The criteria Iranian instructors use for assessing students' translations compared with theorists' opinion

Marziyeh Haji ZARGARBASHI*

Abstract

One of the main reasons for students' dissatisfaction with their exam scores in translation programs is related to the way their translations are evaluated. Although translation courses have been taught for several years in Iranian universities, almost no organized study has been done on the criteria used to assess students' translations. The present study set out to survey the way translation instructors evaluate students' translations. Participants were solicited for the criteria they used to assess students' translations. To achieve the objectives of the study, a questionnaire that included six open-ended questions was administered to 20 translation instructors who have taught translation courses in 6 different Iranian universities. Results of the data analysis indicated that most instructors paid attention to the naturalness, appropriate structure, style, accuracy, fluency and appropriate word equivalent as criteria for doing translation quality assessment. The findings of this study may be useful to the students majoring in translation as well as translation instructors. Students will certainly improve their translations if they are aware of the criteria used to evaluate their translation. Translation instructors who do not have much experience in teaching or testing translation courses can also use the findings of the study to improve their tasks.

Definition of Key Terms:

1. Assessment is a continuous process. It's not simply something that's done at the conclusion of a unit of study or at the end of a lesson. Effective assessment is integrated into all aspects of the curriculum, providing both teachers and students with relevant and useful data to gauge progress and determine the effectiveness of materials and procedures. Assessment in translation studies will focus on the notion of the translation problem, which is closely linked to that of translation error (Nord 1988; Presas 1996).

2. Quality is the degree to which a specific product conforms to a design or specification (Gilmore, 1974).

3. Translation is rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text (Newmark, 1995, 5).

4. Translation theory is a misnomer, a blanket term and it is neither a theory nor a science, but a body knowledge that we have and have still to have about the process of translation. Translation theory's main concern is to determine appropriate translation methods for the widest possible range of texts or text-categories. It is concerned with choices and decisions (Newmark, 1988).

1. Introduction

For having communication among different nations and conveying information, more and more translations are needed. Because of this need, more studies must be done on translation and translation assessment, especially in Iran.

The deficiencies of translation assessment in Iran, the dissatisfaction of students with their scores, and deficiencies of translation courses in training good translators must be considered. With paying attention to the fact that the scores are emblem of the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of curriculum, more attention must be paid to the way translations are scored and the criteria used for assessment of translated texts.

Based on the above fact, the aim in this study is to improve the methods of translation assessment and the criteria used for doing it in Iran. By achieving this aim, the students' dissatisfaction with their scores will be reduced and scores will be more realistic. Consequently, the scores will show the students' real competence in translation and their eligibility for later employment.

Because of the above mentioned reasons and because there are a few researches done on this subject, this study is important. It will hopefully help both instructors and students who study translation as well as all these who are involved in translation and translation assessment.

The findings of this research will be also, very helpful for the development of translation courses, because in this way the goal of these courses will be more specific .The curriculum will be designed based on this information and the students will be prepared to fulfill these specific requirements too.

The study, therefore, sought answers to the following questions:

1. What are the major criteria translation instructors use to assess students' translations?

2. Is there any consensus between Iranian instructors and translation theorists in their applied criteria?

3. Do Iranian instructors have good knowledge of theories of translation? Do they apply them while assessing translations?

* M.A. in translation studies, Department of Foreign Languages, Sheikh Bahaee University, Isfahan, Iran
E-mail: tir_o_takhte@yahoo.com

4. What are the instructors' opinion about objectiveness and subjectiveness of translation quality assessment?

5. What is the instructors' opinion about students' tastes and also additions and deletions in translations?

2. Review of Literature

The criteria the instructors choose for assessing translations are based on how we define translation. The first contribution to formulating criteria for assessing translation came in 1960s when Nida started speaking about dynamic equivalence and equivalent effect. If the translation had the same effect on TL reader, it would be successful. And as a test, it was suggested, to check the level of comprehension by the target reader. Nida (1964:4-8) suggests three criteria for assessing a translation: (i) comprehension of intent, and (ii) communication of intent, and (iii) equivalence of response.

