The Objectivity of the Two Main Academic Approaches to TQA: An Analytical Study

Mashael Almutairi
Princess Nora University, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Translation quality assessment (TQA) is a controversial area in Translation Studies. Scholars attribute this to the subjective nature of quality, believed to result from the multiplicity of assessment criteria. However, the literature review reveals that translation scholars attribute different reasons to the decreased level of objectivity in current TQA practices. This study hypothesises that although subjectivity in TQA cannot be eliminated, it can be reduced to a more acceptable level if quality assessment adopts the criteria believed by translation scholars to lend more objectivity to the assessment.

1. Background

Translation quality assessment (TQA) has been described by many researchers as a process whereby a translation critic examines a translated text for the purpose of assessing its quality (Munday, 2001 & Zequan, 2003). For an examination to be valid and reliable, it has to follow determined rules and standards (Williams, 2001). However, establishing criteria for translation quality assessment is a difficult task, and is believed to be "probably one of the most controversial, intensely debated topics in translation scholarship and practice" (Colina, 2009: 236). This can be attributed to the fact that the assessment criteria are still negotiable in the field, as there is little agreement on how to define the concept of translation quality either from a practical or a theoretical viewpoint (Williams, 2001). This can also be related to the relative nature of quality itself, which is believed to be too complex and too context-dependent to be formulated under one definition (Nord, 1997). The existing disagreements among translation scholars regarding quality assessment criteria have been acknowledged by many researchers such as Reiss (1971), Bowker (2000), and Williams (2001). House (1997) explains that such disagreements arise due to the fact that evaluating the quality of a translation depends on the theory of translation used; different theories eventually express different views of translation, express different concepts of translation quality, and therefore, lead to different ways of assessing quality.

Despite these disagreements, many researchers do agree that translation quality is connected with various factors and can be observed from diverse angles. These factors, which could be attributed to quality, do not all have the same weight in each translation task, and are therefore not equally measurable or assessable. Quality, for instance, can be regarded as the fulfilment of user needs or expectations, the enhancement of work efficiency, profitability, deadline compliance, resources and tools availability, etc. From the industrial sector, quality can be viewed as the ability to fulfil a client-defined set of parameters (Jiménez-Crespo, 2009). However, in academia, the concept of quality has traditionally been linked to values such as accuracy, correctness and fidelity to the original. Notwithstanding the various theories about the concept of quality, some scholars agree that it is a subjective concept, and that this is the main reason for the lack of consensus when it comes to quality assessment criteria (Horguelin and Brunette 1998; Larose 1998; Parra 2005; Maier 2000). However, this subjective nature should not hinder any attempts to provide an objective assessment of translation quality. The

aim of this study is to identify how the approaches that are broadly used to assess translation quality achieve a reduction in the subjectivity inherent to translation quality assessment. This is carried out within the context of political discourse, more specifically, the Arab Spring presidential speeches, where translation played a significant role in the understanding of the political settings and events of the Arab world. Therefore, translation errors can cause unintended consequences, as they can negatively affect the world's understanding of this important junction in modern Arab history.

2. The Objectivity of TQA

Some translation scholars believe that the search for an assessment method that can achieve full objectivity in every situation, context and for every type of text seems illusory (Mateo, 2014:75). Others, in contrast, argue that although subjectivity cannot be entirely eliminated, it can be reduced to an acceptable level if it is based on a set of agreed-upon criteria of objectivity employed as a yardstick for comparing real versus ideal translations (Doyle 2003; Colina 2008, 2009). A survey concerning this particular point reveals that translation scholars suggest the following criteria to ensure a higher level of objectivity. (1) the mark given as a quality index of a particular translation can be justified (Mateo: 2014:80-81), (2) the negative and the positives aspects of the translation are both considered in the assessment of translation quality (Waddington, 2001), (3) the model of assessment is built on scientific theories of translation (House, 1997,2001), (4) the model includes a quantification dimension in the assessment which means that errors are assigned different weights depending on their consequences (Williams, 2001), (5) the assessment follows a multi-perspective viewpoint which means that both micro and macro levels of possible errors (linguistic and nonlinguistic) are covered (House, 2001-2), and (6) the model does not ignore the effect of the text type on the evaluation process which means that text genre is considered in the assessment (Reiss, 1971,2000).

