apply the rating scale and score their TT; they turn in the TT score with a written justification; and the tutor moderates the score. This assessment model is holistic, transparent, easy to understand and conducive to self assessment. So student become aware of the positive and negative aspects of a translation and are able to classify errors and mistakes. As a result, learners acquire editor like training.

Text difficulty

For translator teachers and evaluators a key problem is assessing the difficulty of source texts used in tests and examinations. As Campbell and Hale (1999:2) mention there are two possible source of text difficulty or complexity. The first is readability with criteria such as sentence or word length. The second source is research which links text types with their microliguistic exponents. Pikulski (2002:1) defines readability as the level of ease or difficulty with which text material can be understood by a particular reader who is reading that text for a specific purpose. It is dependent upon many characteristics of a text and many characteristics of readers. Factors of readability are the average number of words per sentence and the number of words in the sample that are not found on a list of familiar or easy words.

He (ibid:1) also quotes from Chall that the purpose of readability assessment is to effect a best match between intended readers and texts... thus, optimal difficulty comes from an interaction among the text, the reader, and his/her purpose for reading. There are two loci of difficulty according to Campbell and Hale (1999:4) definition. The first locus is comprehension and difficulty is likely to be fairly universal. The second locus is production and here there are different levels of difficulty which are lexis and grammar of the target language. They (ibid:2) believe that complexity of an English text for monolingual reading may not equate to its complexity in reading for translation. Degree of difficulty is different. The same text materials may be very easy for one reader yet extraordinarily difficult to

another. Prior knowledge will influence how well a reader can understand text dealing with a particular topic.

Farahzad (2003:31) believes that text difficulty is of two types: comprehension of the source language and translation-specific difficulty. Both function at 3 levels which are lexical, the syntactic and the concept levels and the concept level seem to be the greatest source of difficulty. She suggests that the most effective technique is to rank the texts first on the basis to the type and category of their general concepts and then on the basis of their lexical and syntactic difficulty as determined by the scales given in the article. As Farahzad adds(ibid:33) comprehension difficulty at lexical level are readability contained words which the students find difficult to read and meaning of lexical items such as connections, neologism and culture bound words. Comprehension difficulties at syntactic level include grammatical simple sentences which do not usually make the text difficult, long complex sentence, cohesive links and aspects.

About comprehension difficulty at concept level Farahzad (ibid:39) suggests that text dealing with concrete referent concepts (CRC) are easier to image than abstract referents. Translation difficulties (ibid: 35) at lexical levels includes areas of difficulty such as one to many and many to many correspondence. Lexical mismatching, culture bound words and non universal concepts, adverbs ending in ly, prepositions, lack of equivalent terms in the case of technical terminology. Translation difficulties at syntactic level (ibid: 36) consists of complex sentence, tense difference, passive voice and gerunds. And finally translation difficulty at concept levels shows that the CRCs and ARC's which are universal are not difficult to translate but the difficulty lies in non universal ARC's. Farahzad (ibid) says that CRC's are usually easier that ARC's and universal concepts are easier than non universal concepts.

According to Campbell and Hale (1999:3-4), areas of difficulty which are universal are as follows: 1. Words low in propositional content, 2. Complex noun phrase, 3. Abstractness, 4. Official terms, and 5. Passive verbs.

They also quoted from Hill that difficulty indicators are thematic, formal, stylistic, linguistic and syntactic. Three variable of difficulty are source text, translator competence and translation task type.

Tajvidi (2005:33) mentions that if the words in the text are difficult and the sentences are long, the text will be more abstract and less concrete.

And know what is concept? As Farahzad (2003:38-38) mentions any text made up of several sentences, is in fact made up of several sentential concepts, which produce several sentential images. These concepts together form the textual concept. Concepts are often ranged along a concreteness abstractness continuum. Concepts for which concrete references exist are easily identifiable, imaged, categorized and classified, whereas concepts referring to abstract referents are not easily identified, poorly imaged and resistant to categorization. Riazi (2002:3) also says that in conceptual translation the unit of translation is neither the word nor is it the sentence; rather it is the concept.

Farahzad (2003:43) concludes that the factors which make a text difficult form a network which is impossible to draw a sharp distinction between them. Texts which are difficult to comprehend are not necessarily difficult to translate and there are instances that students understand the text but cannot translate it. It is because they are not master over the target text. Tajvidi (2005:30) believes that the factors of text difficulty are more than just the source text. Translators and the kind of translation expected him/her to do are the other two. He (2005:32) also believes that the most important factor in identifying text difficulty is the reader of the text.

