The Effect of Lexicon-based Debates on the Felicity of Lexical Equivalents in Translating Literary Texts by Iranian EFL Learners

Babak Shaham[*]
Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

Zahra Aslany
Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT: This study was an attempt to investigate the effect of lexicon-based debates on the felicity of lexical equivalents in translating literary texts by Iranian EFL learners. To fulfill the purpose of this study, 59 university students, majoring in English Translation, were randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups from a total of 73 students based on their performance on a mock TOEFL test. Next, a Translation Production Test (TPT), with two brief texts, was administrated to the participants of the study. As a prerequisite, the correlation between participants' scores on TPT and LE (Lexical Equivalence) was calculated. The result indicated a highly positive correlation between students' scores on the test of felicitous lexical equivalent selection and their sores on TPT performance. Then, the participants' score on lexical equivalents were considered as a pretest to assess their ability to select the most appropriate equivalents in the translation of literary texts from L1 to L2. Finally, after a fourteen-session instruction for the experimental group, the participants sat for another TPT, which included two other brief Persian literary texts that were used to investigate the effect of the intervention. The result of statistical analyses indicated that there existed a significant statistical difference between the means of the experimental group (EG) and the control group (CG).

Translation has been characterized as both a process and a product (Cao, 1996 cited in Angelelli, p.13). During the past two decades, with the great strides in science and technology, translation has become a matter of concern and actual requirement for the transmission of information. Translation is almost as old as original authorship and has a history as honorable and as complex as that of any other branch of literature (Savory, 1968). Literature is considered by many as a dynamically complex language which is far removed from the utterances of daily communication.

In fact, translation deals with the transference of meaning. To derive the meaning out of a text, the translator attempts to render it in the target language by proposing the most appropriate equivalents, called the equivalent effect (Newmark, 1988). However, this is not always feasible

especially when the SL (source language) and TL (target language) cultures are remote from each other owing to the fact that the lexicons of the two languages do not match.

Therefore, the translator should work out the precise meaning to detect the relationships and approach the intended meaning of the text which demands not only the understanding of the linguistic features of the text but also the semiotics that deals with "sign systems or structures, sign processes, and sign functions" (Hawks, 1977, p. 47). According to Nida (1964), a translated text (or element of a

[*] Corresponding author`s email address: babakshaham@yahoo.com

text) is equivalent to its source language if it fulfills the same function. Many studies have focused on the empirical and theoretical notion of equivalence in recent years (Catford, 1965; Pym, 1992; Toury, 1995).

Literary translation is a complicated process; the translator needs to make adjustments in meaning which is not less significant than the form. In fact, when the translator starts analyzing the ST, he looks at the words as single units in order to find a direct 'equivalent' term in the TL. Accordingly, finding proper lexical equivalents as the preferred strategy is representative of the translator's purported fidelity to the original text. In fact, literary translation is the expression, in TL, of what has been expressed in SL which presents semantic and stylistics equivalences (Bell 1998).

When students involve in translation activity through the channel of their own native language to another language, they should notice that they are going to write for the people whose cultural and historical background differ from those of the source language audience. Thus, they should try to find words, terms and expressions in the target language to convey the ideas in the text as clearly as possible. Catford (1965) believed that the central problem of translation practice is finding TL equivalents. In addition, Persian literature is difficult to translate because it embodies so much of culture, history and other ingredients that shape the "national" identity of the Iranians; it is so inextricably bound up with Persia's cultural and religious heritage.

Probably, the most sensible concern for contemporary classroom teachers in the course of literary texts translation is how to improve the quality of translation from L1 to L2 by choosing appropriate equivalents. Most difficulties that students face in translation are due to their inability to recognize boundaries between conceptual meanings. That is, the students should know about the reference of the lexis as well as the boundaries that separate the lexis from words of related meanings.

After studying English for many years, most EFL students are likely to demonstrate poor performance on translating literary texts. One of the challenges of translation courses in Iran is that in many cases students fail to find felicitous lexical equivalents in text translation, especially literary ones. Thus, the present study is designed to find a convincing answer to the following research questions:

1. Is there any relationship between students' scores on the test of felicity of equivalents and their scores on the translation of literary tests?

