



Íkala, revista de lenguaje y cultura

ISSN: 0123-3432

revistaikala@udea.edu.co

Universidad de Antioquia

Colombia

Ramírez Giraldo, Juan Guillermo

A Rationale for a Translator-Centered, Process-Oriented Methodology for Translation Quality  
Assessment

Íkala, revista de lenguaje y cultura, vol. 10, núm. 16, enero-diciembre, 2005, pp. 129-147

Universidad de Antioquia

Medellín, Colombia

Available in: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=255020409005>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's homepage in redalyc.org

redalyc.org

Scientific Information System

Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America, the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal

Non-profit academic project, developed under the open access initiative

# **A Rationale for a Translator-Centered, Process-Oriented Methodology for Translation Quality Assessment\***

Trad. Juan Guillermo Ramírez Giraldo\*\*

Normally the translation scholars concerned with the lack of objective parameters with which to carry out effective translation quality assessment processes have conducted their studies based on what is most easily observable: translated texts. In this article, we propose a methodology for the assessment of translated texts within an undergraduate translation program that takes into account not only the final product of the translation, but also the processes that led to the translated text and the subject who produced it.

**Keywords:** Translation Quality Assessment, Translation Criticism, Descriptive Translation Studies, Translation Studies.

En términos generales, los estudiosos de la traducción que abordan el problema de la falta de parámetros objetivos en los procesos de evaluación de la calidad de traducciones realizan sus estudios partiendo de los hechos más fácilmente observables: los textos traducidos. En este artículo proponemos una metodología para la evaluación de los textos traducidos en un programa de pregrado en traducción que tenga en cuenta no sólo el producto final de la traducción, sino también el proceso que lo originó y el sujeto que produjo dicho texto.

**Palabras clave:** evaluación de traducciones, crítica de traducciones, estudios descriptivos de la Traducción, estudios de Traducción.

Un nombre important de théoriciens de la traduction qui s'occupent du manque de paramètres objectifs pour l'évaluation effective de textes traduits ont conduit leurs études sur la base de faits qui sont plus facilement observables : les textes traduits. Dans cet article, on propose une méthodologie pour l'évaluation de textes traduits dans un programme de traduction de premier cycle qui tient compte non seulement du produit final de la traduction, mais aussi du processus dont il est sorti et la personne qui l'a réalisé.

**Mots clefs:** evaluation de traductions, critique des traductions, etudes descriptives de traductions, traductologie.

---

\* Recibido: 31-05-05/Aceptado: 27-06-05



## 1. A Quick Glance at Translation Quality Assessment

It is commonly believed that every translation evaluator is entitled to a self-made assessment methodology, rendering translation assessment a rather subjective discipline. However, according to Van den Broeck (1985), translation assessment can be an objective account if it is based, at least implicitly, on systematic description: “A thorough description demands that not only text structures but also systems of texts be involved in the comparison.” It can be drawn from this affirmation that translation assessment cannot be limited to evaluating the resulting text, but that it has to be articulated with what is beyond that text (a context, in the broadest sense of the word).

One of the main problems that translation evaluators must overcome is the fact that, as Williams (1989) points out, applying evaluation criteria consistently to an intellectual product that is often of uneven quality and heterogeneous in form and content may imply at some point making arbitrary choices.

Farahzad (1996), another author dealing with this problem, states: “Today translation courses are offered at many universities and institutions worldwide (...) and there are excellent textbooks for such courses. Yet little work has been done in the field of assessing students’ (or trainees’) achievements at the end of the courses, presumably because improvement is taken for granted.” We can agree that normally great interest is paid to the contents that are supposed to be taught in translation courses within translation programs, but far less theoretical studies are devoted to the analysis of the criteria used to evaluate the translated texts produced in those courses and the processes through which they were created. If anything, attention within Translation Quality Assessment has been mainly oriented to the analysis of translated texts, as if they appeared out of nowhere, without a subject who produced them, and without attention paid to the particular translation process that was used. Both of these aspects require evaluation as well, so that they can be modified, improved, or conserved.

Farahzad (*ibid.*) also places emphasis on the nature of translation judgments: “Critics often judge translations in terms of personal taste, rather than of concrete criteria. But this subjective approach cannot be used by a teacher of translation who has to



evaluate and score students' work on the basis of concrete criteria during a course and at the finals."

