



The Comparative Effects of Self-Assessment and Peer Feedback on Improving Translation Quality

Mohammad Beiranvand¹, Ghafour Rezaie Golandouz^{2*}

¹ Department of English Language and Literature, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

² Department of English, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran

Received: 18 December, 2017

Accepted: 31 December, 2017

Abstract

This study investigated the effect of self-assessment and peer-assessment on the quality of students' translation. The participants of the study were 60 male and female students. They were selected from the senior students studying English Translation and divided into two groups: self-assessment and peer-assessment. The study adopted a pretest-posttest design and students' translation quality was measured before and after providing them with instructional treatment through self-assessment and peer-assessment using a translation quality checklist. Data were gathered during the pretest and posttest phases and analyzed using independent and paired samples *t*-tests. The results of the study indicated that both self-assessment and peer-assessment were effective in improving the quality of the translation of the students. The comparison of the posttest mean scores also revealed that peer-assessment was significantly more effective than self-assessment in promoting the participants' quality of translation.

Keywords: Peer-assessment, Self-assessment, Translation assessment, Translation quality

INTRODUCTION

Quality of translation is the ultimate goal for those who study translation. It is also one of the most important issues in translation studies (House, 2015). As House argues, translation is a linguistic-textual operation whose process and quality are affected by a multitude of constraining factors. Helping translation students achieve quality in their translation requires attention to all these factors and incorporation of alternative approaches in teaching translation. However, a review of literature on translation studies indicates that the effect of peer feedback and

self-assessment on the translation quality has gone rather underexplored. Peer feedback is assumed to allow students to enhance the abilities and skills and give them a chance to analyze and monitor aspects of both their own learning process and the product of their peers (Rollinson, 2005). Self-assessment also provides learners with an opportunity to take on responsibility for their learning progress (Birjandi & Siyyari, 2010; Butler & Lee, 2010). As O'Malley and Pierce (1996) argue, not only is learners' critical thinking of their own performance enhanced by engaging in self-assessment practices but they are also encouraged to seek solutions to the problems encountered.

*Corresponding Author's Email:
gh.rezaie@iau-garmsar.ac.ir



Translation Quality

Quality of translation has always been a focal point in translation studies with equivalence forming the conceptual basis of its assessment. However, equivalence has been interpreted in different ways and has been one of the most controversial issues in research on translation. Various interpretations of the concept of equivalence form foundations for different approaches to translation quality assessment. Historically, experts from various professions including educators, authors, poets, and translators have evaluated the translated works intuitively and subjectively. These traditional approaches assume that assessing the quality of a translation hinges mainly on the subjective interpretation as well as transfer decisions made by translator which, in turn, are influenced by his/her linguistic and cultural knowledge and experience (House, 1997). Other approaches to evaluating translations have included different criteria in translation quality assessment. In an attempt to develop a new model of translation quality assessment, House (1997, 2015) provides an overview of these approaches.

According to House (1997, 2015), behavioral approaches are mainly concerned with the theory of dynamic equivalence offered by Nida (1964). The focus of these approaches is communicative value implying that readers' responses to a translation are the main yardstick. Nida (1964) proposes three fundamental criteria against which translation quality is judged: (1) the extent to which communication process is generally efficient, (2) grasp of the main intent, and (3) the extent to which equivalence of response is accomplished. Yet, House (1997) believes that the possibility of exactly testing 'the extent to which the criteria are met' cannot be taken for granted. He concludes that the achievement of equivalence of response is as unclear and non-testable as the criterion of understanding the spirit of the original put forward by philologists.

Unlike behavioral approaches, linguistically-oriented approaches consider the original text as the most pivotal factor constituting the translation process. The studies conducted by researchers

such as Baker (1992) and Hatim and Mason (1997) show that those adopting these approaches make a comparison between source texts (STs) and target texts (TTs) in order to identify the regular patterns such as pragmatic, syntactic, and stylistic ones at the time of the transfer process. In other words, as Neubert and Shreve (1992) argue, the linguistically-oriented models of translation focus on systemic relationships between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL).