Assessing text difficulty

Suggesting an exact model for assessing the degree of difficulty in all types of texts is rather impossible. However Farahzad (2003:42) proposes the following holistic and rough estimation which proved to be helpful:

1. To assess lexical difficulty, the number of words which are thought to be difficult for the student.

2. To assess structural difficulty, the average number of sentences per 100 words of the text is estimated.

3.To assess difficulty at the concept level. Here paragraph is the unit of assessment.

Campbell and Hale (1999:6) believe in measuring a text by weighing items in a translation text. Some items would carry a weigh of zero. Harder items carry higher weights, possibly with different

weight for different type. These would include problematic words and grammatical structures. Eh total text difficulty would be based on summing the weights. But as Farahzad says it seems rather impossible to suggest an exact formula for assessing text difficulty.

The impact of corpora in translation evaluation
Bowker (2000:185) says that translator and translator trainers are language specialists who have not received formal training in the subject matter that is treated in the source texts. Therefore they must rely heavily on other resources in order to acquire the necessary subject field knowledge and the translator or evaluator must possess exemplary target language skills, including knowledge of pertinent terminology and also of appropriate style. Wilkinson (2005:1) describes corpus as a large collection of texts in electronic format. It can be a useful performance-enhancing tool in translating. It can be of great help in confirming intuitive decisions, in verifying or rejecting decisions based on other tools such as dictionaries, in obtaining information about collocates, in reinforcing knowledge of normal target language patterns, and in learning how to use new expressions.

There are different corpora such bilingual and monolingual ones. "Monolingual comparable corpus consists of two sets of texts, one originally written in language A and one of similar texts translated into language A from a variety of different languages."(Zanettin, 1998:1, quoted from Baker 1995) he(ibid:4-6) believes that there are a number of ways in which comparable bilingual corpora can be used in the translation classroom:1)using the corpus to translate, 2) to learn about terminology and content and 3) to explore texts.

Zanettin (ibid: 2) describes the second kind of corpus used in translation which is the bilingual or multilingual corpus. Language pairs are put together either on the basis of parallelism or comparability. Parallel bilingual corpora consist of texts in language A and their translation into language B, or vice versa. The relationship between texts is directional. It is mainly used for terminology extraction and machine aided translation. It can also be treated as translation memories. Wilkinson (2005:4-8) have pointed out some benefits of using corpus: a corpus acts as a continual source of additional raw material and the greatest benefit of using TL corpora is that they can suggest multi-word that students are able to use to

produce texts that sound more natural in the target language. He also pointed out that corpora allow unpredictable, incidental learning and also help finding and chasing between terms and verifying or rejecting decisions based on other tools such as dictionaries and the internet. It also very useful for finding information about collocates.

Zanettin(1998:13)describes that using corpus not only enhance the student's linguistic competence but also acquire specific skills related to translation, e.g. cross –linguistic mediation, accuracy in text production, and the ability to process text in electronic format. Corpus has some disadvantages which are mentioned in Wilkinson (2005:10) articles: normalization and excessive recycling but he has pointed out from others that specialized target-language corpora are not supposed to replace other resources. Rather they are invaluable reference tools which-in combination with other resources-have a definite place in the translation process.

Bowker (2000:187-190) describes the differences between corpus with other resources that can help the translators such as dictionary, parallel text, subject field experts and intuition. One of the most chronic problems associated with dictionaries is lack of space, limitation in number of contexts, lack of non lexical information, time-consuming to update, not showing frequency,.... parallel texts are also present two major drawbacks. First, when working manually, the translator or evaluator cannot gather and consult a wide range of documents second detecting linguistic patterns is difficult when one works with paper documents.

The problem of subject field is that translators are sometimes reluctant to consult subject field experts because they do not wish to appear ignorant. Moreover, translators have limited access to such experts while corpora easily contain hundreds of thousands of words that have been written by subject field experts. Many evaluators rely on their native language intuition to help them make judgments about which terms or expressions are appropriate. Although intuition may sometimes be considered a reliable source of judgment in some LGP contexts, the same norms cannot be mapped onto LSP's.

The advantage of corpus in evaluation

Bowker (2000:184) mentions that the use of evaluation corpus will make the task of translation evaluation somewhat less difficult by

removing a great deal of the subject field as documented by experts in that field, it can act as a benchmark against which translator trainers can compare student translations on a number of different levels. By having access to a wide range of authentic and suitable texts, the trainer can verity or correct the student's choices, both conceptual and linguistic, and can provide more constructive and objective feedback based on the evidence in the corpus. The difference between the evaluators who know the corpus with those who don't as Bowker (2000:197-202) says is that:

1) They are more confident in the correction and feedback they provided to students.