2. Do lexicon-based debates (analysis and discussion) have any impact on the felicity of lexical equivalents in translating literary texts by Iranian EFL learners?

Method

Participants
To accomplish the objectives of the study, seventy three senior university students who were studying English Translation at Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch sat for a mock TOEFL test. From among these students, 59 whose scores fell within one standard deviation above and below the mean were selected. The sample consisted of both male and female students whose age ranged between 22 and 35. The participants were all Farsi speakers and they were studying English as a foreign language in an academic setting.

Instrumentation
Three tests were employed in this study: a language proficiency test that was used for homogenizing the students' English knowledge; a test of literary-text translation from L1 to L2 that was used to make sure that there was no significant difference between the students' performance regarding the selection of lexical equivalents in literary translation before the intervention; and a posttest of the same nature for measuring and comparing their improvement in finding felicitous equivalents in translating literary texts.

The following procedure was adopted for undertaking this study:

1. To ensure about the homogeneity of the learners' proficiency, the participants took a mock TOEFL test, which was in multiple-choice format with two sub-tests. The first part (reading section) contained two texts with 20 multiple choice items which were mainly comprehension check or

referential questions. The test also contained a section on structure that contained 10 multiple-choice items tapping the participants' structural knowledge of the language.

2. Having conducted randomization check through comparing the means of the two groups via a mock language proficiency test, the researchers had the participants sit for the pretest, which was a kind of Translation Production Test (TPT) -- a test of literary text translation from L1 to L2. To this end, a Persian literary text consisting of two parts was chosen from Sa'di's works. Then, its readability was estimated to be 68.3, which fell within the range of acceptability.

3. At the end of the course, the participants received another Translation Production Test (TPT) which consisted of a Persian literary text containing two sections, both of which were selected from Sa'di's work. The readability index of this test indicated 69 score grade level.

Materials

The main materials that were used for both the experimental and the control groups were sixteen texts from Sa'di. All the texts were loaded with literary words which needed precision in the selection of lexical equivalents. The readability of all texts was calculated using Flecsh's index of readability. It is worth noting that among the sixteen texts, two were selected for pretest and posttest. The readability index of the pretest and posttest was 68.3 and 69. The remaining fourteen literary texts were taught by a university instructor. The readability of these texts was also calculated using the same formula. The readability index of these texts fell within the range of 60-69, which was truly standard.

Procedure

The first step in conducting the present study was preparing and administrating a piloted mock proficiency test to 73 candidates (who were in two separate classes). The purpose of this test was to determine the homogeneity of groups. Then, the students whose score fell between one standard deviation above and below the mean were included in the study and others were excluded. Then, the two classes were randomly assigned to two groups, namely the control group and the experimental group. Additionally, the two groups were statistically compared to make sure that they were of the same level of language proficiency and were eligible to participate in the study.

The next step was to ensure that there was a correlation between participants' scores on test of finding felicitous lexical equivalents and their scores in translation of literary tests. A literary text consisting of two brief parts was administered to the participants. Two applied linguists were asked to provide two scores for each paper: one as a general task of Translation Production Test (TPT) and the other as the selection of felicitous lexical equivalents. Then, the participants' scores based on lexical rubric were considered as a pre-test. The results indicated that the groups enjoyed the same level of performance in this regard prior to the intervention. The significance of the difference between the obtained means of the experimental and the control groups in the pretest was determined by a t-test.

Treatment

Following the assignment of the control and the experimental groups and the administration of pretest, the actual treatment commenced and both groups received an instructional program. Fourteen Persian texts were selected from Gulistan and their readability indexes were calculated. The length of instruction was 14 weeks (14 sessions of 90 minutes). It is worth nothing that, in order to control the teacher variable, the researchers had the participants in both groups taught by the same instructor who was an assistant professor with over 10 years of experience in English teaching and translation. Both groups studied the same materials while the instructor took a different procedure for each group.