Due to their underlying assumptions, functionalist approaches have played a significant role in the assessment of translation quality. These approaches have downplayed to role of equivalence (House, 2015). As their main contribution, they have introduced the function and/or the goal of the TT as the essential criterion one should use for translation evaluation. Put it other way, when it comes to quality, a translation should be assessed in terms of whether the translation's intended function in the target language is adequately accomplished in translation. House argues that functionalist approaches are based upon Vermeer's skopos theory. In this theory, the main factor determining the strategies of translation is the intended purpose of the TT. Vermeer puts forward the skopos rule according to which human action, one of which is translation, is clarified by its purpose (or skopos). Consequently, action is a function of its purpose.

In descriptive (literature-oriented) approaches, evaluation is made in terms of forms and function inside the TL. Equivalence does not refer to one-to-one correspondence between source and target text, rather it refers to relationships within the receiving culture (Toury, 1995). Therefore, translation is seen as a cultural fact. Descriptive approaches are similar to functionalist approaches in that they move away from the original text and focus on the appropriateness of the translation in the target culture. Descriptive approaches see TT as an entity in the target poly-system in its own right so that it is considered as an inseparable component of the target culture as well as reproduction of another text (Shuttleworth, 1998). Put it other way, the analysis expands its scope, go-

ing beyond the nature of the equivalence that can be created between ST and TT.

Majority of the approaches described above distinguish between original texts and their target counterparts, drawing on it as the basis to develop subsequent arguments on the nature and quality of translation. While these classic translation theories are mainly concerned with verbal version of communication and expression, deconstructionists challenge what is called the logocentrism of Western philosophical tradition with its concentration on the written word (Gentzler, 2001). Deconstructionist approaches have posed challenges to the linguistic, written, and reading constraints through making clear how the concepts definitions limit the scope of the specific theories these concepts can describe.

Drawing on the Hallidayan theory of pragmatics, House (1997, 2015) has developed and revised a new model for assessing the quality of translation. For House (2015), translation is "both a cognitive procedure which occurs in a human being's, the translator's, head, and a social, cross-linguistic and cross-cultural practice" (p. 1). Her latest model House (2015) assumes translation as "double-linkage operation" (p. 62) in which translation quality is assessed based on the relationship between the original text and its translation; the relationship between the original text and how it is perceived by human agents (the author, the translator and the recipient); and the distinction between translation from other types of textual operations. An elaborate system of pragmatic-functional analysis of original and translation is employed to account for the relationship between the text(s) and the human agents involved in the translation process. There is also an overt-covert cline on which a translation is placed so that the type of intended reception is determined. Additionally, a distinction is made between translation and other types of textual operations.

Peer and Self-Assessment

Learning is improved when learners are involved in developing the assessment process. This may

take the form of self and/or peer assessment. Self and peer assessment enable learners to independently assess their own and other students' performance progress with confidence and get actively involved in the learning process. As Hyland (2003) points out, peer feedback gives a chance to the writer to find out the text's potential and to understand the writing context. This provides a sense of audience and an understanding of expectations of their target addressees.

Peer feedback is to place learners together in groups and then encourage each learner to read and make reactions to the strength and weaknesses of each other's production (Kroll, 2001). In peer feedback, the interaction occurs between learners, and it promotes student-centered activities. Crucial skills including critical thinking can be enhanced during the peer feedback process since learners seek to negotiate what they grasp and what they do not from their peer's corrections (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Leki, 1990). Giving the students opportunities to involve in reviewing each other's work is a breakaway from the traditional concept of assessment that considers giving feedback as a responsibility only within the realm of teachers.

The use of peer feedback by many researchers (Clark, 2003; Diab, 2011) has provided support for its positive in improving learner performance. Findings of these studies have shown that peer feedback can serve as a dual function of enhancing students' learning as well as teachers' quality of teaching. Keeping track of various feedbacks given by the learners is an effective way whereby teachers can assess both the learning progress achieved by the students and at the same time make an evaluation of how effective their own teaching has been. Teachers can make appropriate adjustments in their teaching by getting learners involved in intimate dialogues with the each other and assessing their peers.