2) They are much more consistent in their identification of lexical errors, which could mean that they are using more objective criteria to determine errors.

3) The correction made by them is more accurate than others.

4) They can identify and correct a wider range of error types.

5) Students learn more and accepted the feedback that is based on corpus evidence.

As Bowker (2000:206) concludes the evaluation corpus can significantly reduce the subjective element in translation evaluation, and that this will benefit both the evaluators and the students. The use of evaluation corpus as a resource for evaluating translations seems to be offer a number of advantages over conventional resources. It allots evaluators to both identify and correct a larger number of errors and to do so in a more objective way. Its considerable size and electronic form mean that evaluators have easy access to a wealth of authentic examples which provide a common evaluative framework that can be consulted by both evaluators and student. A corpus should not be seen as a replacement for competence and critical judgment on the part of evaluators but rather as an aid to help them make sound and objective judgments.

Text analysis
Riazi (2002:3) quotes from Newmark (1988:144) that there are three basic translation processes:

1) An interpretation and analysis of the SL text;

2) The translation procedure and

3) The reformulation of the text according to the writer's intention,

the reader's expectation, the appropriate norms of the TL, etc

He (ibid: 4) also two patterns of text analysis which are micro and macro analysis. Analysis of the SL text should be text analysis at the macro-level with the goal of unfolding rhetorical macro-structures. By macro structures we mean patterns of expression beyond sentence level. By micro-structure, he means analysis of the lexis and grammar of the text. The evaluators and translators must first analyze the macro level between two texts and after that consider the lexicon and syntax of the texts.

He (ibid: 5-7) mentions that by text analysis, linguists build up descriptions of the language and discover more about how people use language in social communication. The same thing can be considered with the dynamic process of translation in that the discourse and rhetorical structures encoded in the source language can be reconstructed in the target language, and then the translator goes for the appropriate syntax and lexicon. On of the indexes of a good translation would , be to see to what extent a translator has been able to reconstruct the rhetorical structures of the source text in the target language through text analysis.

For instance: in newspaper editorials, the triad organizes the macro structure of them which consists of three elements, namely, Lead, Follow, and Valuate, serving functions of initiation, follow-up, and evaluation of the two. It was found that Leads were mostly expressed in interrogatives, Follows used passive structures; and Valuates used conditional and copulas. The macro level of Khayam's Robaiyat included three components, namely, description, recommendation, and reasoning.

Scoring

Farahzad (1992:276) mentions that the examiner should decide on the unit of translation in each part of the test and the weight that will be given to each part. Usually the unit of translation is sentence, particularly when the examinees must correct a translation or write their own translation of sentences. She (ibid: 277) suggests that each verb in the source language text marks a score, since verb is the major marker of sentence. So the main clause receives one score and each sub clause another score. Features of scoring are to be checked for each unit of translation, namely, accuracy and appropriateness.

Scoring can be done holistically in which the unit is the text or subjected to objectified scoring in which the unit is sentence.

The best way of grading in final exam as Robinson & Sanchez (2006:116) suggest is a holistic method, in this way, translation tasks that do not need a final revision will obtain a higher mark, whereas those that need thorough revision will fail. Rating scale must be transparent and normally available prior to the start of the learning process, meaning that all participants, students and tutor know from the beginning how to assess quality. Based on Bowker (2000:204) idea, the most difficult errors to grade are the non-binary errors because there is no readily available authority for their immediate correction.

Conclusion

The aim of translation teachers must be to train translators who translate efficiently so the objectives of the course determine the objectives of the test. Translation evaluation is the placing of value on a translation i.e. awarding a mark. Evaluation is one of the most problematic areas of translation and the biggest problem in translation evaluation is its subjective nature and lack of universally applicable criteria based on which translation may be assessed. Most evaluators mark translations in terms of personal taste but this subjective approach cannot be used by a teacher of translation who has to evaluate student's work. Assessment can be done only when the goals of instruction are clear to the teachers and they know how to assist the students in achieving them. Students should know the evaluation system teachers use to evaluate their translation and evaluator must be consistent in its use. They have the right to know who is responsible for it and who they have to address for further questions. Accuracy and appropriateness must be evaluated depending on the teacher's aim for that translation passage. A mistake can be considered minor or serious based on that aim. In good translation what is changed is the form and what should remain unchanged is the meaning and message. Evaluators must Use both limited-response tests, free-response ones and other tests such as self assessment to evaluate students during terms. For early stages descriptive sentences, simple meaning and structure and concrete words should be used, but for higher stages literary and technical texts and texts which include abstract concepts

must be used.