Before Nida the success of a translation was always determined by how accurately it rendered the source text into the target language. By focusing on the effect of the target language text, Nida's ideas can be said to presage the so-called Skopos Theory which was developed in Germany by Katharina Reiss and Hans Vermeer (Reiss and Vermeer, 1984).

Tytler formulated three rules of translation, which have been so influential that it is worth quoting them in full:

"I. Translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work.

II. Style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of original.

III. Translation should have all the ease of original composition" (Tytler, 1790).

Rule I is considered today as one of translation criteria under the title of "Omission" or "Completeness".

Rule II refers to one of the criteria that is called "Register" and Rule III to "Style" in today's translation assessment criteria. As a whole, his model clearly evinces two yardsticks that are informativity and naturalness (Tytler, 1790, p.16).

In his book *Approaches to Translation* (1982), Newmark discusses about translation evaluation. He (ibid: 128-129) emphasizes the naturalness of translation. Newmark (1981) builds on Nida's work, but even though he questions whether the effect produced by ST could possibly be reproduced on TT audience, he does not completely abandon Nida's concept of equivalent effect. Using Nida's dynamic and

formal equivalences as a basis, he identifies two types of translation as "correct": communicative and semantic.

As a whole in many cases in translation courses, there are no means to prevent that the evaluator assesses the translation by comparing it to an ideal text she could have produced herself, thus projecting her own individual standards or prejudices onto the actual text. Thus, it does not provide an objective measure of quality in translation (Jensen, 1999; Tirkonnen-Condit, 1986).

Ulsever (1999:48) dubs the period in which Tytler, Belloc and others appeared as the pre-linguistic studies on translation evaluation. He refers to such criteria as "faithfulness to original or recreation of the original's work's specific flavor, the local color and spirit as opposed to a natural flow of translation and reader factor".

Some scholars maintain that two main features are to be checked in scoring for each unit of translation (suggesting that sentence and clause might be the units of translation) and they are:

1. Accuracy: the translation should convey the information in the ST precisely i.e. the translation should be close to the ST norms.

2. Appropriateness: the sentences sound fluent and native, and are correct in terms of structure (Farahzad, 1992).

In another research Massoud (1988) sets the criteria for a good translation as follows:

1. A good translation is easily understood.
2. A good translation is fluent and smooth.
3. A good translation is idiomatic.
4. A good translation conveys, to some extent, the literary subtleties of the original.
5. A good translation distinguishes between the metaphorical and the literal.
6. A good translation reconstructs the cultural/historical context of the original.
7. A good translation makes explicit what is implicit in abbreviations, and in allusions to sayings, songs, and nursery rhymes.
8.

El Shafey (1985: 93) suggests other criteria for a good translation; these include three main principles:

1. The knowledge of the grammar of the source language plus the knowledge of vocabulary, as well as good understanding of the text to be translated.

2. The ability of the translator to reconstitute the given text (source-language text) into the target language.

3. The translation should capture the style or atmosphere of the original text; it should have all the ease of an original composition.

Heaton (1990: 110) proposed an analytical grid for language courses. However, it can be easily adopted for a translation correction. An analytical grid allows the instructor to set clear criteria for correction based on simple arithmetic.

In this case, by using this grid, students can easily know about their strengths and weaknesses. Coupled with descriptive comments, a student will be able to rewrite the translation with a clear focus (Cangelosi, 2000).

El Zeini (1994) suggested a pragmatic and stylistic model for evaluating quality in translation. She explains that the model "places equal emphasis on the pragmatic component as well on the stylistic component in translation.

Correction Criteria	5	4	3	2	1
Fluency /Flow					
Grammar					
Terminology					
General Content					
Mechanics	X	X			

Julian House (1987; 2000) has emphasized the importance of the source text, and indeed the first task in her assessment model is a detailed analysis of the source text. Her approach is based on linguistic stylistics and a Neo-Firthian model.