Similarly, learners' self-evaluations help them set higher goals and devote more energy or time to them, which, in turn, enhances achievement. Self-assessment refers to keeping an eye on one's own performance while involved in language

learning (Richards & Schmidt, 2002). It allows the learners to collect information about their own learning for purpose of consciously monitoring the progress trajectory of their knowledge growth (Dickinson, 1987).

According to Rolheiser and Ross (2013), due to the dramatic and fast changes in educational contexts, teachers need to accommodate their instructional activities to meet the emerging demands. Valuing learners' contribution, role, inclusiveness as well as social justice requires that teachers pave the way for learners' leading role and their collaboration as well as autonomy in learning.

Rational and Research Questions

On major concern among teachers who teach translation is how they can help their learners improve the quality of their translations. This, however, requires a deep understanding of what translation is, what processes it involves, how it might be taught, and what factors affect its quality.

In the context of second language teaching and learning, both peer feedback and self-assessment have been found to have many advantages (Clark, 2003; Richards & Schmidt, 2002). They give the learners a chance to analyze and monitor aspects of both the learning process and the product of their peers. The findings of studies on SLA may have implications regarding the implementation of peer feedback and self-assessment techniques in translation classes. Engaged in self-assessment, translation students may come to know their strengths and weaknesses. Consequently, they can devise strategies to enhance their translation skills. In peer feedback, they need to be involved in an additional activity: identify their peers' problems in translation and provide suggestions as to how they might be improved. Having all this in mind, the present study aimed at investigating the effect of peer feedback and self-assessment on the improvement of translation quality. For this purpose, following questions were examine:

1. *Does self-assessment have any significant effect on the quality of translation?*
2. *Does peer feedback have any significant effect on the quality of translation?*
3. *Is there any significant difference between the effect of self-assessment and peer feedback on the quality of translation?*

METHODS

Participants

The participants of this study included 60 students of English Translation in Payame Noor University in Khoramabad (one of the city in Iran), drawn from a subject pool of 90. Participants were first screened for language proficiency through administering the language proficiency test of TOEFL. Then, those whose scores fell within the score range corresponding to the intermediate level of language proficiency (i.e. 30-60) for reading and structure sections were included in the data analysis. Participants were chosen as intact classes because random selection was not possible for the researchers. They were both male and female and their age ranged from 20 to 30. These participants were selected from the senior students studying translation.

Instruments

Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL)

A sample of TOEFL test chosen from preparation course was used in the present study to make sure that the participants in the two selected intact classes were not statistically different in terms of overall language proficiency. Due to practicality and manageability concerns only the reading (50 items) and structure (40 items) sections of the test were administered. Each correct answer was considered as one point and sum of the points was computed as the final score. Students had 90 minutes to complete the test.

Assessment of Translation Quality at Pretest and Posttest

Two texts containing 400 vocabulary items were chosen to be translated by the participants in both groups at pretest and posttest phases. The texts were chosen after tapping the participants' interest. To this end, the researchers gave the participants a range of 20 different topics and asked them to rate the topics from 0 to 5 on a Likert scale, 0 meaning that '*I really hate to translate texts on this topic*' and 5 meaning that '*I really love to translate texts on this topic*'. The researchers then added up the scores of students for all the topics and selected the two most popular ones for pretest and posttest translations. The purpose of choosing two texts was that students would have more chance of translation skill on at least two topics. The texts were given to 5 EFL instructors with more than 15 years of teaching experience at the advanced level of proficiency to comment on their difficulty level and suitability for undergraduate English Translation (B.A.) students.

They unanimously agreed on the appropriate difficulty of the text for the purpose of the study. The texts were selected from a web site called News in Levels at <http://www.newsinlevels.com>. The website contained various pieces of news in three levels of difficulty: Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3. The texts were selected from the third

level as the cursory look gave the impression that texts were at the appropriate level of difficulty for the target students.