The two main academic approaches in TQA (error-based and holistic) promise to provide objective assessment of translation quality. However, there is no previous empirical study that discusses which of these six criteria of objectivity is employed by each approach. Notwithstanding the rarity of empirical research on this area, the objectivity in the methods that are based on error analysis is believed to stem from the fact that they can give accurate accounts of both the type and number of errors committed in a translation. This is especially true if they are based on established theories and are equipped with statistical tools which, in turn, can be more reliable and objective than basing the evaluation on subjective judgments (Waddington, 2001). However, some scholars argue that the focus of these methods is only on errors, meaning that they are possibly established on a fallacy, this being: "the overall quality of a translation is equal to the sum of the defects it contains" (Waddington, 2001:21). As a result, error analysis methods only measure the defects in a translation, and ignore any positive aspects in the overall quality assessment of a particular text. It is undoubtedly true that errors undermine the quality of a translation, but it is also true that two translations with the same number of errors may vary in terms of overall quality (Waddington, 2001). Therefore, although methods based on error analysis provide a clear justification of the mark reached, they do not account for positive solutions that are used to solve certain translation problems.

On the other hand, the objectivity of holistic methods, the other assessment approach, stems from considering both the negative and positive aspects of the translation in the

assessment process (Waddington, 2001). However, the relevant literature reveals the restricted view of errors in the holistic methods (Pym, 1992). Although they consider both the negative and positive aspects of the translation, the error detection in this approach is not comprehensively governed by a systematic classification or quantification of errors such as that of error analysis, as holistic assessment mainly relies on the detection of certain types of errors and neglect large areas of potential errors. Therefore, it then seems reasonable within the context of this study to hypothesise that the approach encompassing most of these six criteria is more likely to reduce the level of subjectivity inherent to translation quality assessment, and achieve a higher level of objectivity.

While each approach takes different considerations into account in the assessment of translation quality, no evidence has been empirically established on the differences between these two approaches when applied to the assessment of translation quality of political discourse. Therefore, this study intends to put both approaches to the test and examine the outcome of applying them to assess the quality of the same political texts, to explore the reasons behind any differences in their applicability, and to identify how they reduce the subjectivity inherent to quality assessment. There may be some assumptions concerning the superiority of one approach over the other, in terms of providing objective feedback, but with the realisation that there is a rarity of empirical studies in the area of TQA (Colina 2008, 2009; Jiménez Crespo 2001), this study aims to contribute to the field of translation quality assessment by examining the issue in question empirically.

3. Research Methodology

To ensure that the analysis is not based upon subjective considerations, it must be built upon the results of an "objective" measurement tool. However, with regards to translation quality assessment, the main argument is that it is a subjective process (Horguelin and Brunette 1998; Parra 2005). This study is based upon the notion that the recognition of the relative subjective nature of TQA "does not invalidate the objective part of the assessment", rather, "it merely reinforces its necessity" (House, 2001, p. 256). Therefore, in order to assess the quality of a certain translation, following Waddington (2001), three steps should be taken into account: firstly, the concept of quality must be well-defined, because translation quality is traditionally believed to be the one that fits its purpose (Nord 1997, O'Brien 2012). Secondly, the methodology must be chosen precisely, so as to select the assessment method that can successfully measure the defined translation quality. Lastly, the assessment should be carried out in accordance with the predefined notion of quality, and the chosen assessment methodology. In line with these three steps, I will first specify the type of quality that this study aims to address (textual quality), and then will explain the method used to assess this specific quality (textual analysis).

A. Textual Quality

Among the "3Ps" of translation quality, (quality of the producer, of the process and of the product), in this study, assessment focuses on the quality of the product, specifically the textual quality. The view of translation quality in this work equates to the notion that the linguistic choices in the target text should be in line with the source text's standards of cohesion, coherence, informativity, intentionality, situationality, and intertextuality. In other

words, quality is considered to be the level of appropriateness of the linguistic choices made in the translated texts to represent the linguistic and nonlinguistic ones of the original texts (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). House (1997) believes that adopting a textual approach to the assessment of translation quality values the textual quality of the output. Therefore, the textual quality of a translation can best be assessed by means of textual analysis. With this in mind, the discussion will shift to that of textual analysis and its benefits and appropriateness as a methodology to assess the translation's textual quality.

