

BRIDGING CULTURES: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF TRANSLATION ASSESSMENT¹

KÜLTÜRLER ARASINDA KÖPRÜ KURMAK: ÇEVİRİ DEĞERLENDİRMESİNİN ELEŞTİREL BİR İNCELEMESİ

Haldun VURAL

Cappadocia University, Faculty of Humanities, Department of English Translation and Interpreting, Nevşehir / Türkiye
ORCID NO: 0000-0002-4638-4084

Abstract: The process that enables cultures to learn about one another is a different definition of translation. In addition to serving as a tool for communication, language also serves as a conduit for the cultural heritage of communities. This study aims to explore the role that translation evaluation methodologies play in the field of translation studies, as well as how they are defined and applied in relation to assessment concepts and criticism. The importance of language as a medium for cultural legacies is emphasized by this study, which investigates the mechanism by which civilizations can learn about one another via translation. Translating an expression from the source language into the target text as closely as possible is known as equivalency, and it is studied in a variety of contexts and historical periods. With an emphasis on the semantic domains of concepts for translation assessment, the study analyzes theoretical approaches that impact translation criticism and assessment. Assessments of the use, acceptability, and fulfillment of translations are made in relation to the intended audience as well as the translators themselves. Based on the need for efficient communication, the study emphasizes the fundamental role that assessment plays in translation. It indicates that theoretical translation expertise forms the basis of the quality assessment expression employed in the field. In addition to offering definitions and application insights into translation studies, the investigation explains the nuances of translation assessment methodologies. Theoretical techniques and principles of translation assessment are also indicated.

Keywords: Translation, Culture, Criticism, Assessment, Quality Evaluation

Öz: Kültürlerin birbirini tanımasını sağlayan süreç, çevirinin farklı bir tanımıdır. Dil, bir iletişim aracı olmasının yanı sıra toplumların kültürel miraslarının da aktarıldığı bir kanal görevi görmektedir. Bu çalışma, çeviri değerlendirme metodolojilerinin çeviribilim alanında oynadığı rolün yanı sıra değerlendirme kavramları ve eleştirisi ile ilişkili olarak nasıl tanımlanıp uygulandıklarını araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Medeniyetlerin çeviri yoluyla birbirlerini tanıma mekanizmalarını araştıran bu çalışmada dilin kültürel miras aracı olarak önemi vurgulanmaktadır. Bir ifadenin kaynak dilden hedef dile olabildiğince yakın bir şekilde çevrilmesine eşdeğerlik denir ve eşdeğerlik çeşitli bağlamlarda ve tarihsel dönemlerde ele alınarak incelenir. Çeviri değerlendirmesiyle ilgili kavramların anlamsal alanlarına vurgu yapan bu çalışma, çeviri eleştirisi ve değerlendirmesini etkileyen teorik yaklaşımları analiz etmektedir. Çevirilerin uygunluğu, kabul edilebilirliği ve hedefine ulaşmasına ilişkin değerlendirmeler çevirmenlerin yanı sıra hedef kitleyle de ilişkili olarak yapılır. Etkili iletişim ihtiyacından hareketle bu mevcut çalışma, değerlendirmenin çeviride oynadığı temel rolü vurgulamaktadır. Bu, teorik çeviri uzmanlığının alanda kullanılan kalite değerlendirme ifadesinin temelini oluşturduğunu da göstermektedir. Mevcut çalışma, çeviribilime ilişkin tanımlar ve uygulama bilgileri sunmanın yanı sıra, çeviri değerlendirme metodolojilerinin nüanslarını da açıklamaya ve çeviri değerlendirmesinin teorik teknikleri ve ilkelerini de belirtmeye çalışır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çeviri, Kültür, Eleştiri, Değerlendirme, Kalite Değerlendirmesi

¹ Sorumlu Yazar, Corresponding Author: Haldun VURAL, Kapadokya University, Faculty of Humanities, Department of English Translation and Interpreting, Nevşehir / Türkiye, bildirler@gmail.com, Geliş Tarihi / Received: 13.12.2023, Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 28.03.2024, Makalenin Türü: Type of Article: (Literatür - Derleme; Literature - Compilation) Çıkar Çatışması, Yok - Conflict of Interest, None, Conflict of Interest, None, Etik Kurul Raporu veya Kurum İzin Bilgisi Ethical Board Report or Institutional Approval, Yok / None "This study is a type of study that does not require ethics committee permission." "Bu çalışma Araştırma ve Yayın Etiğine uygun olarak hazırlanmıştır. / This study has been prepared in accordance with Research and Publication Ethics."