More recently House (1987; 2000) has emphasized the interaction between source text and target text, and the success of a translation, in her view, is the degree to which it provides a semantically and pragmatically equivalent to the source text.

Dr. Saleh Al-Hammadi(2008) , by using House's model of TQA (House,2001), Darwish (1995,2001), and Honig(2004), classifies the criteria that evaluators must use while evaluating translations in to Accuracy, that includes coherence, cohesion, spelling, grammar, and punctuation; Informativity that includes completeness, fact rendering, redundancy handling; and Reliability that includes ethical considerations and cultural filtering.

Some other criteria that were mentioned in different studies for assessing translation are grammaticality, use of expressions, smoothness, consistency and naturalness, comprehension, fidelity, and accuracy, language appropriateness, appropriate structure, appropriate vocabulary, appropriate terminology TL expressions, TL fluency, Understanding of ST, Understanding of L2 culture, writing skills and logic in L1, appropriate terminology, omitting key words or information, paying attention to genre and register, beauty, precision, clarity, inserting additional information, no excessive literal or free translation, knowledge in special field, accurate transfer of meaning, text style, excessive use of borrowed words, making explicit and understandable what is implicit if it is necessary (Nieminen, 2004; Catford, 1965; Leonardi, 2000; House 1997; Newmark, 1988; Larson, 1984, Frahzad,1992; Evans and Lindsay, 1996; Darwish,1999; Lonsdale,1996; Campbell, 1998; Hatim & Mason, 1997; House, 1997; Hurtado Albir, 1999; Shattleworth & Cowne, 1997; Malcolm, 1989).

3. Methodology

This study was a descriptive and survey study in which translation instructors' methods and ideas about the assessment of students' translations in universities was investigated.

3.1. Participants

Twenty professors of Isfahan University, Sheikh Bahaiee University, Islamic Azad

of Khorasgan, Nahaf Abad and Shahr reza and some Payam-e-Nour, who teach

translation courses participated in this study. They were requested to fill up open-

ended questionnaire related to their method of teaching and assessing students'

translations.

Also, ten professors who had the experience of teaching translation for many

years were asked to act as a rater of four translated texts produced by some junior students whose field of study was English Translation. The students were at their sixth semester of study in different universities.

3.2. Materials

To conduct this study, at first, some theoretical information was gathered about assessment of students' translation by Iranian professors was needed. For this purpose, an open-end-

ed questionnaire was used. The questionnaire included questions related to translation quality assessment criteria which instructors use for assessing students' translations, and method of selecting these criteria. The rationale behind using an open-ended questionnaire, not multiple choice or other types of test, was that this type of test reduces the possibility of responding by chance. Another advantage of this type of test was not to give some pre-planned responses. Therefore, instructors were free to explain their own method of assessment.

For the second stage of the study, five separate literary paragraphs were used to reduce variety and focus on one specific field of study.

4. Results

4.2. Analyzing Questionnaire Number One

For doing analysis, the answers to the questions of open-ended questionnaire (first questionnaire) were analyzed and were organized in some tables to make the results more clear. This questionnaire included seven questions related to translation quality assessment.

4.2.1. Question number 1

Table 1: Frequency of criteria used for translation assessment - In these tables, some criteria that were mentioned in part 2.6 of literature review that are acceptable criteria for doing translation quality assessment among translation theorists and researchers are mentioned and the frequency of their use by different participants (Iranian professors) were calculated.

4.2.2. Question number 2

T*able 2: Frequency of sources used for choosing criteria -* In this question the source of selecting criteria was asked, and based on the data that was gathered, there were three sources including using some theories, studies, or choosing these criteria based on experience. In some cases, no resource was used for selecting translation assessment criteria by some professors.

4.2.4. Question number 3

Table3: Frequency of respecting taste in assessing translations - About respecting the students' tastes, almost all of the instructors respect their students' tastes if it does not disturb complete transfer of information and also Coherence. Faithfulness, naturalness and grammaticality and consistency of using terms have less frequency of use than above mentioned conditions.