B. Textual Analysis

Textuality is believed to be "the complex set of features that texts must have to be considered texts. It is a property that a complex linguistic object assumes when it reflects certain social and communicative constraints" (Neubert and Shreve, 1992, p.70). Textuality is also proposed to be the basis of the actualisation (the evolution of a text) and the utilisation of texts (Beaugrande, 1980). Therefore, selecting a textual approach to the study of translation holds great benefit at both theoretical and practical levels. On the theoretical level, applying a textual approach to the analysis of texts and their translations entails emphasising the textual aspect of translation, and also clears the ground for a more sophisticated treatment of translated texts (Neubert, 1996). It can also be insightful on different levels, and can have theoretical and practical implications that would contribute to the general field of translation, as well as that of translation assessment and translator training. On the practical level, the benefits of applying a textual analysis have been highlighted by many researchers. Al-Faqi (2000), for instance, avers that the analysis of separate sentences would yield partial meanings. The meanings of the text as a whole can only be understood by means of textual analysis, whereby the devices and elements that contribute to the emergence of meaning are all explored. Within the context of translator training, Schaeffner (2002) also points out that textual approaches to the analysis of translations can highlight specific textual features which might present translation problems, in order to steer translation decisions. As for translation students, she adds, following a textual approach can help them "become sensitized to recognize linguistic structures in texts", and

"learn to reflect on the specific functions of textual structures for the overall purpose of texts in a communicative context, and based on such reflections they will be able to make informed decisions as to the linguistic structures required for the target text in the new context and culture for new addresses".
(Schaeffner. 2002, pp. 6-7)

She concludes that applying a textual approach promotes the development of translation competence, since it "heighten[s] students' awareness of the process involved in translating and in the production of translation" (Schaeffner. 2002, pp. 6-7). Moreover, Hartmann (1980) proposes that the transphrastic textuality hypothesis may be the guiding principle behind the development of text linguistics. This hypothesis postulates the following assumptions: (1) the linguistic and extralinguistic factors correlate only in texts, (2) a characterisation of the linguistic patterns should go beyond the phrase or sentence level, and (3) textuality is a more realistic notion for capturing communicative events than the narrowly conceived notions of grammaticality, and semanticality. This notion of textuality, as Beaugrande (1980) maintains, is a factor that arises from communicative procedures for text utilisation, and is thus an essential task in the study of the aspects of text linguistics. In fact, Beaugrande (2004) later suggests that text linguistics logically shifted the conceptual centre from "grammaticality" over

to textuality, which is characterised by its realistic nature.

According to Beaugrande (2002), textuality should be viewed as a human achievement in making connections wherever communicative events occur, and is not a set of theoretical units or rules, nor is it a linguistic property that a text may or may not possess. Beaugrande (2004) also argues that textuality designates the total relatedness of the text; meaning that the seven standards of textuality interrelate to achieve connections. He believes that cohesion is concerned with the connections among linguistic forms, coherence with the connections among concepts, intentionality with the connections to the speakers' intentions, acceptability with the receivers' engagement to the text, informativity with how new the content is, situationality with the circumstances of the interaction, and intertextuality in terms of relations with other texts, particularly those with a similar text type. By proposing the seven standards of textuality, Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) advocate a procedural approach to the study of texts. In such an approach, all the levels are described in terms of their utilisation. They argue (1994) that in a procedural approach the analyst's task is not restricted to only dividing a text into phonemes and morphemes or analysing its syntactic structures, but also to explore textuality aspects. According to them, this is because exploring textuality aspects activates spheres of significance and relevance between linguistic elements and extralinguistic factors such as culture, society, ideology, emotion, personality, and so on.

Given the above discussion, and as the translation quality assessment method has to be customised to assess the predefined quality, and since adopting a textual approach values the textual quality of the output (House, 1997), the seven standards of textuality are proposed as the basis of textual analysis of the outcomes of the holistic and error-based assessment methods as specified below.