INTRODUCTION

It may be suggested that as the field of translation studies has evolved, assessment has not yet been given a thorough definition (Muzii, 2006). Within the boundaries of both concept definition and implementation, assessment of oral translations is not the main focus. This is because interpretation criticism and assessment must be evaluated independently based on factors like fluency, language use, presentation, and immediacy, even if they pertain to different fields of competence (Downing, 2003). Confusion is also brought on by the variety of assessment-related concepts in the translation field. It is believed that comparing the assessment concepts in various sources may assist in providing this relationship. To do this, it is important to first analyze the contexts in which the aforementioned notions are used in translation studies and to establish where each of them fits into the overall system.

A COMPREHENSIVE PERSPECTIVE ON ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES WITHIN A THEORETICAL STRUCTURE

Interpretation of the Term 'concept'

To undertake research in a field of science and put ideas on an equal footing, concepts are essential instruments. A discipline like translation studies, which deals with people, culture, and language, may find it difficult to establish this common language and base. Since translation studies is a section of the social sciences, there may not always be clear distinctions between the concepts and phenomena within this discipline (Gambier, 2018). However, for scientific research to

continue and advance, a shared language and set of ideals are required. On the other hand, all scientific notions cannot develop along a historical line without any breaks or modifications. This is intimately related to the structure of language because language both reflects and undergoes change.

Language changes are influenced by culture, so they cannot be separated from the time and environment in which they take place (Kramsch, 2014). The semantic content and usage contexts of a notion must be examined to discuss this. Conversely, the problem becomes more complex if transference is present. It is possible to adapt a discipline to another culture and language. This transfer takes place through translation, and ideas particular to that field may also be conveyed to the target language (Chan, 2012). The target language system need not always be deficient for this meaning transfer to occur, though. By fusing the usage and meaning areas of various languages with the meaning areas of a single language, concepts produce a hybrid structure. The expression of a concept in several languages adds to the content of that meaning since meaning is a structure that comes to life as it is translated. How concepts are translated also significantly affects how much meaning is conveyed; the metaphor of the afterlife is used to explain this circumstance (Schulte & Biguenet, 1992). As an illustration, the richer and more complementary the semantic content of the concept of bread becomes as it is stated in more languages, like in the case above. Concepts' meanings in their original languages and the meanings they acquire

while being translated into the target language interact. To put it another way, when a word is translated, its semantic field in the target language is enhanced by the addition of its background in the source language.

Concepts of translation assessment follow a similar procedure. Analysis, revising, proofreading, review, post-editing, assessment, evaluation, measurement-evaluation, examination, quality assessment, interpretation, and criticism are some assessment-related ideas that work well together, and they alter and broaden the meaning. However, depending on their fields of application, these terms and their job descriptions may change (Gouadec, 2007). For instance, the term post-editing is specifically used in the field to refer to the direct revision of machine translation, and it has several forms and quality assurance procedures (DePalma, 2013). As another illustration, the terms assessment and evaluation may differ depending on the field in which they are applied or they may be used synonymously (Maier, 2000). Assessment and evaluation are terms that are used to refer to measurement and evaluation in the realm of education (Colina, 2011). Due to their sectoral connotations, quality evaluation or quality control are interchangeably utilized. For example, terminology coherence, informativeness, and accuracy are the only criteria considered in certain research for evaluating quality. Additionally, this demonstrates how technical texts' main points tend to shape this view (Gouadec, 2007). However, this

does not imply that the concept's meaning is fixed and unalterable. For instance, the definition of quality may alter depending on questions like how errors will be classified or whether only a portion of the text needs to be examined rather than the entire document (Williams, 2001). The customs surrounding the various text genres and the expectations of the industry's players may also give rise to different viewpoints and requirements. This circumstance exemplifies the concept's diversity.