4.2.5. Question number 4

Table4: Frequency of instructors' opinion about objectiveness of translation assessment - Question number 4 is about whether the instructors believe translation assessment to be objective or subjective. It should be mentioned that participant numbers 12 and 16 have not responded this question.

4.2.6. Question number 5

Table5: Frequency of applied theories for assessing translations - Question number 5 is about the theories that instructors sue for assessing students'translations and as a result of this study it will concluded that most of the instructors do not follow special theory.

Table 1: Frequency of criteria used for translation assessment

Criteria	frequency	percentage
Style	7	9.45
Accuracy	7	9.45
Beauty	1	1.35
Fluency	7	9.45
Consistency	1	1.35
Naturalness	9	12.16
Fidelity	5	6.75
Choice of word	5	6.75
Appropriate structure	8	10.8
Cohesion &coherence	1	1.35
Complete transfer of information	3	4.05
Precision	0	0
Clarity	1	1.35
Register	1	1.35
Genre	1	1.35
Adapting to culture	3	4.05
Appropriate word equivalent	6	8.10
Appropriate terminology	2	2.7
Having the same effect	3	4.05
Understanding ST	1	1.35
Appropriate Function	2	2.70

Table 2: Frequency of sources used for choosing criteria

	frequency	percentage
theory	4	18.18
experience	4	18.18
studies	4	18.18
No special resource	10	45.45

Table3: Frequency of respecting taste in assessing translations

	Frequency	Percentage
Respecting students' tastes	9	45
Not respecting tastes	1	5
Respecting with some conditions	10	50

Table4: Frequency of instructors' opinion about objectiveness of translation assessment

	Frequency	Percentage
subjective	3	16.66
objective	4	22.22
Some thing in between	4	22.22
In some cases objective	2	11.11
Must try to be objective	2	11.11
Both objective and subjective	3	16.66

Table5: Frequency of applied theories for assessing translations

	Frequency	percentage
Specific theory	6	30
Different theories based on subject	4	20
No theory	10	50

4.2.7. Question number 6

About question number six, according to this study, additions and deletion are almost acceptable for all the instructors (with few exceptions), but there are some conditions that will be mentioned in the following table:

Table6: Frequency of conditions for accepting additions and deletions in assessing translations.

4.3. Expert Questionnaire

For testing the above mentioned criteria and the information that was gathered through questionnaire number one, another part was added. This part includes one text that consists of five separate literary paragraphs that were translated by four B.A students that their field of study was English Translation. Ten participants that were present in the previous section were requested to take part in this section. They were most experienced participants. In this part participants were requested to give 1 that stands for weak translation, 2 for not good transla-

tion, 3 for good translation and 4 for very good translation to each paragraph of each translation and they were requested to explain about the criteria that they have used and the advantages and disadvantages of each translation in their own opinion.

Table 7: Frequency of assigning 4, 3, 2, and 1 to different paragraphs of different translations by several instructors

5. Discussion

5.1. Explanation about the Responses to Question Number One

Based on the information mentioned in literature review, the criteria that are accepted globally and different scholars mention them as important criteria are style, accuracy, beauty, fluency, consistency in term, naturalness, fidelity, choice of word, appropriate structure, cohesion and coherence, complete transfer of information, precision, clarity, register, genre, cul-

Table6: Frequency of conditions for accepting additions and deletions in assessing translations

	Frequency	percentage
accuracy	4	16
naturalness	4	16
fidelity	2	8
Complete transfer of information	5	20
Author's intention	1	4
Tone	1	4
Style	1	4
structure	2	8
effect	1	4
Poor trans.	1	4
Depending on the text	4	16

Table 7: Frequency of assigning 4, 3, 2, and 1 to different paragraphs of different translations by several instructors