The instructor provided the students with a text of L1 and gave them time to translate the text. They were allowed to use any kind of dictionary they wished, ranging from monolingual or bilingual or even cell phone installed dictionary or any other kind of digital ones. The students in the control group, as it was observed, translated their texts without using the Lexicon dictionary. Then, the teacher called on students randomly to read the sentences of the text they had translated. Finally, the instructor himself provided the best choice for all. This trend went on until the students completed translating the whole text. In the conventional approach to translating literary texts, the teacher carefully controls the final outcomes. There were teacher-led explanations and interventions and less engagement by

learners. That is, the students did not engage in any class activity to distinguish the nuances of meaning. In fact, it was a kind of teacher-centered class because the conventional techniques of teaching literary texts translation such as giving options by teacher and corrective feedback on his part were applied in the class since it was the prevalent procedure.

The experimental group was trained to employ dictionary use (DU) and dictionary-based debates (DBB) as a translation strategy . In the experimental group (EG), first participants read the text and translated it, then the instructor asked them about some particular lexical equivalents and everyone in the class was given a chance to provide his/her option. In the EG, the lexical nuances were explained and discussed through comparing and contrasting the lexical items with close semantic features. Moreover, the learners participated in some debates based on their own ideas in selecting the proper equivalents.

Below is an illustration of what has been done in the experimental group: when learners faced such a sentence in a text, everyone in class gave his/her option for the words in the sentence. For instance, for "خیالی" one said "Fancy", another said "Fantasy" and so on. Then, the instructor had the students look up the words 'Fancy and Fantasy' in the Lexicon dictionary and they were asked to read the definition. Then in order to decide upon the felicity of equivalents, the students entered into debates under the supervision of the instructor.

After 14 weeks of instruction the students sat for the posttest. The test was Translation Production Test (TPT) from Persian to English chosen from the Gulistan. The text readability index turned out to be 69, which was comparable with those texts taught during the course. Following the instruction, the performance of the learners in both groups was scored in accordance with the scoring rubrics.

Two experienced applied linguists were asked to score the pre-test and post-test papers based on two rubrics: lexical equivalents rubric (see appendix), and Angelelli's rubric (2009). Then, the correlation between the participants' scores on TPT performance and lexical equivalents felicity was calculated for the pre-test. In the post-test, the raters scored the ten selected lexical equivalents, which were adopted from Angelelli's (2009) translation scoring rubric in teaching literary texts translation.

Results

In order to determine the homogeneity of the groups, a mock language proficiency test with 35 items was first administrated to 30 students with almost the same level of proficiency for the piloting phase. After item analysis, the poor items of the test were discarded and therefore the number of items reduced to 30. The reliability index of the modified test (the remaining items) was computed using Cronbach's alpha, which is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Reliability Statistics*

Cronbach's alpha	N of Item
799	30

After the pilot test, the mock TOEFL was administrated to the whole population of two intact classes (73 students) with the aim of selecting a homogeneous sample for the study. The descriptive statistics of this process is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics of the Initial Language Proficiency*

groups	Mean	N	SD	Variance Skewness	Skewness	Std. Error of
G1	15.54	37	3.22	10.42	.372	.388
G2	16.5	36	3.76	14.1	.034	.393
Total	16.0	73	3.56	12.3	.225	.281

Using the newly obtained scores, the mean and standard deviation of the test were estimated, and the students whose scores were between one standard deviation above and below the mean were included in the study and others were excluded. Accordingly, the number of students reduced to 59.

The next step was to analyze the statistics of each group in isolation with respect to the modified general proficiency test in order to make sure that the participants of the two groups were at the same level of proficiency at the outset of the study. The details of this analysis are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. *Descriptive Statistics of Language Proficiency Test*

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Control	29	15.07	2.034	.378
Experimental	30	15.83	3.007	.549

As Table 3 indicates, the performance of the two groups on the proficiency test showed remarkable similarities. However, a *t*-test was run in order to ascertain that the two groups did not differ significantly before exposure to the instructional intervention. It is worth mentioning that the groups were homogenous in terms of their variance [F (1,57) = 7.37, *p* = .25 (two-tailed). Table 4 presents the result of this analysis.

Table 4. *Independent Samples t-test of Language Proficiency Test*

| | Levene's Test | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | 95% Confidence | |
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	7.37	.00	-1.14	57	.25	-.76	.67	-2.10	.57
Equal variances not assumed			-1.14	51	.25	-.76	.66	-2.10	.57

Examining the mean difference of -.76 with *t*(57) = -1.14, *p* = .25 (two-tailed) revealed that the difference between the two groups was not significant at the outset and that they belonged to the same population.