The methods used for the evaluation should be reliable, valid, objective and practical. Waddington (2001) in his articles describes four methods of assessment among which method A is the best. Also Farahzad (1992) methods of evaluation which are described above are more practical than other subjective methods. Another method of evaluation is self assessment. It is a process that enables students to assess their own performance and greatly facilitates their acquisition of increased responsibility for their learning and performance. For translator teachers and evaluators a key problem is assessing the difficulty of source texts used in tests and examinations. Texts which are difficult to comprehend are not necessarily difficult to translate and there are instances that students understand the text but cannot translate it.

Evaluation corpus can significantly reduce the subjective element in translation evaluation, and that this will benefit both the evaluators and the students. The use of evaluation corpus as a resource for evaluating translations seems to be offer a number of advantages over conventional resources. It allots evaluators to both identify and correct a larger number of errors and to do so in a more objective way. Its considerable size and electronic form mean that evaluators have easy access to a wealth of authentic examples which provide a common evaluative framework that can be consulted by both evaluators and student. The evaluator and translator also must have the ability to analyze the text. On of the indexes of a good translation would , be to see to what extent a translator has been able to reconstruct the rhetorical structures of the source text in the target language through text analysis. The examiner should decide on the unit of translation in each part of the test and the weight that will be given to each part.

Usually the unit of translation is sentence, particularly when the examinees must correct a translation or write their own translation of sentences. Rating scale must be transparent and normally available prior to the start of the learning process, meaning that all participants, students and tutor know from the beginning how to assess quality.

References:

Adab, B .(2000). *"Evaluating translation competence"*. In Developing translation competence, Schäffner, Christina and Beverly Adab (eds.), 215 ff.

Albir, A & Melis, N. (2001) *Assessment in translation studies: Research needs.* Meta, XLVI, 2: 272-278

Al-Qinai, J. (2000) *Translation quality assessment. Strategies, parameters and procedures.* Meta, XLV, 3.

Bowker, L. (2000) *A corpus-based approach to evaluating student translations.* St Jerome Publishing, Manchester

Campbell.S & Hale.S. (1999) *What makes a text difficult to translate?* Referred Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ALAA Congress.

Farahzad, F. (1992) *Testing achievement in at translation classes,* in Cay Dollerup and Annette Lindegaard (eds) Teaching Translation and Interpreting : Training, Talent and Experience, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 271-78.Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Farahzad, F. (2003*) Sequencing texts on the basis of difficulty in a translation program,* in Translation studies 1(1): 31-44.

Goff-Kfouri, C. (2004). Testing and evaluation in the translation classroom. The Translation Journal, vol. 8, No (3).p.14641

House, J. (1995) *Quality of translation.* In Baker's Encyclopedia of translation.

Orozco, M & Albair ,A,H.(2002).*Measuring translation competence acquisition*, Meta,XLVII, Vol 3,p375-403

Pikulski,J. J. (2002) *Readability.* Litho, USA, Houghton Mifflin C.o

Riazi, Abdolmehdi. (2002) *The invisible in translation* : *The role of text structure*, presented at the first international conference on language, literature , and translation in the third millennium, Bahrain University.

Robinson, B, Rodriguez, C, & Tercedor Sanchez, M. (2006) *Self-assessment in translator training,* in Perspectives: Studies in Translatology, Vol. 14, No.2:115-138.

Sainz, M. J (1992) *Student-centered corrections of translations.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Schaffner, C. (2004) *From "good" to functionally "appropriate": Assessing translation quality.*

Tajvidi, G. R. (2005) *Text Typology, Text readability & translation: guidelines for selection of translational texts.*Motaleat Tarjome,vol.12, No 3:29-47

Waddington, C. (2001) *Different methods of evaluating student translation:*

The question of validity. Meta, XLVI, 2, 2001.

Wilkinson, M. (2005) *Using a specialized corpus to improve translation quality.* Translation Journal 9. Retrieved from: www.accurapid.com/journal/33corpus.htm

Zanettin, F. (1998) *Bilingual comparable corpora and the training of translators.* Meta, XLIII, 4.