	Frequency of 1 (weak trans.)	Frequency of 2 (not good trans.)	Frequency of 3 (good trans.)	Frequency of 4(very good trans.)
Paragraph1 trans.1	1	3	5	1
Para.1 trans.2	0	3	4	3
Para.1 trans.3	0	0	6	4
Para.1 trans.4	1	2	0	7
Para.2 trans.1	0	2	7	1
Para.2 trans.2	1	2	6	1
Para.2 trans.3	1	3	4	2
Para.2 trans.4	0	1	3	6
Para.3 trans.1	2	1	6	1
Para.3 trans.2	3	2	3	2
Para.3 trans.3	1	1	5	3
Para.3 trans.4	2	3	1	4
Para.4 trans.1	1	5	2	2
Para.4 trans.2	1	4	4	1
Para.4 trans.3	2	4	3	1
Para.4 trans.4	0	5	2	3
Para.5 trans.1	6	1	3	0
Para.5 trans.2	6	2	2	0
Para.5 trans.3	2	3	4	1
Para.5 trans.4	1	4	3	2
Total	31	51	73	45

ture, and appropriate word equivalence.

Analyzing the information related to this question, shows that naturalness, structure, accuracy, fluency, style, and appropriate equivalent are the criteria that are mostly used by Iranian instructors for assessing students' translations. Fidelity and choice of word will be placed in lower ranks. According to the findings of this study, most of Iranian instructors did not pay attention to beauty, consistency in using terms, cohesion and coherence, precision, clarity, register, genre, appropriate terminology, having the same effect, understanding ST, and appropriate function. So, naturalness, fluency, accuracy, appropriate equivalence, appropriate structure and style are criteria that are acceptable by most Iranian instructors, but not all of them. As a result it was found that Iranian instructors do not know all the acceptable criteria that are acceptable globally or they do not apply them in assessing students' translations. There is also evident that there is no standard criterion that is acceptable for all Iranian instructors and each instructor has special point of view about way of assessing translations.

The findings of this study has contradiction with the findings of a research that was done by Riazi(2004). As a result of his research complete transfer of information, appropriate structure, appropriate equivalent have most frequency of use and register and genre and paying attention to culture will be at lower ranks but still the frequency of them is more than other criteria. In comparison with findings of present study complete transfer of information, register and genre and culture that are among the criteria that have high frequency of use in that study have law frequency of use here and just appropriate structure and appropriate equivalence have approximately the same frequency of use in both studies.

5.2. Explanation about the Responses to Question Number Two

In this case instructors were requested to explain about the source of choosing the criteria they use for assessing students' translations. The findings of this study show that some instructors use some theories as a source for choosing special criteria and some others do that based on some studies or their own experience. But most of them have no special source for choosing criteria for assessing translations and this again shows that Iranian instructors do not have enough knowledge about theories of translation and also they do not have enough studies related to this field or maybe they have knowledge but they do not apply it.

5.3. Explanation about the Responses to Question Number Three

Question number three is related to the instructors' opinion about the role that students' taste plays in translations and whether they regard it as appropriate or inappropriate. Most of the instructors regard it as appropriate but among these instructors again most of them regard it appropriate if it has some special conditions. These conditions were faithfulness to original, coherence, naturalness, and grammaticality and complete transfer of information. Coherence and, complete transfer of information have more frequency of use than others. But faithfulness, naturalness, grammaticality and consistency have less frequency of use than the above mentioned criteria. About conditions that each of these instructors have mentioned that makes using taste appropriate or inappropriate, in many cases these conditions were not mentioned in many instructors' re-

sponse to question number one (Data analysis, 4.2.1). For example, participant number five has mentioned coherence as a condition but he has not mentioned this criterion in responding to question number one. This situation is the same for participant number six and number fifteen. This again shows some problems related to translation quality assessment in Iran.