Review is another concept whose meaning varies depending on the context. The term book review and other terms with the connotation of book promotion are frequently used to refer to this idea, especially in literature (Drugan, 2013). The term review in education can refer to applications where the students assess and examine their own translation choices such as summary description, and remark (Pereira et al., 2016). At every point of the assessment classification, any of the aforementioned concepts may be incorporated, either implicitly or explicitly. Therefore, it may be suitable to demonstrate the diversity in assessment, to highlight applications from various sectors within this diversity, and to highlight the state of indeterminacy that occasionally occurs.

Concepts at the Intersection of Different Branches of Science

Within the confines of its own field requirements, each area of science is capable of developing semantic fields of its own concepts with various viewpoints and background knowledge. This could be due to

diverse linguistic systems, scientific fields, and educational institutions (Marco, 2007). The same holds true for the study of translation. In the course of its development, the science of translation studies has taken theories, practices, and methodologies from other scientific fields such as fields of literature and translation studies.

In this context, criticism is just one example, and within this framework, it is possible to analyze the connections between criticism, literature, and translation. The history of literary criticism has had a profound impact on translation assessment theories from a variety of perspectives (Pym, 2023). Literary texts are a major focus of the theoretical research in the subject of translation studies. This leads to the misconception that literary works are the principal exception to the validity of critical approaches. The fact that literary works are open to subjective interpretation and judgments might be viewed as a deciding factor when evaluating translations of these works. The overstatement of subjectivity is one of the risks at this time. One can consider a text to be inadequate and flawed if it is only criticized per personal preferences and tastes. In fact, the method of translation directly affects how the definition of error will be used in the course of the assessment. Every assertion that deviates from the source text (ST) is seen to be an error as a result of a subjective assessment. At this point, translators are humans surrounded by extra-textual aspects in both literary works and other translation contexts, and they make decisions in communication scenarios

(Munday, 2012).

Concepts Interpreted Differently in the Same Branch of Science

Each area of specialization has a fairly standard language, but the meanings of terms may vary. Sometimes it is apparent that the act of assessing is referred to differently or that the concepts are employed in some other ways. Concerning the educational assessment of a translation, Reiss (Reiss & Rhodes, 2014), for instance, employs the German term *Übersetzungskritik* (translation criticism). The word critique in French, however, might be connected to oral translation (Paloposki, 2012). It is also suggested that assessment and criticism concepts should apply to all forms of text types, including literary texts. Some approaches manage translations for specialized fields including medicine, economics, and law under the heading of assessment or quality assessment. Additionally, certain schools of thought contend that literary works ought to be assessed using a different term, such as criticism. However, it is also true that translation quality may vary over time and across different contexts. Because several factors might influence how a translation is perceived, it is challenging to provide a single, unambiguous definition of quality (Mossop, 2020). The positions of the terms review and criticism in the subject of literature are explored in one study, and it is said that while these concepts are distinct from one another, they are in general related.

Contrary to the evaluation, review, and

criticism practices in the field of literature, these concepts have not developed into traditions in translation studies. This is because it might be challenging to identify appropriate standards by which to evaluate and assess translations. Criticism at this moment is characterized as an activity centered on literature and innovation. Source text (ST) -target text (TT) comparisons are frequently used in criticism models. TT and culture-oriented assessments are included in Toury's norm method as well as the polysystem approach (Baker & Saldanha, 2019). Post-colonial methodologies alter the definition of translation as well. Next, new criteria for assessment are introduced. Despite being mentioned in the text as an activity, assessment is more commonly referred to as criticism.

Another researcher asserts that varied perspectives on translation contribute to quality assessment, which can then be interpreted in line with various approaches (House, 2013). The term quality assessment has been understood in this variety in three different ways: text-based, response-oriented, and subjectively and ad hoc. Anecdotal and subjective, response-oriented, and text-based are the three categories in which the concept of quality assessment has been interpreted in this form. For the most part, fidelity to ST is the only metric used to assess translation quality. The translator's expertise, intentions, and aesthetic ability all play a role in this quality.