C. Description of the Error Analysis Method (A):

In the proposed model, each of Beaugrande and Dressler's seven standards of textuality is considered to be a criterion against which the quality of the translation is measured. This means that quality is addressed against seven main potential areas of errors. Beaugrande and Dressler's seven standards are used to conduct a contrastive textual analysis of the presidential speeches selected for the study and their respective translations, for the purpose of assessing their quality. Textual analysis of the selected data essentially consists of two main procedures: analysing the ST's potential area of error, and a comparison of the ST to the TT for assessment. After conducting the textual analysis and identifying the errors, errors will then be counted in order to establish a preliminary quality index for that particular translation. The number of errors compared to the number of words in each text is finally calculated to assign a mark out of ten for the quality of each text.

D. Description of the Holistic Approach Method (B):

To ensure that both approaches are treated equally, and since the researcher has tested

the method (A) herself, two external evaluators from the CIOL (the Chartered Institute of Linguists) are given the same translations in order to provide a holistic assessment of their quality. In addition, to also ensure that the assessment is not a reflection of the raters' selected holistic model, they have been provided with the same holistic method. Using the same model (Waddington's model), the raters must assign a mark out of ten for the quality of each translation, provided that the assigned mark is justified in a written feedback. For each of the five levels of quality indicated in Waddington's model, the translation can be graded on a scale of two points against each of the five levels. In this model, a translation is assessed based on two main parameters: the accuracy of transferring the ST content and the quality of expression in the TL.

After applying both methods of assessment to the same texts, the overall quality index of each method will be compared. By the end of the research, each of the four translated texts will have received two marks: one from the application of assessment method (A), and one from the application of method (B). Finally, both results will undergo close contrastive analysis in order to investigate the differences between the application of each approach, and identify how they reduce the subjectivity inherent to quality assessment.

4. Discussion of Results

4.1 Justification of the Quality Index

The overall quality index obtained with each assessment method is summarised in the table below:

Quality Index	Speech No (1)	Speech No (2)	Speech No (3)	Speech No (4)
Method (A)	3.4/10	6/10	4.6/10	5.2/10
Method (B)	2.75/10	6/10	6.75/10	7.75/10
The Overall Quality Indexes from Method (A) and Method (B)				

As discussed above, translation scholars strongly emphasise that following a predetermined set of rules in translation quality assessment is the dividing line between objective and subjective quality assessment (Martinez and Hurtado, 2001). They also add that without a clear perspective bases on which translation is assessed, TQA cannot escape the accusation of being a random, subjective practice. Mateo (2014) is one of the translation scholars who believe that one of the important criteria of objectivity that has to be considered in any translation assessment task to reduce its subjectivity is that the mark given by the evaluator as a quality index can be justified. This criteria of objectivity is actually to ensure that the rater of a certain translation task is basically following a predetermined criteria of assessment and, therefore, can justify his/her awarded marks.

- From the application of both methods, it can be noted that the mark obtained with Method (A) is quantitatively justified, as it is a reflection of the number of the errors present in the translated text compared to the total number of words in that translation, whereas the mark reached in Method (B) is only be qualitatively justified. Therefore, it can be concluded that the judgment statements, provided by the raters in this study, were not supported with any quantitative statistics.

- Although qualitative statements are hypothetically believed to increase the subjective nature of translation quality assessment given that, for the most part, they do not stem from a predefined set of parameters, but from raters' judgment and estimation, it is worth mentioning that the inter-rater reliability between this study's two external raters is quite high. This demonstrates that there is much consensus in the ratings, which were given independently by the two raters for the same assessment task. This could be considered as a positive aspect of the holistic model adopted.

- The translation error rate adopted in this study to render the number of errors detected from the error analysis in Method (A), does not appear to be affected by the length of the translated text. Although one would assume that the quality index would be significantly affected by the number of errors in short texts than in comparatively lengthy texts, the results obtained from the application of Method (A) proves this to be a false assumption. To elaborate, the quality index of the second speech is (6/10), whereas the quality index of the fourth speech is (5.2/10). The number of errors detected in these speeches compared to their word count vary considerably; the second speech has 29 errors, whereas the fourth speech has only 8. The word count in the second speech is (1014 words) compared to (311 words) for the fourth one. This sizeable difference is not matched in the awarded quality index, as the difference between the two values is small. Additionally, the number of errors compared to the number of words in the translated text does not appear to have much impact on the quality index in Method (B), where the quality is determined depending on two assessment criteria.