5.4. Explanation about the Responses to Question Number Four

Here instructors have been requested to tell us whether they consider translation quality assessment to be subjective or objective. Regarding the data, most instructors regard it to be objective or something in between. The instructors that regard it as subjective are fewer. Still ones who believe it to be in some cases objective or they try to be objective or both objective and subjective are fewer than the previous categories. To be objective, instructors must have specific criteria for assessing translations. About participant number 17 that regards translation assessment to be objective, he has not mentioned any criteria for assessing translations and here contradiction is obvious. Also participants number three, number four, and number thirteen have mentioned many criteria in responding to question number one but they believe translation assessment to be subjective. Participant number eleven also has mentioned some criteria but he believes translation assessment to be subjective. About comparing the results of this study it has again contradiction with translation theorists' opinion about subjectivity ad objectivity of translation. Most of these scholars believe translation assessment to be subjective, but the finding of this study shows that most of the instructors believe it to be objective.

5.5. Explanation about the Responses to Question Number Five

In this question it was requested to mention the theory or theories that instructors apply while assessing translations. According to the data, most of them have not mentioned any specific theory. The number of instructors who have mentioned specific theory and those who use different theories in different situations is the same and is less than the number of those who use no theory. About those who have mentioned some specific theories, the frequency of those who have mentioned Nida and New mark, and skopos theory is more than others. Referring to reader-response theory, it has less frequency of use than above mentioned theories. By having this information we can conclude that most Iranian instructors have no information about translation theories or they know them but they do not apply them. In this way, the probability of assessing translations based on intuition and also subjectivity of assessment will be increased.

With comparing the findings of this question with the findings of question number one, we can understand that in some cases the findings have contradiction with each other. For example participant number three, has stated that he uses no special source for choosing the criteria for doing translation quality assessment while responding to question number two , but he refers to Nida and Newmark's theory in responding to question number 6 and here we can see contradiction. So, as a whole these contradictions show that some Iranian instructors do not apply translation theories properly and practically in assessing students' translations.

5.6. Explanation about the Responses to Question Number Six

Here the instructors were requested to mention the cases that they give negative or positive marks for additions and deletions in students' translations. According to the finding of this study except for participant number two who regards all deletions and additions negative, all the participants accept it. But most of them regard these changes acceptable when they have some special conditions. Among these conditions are naturalness, accuracy, complete transfer of information, fidelity, author's intention, tone, style, and appropriate structure and effect. Among these conditions naturalness, accuracy and complete transfer of information have more frequency of use that others. While comparing these conditions with the criteria mentioned in responding to question number one, some of the participants have mentioned some criteria that they have not mentioned in responding to question number one. For example participant number one has mentioned naturalness in responding to this question that is absent in his response to question number one.

5.7. Explanation about the Responses to Expert Questionnaire

5.7.1. Explanation about criteria mentioned by each participant

Participants were requested to mention advantages and disadvantages of each translation and to justify the marks that they have given to each translation. About participant number three, he has mentioned understanding L1, choosing lexical equivalent, fluency, writer's intention, and over translation. Among these criteria just fluency was mentioned in responding to question number one too. So there is contradiction between the criteria that participants use for assessing translation and the ones that have mentioned in responding to question number one. About participant number five, he has mentioned exact addition, appropriate equivalent, transferring complete information, and naturalness. Just appropriate equivalent and naturalness were mentioned in responding to question number one. So again contradiction can be seen. About structure that has been mentioned by this participant in responding to question number one, this criterion was not considered in responding to expert questionnaire. Related to participant number eight, beauty, fidelity and brevity were mentioned in responding to expert questionnaire. None of these criteria were mentioned in responding to question number one. So again here contradiction between what this participants know theoretically and what he applies while assessing translations is obvious. About participant number eleven, appropriate equivalent and structure were mentioned in responding to second questionnaire, but again like the previous example these criteria do not compromise with the criteria that were mentioned before. About participant number twelve, he has mentioned appropriate equivalent, appropriate structure and naturalness but he has mentioned equivalence and structure beforehand. About participant number sixteen again he has mentioned structure, naturalness, appropriate equivalent, accuracy, but he has mentioned some other criteria like style, fluency, fidelity, genre, choice of word, and culture in responding to question number one. About participant number four understanding L1, fidelity, appropriate equivalent, paying attention to audience, naturalness, appropriate structure, beauty, style, and fluency were mentioned. Among these elements

just fidelity, appropriate equivalent, naturalness, appropriate structure, style, and fluency were mentioned in responding to question number one. In this case we can not see that contradiction. Participant number 17 too has not mentioned any criteria for assessing translation while responding to question number one, but he has mentioned naturalness, message, and beauty while responding to expert questionnaire.