The following period uses a quality approach that begins with a dynamic and

communication-focused equivalency period. The quality criterion here is the equivalence between the impact ST has on the target audience and the impact it has on the TT target audience (Venuti, 2021). The discussion moves on to an assessment strategy that takes into account factors including message accuracy, understandability, and informativeness. Following that is Reiss' text focus theory (2014), where she makes the case that the ST type is the key factor in a translation. Another crucial theory is polysystem theory (Even-Zohar, 2005), which is based on comparative literature and holds that the effectiveness of a translation is determined by how well it performs within the target system. And an illustration of a functional-operational model is Juliane House's (2014) quality evaluation model.

As a result of the diversity in the field of translation and the inclusion of various theoretical viewpoints and translation understandings, the concept of quality assessment offers a framework that is more inclusive. However, because the idea of criticism in the literary tradition is so deeply ingrained, it has typically been utilized in a literary context (Waugh, 2006). The primary issues in both the ideas of quality evaluation and criticism are the variety of evaluation criteria and the challenge in identifying them. However, the theoretical perspective is closely related to how the ideas of translation and the act of assessment are defined in both cases.

In general, several viewpoints are used to interpret the concepts of translation

assessment and criticism. The terms translation assessment and translation criticism are typically understood from several angles. Regarding the approach used by these performances and the kinds of texts they cover, there are various viewpoints and perceptions. The distinction between the two ideas relates to how the process of translating is seen. Furthermore, it can be claimed that particular viewpoints have developed for analyzing translations using methods connected to these ideas. It would be beneficial to give a broad explanation of the principles in this setting (Mossop, 2020).

EXPLANATIONS AND MODELS

The literature has a large number of studies on translation assessment. However, most of the reviews are on literary texts. At the beginning it can be claimed that what is expected to be achieved through translation is the complete overlap of ST-TT. Although ST-TT comparisons are crucial for translation assessments, not all comparisons are criticism. When it comes to TT assessment, there is variation and occasionally uncertainty. Depending on how competency is achieved and the theory behind the idea, assessment concepts can differ (Colina, 2013). Review, criticism, and assessment are terms that are typically employed while analyzing studies that assess TT. Both translation studies and literature share this circumstance.

The concept of criticism is described in simple dictionary definitions as assessing literary works and identifying the good and bad qualities of the work or subject (Krieger, 2019). Concepts such as quality, quantity,

and measurement are central to the assessment idea. On the other hand, examining something involves focusing on that thing to understand it. Assessments of translations from ST to TT are conducted in a variety of contexts, including academia, business, government, and the target public. It may be claimed that the translation industry, educators, and academics all contributed to the development of various approaches used for translation assessment.

Assessment

In the evolution of translation studies, TT assessment first becomes prominent in the 1980s. As a result of ST-TT comparison, literal semantic shortcomings in translations are highlighted in translation criticism. Others can be examined in the context of expression changes that occur during translation (Alves & Albir, 2017). The criteria to assess translations can be helped by looking at the expression shifts. Not being able to appropriately determine the syntactic context may be another definition of error. Equivalence is initially seen as an ST-based requirement. On the examination of written and spoken materials, it may be said that there is a shift to TT focus later on. While language-focused theorists employ source language and text equivalence as a criterion, culture- and literary-focused theorists prefer to assess TT in its own context throughout the historical process (Andrienko & Shpeniuk, 2021). Equivalence in this context can be characterized as being comparable to the function, semantic equivalence, intended effect, and intention within the context of the target text.

Target-oriented approaches concentrate on the text-linguistic value of the target text, how much it benefits from the text genre traditions of the source language, and whether there is an acceptable use of language in the target language. They also emphasize the discursive value of the target text, its pragmatic value with its recipient, its form, mode of transmission, and its purpose, as well as how it reaches the target recipient and the impact it forms (Zhang, & Munday, 2018). Nevertheless, since assessment techniques vary, it is possible that a certain technique cannot always be applied to a text.