- The quality index in Method (B) is based on the separate scores that raters assign for the two governing criteria in the adopted holistic model (the accuracy of transfer from the original language and the quality of expression in the target language). In Speech No. (3) and (4), the relatively high marks awarded for the second criterion (the quality of expression in the target language) increased the overall quality index of those translations, notwithstanding the low marks assigned for the first criterion (the accuracy of transfer). In other words, the overall mark obtained in Method (B) may not reflect the low mark given for the first criteria, if the mark assigned for the second is relatively high.

4.2 Considering Translation Negative and Positive Aspects in TQA

The examination of this aspect reaches the following conclusions:

- The quality index in Method (A) reflects the defects in the translations only. It gives no credit

to creative strategies adopted by the translators to solve certain translation problems. Therefore, it can be argued that the view of TQA in error analysis models is restricted, since it focuses only on the negative aspects of a translation, which supposedly increases the element of subjectivity in the assessment.

- The view of translation quality seems to be more comprehensive in Method (B), given that it considers both the negative and positive aspects of quality. Both of the raters who are part of this study have asserted that they have given credit for good translations of certain phrases when awarding the marks. However, the importance of the positive aspects in Method (B) is only roughly estimated by the raters.

4.3 Building TQA Models on Established Theories of Translation

As for the implementation of this criterion, in the two assessment methods, it can be concluded that:

- Method (A) is built on a linguistic approach to translation that is extracted from the scientific theory of textuality. Beaugrande and Dressler's seven standards of textuality were used as evaluative parameters to assess the quality of the selected Arab Spring presidential speeches' translations. Assessment is, therefore, not based on subjective preferences but rather on whether the translated texts fulfil the expectations of the seven standards, as described by the original authors of the theory.

- Method (B) is also based on prominent notions in the field of translation, as it is mainly derived from a verifiable classification of translation adequacy. The assessment in this model is based on two criteria, namely, quality of accuracy of transfer from the SL and quality of expression in the TL, which together are established as verifiable notions of in TQA.

4.4 Including a Quantification Dimension in TQA

According to translation scholars, quantification is a criterion that can lend TQA more objectivity. Believing that without error weighing and quantification, the measurement criteria may not offer a convincing judgment, some translation scholars advocate combining both qualitative and quantitative measures in translation assessment (Williams, 2001). Generally speaking, most error analysis methods allocate different weights to different types of errors

according to the consequences they entail in the target text (Williams, 2001). Method (A), for instance, has a quantification dimension as the total number of errors is calculated against the total number of words of the translated texts to provide the overall quality index. This guarantee that the overall mark given for the overall quality is not randomly awarded.

As for the holistic model, although translated texts are given certain marks following a predefined set of criteria, the marks assigned for each level are too general that it cannot escape the need to rely on the rater's own judgment and evaluation, which may increase the level of subjectivity. Both raters emphasised that different types of errors were considered in the overall assessment. However, without having any clear predefined set of rules, the evaluator can only rely on his or her own view (Colina 2009), which is likely to increase the element of subjectivity. Both assessors differentiate in their feedback between errors that affect the successful transfer of meaning, and those that affect the quality of expression in the target language, without classifying them as major or minor errors every time they encounter them. The raters describe minor errors as those that result from incorrect use of English tenses throughout the text, misuse of definite and indefinite articles as well as prepositions, incorrect word order, and misspelling. Nevertheless, the raters in this study did not explain how they reflected the different type of errors that they have identified in their overall awarded marks.

The examination of the way in which this criterion of objectivity is implemented in the two assessment methods revealed that:

- Error quantification is implemented in Method (A), which is based on error analysis. As explained above, quality index is calculated following the adopted TER which basically reflects the total number of errors against the total number of words count in the translated texts.

- Method (B), on the other hand, does not quantify the type of errors or calculate the number of errors committed in a translation. This method does not clearly differentiate between different types of errors, and nor does it include explicit criteria upon which to base the evaluation.