We see then a great need to construct an assessment system that uses concrete and objective criteria and that goes beyond the mere evaluation – normally in quantitative terms – of the translated texts. In order to present our conception of how translation quality assessment should be understood and carried out, it is important to review the way in which some theoretical currents approach TQA.

Nida (1974), in the development of his "Science of Translating," bases his conception of translation quality assessment on what he calls "Equivalent effect," a concept that conforms to a marked behaviorist conception of assessment. In this framework, the yardstick for assessing translations is readers' reaction to them. However, there is a problem with taking this approach as a starting point when constructing a system for the assessment of texts produced within a translation program: Since there is not an actual readership for the translation, it will be difficult to evaluate whether the text produces the same effect in the reader that the original text produced, especially since the teacher (who is normally the only reader of these translated texts) has also access to the original text and his approach to the translation may be biased by what he already knows and has read in the original text.

Translation quality assessment has also been analyzed from a functionalistic standpoint, particularly in the works of authors like Nord and Vermeer. The concept of "Skopos" plays a transcendental role in this approach, defining the way in which the translated texts respond to or fit in the culture in which they will be inscribed; this concept is used as the main evaluation criterion. We can see here a marked target-oriented approach to translation, which marks a breaking point with other conceptions of translation quality assessment. This particular conception can lead to an assessment system that evaluates translations based on how "natural" they read, rather than on how effectively they reproduce the contents extant in the original text.

The description of the relations existing within a translation and between texts has been a current widely disseminated by the so-called "Tel-Aviv" school. Its principal exponent is Gideon Toury who, in his book *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (1995), has established the basis for what has been called "Descriptive



Translation Studies” (hereafter referred to as DTS). This current of thought claims the need for a more scientific ground for Translation Studies.

In DTS, there is not a concept of assessment, properly speaking, since he who carries out the study does not pronounce a value judgment. The ultimate goal of DTS is to create a corpus that accounts for the procedures and the regular patterns used by translators in the performing of their task, in order to establish a global Concept of Translation underlying this corpus. However, if we draw out some of the concepts proposed by Toury and put them in a pedagogical perspective, a model can be established in which the assessment is based on the assumption that the “critic” will keep in view both the original act of communication and that of meta communication (i.e. what is commonly – and sometimes mistakenly – referred to as extra textual factors).

In DTS, we find a key element in the construction of a system for translation quality assessment: When carrying out a descriptive study it is necessary to analyze three aspects: the product (translated text), the process that originated the product, and the function of the translated text within the textual system of the target culture. We see here a combination of what has been stated by Nida (the fact that it is important to take into account the readership’s response to the translated text) and by the functionalist theorists (the fact that the assessment of translations should be based on whether the text heeds or flouts the norms of the target culture).

It is also of great importance to analyze the importance of deconstructionist thinking on the revision of the postulates that guide TQA, and, in a broader sense, Translation Studies. Reconsidering and revisiting the dualities that have been developed through history in the Western world is of critical importance for the rethinking of Translation Studies, particularly in terms of the relationship between the original text and the translated text. Some of the most important current trends in Translation Theories have originated from deconstructionist thinking, particularly post-colonial translation theories (which suppose a new way of understanding oppressed peoples and revaluating the values inherited from dominant cultures), feminist theories (which denounce the historical treatment that has been given to translated texts, basically because of the feminine character that has been given to translation), and cannibalistic theories.



Finally, we would like to present – in two separate sections – two concepts that are central to the development of this methodology: that of translation criticism and that of the chain “translation competence/translation difficulty/translation problem/translation error,” which is ultimately the road to failure in the translation process.

## 2. Translation Criticism and Translation Quality Assessment

Translation criticism is one of the least developed areas within translation studies, especially in the Colombian academic environment. Even if this discipline is extremely related to translation assessment, translators’ educators are not aware of the fact that every translated utterance, before being “scored” (which is the common view of evaluation), needs to be criticized. Certainly since there are two different cultures coming together there has been a need for translation and hence translation criticism occurs. However, if translation criticism is to be defined as the unveiling of the facts behind translations (Berman, 1995), which make translations what they are, then this is a newborn discipline.