The quality of translations of the participants were measured using a checklist developed by Khanmohammad H. and Osanloo (2009). The checklist has five components of accuracy, finding equivalent, register, target language culture, grammar and style, and shifts, omissions, additions and inventing equivalents along with descriptors for each (see Appendix A). Each descriptor has a corresponding score and through adding up the descriptors' scores that best describes the translation works of the students' final score for translation quality is obtained. In order to confirm the reliability of the checklist, 20 students with characteristics similar to the characteristics of the actual participants of the study were asked to participate in the pilot phase during which they were asked to translate a text from English to Persian. Their translations were judged by two raters using the checklist. The relationship between two sets of scores given by raters was considered as the reliability index which was found 0.74. Table 1 shows the results of Pearson correlation coefficient between the scores given by the two raters in the pilot study. These two raters later scored the translations of the actual participants and the average of their scores was used as the final scores in data analysis.

Table 1

Results of Pearson Correlation for Inter-rater Reliability of the Translation Quality Scale

	Translation quality Pilot Rater 2	
	Pearson Correlation	.741 **
Translation quality Pilot Rater 1	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	20

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Materials

The materials provided during the treatment phase consisted of two components: texts for translation practice and translation quality checklist for peer feedback and self-assessment. In relation to the former, about 10 texts with the difficulty level of 3 were randomly chosen from

the website <http://www.newsinlevels.com> for treatment sessions. In order to get learners involved in the peer feedback and self-assessment, a simplified version of translation quality checklist developed by Khanmohammad H. and Osanloo (2009) was given to them based on which they could assess their own and peers'

translations (see Appendix B). The students were asked to assess their own and peer's translation products on a scale of 1 to 5.

To assure the validity of the simplified assessment scale, expert opinion was sought. To this end, the modified version along with the original one were given to a PHD and an MA holder in translation studies, and they were asked to comment on the modified version of the checklist. Their comments were addressed, and the final version of the checklist was prepared.

To further assure that the checklist was appropriate for the purposes of this study, it was also given to five students having similar characteristics to the main participants of the study, and they were asked to use it for assessing one of their own translation products. The students were then asked about the clarity of the items and due revisions were carried out on the items.

Procedure

At the outset, the researchers chose 60 university students from a subject pool of 90. The researchers gained the instructors' consent through contacting them in person. Participants were given a TOEFL, the results of which were analyzed for choosing homogeneous participants in terms of language proficiency. Participants were then divided into two groups: peer assessment group and self-assessment group.

Next, students in the two groups were given a pretest of translation. To do so, they were given two text containing 400 words and asked to translate them. The translations were assessed using the checklist by the two raters and inter-rater reliability was established. Then, the two groups were compared in terms of translation quality ability using Independent Samples t-test. The t-test indicated that two groups were not significantly different in terms of translation ability prior to the treatment. In the first experimental group, the participants received peer feedback. To do so, the following steps were taken:

- The participants were asked to translate the course material provided to them by the course instructor.

- One of the researchers provided the participants with the simplified translation quality checklist (See Appendix B). Half an hour was spent to elaborate on the components of the check list and familiarize learners with them.
- The instructor asked the participants pair up and swap their translated texts with each other.
- They were then asked to comment on their peer's translation based on the components of the checklist.
- The participants were also informed that apart from the components of the checklist, they could also give overall comments regarding the quality of their peer's work.
- In the next phase, the participants were asked to talk about the comments with their peers.
- Peers revised their work according to the feedback they received.

As for the self-assessment experimental group, the following procedure was carried out:

- The participants in this group, similar to the peer feedback group, received a copy of the simplified assessment checklist (See Appendix B) and the components were elaborated on by one of the researchers.
- The participants were asked to translate the course material provided by the course instructor.
- To assure that the assessment process was done effectively, one of the researchers self-assessed one of his own works and gave a copy to the participants.
- The participants were then asked to evaluate their own work based on the components of the checklist.
- They were also asked to give their translation an overall score indicating the quality of their translation.

- Finally, they revised their translation works according to the checklist criteria and their own evaluation.

The duration of the study was approximately 13 weeks, with the classes meeting one session a week. The treatment phase lasted for ten weeks. The first session was spent on the TOEFL administration. The second session was devoted to pretest and the last session was allocated to posttest. Upon administering the posttest, the researchers gave both groups the posttest of translation and scored them based on the components of the as

essment checklist with the aid of another rater.