4.5 Following a Multi-Perspective Assessment

Viewing translation evaluation as a generally arbitrary and subjective practice, and believing that the main task of translation quality assessment is to improve the evaluation

process, Holmes (1988, p.78) argues that this improvement can only be ensured if quality assessment is built on objective criteria. House (2001) argues that translation scholars can objectively assess a translation by following a multi-perspective viewpoint. If the evaluator carries out the analysis on both micro and macro levels, and at the same time maintains other important elements such as function, ideology, genre, register, and the communicative value of individual linguistic items, then subjectivity may be reduced. If the rater carries out the assessment on both micro and macro levels, subjectivity may be reduced, enabling the rater to then assess the translation quality more objectively. Therefore, adopting a multi-perspective assessment is a criterion that is believed to increase the level of objectivity in the assessment process. Models that reduce the concept of quality to the satisfaction of one or two quality criteria, such as function or translation effect, consequently restrict their view of quality. Thus, subjectivity can be reduced if quality assessment is based on the consideration of both the linguistic and nonlinguistic factors in the process of interpretation of the source text, and the assessment of the equivalent target text.

Method (A) considers both micro and macro levels of assessment, as the concept of textuality itself covers both the micro and macro levels of analysis and evaluation. Altogether, the seven standards of textuality accounts for both the linguistic and nonlinguistic factors that affect the creation of meaning and thus, can prove to be a suitable benchmark for evaluation.On the other hand, Method (B) does not reflect such inclusivity. The first rater stated that she "mainly considered the linguistic aspects of the translations only", and attributes this to the possibility that the translators could be under the pressure of deadlines, and thus concentrate on speed of delivery rather than absolute accuracy. She also justifies that translators "may be under instructions to omit passages they consider superfluous". However, she, along with the second rater, acknowledged that she had not considered nonlinguistic factors as mitigating factors in her assessment.

Examining the two methods of assessment in light of this criterion of objectivity exposed the following:

- As far as following a multi-perspective viewpoint of assessment is concerned, Method (A) proved to be comprehensive. This is because it covers most of the aspects of the text that contribute to the creation of meaning and as well as those which can be affected during the process of translation, and therefore can in turn impact the process of transferring the original

text's communicative value.

- The view of translation quality in Method (A), where the error analysis is based on the textuality theory, is that the linguistic choices in the target text should reflect the standards of cohesion, coherence, informativity, intentionality, situationality and intertextuality of the source texts, and considers quality to be the appropriateness of the linguistic choices in the translated texts with regards to the linguistic and nonlinguistic ones of the original texts. The assessment of quality in Method (A) proved to be based on the appreciation of both the micro level (represented in the standards of cohesion, coherence, informativity, and intentionality) and the macro level (represented in the examination of the standards of acceptability, situationality and intertextuality).

- Method (B) focuses mostly on the micro level of assessment. Assessment in this method is based on the acknowledgement of two main parameters: accuracy of transfer from the original text and quality of expression in the target language. These two parameters are generic, meaning that subjectivity can stem from the sole reliance on certain parameters, and the lack of consideration for other influencing factors.

4.6 Considering the Text Type in TQA

Reiss (1971, 2000) attributes the low level of objectivity in the current TQA practices to the ignorance of the text type's effect on the evaluation process. Hartmann (1980) believes that Reiss's book on translation criticism, which was written in 1971, is one of the earliest attempts to set up objective text typological criteria for the evaluation of all translation types. Reiss assumes that different text types require different translation methods, and that they would also need different evaluation criteria; a fact which she suggests translation scholars should take into consideration. Therefore, she advocates that translation scholars should identify the text type in order to avoid using inappropriate criteria for assessment. Therefore, Reiss suggests that establishing a text typology (namely literary, linguistic, and pragmatic) is the first step towards ensuring objectivity in translation quality assessment; a criterion which is only explicitly considered in Method (A) as the the text type is considered in the standards of intertextuality and acceptability.