Next, lexical rubric was employed to calculate the scores of the participants in both the experimental and the control groups. After calculating the inter-rater reliability between the two sets of scores in each group, a *t*-test was run between the mean score of the experimental group (M = 10.38, SD = 2.11) and the control group (M = 10.39, SD = 2.04) to check whether there was any significant difference between the means of the two groups. The descriptive statistics and the result of the *t-test* are presented below in Tables 5 to 7.

Table 5. *Inter-rater Reliability of Control Group Lexicon*

Cronbach's alpha	N of Items
.929	2

Table 6. *Inter-rater Reliability of Experimental Group Lexicon*

Cronbach's alpha	N of Items
.957	2

Table 7. *Group Statistics of the Two Groups Prior to the Treatment (Lexical Equivalents)*

groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
control	29	10.39	2.04	.379
experiment	30	10.28	2.11	.386

The second part of the pretest data analysis which is in line with the TPT analysis is presented below:

Table 8. *Inter-rater Reliability of Control Group TPT*

Cronbach's alpha	N of Items
.941	2

Table 9. *Inter-rater Reliability of Experimental Group TPT*

Cronbach's alpha	N of Items
.909	2

Table 10. *Group Descriptive Statistics*

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Std. Error
Control	29	12.56	2.103	4.424	-.462	.434
Experimental	30	12.43	2.932	4.734	-.449	.427
Total	59	12.16	2.548	4.495	-.465	.411

To check whether the first null hypothesis could be rejected or not, the Pearson-Product correlation was used.

Table 11. *Correlations*

		Lexical	TPT
lexical	Pearson Correlation	1	.980[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	59	59
TPT	Pearson Correlation	.980[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	59	59

As Table 11 shows, there is a highly positive correlation between students' score on selecting lexical equivalents and their scores on Translation Production Test (TPT).

Table 12. *Independent Samples t-test of the Two Groups' Mean Scores on the Pretest*

	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence	
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.06	.80	.20	57	.83	.11	.54	-.97	1.19
Equal variances not assumed			20	57	..83	.11	.54	-.97	1.19

As we can see in Table 12, with the variances assumed equal [F (1, 57) = .06, *p* = 0.80 (two-tailed)], the *t*-test results indicated that there was no significant difference between the mean t scores of the two groups on the felicity of lexical equivalents pretest, *t(57)* = .20, *p* = .83 (two-tailed) and hence, the researchers could assume that the experimental and control groups manifested no significant difference prior to the treatment.

After the treatment, another Translation Production Test (TPT), which was similar to the pretest in every aspect, was utilized as posttest. The inter-rater reliability between two sets of scores was calculated before any statistical data analysis.

Table 13. *Inter-rater Reliability of Control Group Lexical*

Cronbach's alpha	N of Items
.929	2

Table 14. *Inter-rater Reliability of Experimental Group Lexical*

Cronbach's alpha	N of Items
.936	2

The descriptive statistics of the experimental group (M = 15.61, SD = 1.95) and the control group (M = 12.32, SD = 1.95) are demonstrated in Table 15:

Table 15. *Group Statistics of Lexical Equivalents Posttest*

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Control	29	12.32	2.42	.449
Experimental	30	15.61	1.95	.357

The means of the two groups on the felicity of lexical equivalents in the posttest were compared using a t-test. As Table12 shows, F (1, 57) = 1.51, *P* = .22 (two-tailed) confirmed the equality of variance and *t*(57) = -5.74, *p* = .00 (two-tailed) suggesting that the mean difference of -3.28 is significant and the first null hypothesis can be safely rejected.

Table 16. *Independent Samples t-test of the Experimental and Control Groups at the Lexical Equivalents Posttest*

	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence	
	F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	1.51	.22	5.74	57	.00	-3.28	.57	-4.43	-2.14
Equal variances not assumed			5.72	53.84	.00	-3.28	.57	-4.44	-2.13

In order to test the second null hypothesis, another statistical analysis based on students' performance on the posttest was done, which are reflected in the afore-mentioned tables. First of all, the inter-rater reliability between the two sets of scores on lexical equivalent performance based on the lexical equivalents scoring rubric was conducted. Then, the group descriptive statistics of students' performance was presented in Table 15 and at last, the t-test was run to see whether the mean difference between the two groups is statistically significant or not.

Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that there was a statistically significant correlation between the holistic translation scores and lexical felicity scores. Therefore, this study shows that improving students' performance in finding lexically felicitous equivalents in literary text translation leads to optimizing their translation quality as a whole. In addition, the data generated by this study reveals a significant difference between the scores in the selection of felicitous lexical equivalents of the two groups allowing the rejection of the second null hypothesis with more than 99% confidence. This can be due to the fact that the experimental group outperformed the control group on the post-test. Thus, firstly this study supports the use of Lexicon dictionary for the purpose of finding equivalents in L2 (English) by Iranian EFL learners and secondly for the improvement of literary text translation. This can be attributed to the instructional intervention provided for the experimental group involving Lexicon-based debates in the selection of felicitous lexical equivalents in literary translation from L1 to L2. The findings of this study also agree with other similar studies such as Nida (1964), Catford (1965), House (1977), Newmark (1988).

This study does not reject the role of other instruments in translation such as various kinds of monolingual or specialized bilingual dictionaries in the field of translation. Bell (1998) believed because the semantic boundaries between words turn out not to be clear or sharp, so the translator is uncertain about the features and qualities associated with the words in the SL. To this end, Lexicon dictionary embodies nuances of meaning illustrated through pragmatically employed sample sentences which enable the students as would-be translators to come up with precise and natural equivalents. The present study merely aimed to verify the claim that the use of Lexicon dictionary and Lexicon-based debates in the classroom context is a fruitful tool for facilitating the selection of equivalents for literary translation.

The findings of the present study underscore the role of Lexicon dictionary in literary translation. It could be argued that learners should train to use Lexicon dictionary in order to distinguish the lexical nuances and boost their autonomy and self-confidence when translating a text. When learners use an adequate instrument such as Lexicon dictionary for translation in classroom context, they apply different cognitive, metacognitive, social and affective strategies. Lexicon-based debate as a fruitful strategy helps learners to move from one end of the continuum, which is selective attention (fully controlled process) towards the other end which is automaticity (fully automatic processing). Since the participants' response time and number of errors decrease significantly, this can be interpreted as a sign of increasing automaticity. Newell (1990) believed that automatic processes are fast and effortless. In other words, when the skill becomes automatic, decision-making is reduced and there is no requirement for attentional effort. Therefore, automatizing in lexical equivalent felicity results in reduced response time and fewer number of errors in word selection. Wood and Segalowitz (1998) stated that practice and experience with a language typically lead to faster processing, which is commonly reflected in various ways, including faster lexical decision times and more saving of attentional resources for other purposes such as cohesion and coherence in translation. This study has several implications for teaching literary translation courses ranging from university instructors to materials development.

Conclusion

The selection of felicitous lexical equivalents as a decision-making process is a complex cognitive skill; however, through extensive practice of applying Lexicon dictionary for felicitous selection of equivalents, it becomes a less effortful and more stable performance. Therefore, employing Lexicon dictionary in translation of literary text can be a great help in finding felicitous lexical equivalents. Logan (1988) regarded automaticity as a transition from algorithm-based performance to memory-based performance. Extensive practice and repetition through Lexicon dictionary under particular conditions and circumstances can enhance memory-based performance consuming less attention and in turn leading to improvement of the quality of translation as a whole.

In order to optimize the quality of literary translation, this study examined the effectiveness of Lexicon-based debates in the selection of felicitous lexical equivalents. Leonardi (2010) believed that equivalence is the central issue in translation. In fact, in translating literary text, the selection of

equivalents is very demanding because it is difficult to find a standard equivalent in one language for another and also, literary text translation is not a search for sameness. Thus, translating literary texts is something more than the process of substituting words, phrases, or structures and it dedicates itself to recognizing delicate lexical nuances. Newmark (1988) claimed that "the overriding purpose of any translation should be to achieve equivalent effect" (p.48).

