THEORY AND METHODS OF TEACHING.
ТЕОРІЯ І МЕТОДИКА НАВЧАННЯ

Approaches to Assessing Translation Proficiency

Valentyna STRILETS
PhD in Pedagogy,
Associate Professor,
Department of Foreign Philology and Translation
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine,
15 Heroyiv Oborony Street, Kyiv 03041, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0806-0289

Abstract. Introduction. An important component of the system of specialized translation competence development is the assessment of its proficiency level, which should be based on the latest developments in the field of translator training methodology, the translation service industry requirements, and current national and international academic standards.

The **purpose** of this paper is to analyze approaches to translation competence assessment and to distinguish those relevant to assessing specialized translation proficiency of 4th-year Philology students.

The author applies theoretical **research methods**: analyzing research papers referring to translation assessment and academic standards namely the CEFR and the PETRA-E Framework, collating and generalizing their key ideas and provisions as well as synthesizing them in order to outline the approaches to specialized translation competence assessment.

Discussion. The level-based approach should be implemented through defining the initial and target levels of specialized translation proficiency separately for English-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-English language pairs and taking into account the CEFR global scale descriptors concerning translating a written text in writing, modified with regard to text type, translation variation (full, fragmentary, summary, abstract), and ICT skills; as well as the PETRA-E Framework competence-based descriptors, altered in accordance with specialized translation features, in particular, terminology and subject matter knowledge and relevant skills. The process-oriented approach is better manifested during formative assessment, the purpose of which is to receive feedback on the effect of specialized translation knowledge acquisition and skill formation. It is implemented through the check-list method and translation text analysis. The product-oriented approach involves evaluating the target text using holistic, analytic (analytic proper, error count, check-list, and norm-referenced) and combined methods depending on translation variation, type and purpose of assessment.

Conclusions. Assessing specialized translation competence of 4th-year students majoring in Philology is a complex multifaceted process that is grounded on the level-based, process-oriented and product-oriented approaches. Their implementation relies on the modified CEFR and PETRA-E Framework proficiency descriptors and depends on translation variation, assessment type and purpose.

Key words: trainee translators, specialized translation, translation competence, proficiency level.

Introduction. An important component of the system of specialized translation competence development is the assessment of its proficiency level, which allows both a translator trainer and trainee translators to see how successful the teaching-learning process has been and whether the expected learning outcomes have been achieved. The academic subject *Specialized Translation* is taught, as a rule, in the 4th year of the bachelor's degree program, when students are preparing for future professional activities and should be aware of the requirements for specialized translation quality, which is achieved in the educational process through simulating the conditions of the translation service industry. On the other hand, as S. Fokin (Fokin, 2016: 314) rightly asserts, the conditions of assessment and evaluation in the academic setting differ from those in the professional environment. Trainee translators' proficiency assessment must meet the basic requirements, namely reliability and validity, be objective and as transparent, clear and balanced as possible. To this end, scholars and translator trainers should choose appropriate approaches based on the latest developments in the field of

translator training methodology, the translation service industry requirements, and current national and international academic standards.

Literature review. In recent years, scholars and translator trainers have addressed different issues of assessing students' translation proficiency and target text quality.

Ya. Fabrychna has thoroughly examined current researches concerning assessment in translation didactics, in particular "approaches, aims, functions, objects, kinds, methods and instruments, their peculiarities and requirements to them in terms of kind of translation, language pair, subject domain, higher education grade level (Fabrychna, 2021: 16 – 17)".

Comprehensive research into the problem of assessment in translator training has been carried out by T. Korol who has covered such issues as advantages and drawbacks of holistic and analytic translation evaluation methods (Korol, 2020), applying refelective approach (derived from the social constructivist one) to assessing trainee translators' competence (Korol, 2023), combining "screen video recording as the way to fix and analyse translation problem-solving manifestations and think aloud protocol to promote translation problem solution and provide subjective information on the translation process workflow (Nikolaeva & Korol, 2021: 41)".