It appears that translation criticism has primarily dealt with literary and holy texts throughout history. It might be claimed that translation criticism has taken on this form, and that its conventional definition is a comparison that emphasizes the similarity of the source and target texts (Long, 2013). The paradigms then shift, and the criteria take on the form of a framework for functional assessments. With the use of these criteria, translations are assessed holistically and, in the context, where they are produced, and translation studies start to look at texts produced by other academic disciplines (Gambier & Van Doorslaer, 2016). The comparison of the source and target texts cannot, it can be claimed, be the sole focus of translation criticism. Thus, methods that consider contextual, social, political, economic, cultural etc. variables that surround translation can be referred to as translation criticism criteria. In translation criticism, there are additional elements that influence the translation process, such as the

context and ideologies in which the translation is produced, disseminated, and used. Furthermore, translation critics need to be knowledgeable about their respective fields and practice criticism that is relevant to those fields.

Criticism

Translation criticism initially appears to be restricted to book reviews in periodicals or newspapers, particularly in literary translation. It might be argued that subjective elements like subjectivity, personal preference, and intuitive judgment are present in translation criticism. Translation theories and translation criticism are actually related to each other, and comprehension of translation is related to criticism. It is critical to remember that the target system should be taken into account in addition to the equivalence established using ST as assessment criteria where target-oriented techniques become prevalent (Reiss & Rhodes, 2014). The science of translation is interconnected with numerous and diverse fields of study. Translation should therefore be considered with respect to various disciplines. This, however, cannot be resolved solely by practical experience; theories are also crucial. Adding analysis, assessment, and judgment to the list of things that fall under the category of criticism may be necessary. Because they are assessed in context, translations naturally involve subjectivity, but it is crucial to control how much subjectivity exists (Paloposki, 2012). Translation criticism needs to be methodical and objective. It might not be appropriate to

shape the criteria for criticism per the accurate notion of the critic. The translation goal should therefore be the primary criterion. A methodical translation criticism should include both ST and TT as a whole and assess them in connection to other languages and systems. It can be helpful to assess the translation's quality by determining the limitations that the translator has to work within (Lefevere, 2016).

Also, the original text and the translated text within the ST and TT systems should frequently be discussed through comparative analysis in translation criticism. Comparative analysis is used to determine which factors have an impact on how a text is transferred from one language to another using linguistic indicators, as well as to determine the causes of any deviations from the original text (Daems et al., 2017). Language, culture, message, and literary aspects of ST should be highlighted in this analysis, and the same approach should be applied in comparison to the translated text.

The purpose of translation criticism may be to give a systematic narrative of the translation, the product, and the translation process, and to represent what is known about the translation process and product, as well as the objective judgments and subjective thoughts obtained. The viewpoint on translation is related to differences in the viewpoint on translation criticism. Translators, linguists, and literary figures may occasionally offer criticism based on their personal opinions. The translation itself may sometimes be the only subject of

criticism, with neither the translation process nor the translation product being taken into consideration (Reiss & Rhodes, 2014).

Translation criticism is approached from the standpoint of literary translation, as is previously stressed. However, it can be stated that the methodical and empirical approaches that literary criticism has developed are not yet apparent in translation criticism. Translation criticism is seen as a subjective analysis of the precision or imprecision of the text produced in the target language within the context of the source text and the existence of a one-to-one equivalent (Lefebure, 2019). However, since the 1980s, as the field of translation has flourished, its connections to other disciplines have grown, and its descriptive nature has been more apparent, translation scholars have made efforts to situate translation criticism. It might be said in this context that Van den Broeck's (2014) model is suitable for translation education. This paradigm is said to address translation studies with all of its past and present uses in a methodical, practical, thorough, descriptive, and goal-oriented manner.