RESULTS

Investigating the First Research Question

The first research question was about the effect of self-assessment on the quality of translation. In order to examine the effect of self-assessment on the quality of translation, quality of translation of the group receiving self-assessment before and after the treatment was compared. Table 4.2 shows the learners' scores in the quality of translation before and after the self-assessment.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest of Self-Assessment Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
						Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Pair 1	Pretest Self	55.4833	30	11.94563	2.18096	.071	30	.200*
	Posttest Self	60.0167	30	12.47583	2.27776	.131	30	.197

As can be seen in Table 2, the mean score of the group is 55.48 before the treatment and 60.01 after the treatment. In addition, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality demonstrated the normal distribution of both pretest and posttest scores

($p > 0.05$). In order to investigate the statistical significance of the mean difference, a paired samples t-test was employed. Table 3 shows the results of the paired samples t-test.

Table 3

Results of Paired Samples t-test between Pretest and Posttest of the Self-Assessment Group

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pretest Self – Posttest Self	-4.53333	7.22177	1.31851	-7.22999	-1.83668	-3.438	29	.002

Based on the output of paired samples t-test, there was a significant difference between pretest and posttest mean scores ($t_{(29)} = 3.43, p = 0.002$). Accordingly, the null hypothesis was rejected. It could be concluded that self-assessment had a significant and positive effect on the translation quality of students.

Investigating the Second Research Question

The second research question was about the effect of peer-assessment on the quality of translation. Quality of translation of the group receiving peer-assessment before and after the treatment was compared. Table 4 shows the learners' mean scores before and after treatment for the peer-assessment group.

Table 4**Descriptive Statistics for Pretest and Posttest of Peer-Assessment**

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
						Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Pair 1	Pretest Peer	53.3000	30	15.03421	2.74486	.153	30	.071
	Posttest Peer	67.0333	30	12.04656	2.19939	.120	30	.200*

As Table 4 indicates, the pretest mean score of this group is 53.30 and the posttest mean score is 67.03. In addition, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality demonstrated that data were

normally distributed ($p > 0.05$). Table 5 shows the results of the paired samples t-test between the pretest and posttest for the peer-assessment group.

Table 5**Results of Paired Samples t-test between Pretest and Posttest for the Peer-Assessment Group**

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	PrePeer - PostPeer	-1.3733E1	8.5930	1.56887	-16.9420	-10.5246	-8.75	29	.000

Based on the output of paired samples t-test, there was a significant difference between pretest and posttest scores ($t_{(29)} = 8.75$, $p = 0.00$). Accordingly, the null hypothesis was rejected. Peer-assessment had a significant and positive effect on the translation quality of students.

Investigating the Third Research Question

The third research question was proposed to ex

amine any significant difference between the effect of self-assessment and peer feedback on the quality of translation. Therefore, the pretest and posttest scores of the two groups (self-assessment vs peer assessment group) were compared. Table 6 shows the translation quality scores of the two groups of the study in pretest and posttest.

Table 6**Pretest and Posttest Scores of the two Groups of the Study**

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pre	peer	30	53.3000	15.03421	2.74486
	self	30	55.4833	11.94563	2.18096
Post	peer	30	67.0333	12.04656	2.19939
	self	30	60.0167	12.47583	2.27776

As can be seen in Table 6, peer-assessment had a mean score of 53.30 while self-assessment had a mean score of 55.48 in pretest. In posttest, peer-assessment had a mean score of 67.03 while self-assessment had a mean score of 60.01. It was previously established that pretest and posttest scores of the two groups were normally

distributed. Therefore, to make sure about the statistical significance of differences in terms of mean scores, two independent samples t-tests was employed. Table 7 shows the results of independent samples t-tests on the pretest and posttest scores of the two groups.

Table 7**Results of Independent Samples t-test on Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Groups**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Inter- val of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Pre Peer and self-Groups	4.713	.034	-.623	58	.536	-2.18333	3.50583	-9.20102	4.83435
Post Peer and self-Groups	.074	.786	2.216	58	.031	7.01667	3.16631	.67861	13.35473

In pretest, there was no significant difference between self-assessment and peer-assessment groups in terms of translation quality ($t_{(58)} = .623$, $p = 0.536$), but peer-assessment group outperformed the self-assessment group in posttest ($t_{(58)} = 2.21$, $p = 0.031$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. That is, a significant difference existed between the effect of self-assessment and peer-assessment on translation quality of students, with the peer assessment group outperforming the self-assessment group.

DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

The purpose of the study was to explore the effect of self-assessment and peer assessment on translation quality. The translation quality of the participants were measured using translation quality assessment checklist before and after treatment. Through running paired samples t-test, it was found that there were significant differences between pretest and posttest scores of the participants suggesting positive effects for self-assessment and peer-assessment on the translation quality of the participants. Result of independent samples t-test showed that peer assessment group scored significantly higher in posttest pointing to the fact that peer assessment was more effective than self-assessment on the translation quality of the students.

The first explanation for the positive effect of both self-assessment and peer-assessment on the translation quality of the students can be the significant role assessment has in encouraging students to work more robustly on translation

quality. Encouraging all students to comment or to correct their mistakes can be of enormous help because sometimes they may not notice the problems and mistakes in their writing or translation unless they are made aware of them through some kind of feedback procedure. As Alexander, Schallert, and Hare (1991) argue, feedback can be seen as information used by a learner to confirm, augment, overwrite, adjust, or restructure information in memory. This feedback can be given through self-assessment procedure or peer-assessment procedure as was the case in the present study. Feedback enables them to set plausible goals and to monitor their performance with respect to their goals so that adjustments in effort, direction, and even strategy can be made as need rises.

With regard to the positive effect of self-assessment on the translation quality of students, it can be noted that self-assessment can be beneficial for learners by enhancing their autonomy. With the emergence of the theories and principles of learner autonomy, some concepts including self-assessment were highlighted in L2 teaching and testing (Gipps, 1994). According to the definition given by Pintrich and Zusho (2002), self-regulated learning is concerned with a dynamic constructive process through which individuals set goals for their learning. During this process, they monitor, regulate, and manage their cognition, motivation, and behavior. Rolheiser and Ross (2013) maintain that the learners' positive self-evaluations motivate them to set higher goals and devote more energy or time to them. Kastrati

(2013) argues that self-evaluation can result in the following 3 benefits: (1) learners would perform more cognitively especially with respect to self-evaluation of narrative writing skills, (2) Self-evaluation enhances learners' motivation, and (3) being provided with a chance to self-evaluate, students tend to actively participate in their learning activities, resulting in positive perception of their own evaluation.

On the other hand, the higher effect of peer assessment can also be justified by the points already discussed above in relation to the benefits of assessment. In addition, there are some extra benefits pertinent to peer assessment because of interactions occurring in peer assessment. One of the main learning theory behind interaction is ZPD and sociocultural theory of Vygotsky. In these theories, certain elements like interaction, feedback, and cooperation and collaboration play important roles (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). All these elements are considered essential in various forms of human learning. Harris (1997) rightly maintains that, in order to learn effectively, learners should be aware of their own learning, capabilities, and the achievements that they are having and what they are or are not able to do regarding what they have learned.

One major limitation of the present study is that it investigated the quality of translation as a product rather than a process. Future studies may replicate this study but focus on the development of quality in the course of self and peer-assessment. Mechanisms involved in peer and self-assessment might be associated with different aspects of quality of the final product.

CONCLUSION

Quality translation is the ultimate goal for those studying translation which points to the fact that enhancing the quality of translation among the translation students is of utmost importance. But how this goal is achieved and how learner can best be trained for this purpose is still under investigation. Having said that the relationship between translation quality and translation quality assessment can be better understood. The current

study was an attempt to investigate the effect of self-assessment and peer-assessment on the quality of students' translation. The study adopted a pretest posttest design and students' translation quality was measured before and after practicing self-assessment and peer-assessment. Self-assessment was operationalized through students' evaluation of their own translation works by using the criteria in a given assessment checklist while peer-assessment was operationalized through students' evaluation of their partners using the same but a simplified assessment checklist.

The results of within groups and between groups comparison indicated that both self-assessment and peer-assessment were effective in enhancing the quality of translation of students. Moreover, it was found that peer-assessment was more effective than self-assessment in this regard.