As for Method (B), the model itself does not refer to this particular criterion of objectivity. This resulted in contradicting application of this model between the two raters. The first rater clearly stated acknowledging the effect of the text type in the assessment given, and having been aware that "these are political speeches addressed directly to the populace of the countries concerned, aimed at galvanising, persuading or reassuring them". She emphasised that the style of the translation should satisfy the style of the original author. The second rater, on the other hand, believes that the style of the text as a whole should be similar to the style expected from presidential speeches in the target language (English). The difference in the appreciation of the text type between the two raters is actually a normal consequence of the vagueness of the holistic model concerning this particular aspect.

Considering text type as a criterion of objectivity in the study's two methods of assessment uncovered the following:

- Although considering the text type in TQA is believed to lend the assessment process more objectivity, it is not explicitly implemented in either of the two assessment methods. The style, however, is considered in both methods.

- In Method (A), the effect of the text type on the assessment is acknowledged in the selected model, as the style is considered in the appreciation of the standard of acceptability, where the naturalness of the TT style is regarded as an assessment criterion. Style is also taken into account in the standard of intertextuality, where the relevant target text's style should resemble texts of similar nature.

- Text type is also considered in Method (B). However, it does not specify whether the style should reflect that of the original author, or of the text genre conventions in the target language. Therefore in this case, there is more room left to raters' preferences and judgments in Method (B) than Method (A).

It can be concluded here that the two assessment methods vary in their implementation and application of the above-mentioned objectivity criteria. Each applies some parts of the criteria more than the other. Method (A), for instance, sets a more systematic and inclusive approach to the detection of errors than the holistic assessment. The more specification the model has, the less room is left for the rater's preferences and therefore, subjectivity. Method (B), on the other hand, appreciates the inclusion of both the negative and positive aspects of assessment, whereas the other method focuses only on the negative elements, consequently

91

increasing subjectivity. Having said that, the differences in their application of the objectivity criteria does not imply that either method is more objective than the other. This study aimed to explore how the criteria of objectivity are implemented in each approach, in the optic of shedding light on various considerations regarding the need to focus more on certain criteria, so as to reach a higher level of objectivity.

5. Limitations of the Study

In this study, the ratio of the number of errors, which represent translation mistakes, to the number of errors, which illustrate language mistakes, is relatively high. The application of Method (A) resulted in (65) major errors and (18) minor errors, resulting in a relatively high ratio of approximately 4:1. However, this cannot be attributed to the restrictions of the model itself. Given that the translated texts are published in important English news agencies, language mistakes are less likely to be made than translation ones.

There could have been a greater number of texts included in this study if the non-official versions of the translations had not been excluded. The total word count of the translations used is (3728 words), and the total word count of the original texts is (2866 words). From the 12 presidential speeches delivered in 2011, four adhered to the selection criteria adopted in this study, meaning that they were fully translated and published by reliable English news agencies. The fan and crowdsourced translations were beyond the interest of this study, as they entailed different assessment criteria. As this research's main objective is to examine the differences in the application of two main approaches with regards to their objectivity, the limitation in the number of texts did not prevent the examination of the desired aspects.

6. Suggestions for Further Studies:

This study examined the objectivity of the holistic and error-based approaches to TQA, and attempted to identify how each method functions to reduce the subjectivity inherent to quality assessment practices. The conclusions reached in this study were based on the examination of two representative models, one from each approach. However, it would be interesting to apply another set of models from the same approaches to determine whether they generate similar results, to increase the validity of the current conclusions. In addition, it would be worthwhile to explore the identification and implementation of the criteria of objectivity for

the assessment of the other two types of translation quality - the quality of the process and the quality of the producer. This study attempted to propose a model for the TQA of Arabic-English translations based on the adaptation of some of the seven standards of textuality (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). Given that in this research, the proposed model was applied to political texts, it would be constructive to apply the adapted model on another genre and explore the outcomes.

References

Beaugrande, de R. (1980). *Text, Discourse, and Process Toward a Multidisciplinary Science of Texts*. Norwood, N. J.: Ablex,.

Beaugrande, de R. (2002). 'A Brief Survey of Discourse Analysis'. Retrieved June, 2015 from http://beaugrande.bizland.com/survey%20of%20discourse%20analysis.htm

Beaugrande, de R. (2004). 'A New Introduction to the Study of Text and Discourse'. Discursivism and Ecologism. Retrieved July 10, 2014 from http:// www.beaugrande.com/new_intro_to_study.htm

Beaugrande, de R. & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Bowker, L. (2000). 'Towards a Methodology for Exploiting Specialized Target Language Corpora as Translation Resources'. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 5: 17-52.