References

Abrams, M.H. (1988). *A glossary of literary terms*. Orlando: Rinehart.

Angelelli, C.V. (2009). Using rubric to assess translation ability. In C.V. Angelelli & H.E. Jacobson (Eds.), *Testing and assessment in translation and interpreting studies* (pp. 13-49). Philadelphia: John Benjamin.

Bell, R. T. (1998). Psychological/cognitive approaches. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp.211-215). New York: Routledge.

Catford. J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistic.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hawks, T. (1977). *Structuralism and semiotics*. London: Methuen.

House, J. (1977). *A model for translation quality assessment*. Tubingen: Gunter.

Leonardi. V. (2010). *The role of pedagogical translation in second language acquisition*. New York: Peter Lang.

Logan, G. (1988). Toward an instance theory of automatization. *Psychological Review, 95* (4), 492-527

Newmark, P. (1988). *A text book of translation*. Hetfordshire: Prentice Hall.

Newell, A. (1990). *Unified theories of cognition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Nida, E.A. (1964). *Toward the science of translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Pym, A. (1992). *Translation and text transfer*. New York: Peter Lang

Savory. T. H. (1968). *The art of translation*. London: Cape.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: Benjamin.

Wood, A. & Segalowitz, N. (1998). Assessing the development of automaticity in second language word recognition. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(1), 53-67.

Authors

Babak Shaham is an Assistant Professor of the Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch. He has authored many books for IELTS & TOEFL preparation courses and authored many papers and articles. His main concerns are in the realm of Minimalist Andragogic Approach to Language Teaching and Testing.

Zahra Aslany received her B.A. from Payame-Noor University and recently finished her M.A. in TEFL at the Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch. She has been teaching English for years at different language institutes.

Appendixes

Translation Production Test (pretest)

بخش اول

یاد دارم که شبی در کاروانی همه شب رفته بودم و سحر در کنار بیشه ای خفته. شوریده ای که در آن سفر همراه ما بود نعره برآورد وراه بیابان گرفت. و یک نفس آرام نیافت. چون روز شد گفتم: این چه حالت بود؟ گفت: بلبلان را شنیدم که به نالش در آمده بودند از درخت و کبکان در کوه و غوکان در آب و بهایم در بیشه؛اندیشه کردم که مروت نباشد همه در تسبیح و من به غفلت خفته.

بخش دوم

ملک گفت: هر آیینه ما را خردمندی کافی باید که تدبیر مملکت را شاید گفت: ای ملک نشان خردمند کافی جز این نیست که به چنین کارها تن در ندهد.

Translation Product Test (posttest)

بخش اول

یکی از ملوک عرب رنجور بود درحالت پیری و امید از زندگانی قطع کرده,که ناگه سواری از در درآمد و مزده براورد که فلان قلعه را به دولت خداوند گشادیم و دشمنان اسیر شدند و سپاه و رعیت آن طرف به جملگی مطیع فرمان گشتند. ملک را نفسی سرد از سر درد برآمد و گفت:این مزده را مرا نیست دشمنانم راست یعنی وارثان مملکت.

بخش دوم

روباه گفت: خاموش! که اگر حسودان بغرض گویند شترست و گرفتار آیم که راغم تلخیص من باشد تا تفتیش حال من کند.

Scoring Rubric for Lexical Equivalents

	Pretest	**Posttest**	**2point** Word choice reflects a nuances of words	**1/5 point** Word choice is skillful and apt	**1point** Word choice is good	**0/5 point** Word choice is either too formal or too colloquial	**0 point** Word choice is inaccurate
Item 1	Desert	decrepitude					
Item 2	Distracted	trooper					
Item 3	Journey	fort					
Item 4	Daylight	conquered					
Item 5	State	captured					
Item 6	Carelessness	obedience					
Item 7	Sufficient	heirs					
Item 8	Intelligent	envious					
Item 9	administration	release					
Item 10	Engage	investigate					

The following is a Working draft for rubric to assess translation by Angelelli (2006).

T= Trans; TL= Target Language; ST= Source Text

Source Text Meaning

5 T contains elements that reflect a detailed and nuanced understanding of the major and minor themes of the ST and the manner in which they are presented in the ST. The meaning of the ST is masterfully communicated in the T.