About participant number eighteen, in responding to expert questionnaire accuracy, naturalness, and style were mentioned. Just accuracy has been mentioned in responding to question number one too.

About participant number nineteen, naturalness, accuracy, choice of word and style were mentioned in responding to this question that just accuracy, style, and choice of word have been mentioned before too.

About participant number twenty, having the same effect, appropriate equivalent, structure, and complete transfer of information have been mentioned in responding to expert questionnaire. Among these criteria just effect have been mentioned in responding to question number one.

As a whole we can see that instructors do not have specific criteria to apply in all cases. It can be understood from these contradictions between the criteria that were mentioned in responding to question number one and expert questionnaire. It can be explained by mentioning this fact that instructors usually do not have good theoretical information about the criteria or they have knowledge but they do not apply this knowledge while assessing translations.

6. Conclusion

Most of the instructors were not familiar with the translation theories and most of them didn't apply the theories to assess students' translations. So we can say the criteria that are considered to assess students' translations are teacher-made, because most of the instructors are not familiar with theories and global criteria. The followings are the most important translation criteria used by instructors to assess students' translations.

What the students must take care in their translations as the most important factors are naturalness, structure, accuracy, fluency, style, and appropriate equivalent. About objectiveness and subjectiveenss of assessments, most of the instructors believe it to be objective.

Most of the instructors have used no theory for choosing criteria and did not apply these theories for assessing translations. Most of the instructors also respect taste and also accept additions and deletions while assessing translations.

References

Lonsdale, B. A. (1996). Teaching translation from Spanish to English, Words beyond words, University of Ottawa Press, Canada

Catford, J. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation. Oxford: Oxford University

Press

Campbell, S. (1998), Translation into the second language, General Editor : C. N. Candlin

Cangelosi, J. (2000). Classroom management strategies,

gaining and maintaining Students'cooperation, 4th ed. John Wiley and Sons. USA

Darwish, A. (1999). Towards a Theory of Constraints in Translation. Retrieved March 30, 2013 from http://www.at-turjuman.com/

Darwish, A. (1989). Managing Translation Projects. Oryx Technicom: Melbourne

Darwish, A. (1989). The Translator's Guide. Oryx: Melbourne. First edition

Darwish, A (1998). Translation as a Decision Making Process under Constraints. PhD Thesis. RMIT University, Victoria, Australia

Darwish, A. (1995). A Model for Designing Decision Based Translation Tests. Online

publication. http://www.at-turjuman.com/

El Shafey, F.,A.,M.,(1985). Compounding in English and Arabic, Implications for Translation Methodology. M.A Thesis, Faculty of Arts, Cairo University

El Zeini, N.,T.,(1994). Criteria for the Evaluation of Translation : A Pragma-stylistic approach. PhD. Thesis, Faculty of Arts, Cairo University

Evans, J. R. and Lindsay, W.M. (1996). The Management and Control of Quality, Third Edition, West Publishing Company: Minneapolis

Farahzad, F. (1992) 'Testing Achievement in Translation Classes' Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Cangelosi, J. (2000). Classroom management strategies, gaining and maintaining Students'cooperation, 4th ed. John Wiley and Sons. USA

Farahzad, F. (1992) 'Testing Achievement in Translation Classes' Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Hatim, Basil & Mason Ian (1997), The Translator as communicator, London : Routledge

Heaton, J.B. (1990). Classroom testing. Longman, New York

Heaton, J.B. (1990). Writing English Language Tests. New York, Longman

House, J. (1997), Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited. Tubingen: Narr

House, J. (1981): A model for Translation quality assessment, Tübingen, Narr

House, J. (2001). Translation quality assessment: Linguistic description versus social evaluation. Meta, XLV1, 2, 243-257

House, J. (1997). Translation quality assessment: A model revisited. Tubingen: Gunter Narr

Hurtado Albir, A. (1999). Enseñar a traducir, Edelsa Grupo Didascalia, Madrid

Jensen, A. Time pressure in translation. In G. Hansen (ed.). Probing the process of translation: methods and results. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur. p.103-119.