For Berman (*Ibid.*), translation criticism is much more than a solely academic activity. Literary works need criticism to communicate, to be accomplished, and to be perpetuated. Therefore, criticism is ontologically linked to the texts. He is certain that translation is as necessary to texts – to their manifestation, to their accomplishment, to their perpetuation, to their circulation – as criticism itself, not to mention the fact that it responds to a more evident empirical need. The criticism of a translated text is, therefore, the criticism of a text that results, in turn, from a critical work (given the critical condition of translation).

Berman’s methodological procedure for translation criticism is of great importance to the development of the assessment project proposed hereof. The reading and re-reading of the translated text (leaving completely aside the original text) is the first step proposed by Berman for translation criticism. The purpose of this is to detect problematic “textual zones” where *defectivity* comes into the scene, as well as miraculous “textual zones,” in which there is, presumably, an accomplished rendering of the original text. The second step is the reading of the original text, but bearing in mind the “textual zones” previously found. After these two steps



(pre-analysis), the translation critic starts patiently working on the selection of pertinent and significant stylistic excerpts from the original text. Once this has been done, the actual critical confrontation between the translated text and its translation begins.

After the “critical” stage of the project, there comes the greatest accomplishment of the Bermanian critical project: The Search for the Translator. In this stage of the critical process, it is necessary to define who the translator is. This definition is based on three hermeneutic approaches to the translator, namely his conception of translation, defined as the way in which the translator perceives the translator’s task and the way he has “incorporated” Translation Theory. The second element is his translation project (i.e. his translation method). Finally, we have the translator’s horizon: the ensemble of linguistic, literary, cultural and historical parameters that determine his feeling, his thinking and his acting.

It is important to highlight, as we have seen before, that the theoretical trends that have examined, directly or indirectly, translation quality assessment, have focused on elements that exclude the translator (i.e. he who is being assessed), in favor of other elements such as the function of the text (functionalism), the reaction of the readership (in Nida’s terms) or the way in which the text is incorporated into the literary poly-system of the target language (DTS). It is Berman, who sets out to create a theory of the “*sujet traduisant*,” through the inclusion of this at the initial stage of the assessment process, giving origin to an assessment methodology that takes the translator as its *raison d’être*.

### **3. “Translation Competence, Translation Problem and Translation Error” or the Road to Failure**

If we are to evaluate the subject that produced the translated text, one of the ways in which we should do so, is by analyzing the competences that make him a translator. “Translation Competence” is defined by Hurtado and Martínez (2001) as the underlying system of knowledge, aptitudes and skills necessary in order to be able to translate. In order to be a competent translator, it is necessary to develop what they call “sub-competences,” which have to do with specific elements in the development of the translator’s task:



The translator should have, of course, a linguistic competence in both languages. This raises a question for translation evaluators, especially those who evaluate translation at the final stages of translation programs, such as the practicum courses<sup>1</sup>: What is the evaluator to do when there is a lack of communicative competence in the foreign language? This could occur when the student enters a translation program without a proper linguistic competence, when the language courses are poorly articulated or when there is not an effective evaluation system for the acquisition of the foreign language(s). One possibility in order to solve this problem would be the establishment of remedial language courses for the translation practitioners, so that they can achieve the language level they need in order to accurately translate the texts. However, this would only be a temporary solution, which would only be treating the symptoms of a much greater disease (a lack of structure, coherence, and clear assessment and promotion criteria in language courses previous to the ones in which translations are produced).

A second sub-competence is what Hurtado and Martinez call “Extralinguistic Competence,” which can be related to the knowledge of the topic dealt with in the text, of both the original and target culture and of translation theory. In addition, we have what they call “Transfer Competence” (i.e. the ability to perform the comprehension/re-expression stages in the translation process). There is also an “Instrumental Competence,” which has to do with the way in which the translator uses the resources he has at hand. Characteristics such as creativity, logical thought, memory, attention, curiosity, perseverance, and confidence are included in a fifth sub-competence, which is referred to as “Psychophysiological Competence.”

A sixth sub-competence, essential to the performing of the translator’s task is called “Strategic Competence,” and refers to the ability that the translator has to face and solve the problems that he encounters in the translation process.

---

1 The translation program we are referring to is that offered by the University of Antioquia, in which the students are supposed to complete five levels of foreign languages (French and English) before they can begin with their translation practicum (See Appendix).



Even if one agrees that every translator should have all the sub-competences listed above, one may wonder what would happen should there be a lack of one of them. At this point, it is necessary to introduce yet another concept: that of translation problems. According to what we stated before, we can define a translation problem as an event that occurs when a particular translator lacks one of the sub-competences mentioned in the performing of his task. The translator should appeal then to his strategic competence to overcome the problem that he is facing; otherwise, he would be prone to producing an error.