4 T contains elements that reflect a complete understanding of the major and minor themes of the ST and the manner in which they are presented in the ST. the meaning of the ST is proficiency communicated in the T.

3 T contains elements that reflect a general understanding of the major and most minor themes of the ST and the manner in which they are presented in the ST. there may be evidence of occasional errors in translation but the overall meaning of the ST appropriately communicated in the T.

2 T contains elements that reflect a flawed understanding of the major and/ or several minor themes of the ST and the manner in which they are presented in the ST. there is evidence of errors in interpretation that load the meaning of the ST not being fully communicated in the T.

1T shows consistent major misunderstanding of the ST meaning.

Style and Cohesion (addresses textual sub-component)

5 T is very well organized into sections and/or paragraphs in a manner consistent with similar TL texts. The T has a masterful style. It flows together flawlessly and forms a natural whole.

4 T is well organized into sections and/or paragraphs in a manner consistent with similar TL texts. It flows together well and forma coherent whole.

3 T is organized into and/or paragraphs in a manner consistent with similar TL texts. The T style may be inconsistent. There are occasional awkward or oddly placed elements.

2 T is somewhat awkwardly organized in terms of sections and/or paragraphs or organized in a manner inconsistent with similar TL texts. The T style is clumsy. It doesn't flow together and has frequent awkward or oddly placed elements.

1T is disorganized and lacks divisions into coherent sections and/or paragraphs in a manner consistent with similar TL texts. T lacks style doesn't flow together. It's awkward sentences and ideas seen unrelated.

Situational appropriateness (addresses pragmatic sub-component)

5 T shows a masterful ability to address the intended TL audience and achieve the translations intended purpose in the TL. Word choice is skillful and apt. cultural references, discourse, and register are completely appropriate for the TL domain, text-type, and readership.

4 T shows a proficient ability to address the intended TL audience and achieve the translations intended purpose in the TL. Word choice is consistently good. Cultural references, discourse, and register are consistently appropriate for the TL domain, text-type, and readership.

3 T shows a good ability to address the intended TL audience and achieve the translations intended purpose in the TL. Cultural references, discourse, and register are mostly appropriate for the TL domain but some phrasing or word choices are either too formal or too colloquial for the TL domain, text-type, and readership.

2 T shows a weak ability to address the intended TL audience and achieve the translations intended purpose in the TL. Cultural references, discourse, and register are at times inappropriate for the TL domain. Numerous phrasing and/or word choices are either too formal or too colloquial for the TL domain, text-type, and readership.

1 T shows inability to address the intended TL audience and achieve the translations intended purpose in the TL. Cultural references, discourse, and register are consistently inappropriate for the TL domain. most phrasing and/or word choices are either too formal or too colloquial for the TL domain, text-type, and readership.

Grammatical and mechanics (addresses micro-linguistics sub-component)

5 T shows a masterful control of TL grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Very few or no errors.

4 T shows a proficient control of TL grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Occasional minor errors.

3 T shows a weak control of TL grammar, spelling, and punctuation. T has frequent minor errors.

2 T shows a lack of control of TL grammar, spelling, and punctuation. T is compromised by numerous errors.

1 T shows a lack of control of TL grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Serious and frequent errors exist.

Translation Skill (addresses strategic sub-component)

5 T demonstrates able and creative solution to translation problems. Skillful use of resource materials is evident.

4 T demonstrates consistent ability in identifying and overcoming translation problems. No major errors and very few minor errors are evident. No obvious error in the use of resource materials is evident.

3 T demonstrates general ability in identifying and overcoming problems. However, a major translation error and/or accumulation of minor errors are evident and comprise the overall quality of the translation. improper or flawed use of resource materials may be reflected in the TL.

2 T demonstrates some trouble in identifying and overcoming translation problems. Several major translation errors and/or a large number of minor errors are evident and comprise the overall quality of the translation. Improper or flawed use of resource materials is reflected in the TL.

1 T demonstrates an inability in identifying and overcoming common translation problems. Numerous major and minor errors lead to a seriously flawed translation. Reference materials and resources consistently used improperly.