Larson, M. L. (1984). Meaning-based translation: A guide to crass-language equivalence. New York & London: University Press of America

Leonardi, V. (2000, October). Equivalence in translation: Between myth and reality. Online Translation Journal, 4, 4, 1-14. Retrieved 27/2/2012 from http://accurapid.com/journal/14 equiv.htm

Massoud, M.F.(1988). Translate to Communicate, A Guide for Translators. New York: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Newmark, P. (1988a). A Textbook of Translation. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall

Newmark, P. (1988b). Approaches to Translation. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall

Nida, E. A.: Toward a Science of Translation, published 1964, by Brill, Leiden

Nida, E.A. & Taber, C.R. (1969). The Theory and Practice of Translation. Brill, Leiden

Nieminen, T. (2004). The value of register, text type and genre for translation and translation assessment. Retrieved 20/8/2012 from http://www.uta.fi/

Nord, C. (1988). Textanalyse und Ubersetzen, Heidelberg, J. Groos Verlag [transl.: (1991): Text -Analysis in Translation, Amsterdam, Rodopi]

Reiss, K. & Vermeer, H.J. (1984). Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie. Niemeyer, Tübingen

Riazi, A.M. & Razmjoo, L. (2004). Developing Some Guidelines for a Change in the Program of English Translation in Iranian Universities. Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities of Shiraz University. Vol.21, NO.1, 28-39

Shuttleworth, M. & Cowie, M. (1997). Dictionary of Translation Studies. UK: St. Jerome Publishing

Tirkonnen-Condit, S. (1986). Reader impressions and textlinguistic priorities in translation quality assessment. In S. Tirkonnen-Condit (ed.). Empirical studies in translation: text-linguistic and psycholinguistic perspectives, (Studies in Language 8). Joensuu:Fac. Of Arts. p.49-73

Wiliams, M. (1989). The Assessment of Professional Translation Quality : Creating Credibility out of Chaos, Traduction, Terminologie, Redaction, 2 (2), p. 13-33

Appendix A: Questionnaire No. 1

Please answer the questions about assessing translation tests.

1. What are the major criteria that you use to assess students' translations? Please describe.

2. How do you select the criteria that you apply while assessing translations?

3. Do you respect your students' tastes in translation, especially for finding equivalents?

4. Do you believe translation assessment to be objective or subjective? Please explain.

5. Do you follow a special theory of translation? If yes, what is it and why do you follow it?

6. In which situations will students get negative or positive point for additions and deletions in their translations?

Appendix B: Questionnaire No. 2

Part A: Please translate these paragraphs into Persian.

Confide not to a friend every secret thou possessest. How knowest thou that he will not some time become thy foe? Inflict not every injury thou canst upon an enemy, because it is possible that one day he may become thy friend.

Property is for the comfort of life, not for the accumulation of wealth. A sage, having been asked who is lucky and who is not, replied: 'He is lucky who has eaten and sowed, but he is unlucky who has died and not enjoyed.

Little by little becomes much and drop by drop will be a torrent; that is to say, he who has no power gathers small stones that he may at the proper opportunity annihilate the pride of his foe.

For some time he lay on his couch watching the sky gradually close over, listening to the silence. It was this silence that had seemed painful to him during the first days here, after the war. He had requested a post in the little town at the base of the foothills separating the upper plateaus from the desert. There rocky walls, green and black to the north, pink and lavender to the south, marked the frontier of eternal summer.

The policeman on the beat moved up the avenue impressively. The impressiveness was habitual and not for show, for spectators were few. The time was barely 10 o'clock at night, but chilly gusts of wind with a taste of rain in them had well nigh depeopled the street.