Colina, S. (2008). 'Translation Quality Evaluation'. *The Translator*, 14(1), 97-134. doi: 10.1080/13556509.2008.10799251

Colina, S. (2009). 'Further evidence for a functionalist approach to translation quality evaluation'. *Target*, 21(2), 235-264. doi:10.1075/target.21.2.02col

Doyle, M. (2003). 'Translation Pedagogy and Assessment: Adopting ATA's Framework for Standard ErrorMarking'. *The ATA Chronicle* November/December 2003.

Hartmann, R. (1980). *Contrastive Textology* (1st ed.). Heidelberg: Groos. Holmes, J. (1988). *Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam:

Rodopi.

Horguelin, P. & Brunette. L. (1998). Practique de la Revisión, 3ème Edition Revue et Augmenteé. Québec: Linguatech éditeur.

House, J. (1981). *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment.* Tubingen: Narr Verlag.

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

House, J. (2001). 'Translation Quality Assessment: Linguistic Description versus Social Evaluation'. *Meta*, 46(2), 243. doi:10.7202/003141ar

Jimenez-Crespo, M. (2009). 'The Evaluation of Pragmatic and Functionalist Aspects in Localization: Towards a Holistic Approach to Quality Assurance'. *The Journal of Internationalization and Localization* 1: 60-93.

Jimenez-Crespo, M. (2001). 'A Corpus-based Error Typology: Towards a More Objective Approach to Measuring Quality in Localization'. *Perspectives*, 19(4), 315-338. doi: 10.1080/0907676x.2011.615409

Maier, C. (2000). *Evaluation and Translation* (1st ed.). Manchester: St. Jerome. Martinez, N., and Hurtado, A. (2001). 'Assessment in Translation Studies: Research Needs'.

Meta, 47, 272287.

Mateo, R. (2014). 'A Deeper look into Metrics for Translation quality assessment (TQA): A case Study'. *Miscelánea journal of English and American studies* 49 (2014): pp. 73-94 ISSN: 1137-6368.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies* (1st ed.). London: Routledge. Neubert, A., & Shreve, G. (1992). *Translation as Text* (1st ed.). Kent, Ohio: Kent State

University   Press.
Neubert, A. (1996). 'Textlinguistics of Translation: The Textual Approach to Translation'.

Translation Perspectives (9), 87-106.

Nord, C. (1997). *Translation as a Purposeful Activity*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.

O'Brien, S. (2012). 'Towards a Dynamic Quality Evaluation Model for Translation'. *Jostrans*: *The Journal of Specialized Translation* 17. Retrieved from http://www. jostrans.org/issue17/art_obrien.php (Accessed June, 2014).

Parra, Si. (2005). 'La Revisión de Traducciones en la Traductología: Aproximación a la Práctica de la Revisión en el Ámbito Profesional Mediante el Estudio de Casos y Propuestas de Investigación'. (Doctoral Dissertation, Universidad de Granada, Spain).

Pym, A. (1992). 'Translation Error Analysis and the Interface with Language Teaching'. *The Teaching Of Translation*, 279-288.

Reiss, K. (1971). Moglichkeiten und Grenzen der Ubersetzungskritik (1st ed.). Munchen: M. Hueber.

Reiss, K.. (2000). *Translation Criticism: the Potentials and Limitations* (1st ed.). Manchester, U.K.: St. Jerome Publications.

Schäffner, C. (2002). *The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translator Training*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Waddington, C. (2001). 'Different Methods of Evaluating Student Translations: The Question of Validity'. *Meta*, 46(2), p. 311.

Williams, M. (2001). 'The Application of Argumentation Theory to Translation Quality Assessment'. *Meta* (2), P. 26-44.

Williams, M. (2003). *Translation Quality Assessment*. Ottawa: Ottawa University Press.

Zequan, L. (2003). 'Register Analysis as a Tool for Translation Quality Assessment'. *Translation Journal,* Vol. (3), (7-26).