Besides, it is possible to think of translation as a broad activity including various textual genres. Translation studies includes translation criticism as one of its areas of study, and it can be said that since the second half of the 20th century, translation criticism has begun to acquire a scientific status (Venuti, 2017). When criticizing a translation, there should be a set of standards, and the criticism should be

presented in a variety of ways. The purpose of the criticism, the degree to which the source and target texts are used as a foundation for the criticism, the inclusion of extra-textual considerations like the translator, culture, and politics, as well as the text type's characteristics can all be included in the assessment criteria for translations. The prevalence of these issues may cause conceptual ambiguity in discourses on translation criticism (Han, 2020). Nevertheless, because terms like target emphasis, resource, equivalence, and functioning can be construed in different ways, it can be argued that there is not an absolute overlap between the terms connected to criticism. It might be argued that the fundamental differentiation and standards in translation have evolved over time in accordance with the type of text.

The oral translation is the subject of certain translation criticisms as well. The text, the setting, the position, and the professional aspect of oral translation can all be taken into consideration when assessing oral translation criticism. Examining the components of comprehension within the context of communication may be useful in oral translation criticism (Woang, 2021). Oral translation criticism is a type of assessment and discussion about a work that, like other forms of criticism, may be understood as an activity (Paloposki, 2012). Therefore, areas like literature, philosophy, technology, and oral translation can all be included under translation theory. The perception of loyalty to the critic and ST can be considered to have first influenced the

evaluation criteria. In the modern world, evaluation is handled more within the context of the purpose, function, communication context, reader characteristics, and expectations.

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

The word assessment can refer to a variety of meanings within the field of translation studies depending on how it is coupled with other words (Reiss & Rhodes, 2014). As can be seen, assessments done in the field of education are primarily subject to measurement and evaluation (Scheerens et al., 2003). Over time, translation studies have developed into a stand-alone field of research and have been given a new role in education. The act of assessment and evaluation is a supplement to the education given. Since they assess the knowledge and abilities that students have acquired in class, exams are integral aspects of both courses and instruction.

Along with the measurement-evaluation concept, quality assessment is a term that is also employed in translation studies. However, it is expected that translators will do more than just translate; they will also need to review and assess this translation (House, 2014). According to the job description and the industry the text belongs to, the translator in this situation converts the source material into the target language. S/he also employs information technology tools that are typical of translations in the particular field s/he selects to construct the target text. A translator must also check the target text independently from the source text for grammatical and discursive errors.

Besides, a translator outlines the techniques s/he takes to solve the challenges s/he encounters while translating to assess the translation. S/he describes the information sources s/he utilizes to translate from and how s/he incorporates them. A translator also discusses the topics that need to be reviewed in the translation with the relevant subject matter expert or the service requester (International Labour Organization, 2012).

Review is a term used frequently to describe an action that occurs within the context of analyzing the target text. The source text should not be the main emphasis of the translation. Additionally, translators must consider what they are translating and for whom at the beginning. Depending on the circumstances, the interpretation of a proper or wrong translation may change, and external influences might have a significant impact. This poses serious issues with assessment in particular. Translators should be aware of the translation techniques that might be used in various circumstances and contexts and consider these when they are translating. Furthermore, translators should avoid using ambiguous and nebulous terms like loyalty.

CONCLUSION

Undoubtedly, there are connections between translation criticism and the theories, concepts, and academic research in the discipline of translation studies. As the historical process of translation evolves, so do the perspectives on it, and these shifts have an impact on how translation theories are perceived when analyzing the target text.

Sometimes the assessment may not make explicit or specific reference to the theoretical framework. There is, in fact, an underlying theoretical perspective even in such situations. All these methods and understandings, as well as the definitions of the terms used in evaluation concepts and the selection criteria, have connections and variations, by all means. Additionally, various factors can influence concept scopes. The context in which translation is assessed, as well as factors like education, the translation market, and target audience perceptions, all have impacts, and they may differ.

The significance of choosing criteria for translation assessment is emphasized in almost every theoretical approach. There are various points of view on how these principles should be made concrete and put into practice. In light of this, major headings such as the response of the target audience, the source text, purpose, and function can be used as criteria in translation assessment. The research team's background, the sources they consult, and the text genre traditions they study may all have influences on the diversity of the samples used in this process. The context of the translated text, text traditions, the function of the source or target text, the author of the source text, and the job description may all be used as assessment criteria for translation.