The question concerning translation problems is whether they come from a specific “incompetence” in the translator or whether they are in fact posed by the text. In order to solve this duality, we should establish two separate concepts: Problem and Difficulty. A difficulty is specifically linked to the text itself, and can be of a diverse nature (it could originate at the lexical level of the text, in its grammatical structures, in the use of metaphors, etc.). However, these difficulties do not become a problem unless the translator has not yet developed, as we said before, a particular competence, and problems do not turn into an error unless the translator is unable to solve that particular problem.

Thus, we can establish a chain, which could be described as a “Road to Failure” in the translation process: Given the translation sub-competences previously mentioned, the translator should be able to carry out a successful translation project. Should any of the sub-competences be lacking, translation problems will occur. If – and only if – the translator is able (i.e. competent) to find a quick and effective solution to a given problem, he should be able to succeed in his translation task. Otherwise, an error will occur.

The problem, according to Hurtado and Martínez (2001), is that we lack empirical studies that can validate a typology of errors, the degree of occurrence of specific errors in specific texts, the level at which they occur in learning, etc. This concern is shared by Lee-Jahnke (2001), who affirms that, on the one hand, assessment criteria are not as clear as desired and, on the other, our profession is lacking strong grounds in this domain (i.e. translation criticism and TQA).

Another problem with errors in translation is that, as Séguinot (1989) has pointed out, errors have always been defined in terms of a violation of translational or language



norms.<sup>2</sup> According to her, “norms merely provide ways to identify errors, and errors are viewed as surface manifestations of phenomena which are the object of study” (Séguinot, 1989), and hence the study of translation errors should not be focused on what norms the translator is breaking when he makes a mistake, but on what factors trigger the production of it.

This approach to errors in translation would allow for better predictions to be made about what kind of errors are likely to occur in the translation process and under what conditions.

We can see, then, that in order to justly analyze errors, it is necessary to first take into account the translation project in which the translated text was produced, the elements that triggered the production of the error, the consequences of the error as to that project and the remedial measures that are to be taken in order to overcome the problems and deficiencies that lead to the production of the error.

#### 4. Construction of an Assessment System

There is an obvious need for a defined set of norms governing translation assessment if translation quality is to be the ultimate goal of translation programs. As stated by Lee-Janke (2001), a qualified translation requires, as any other product, a certain number of precise conditions to be **previously** fulfilled. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to bear in mind that assessment is to be carried out from the beginning of the learning process.

This proposal is intimately linked to what has been called “Formative Assessment.” According to Prégent (in Lee-Jhanke, 2001), assessment is formative when the teacher pronounces judgment of learning at any moment during the learning process, with the goal of helping students to improve the learning taking place. This type of assessment helps students improve their per-

---

2 Robert Larose (1989), for instance, defines an error in translation as an “inobservance of the rules stated in the translation project” that violates either a communicational, linguistic, translational or cultural law.



formance. However, this improvement does not only refer to successful examinations. It is supposed to improve translation competence and, only then, the final product (i.e. a qualified translation).

Abrecht (in Martínez and Hurtado, 2001) points out that Formative Assessment is intended primarily for the students who, as a result of awareness, become actively involved in their own learning process and, hence, it becomes totally integrated into this process. Formative Assessment is also flexible and plural, since it has to be adaptable to individual situations.

One of the main problems of analyzing Translation (not *a* translation) within a university program is that students (particularly those who are in the last semesters) are regarded both as professionals (since they are given REAL texts to translate) and as learners (hence, a tutor is constantly revising the TEXT they produce). Given that double nature accorded to translators in our academic environment, the practice of translation also has a double condition: It is real in the sense that the text resulting will be used and treated in the exact same way a text produced by a professional translator would be. On the other hand, the apprentice/translator is prone to make mistakes that could be easily avoided or corrected by an experienced translator or one who has already finished his university training (if that training is really effective!), and that is the role of the tutor. Thus we can see, in this last case, that translation practicum is the place to correct mistakes and to receive feedback about each individual's translation process.

Some questions remain: What is being assessed? The text? The process? The translator?

