



Islamic Azad University
Science and Research Campus
Department of English Translation Studies

Two Methods of Evaluating Students' Translations: The Question of Validity

*Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in English Translation Studies*

Adviser:

Dr. Farzaneh Farahzad

Reader:

Dr. Ahmad Sedighi

By:

Babak Mohammadi

January 2008

Tehran, Iran

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	V
TABLES.....	VII
APPENDIXES.....	VIII
ABSTRACT	1
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	3
1.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.....	4
1.3 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	5
1.4 OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	11
1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES	11
1.6 DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS	12
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	15
2.1 OVERALL APPROACHES TO TQA	15
2.1.1 BOWKER'S USE OF ELECTRONIC CORPORA TO TQA	18
2.1.2 MCALESTER'S NOTIONS ABOUT THE BACKGROUND OF TQA MODELS	19
2.1.3 NORD'S POSITIVE EVALUATION METHOD	24
2.1.4 EDITING TIME AS A CRITERION TO TQA	25
2.2 WILLIAMS'S CLASSIFICATION OF TQA MODELS	27
2.2.1 MODELS WITH A QUANTITATIVE DIMENSION	28
2.2.2 NON-QUANTITATIVE MODELS	31
2.2.3 WILLIAMS'S OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE TQA MODELS	32
2.2.4 APPLICATION OF ARGUMENTATION THEORY TO TQA.....	34
2.3 AL-QINAI'S OVERVIEW OF THE DOMAIN	35
2.3.1 AL-QINAI'S MODEL FOR TQA	37
2.4 WADDINGTON'S INTRODUCTION TO TQA	41
2.4.1 WADDINGTON'S VALIDITY STUDY	44
2.5 SECARA'S JUDGMENT OF SOME TQA MODELS.....	46
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	49
3.1 DESIGN.....	49
3.2 SELECTION OF SUBJECTS	49
3.3 INSTRUMENTATION	50
3.4 PROCEDURE	50
3.5 DESCRIPTION OF THE TWO METHODS OF EVALUATION	50
3.5.1 METHOD A	50
3.5.2 METHOD B	52
3.6 THE VALIDITY STUDY.....	53
3.6.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE EXTERNAL CRITERIA	53
3.6.2 CRITERION-RELATED VALIDITY.....	55
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	58
4.1 VALIDITY	58
4.2 THE VARIABLES	58
4.3 CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE VARIABLES	59
4.4 ANALYSIS OF THE CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS	61

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	64
5.1 VALIDATION.....	64
5.1.1 FIRST COURSE GROUP (X1) AND THE TWO METHODS (Y1, Y2).....	64
5.1.2 SECOND COURSE GROUP (X2) AND THE TWO METHODS (Y1, Y2).....	65
5.1.3 THIRD COURSE GROUP (X3) AND THE TWO METHODS (Y1, Y2).....	65
5.1.4 FOURTH COURSE GROUP (X4) AND THE TWO METHODS (Y1, Y2).....	66
5.2 CRITERION-RELATED VALIDITY OF THE TWO ASSESSMENT METHODS.....	67
5.3 ADDITIONAL FINDINGS.....	68
5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	69
APPENDIXES.....	73
APPENDIX A THE ENGLISH TEXTS TRANSLATED BY THE STUDENTS INTO PERSIAN (AS THEIR MOTHER TONGUE):.....	73
APPENDIX B TABLES OF STUDENTS' SCORES.....	75
84	چکیده

Tables

Table 1 Matrix of Correlation Coefficients	61
Table 2	64
Table 3	65
Table 4	66
Table 5	66

Abstract

Different views on how to do translation have given rise to various approaches to evaluating translation. In this study, some models for evaluating students' translations are presented. Then two of them, that is, Farahzad's Objectified Method (1992) and Hurtado's Negative Scoring Method (1995) are examined in terms of validity. In other words, this study was designed to see whether these two methods were valid or not. To do so, translation students translated a text from English into Persian under exam conditions. Then three raters scored their works, first applying the Objectified Method, then the Negative Method. The mean scores given by the raters were compared to the students' scores in 18 of translator training courses which were later categorized into four groups. The students' grades in these courses were used as the external criteria, and were compared to their translation scores. The correlation coefficients between these two sets of scores indicated the validity of the two methods. The results obtained by using Pearson's correlation formula proved that the methods were valid as the correlation coefficients were above 0.4, ($0.4 < r$). Moreover, as the differences between them were less than 0.1, the researcher concluded that they were equally valid.

چکیده

در مورد ارزشیابی ترجمه دانشجویان بحث‌های زیادی انجام گرفته و نظریه‌های گوناگونی در مورد آن وجود دارد. با این حال، در عمل، برخی بهتر از بقیه بوده‌اند. در این تحقیق برخی شیوه‌های ارزشیابی ترجمه مورد بررسی قرار گرفته و سپس دو روش مورد تحلیل قرار گرفتند. روش اول شیوه‌ای است که توسط خانم دکتر فرحزاد در سال ۱۹۹۲ ارائه گردیده و دومی شیوه‌ای است که به هورتادو [Hurtado] منسوب است و در سال ۱۹۹۵ ارائه شده است. در این تحقیق این دو روش از بعد روایی [Validity] مورد بررسی قرار گرفتند. به عبارت دیگر، این مطالعه تلاش نمود که میزان روایی این دو شیوه را مشخص سازد. نتیجه کار نشان داد که هر دوی این شیوه‌ها دارای روایی مناسبی هستند ($t > 0/4$). از سوی دیگر از آنجائیکه تفاوت ضرایب همبستگی آن دو از ۰/۱ کمتر بود نتیجه گرفته شد که این دو شیوه به یک اندازه دارای روایی هستند.



دانشگاه آزاد اسلامی
واحد علوم و تحقیقات

پایان نامه کارشناسی ارشد مترجمی زبان انگلیسی (M.A.)

موضوع:

دو روش ارزشیابی ترجمه دانشجویان:

مسئله روایی

استاد راهنما: خانم دکتر فرحزاد

استاد مشاور: آقای دکتر صدیقی

نگارنده: بابک محمدی

سال تحصیلی ۱۳۸۶-۱۳۸۷