Depending on the material, it may also matter at what point in the translation process the assessment is conducted. In criticism studies, it is typically observed that both the source text and the target text are

assessed following the translation process. However, in sector-oriented translations, quality assessment may be part of the translation process and incorporates the responsibilities of process actors like the editor, last reader, and proofreader.

Finding and assessing the proper and wrong elements, particularly in literature, can be viewed as translation criticism. Since forming a judgment based on criteria is a common component of assessment, it can apply to a variety of topics. And a review is regarded as an effort to comprehend the content. In some studies, however, the terms criticism, examination and assessment can also be used to refer to considering, examining, and questioning. The result could be conceptual ambiguity. The terms criticism and assessment are more frequently employed with translation. In the process of criticism or assessment to address various issues, the concept of review can also be employed as an action or goal of the study. This may also demonstrate how the terms analysis, examination, and assessment can all be used interchangeably.

A comparison of the source and target texts forms the basis of some assessment studies. Studies have also suggested that one should only consult the original text when absolutely essential. Some research propose their own assessment model or do not specify one at all. The Van den Broeck model is mostly included among those that adhere to the measures recommended by a model, either completely or in part. Furthermore, when viewed in the context of the idea of purpose, Vermeer and Manttari's work is

distinctive. Also, it is evident that Toury's methods are applied as a theoretical framework within the context of norms.

It is possible to assume that criticism of translations is always connected to literary works when it is brought up. However, various text kinds are also covered under translation criticism. Text type may therefore also result in variations in the assessment procedure. Since the purpose of technical documents is to accurately instruct the user, it is necessary to identify and rectify faults to improve the translation quality of these texts. Nonetheless, literary writings are interpreted differently and have multiple levels of meaning; as a result, they emphasize the representation of accurate and inaccurate translation choices.

In the field of translation studies, there exist significant pioneering theories. In fact, it can be said that the theorists who advance these theories have typically come from a background or field of study related to literary translation. One could argue that literary texts are the primary focus of theoretical and applied research on the subject of translation criticism. Focusing on literary materials may perhaps have influenced the fundamental ideas and methods of translation criticism. Thus, it can be argued that the methodologies mentioned above open up fresh opportunities for academics to employ them in the assessment of literary texts. Yet, there are also activities underway to modify theoretical research conducted within the literary framework to fit various text kinds and literary compositions. However, efforts are being

made to adapt theoretical research in the subject of literature to various text types.

Diverse viewpoints on translation and the nature of the notion can be observed in various and comparable meanings found in the concepts of assessment, review, and criticism. Given this, it could be useful to think about criticism and quality evaluation within a framework of criticism and assessment, particularly when using literary and technical texts from various settings and traditions. Hence, describing the diversity and occasional uncertainty that are previously discussed can help to concrete the overall structure. Thus, a contribution to the establishment of links between academia and industry can be made. This could further demonstrate how translation assessment accounts for both similarities and differences.

REFERENCES

- Andrienko, T., & Shpeniuk, I. (2021). Book Review. A New Contribution to the Treasury of Translation Theory: Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. (2020). O. Kalnychenko & L. Chernovaty, (Eds.). Vol. 2. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.29038/eejpl.2021.8.2.and>
- Alves, F., & Albir, A. H. (2017). Evolution, challenges, and perspectives for research on cognitive aspects of translation. *The handbook of translation and cognition*, 535-554.
- Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (2019). *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. Routledge.
- Chan, L. (2012). A survey of the 'new' discipline of adaptation studies: between translation and interculturalism. *Perspectives*, 20(4), 411-418.
- Colina, S. (2011). Evaluation/Assessment. *Handbook of translation studies*, 2, 43-48.
- Colina, S. (2013). Assessment of translation. *Guide to Print Pagination*, 113, 11.
- Daems, J., Vandepitte, S., Hartsuiker, R. J., & Macken, L. (2017). Translation methods and experience: A comparative analysis of human translation and post-editing with students and professional translators. *Meta*, 62(2), 245-270.
- DePalma, D. (2013). Post-editing in practice. *Translation and Localization*.
- Downing, S. M. (2003). Validity: on the meaningful interpretation of assessment data. *Medical education*, 37(9), 830-837.
- Drugan, J. (2013). *Quality in professional translation: Assessment and improvement* (Vol. 9). A&C Black.
- Even-Zohar, I. (2005). Polysystem theory (revised). *Papers in culture research*, 38-49.
- Gambier, Y. (2018). Concepts of translation. *A history of modern translation knowledge*, 19-38.
- Gambier, Y., & Van Doorslaer, L. (Eds.). (2016). *Border crossings: Translation studies and other disciplines* (Vol. 126). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gouadec, D. (2007). *Translation as a Profession*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Han, C. (2020). Translation quality assessment: a critical methodological review. *The Translator*, 26(3), 257-273.