It is clear (and the literature available confirms it) that enough efforts have been made to establish sets of criteria to assess translations in the field of professional translation, and most of them focus on the analysis and evaluation of the translated text, not on the process that led to it or the subject that produced that translated text. Some translation scholars (and teachers of translation) have assumed that, since it is not possible to directly observe the translation process, it should not be evaluated, and they focus rather on the evaluation of the directly observable facts: the translated texts. Their being observable renders them quantifiable. The process,



on the other hand, is only **indirectly** available for study, and as Toury (1985) puts it, “The main way to get to know those processes is (...) through a retrospective reconstruction on the basis of the (translational) relationships between the observable output and input of single processes.” That is, however, only one way to do it. Other theoreticians, like Seleskovitch (1980), point out that the best way to carry out a conscious and effective translation process is by stating explicitly what the choices in the process that led to success or failure were. However it may be, they agree upon the fact that ultimately the process can only be analyzed through the product.

There is a third way, proposed by Dechert and Sandrock (1986), in which what they call the “Think Aloud Protocol (TAP)” is applied to translation. Here, the translator has to explicitly verbalize his every decision, preferably using audiovisual recording methods, and thus account for a detailed process that, if not strictly reflecting the thought processes, does present data correlated with underlying thought processes, and indicative of them. One of the main criticisms that has been made to TAP is the fact that, at some point, it will be necessary to verbalize what would normally be a written activity, hence producing an oral text with characteristics of a written one. However, it may be useful if we want a clear documentation of all the processes that the translator undergoes in the performing of his task. In addition, it makes him much more aware of the manner in which he conducts himself as a translator.

Translators (it cannot be overemphasized) are conditioned by their context. This is especially the case when they are university students, who complement their academic (translational) activity with their extracurricular, family and social activities. In order to analyze the real impact of these surroundings, students need to be assessed in terms of: a. their conception of translation; b. their translation project; and c. the horizon of their translation.

We propose then that students carry out their translation process as consciously as possible, writing what Larose calls “Cahier de charges,” a translator’s log in which he will render explicit all the elements that surround the translation process and the translation act, first and foremost as a translating individual with a *pulsion de traduire* (Berman, 1995).



#### 4.1. The Translation Project

From what we stated before, we can conclude that it is not desirable to perform an accurate translation process that leads to successful results without having a framework in which that project is inscribed and one that determines the conditions under which the translation is going to be produced. That is what we call a “Translation Project.”

Berman defined the Translation Project as a resulting force between the translator’s conception of translation and the horizon of the translated text (the impositions of its context). When the translator faces the text to be translated and starts the translating process he does so keeping in mind (either consciously or unconsciously) what he knows and believes about translation and (on a definitely conscious level) the requirements of the initiators of the translation. Only taking into account the elements that surround the production of translated texts and the ideas that the translator has about his task is it possible to determine the nuances that may account for one decision or the other when assessing translations (i.e. only if there is a defined translation project will it be possible to determine to what extent the problems faced by the apprentice/translator are a result of a systemic fault a problem or are just a contingency in a particular translation activity a difficulty).

The concept of Translation Project is also central to Robert Larose’s proposal of Translation Quality Assessment. According to Larose (1989), the error in translation is the result of the violation of the norms stated in the Translation Project, to which he refers as the “log” in which the principles and postulates of translation are enunciated. It is based on the Translation Project that choices regarding general communication, linguistics, and translational laws are assessed. Hence, an error would be defined as the deviation from the purposes stated in the Project. Consequently, it is of great importance, in order to accurately assess translations in any translation program, to define a Translation Project, containing all the purposes of the translations, a readership (either real or fictional) for them and the textual system in which the translated text will be received.



#### **4.2. Assessment of the Translator and his Competences**

The apprentice/translator should – in collaboration with his tutor – write a complete self-analysis in terms of his position, project, and the translation's horizon. Then, they should validate it at the end of the translation process, in order to see whether his actual performance as a translator follows his preconceived notions on the matter, or if, on the contrary, they should be reconsidered.

However, it is not only the translator as an individual who is going to be evaluated. It is important, as well, during all the translation process, to evaluate the competences that a translator should have, either by measuring to what degree he has acquired them or by assessing how he utilizes them in the translation process.