Based on the findings, it was concluded that self-assessment and peer-assessment have the potentials to be used positively to improve the quality of translation. However, research findings are rarely conclusive and any generalization regarding the efficacy of either kinds of assessment should be done with care.

With regard to theoretical implications, the current study provides additional support for theories on interaction, feedback and assessment. Based on the results of the study, Iranian teachers are encouraged to use assessment either in the form self-assessment or peer-assessment to enhance translation quality of students. Moreover, material developers can also take benefit of positive aspects of self-assessment or peer-assessment for translation instruction.

References

- Alexander, P. A., Schallert, D. L., & Hare, V. C. (1991). Coming to terms: How researchers in learning and literacy talk about knowledge. *Review of educational research, 61*, 315-343.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A course book on translation*. London: Routledge.
- Birjandi, P., & Siyyari, M. (2010). Self-assessment and peer-assessment: A

- comparative study of their effect on writing performance and rating accuracy. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 23-45.
- Butler, Y., & Lee, J. (2010). The effects of self-assessment among young learners of English. *Language Testing*, 27, 5-31.
- Clark, I. L. (2003). *Concepts in Composition: Theory and practice in the teaching of writing*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Diab, N. M. (2011). Assessing the relationship between different types of student feedback and the quality of revised writing. *Assessing Writing*, 16(4), 274-292. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2011.08.001
- Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice (2nd ed.)*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gentzler, E. (2001). *Contemporary translation theories*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gipps, C. (1994). *Beyond Testing: Towards a theory of educational assessment*. London: Falmer Press.
- Harris, M. (1997). Self-assessment on language learning in formal setting. *ELT Journal*, 51, 12-14.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.
- House, J. (1997). *Translation quality assessment: A model revisited*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment. Past and present*. New York: Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. New Yor: Cambridge University Press.
- Kastrati, S. (2013). Student self-evaluation in Albanian language. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 3, 431-456.
- Khanmohammad H., O., M., & Osanloo, M. (2009). Moving toward objective scoring: A rubric for translation assessment. *JELS*, 1, 131-153.
- Kroll, B. (2001). Consideration for teaching an ESL/EFL writing course. Retrieved from <http://getyourreadings.wikispaces.com/file/view/Kroll%20writing.pdf/394116670/Kroll%20writing.pdf>
- Lantolf, J. O., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leki, I. (1990). Potential problems with peer responding in ESL writing classes. *CATESOL Journal*, 3, 5-19.
- Neubert, A., & Shreve, G. M. (1992). *Translation as text*. Kent: Kent State University Press.
- Nida, E., A. (1964). *Toward a science of translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- O'Malley, J., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). *Authentic assessment for language learners*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Publishing.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Zusho, A. (2002). Student motivation and self-regulated learning in the college classroom. In J. C. Smart & W. G. Tierney (Eds.), *Higher Education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. vol. XVII). New York: Agathon Press.
- Richards, J., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3 ed.). London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Rolheiser, C., & Ross, J. (2013). Student self-evaluation what research says and what practice shows. *Plain talk about kids*, 43-57.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59, 23-30.
- Shuttleworth, M. (1998). Polysystem theory. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. pp. 176-179). London: Routledge.
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam John Benjamins.

Biodata

Mohamad Beiranvand is a master degree student in the field of Translation Studies at the Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran. In his master's thesis, he investigated the roles of self-assessment and peer feedback in improving translation quality.

Email: mbeyranvand49@gmail.com

Dr Ghafour Rezaie is an assistant professor of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) at the Islamic Azad University, Garmsar Branch, Garmsar, Iran. His main research interests include cognitive aspects of second language acquisition, research in applied linguistics, and language assessment. He has published, reviewed, and edited numerous research articles.