- House, J. (2013). Quality in translation studies. In *The Routledge handbook of translation studies* (pp. 534-547). Routledge.
- House, J. (2014). Translation quality assessment: Past and present. In *Translation: A multidisciplinary approach* (pp. 241-264). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- International Labour Organization. (2012). *International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO)*. Retrieved from <https://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/isco/docs/publication08.pdf>
- Kramsch, C. (2014). Language and culture. *AILA review*, 27(1), 30-55.
- Krieger, M. (2019). *The Theory of Criticism: A Tradition and Its System*. JHU Press.
- Lefebure, C. (2019). Translating letters: criticism as a perspective for a translator. *Applied Translation*, 13(1), 32-39.
- Lefevere, A. (2016). *Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame*. Taylor & Francis.
- Long, L. (2013). The translation of sacred texts. In *The Routledge handbook of translation studies* (pp. 464-474). Routledge.
- Maier, C. (Ed.). (2000). *Evaluation and translation*. St. Jerome.
- Marco, J. (2007). The terminology of translation: Epistemological, conceptual and intercultural problems and their social consequences. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 19(2), 255-269.
- Mossop, B. (2020). *Revising and editing for translators*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Munday, J. (2012). *Evaluation in translation: Critical points of translator decision-making*. Routledge.
- Muzii, L. (2006). Quality assessment and economic sustainability of translation.
- Paloposki, O. (2012). Translation criticism. *Handbook of translation studies*, 3, 184-190.
- Pereira, D., Flores, M. A., & Niklasson, L. (2016). Assessment revisited: a review of research in Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(7), 1008-1032.
- Pym, A. (2023). *Exploring translation theories*. Taylor & Francis.
- Reiss, K., & Rhodes, E. F. (2014). *Translation criticism-potentials and limitations: Categories and criteria for translation quality assessment*. Routledge.
- Scheerens, J., Glas, C. A., & Thomas, S. (2003). *Educational evaluation, assessment, and monitoring: A systemic approach* (Vol. 13). Taylor & Francis.
- Schulte, R., & Biguenet, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Theories of translation: An anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida*. University of Chicago Press.
- Van den Broeck, R. (2014). Second thoughts on translation criticism: A model of its analytic function. *The Manipulation of Literature (Routledge Revivals)*, 54-62.
- Venuti, L. (2017). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (Ed.). (2021). *The translation studies reader*. Routledge.
- Waugh, P. (Ed.). (2006). *Literary theory and criticism: An Oxford guide*. Oxford University Press.
- Williams, M. (2001). The application of argumentation theory to translation quality assessment. *Meta*, 46(2), 326-344.
- Woang, J. P. (2021). Translation activities on oral translation and written



ISSN Print: 2147-4168 Online: 2147-5385

Ocak / Şubat / Mart Yılı: 2024 Sayı: 33 Kış Dönemi

January / February / March Year: 2024 Number: 33 Winter Term

translation. *Applied Translation*, 15(1), 28-38.

Zhang, M., & Munday, J. (2018). Innovation in discourse analytic approaches to translation studies. *Perspectives*, 26(2), 159-165.