One of the most elaborate systems of measuring if and how the translator has acquired translation competence is that presented by Orozco and Hurtado Albir (2002). They propose three assessing instruments for this: the first intends to evaluate the notions about translation that the student has acquired (his Extralinguistic Competence). The purpose of the second instrument is to evaluate how well students are able to solve the problems that they encounter in the performing on their task. Finally, a third instrument measures the mistakes and successful solutions found in the translation.

#### **4.3. Assessment of the Translation Process**

What is an accurate process? Does every translator follow a different methodology? Are those methodologies valid for different situations? These questions only have one answer: it is not possible to study (and hence to evaluate) a translation process without taking as a reference the translated text that was created after that process. In fact, not one of these elements (analysis of the translator, the process, and the text) can be examined without taking into account the other counterparts, since they are interdependent.

However that may be, there are some effective and achievable ways to accurately assess the process that leads to the production of a translated text. One of



them, which we have already mentioned, is what has been called “Think Aloud Protocols” (TAP). Here, basically the student is supposed to create a verbalized record (using video or audiotapes) of his translation process, documenting all the problems he encountered, trying to explain the reason why each situation occurred and stating the eventual solution that he appealed to. As the translator is more aware of his process, he will then be able to detect and overcome the factors that lead him to failure and to apply systematically the ones that lead him to success.

Another possibility when evaluating the process is that proposed by Toury (1995). Here, the translator should leave a written record of every one of his “versions” of the translated text, from the very moment in which he starts his translation process until the last version that he presents to the reader of his translation (in this case, the teacher/evaluator). Through studying the changes and improvements that the translator introduced in the translated text, the evaluator will have a significant testimony of the processes that the translator underwent during the process. These decisions will be an eloquent sample of how the apprentice/translator conceives his task and will help to clarify what factors lead him to make the decisions he makes.

#### **4.4. Assessment of the Translated Text**

Once we have a clear vision of who the apprentice/translator is (in terms of his conception of translation and his competence), it is possible to analyze the translated text that he produced, since we now have a documented way to evaluate the decisions that ultimately led to the text we are reading.

With that in mind it will be impossible to continue to think of – and hence evaluate – the translated text as if it were a text directly produced in the target language. We rather like to think of evaluating parameters that account for the fact that the translated text has a background and goes beyond the rules imposed by the target culture.

We find that five basic parameters – all of them quantifiable – should be taken into account when evaluating a translated text. Those parameters relate to the double



nature of the text (as a fact of both the source and the target culture). Regarding the original text, it should be evaluated based on its intentionality (i.e. the fact that the text has a particular purpose, whether it is the same that the original text had, or a different one imposed by the public to which the text is aimed), its situationality (i.e. the fact that within the text there is a situation and the translation must concur with that situation, whatever the external factors of the translated text may be), and its intertextuality (i.e. how the original text belonged to a textual system in the original culture, and how eventually the translated text will be inserted in a different textual system).

Regarding the translated text as a text that must convey the norms of the culture in which it will be inscribed, it will be evaluated based on its acceptability, in terms of whether it heeds or flouts the norms of the target culture, and its cohesion (i.e. the fact that the text establishes logical relationships among the elements that conform it).

## **FUTURE PRACTICAL AND THEORETICAL PROBLEMS**

Up to now, we have presented an assessment system that takes into account the translated text, the process from which it resulted, and the subject who produced it. However, as Martinez and Hurtado (2001) have stated, there is a strong lack of empirical and experimental studies through which these types of proposals can be validated. In this article, we have tried to set the basis for a deeper study of the phenomena involved in the evaluation process. There is the need for a more profound and exact examination of what the role of the teacher/evaluator should be in this process and what the instruments that should be used in this assessment system are.

At a theoretical level, since new parameters for the study and comprehension of texts have been established by new trends such as post-modernism and post-structuralism, there is a need for a more profound study of the relationships existing between the original text and its translated counterpart. Undoubtedly, if the translated text is to be given a reevaluated status, different from that of the text from which it “originated,” it will be necessary to restudy the parameters and criteria that guide us in assessing translated texts.