Email: gh.rezaie@iaugarmsar.ac.ir

Appendix (A)

Translation Assessment Checklist for the Raters (Khanmohammad & Osanloo, 2009, pp. 146-149)

Score range	Description
Accuracy (30%)	
25-30	No identifiable problems of comprehension; original message has been conveyed completely to TL readers; no omissions or additions to information
21-24	Virtually no problems of comprehension except with the most highly specialized vocabulary with no influence on TL readers' understanding; some partial omissions and additions
16-20	Information is conveyed to TL readers with some difficulty due to translator misunderstanding of some parts of original message; apparent omissions and additions
11-15	Poor expression of ideas; numerous serious problems in understanding ST interfere with communication of original message; difficult to understand TT
1-10	Severe problems interfere greatly with communication of original message; TL reader can't understand what original writer was trying to say
Finding equivalent (25%)	
20-25	All lexical and syntactic elements have been understood; precise vocabulary usage; words have been chosen so skillfully that the work reads like a good publishable version
15-19	Full comprehension and good usage of a wide range of vocabulary and structures; specialized vocabulary presents some problems with unsuitable equivalents
10-14	General comprehension of a fair range of vocabulary although some gaps observed; some vocabulary misused; some evidence of plausible attempts to work around difficulties of finding equivalents, perception, wordplay and other linguistic features
5-9	Comprehension of vocabulary and structures show quite noticeable gaps which obscure sense; problems in finding correct vocabularies; unable to cope with specialized vocabulary
1-4	Inappropriate use of vocabularies; comprehension of original seriously impeded even with fairly everyday vocabulary and structures; translation as a whole makes little sense
Register, TL culture (20%)	
17-20	Good sensitivity to nuances of meaning, register are precisely and sensitively captured; there is a sophisticated awareness of the cultural context; translation shows a sophisticated command of TL lexis, syntax, and register

13-16	There is a fair degree of sensitivity to nuances of meaning, register, and cultural context
9-12	There is a lack of sustained attention to nuances of meaning, register, and cultural context; no awareness of register; TL lexis, syntax, and register are not always appropriate
4-8	There is scant attention to nuances of meaning, register, and cultural context; there are serious to severe shortcomings in the use of appropriate lexis, syntax, and register
1-3	There is no appreciable understanding of nuances of meaning, register, and cultural context; no concept of register or sentence variety

Grammar and ST style (15%)

13-15	Gives the feeling that the translation needs no improvement from grammatical and stylistic points though one or two natural failings might be observed; native-like fluency in grammar
10-12	Shows flair for stylistic manipulation of TL items as if text were written in TL originally except where the language is placed under severe pressure of comprehension; maintains advanced proficiency in grammar; some grammatical problems but with no influence on message
7-9	Tends to have awkward grammatical usage in TL and literality of rendering though but not impeding sense in a significant manner; some attempts to reflect stylistic features of the original; some grammatical problems are apparent and have negative effects on communication
4-6	Clumsy TL; often nonsensical grammatical usages in TL; unnatural sounding; little attempt to reflect stylistic features of the original; there is evidence of clear difficulties in following style; grammatical review of some areas is clearly needed
1-3	Little sense of style which often makes poor sense in TL; knowledge of grammar is inadequate; use of TL grammar is inadequate; severe grammatical problems interfere greatly with message

Shifts, omissions, additions and inventing equivalents (10%)

9-10	Correct use of relative clauses, verb forms; use of parallel structure; creative inventions and skillful solutions to equivalents; no fragment or run-on sentence
7-8	Almost all shifts appear with partial trespass, attempts variety; some inventions for not available equivalents in TL; no fragment or run-on sentence
5-6	Some shifts but not consistency; awkward and odd structure; only few run-on sentences or fragments present
3-4	Lacks variety of structure due to not preserving necessary shifts except for few cases; little or no evidence of invention in equivalents
1-2	Unintelligible sentence structure due to completely ignoring necessary shifts; no skillful handling of equivalents; no trace of invention

Appendix (B)

Translation Assessment Checklist for the Participants (based on Khanmohammad & Osanloo, 2009)

Number	Items	Score Out of Five
1	The text in the target langue (Persian) is comprehensible.	
2	The Persian and English text both have the same message and the main content has been translated well.	
3	The equivalences used for the words are precise and well-chosen.	
4	The points related to the cultural norms of the target language (Persian) have been well-observed in choosing the equivalences.	
5	The translation does not need any improvement in terms of grammar and word choice.	
6	The verb forms and relative clauses have been used without any mistakes in the target language (Persian).	
7	The sentences of the translated work are short enough to be comprehended well by the readers.	
8	Overall, the translation seems satisfactory to me.	