Juan Guillermo Ramírez Giraldo

## REFERENCES

- Berman, Antoine, 1995, *Pour une critique des traductions : John Donne*, Paris, Gallimard.
- Dechert, Hans W. and Ursula Sandroock, 1986, "Thinking-Aloud Protocols: The Decomposition of Language Processing." In: Vivian Cook, ed. *Experimental Approaches to Second Language Learning*, Oxford, Pergamon.
- Delisle, Jean and Hanneloree, Lee-Jahnke, 1998, *Enseignement dans la traduction et traduction dans l'enseignement*, Ottawa, Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.
- Farahzad, Farzaneh, 1992, "Testing Achievement in Translation Classes." In: C., Dollerup and A. Loddegaard, eds. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting: Training, Talent and Experience*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publication Co.
- Hermans, Theo, 1985, "Translation Studies and a New Paradigm." In: Theo, Hermans, ed., *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, New York, St. Martin's Press.
- House, Juliane, 2001, "Translation Quality Assessment: Linguistic Description versus Social Evaluation", *Meta*, 46 (2), Montréal.
- Larose, Robert, 1989, "L'erreur en traduction: par delà le bien et le mal", *TTR*, 2 (2), Montréal.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1998, "Méthodologie de l'évaluation en traduction", *Meta*, 43 (2), Montréal.
- Lee-Jahnke, Hannelore, 2001, "Aspects pédagogiques de l'évaluation en traduction", *Meta*, 46 (2), Montréal.
- Martínez Melis, Nicole and A. Hurtado Albir, 2001, "Assessment in Translation Studies: Research Needs", *Meta*, 46 (2), Montréal.
- Nida, Eugene and C. Taber, 1974, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Amsterdam, United Bible Society.
- Nord, Christiane, 1996, "El error en traducción: categorías y evaluación." en: A. Hurtado Albir, ed. *La enseñanza de la traducción*, Castelló de la Plane, Universitat Jaime I.
- Orozco, Mariana and A., Hurtado Albir, 2002, "Measuring Translation Competent Acquisition." *Meta*, 47 (3), Montréal.
- Séguinot, Candace, 1989, "Understanding Why Translators Make Mistakes", *TTR*, 2 (2), Montréal.
- Seleskovich, Danika, 1980, "Pour une théorie de la traduction inspirée de sa pratique", *Meta*, 25 (4), Montréal.
- Toury, Gideon, 1995, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam, Benjamins Translation Library.
- Toury, Gideon, 1985, "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies", In: Theo, Hermans, ed. *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, New York, St. Martin's Press.



Van den Broeck, Raymond, 1985, "Second Thoughts on Translation Criticism: A Model of its Analytic Function", In: Theo, Hermans, ed. *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, New York, St. Martin's Press.

Williams, Malcolm, 1985, "The Assessment of Professional Translation Quality: Creating Credibility out of Chaos", *TTR*. 2 (2), Montréal.

## THE AUTHOR

\*\* An English-French Spanish translator from the University of Antioquia, he is currently a full time teacher in the School of Languages at that University. He is also a member of the Translation Studies Research Group.  
E-mail: jgramirezg@epm.net.co



Juan Guillermo Ramírez Giraldo

### **Appendix 1**

#### **Course List for the BA Translation Program at the University of Antioquia**

##### **1<sup>st</sup> Semester**

Basic English I and Translation Workshop  
Basic French I and Translation Workshop  
Spanish I  
Spanish Composition  
Fundamentals of Computers  
History of Translation

##### **2<sup>nd</sup> Semester**

Basic English II and Translation Workshop  
Basic French II and Translation Workshop  
Spanish II  
Logic and Linguistics  
Culture and Translation  
Psychoanalysis and Psychology

##### **3<sup>rd</sup> Semester**

Basic English III and Translation Workshop  
Basic French III and Translation Workshop  
Spanish III  
Literary Theory  
Lexicology

##### **4<sup>th</sup> Semester**

Basic English IV and Translation Workshop  
Basic French IV and Translation Workshop  
Translation Theory  
French Grammar and Stylistics  
English Grammar and Stylistics

##### **5<sup>th</sup> Semester**

Basic English V and Translation Workshop



Basic French V and Translation Workshop  
English Reading and Composition  
French Reading and Composition  
Professional Writing  
Legal Translation I

6<sup>th</sup> Semester  
French Civilization  
English Civilization  
Legal Translation II (English)  
Legal Translation II (French)  
Latin-American Thought

7<sup>th</sup> Semester  
Translation Practicum I (English)  
Translation Practicum I (French)  
Terminology  
Scientific and Technical Translation  
Machine Translation

8<sup>th</sup> Semester  
Translation Practicum II (English)  
Translation Practicum II (French)  
Translator's Ethics  
Greek and Latin Roots  
Business English  
Business French