The main debate revolves around the question of evaluation methods, their justification being proved with empirically obtained data. Among the proponents of the holistic scale is M. Garant (Garant, 2009), who by means of interviewing has determined it as the most preferable method used by translator trainers in Helsinki. The analytic method is promoted by L. Chernovatyi (Chernovatyi, 2013), who having adapted other scholars' findings substantiates 11 criteria for assessing translation of an abstract as a scientific-technical text type. 9 of these criteria are used by V. Ihnatenko and V. Borshchovetska for assessing abstract and gist translation from French into Ukrainian (Ihnatenko & Borshchovetska, 2020). When analyzing the structure and content of a summative specialized translation test common for Saudi Arabian educational institutions, R. Al-Jarf (Al-Jarf, 2021) focuses

on both qualitative and quantitative aspects to be assessed, the former including organization, layout, grammar, cohesion and coherence, punctuation, spelling, rendering meaning; the latter comprising text length and time allotted

The error count method is advocated by S. Fokin (Fokin, 2016), who has summarized the criteria suggested by other researchers for evaluating students' translation of a non-specialized text and justified types of errors within them, and by V. Ihnatenko and V. Borshchovetska (Ihnatenko & Borshchovetska, 2020), who have elaborated an assessment scale with penalty points. E. Vázquez y del Árbol has empirically revealed the most common sense mistakes in specialized translation of scientific-technical texts and explained the reasons for their occurrence but she has failed to describe the assessment process (Vázquez y del Árbol, 2014). In the context of applying corpus technologies for teaching and assessing specialized translation, N. Kübler et al. (Kübler et al., 2018) suggest using the MeLLANGE error typology, which contains content-transfer and language errors however the authors do not estimate their severity.

J. Eyckmans and Ph. Anckaert (Eyckmans & Anckaert, 2017) have introduced a sample-based methodology (the Calibration of Dichotomous Items) belonging to norm-referenced methods to determine translation competence.

Given such a variety of methods and their proven advantages, it is quite obvious that research papers offering combined assessment models are emerging. Thus, R. Mateo has elaborated a model combining a top-down approach through the rubric assessing "macro-textual elements of the text by allotting them bonus points" and a bottom-up one through the metrics counting micro-textual errors and subtracting penalty points (Mateo, 2014: 90). M. Williams has developed a holistic-componential model for assessing translation student performance and competency supplementing it with reference to standards and expected learning outcomes (Williams, 2013). The third combined method has been presented by A. Hurtado Albir and S. Pavani in their empirically proven study on multidimensional summative assessment "based on a range of criterion-referenced and competence-based

assessment instruments and tasks (Hurtado Albir & Pavani, 2018: 25)", which allows translator trainers to obtain data on translation sub-competence acquisition.

Noteworthy is the research conducted by H. Mei and H. Chen (Mei & Chen, 2022) who have integrated China's Standards of English, in particular its chapter concerning translation skills, with cognitive diagnostic assessment approaches to gain information on students' translation proficiency. No similar studies regarding the application of written mediation proficiency descriptors contained in the updated version of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2020) have been conducted, which confirms the topicality of this research.

In spite of scholars' increasing interests in different aspects of assessing trainee translators' proficiency and target text quality, the issue of substantiating approaches pertinent to assessing specialized translation competence has not been highlighted in academic publications.

The purpose of the article is to analyze approaches to translation competence assessment and to distinguish those relevant to assessing specialized translation proficiency of 4th-year Philology students.

Materials and research methods. Carrying out this study we resorted to analyzing research papers referring to translation assessment and academic standards namely *the Standard of Higher Education of Ukraine for the first (Bachelor's) degree in 03 Humanities (field of knowledge), 035 Philology* (*specialty*) (Standard, 2019), *the Common European Framework of References for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment – Companion volume (CEFR)* (Council of Europe, 2020), and *the PETRA-E Framework of Reference for the Education and Training of Literary Translators* (PETRA-E Framework, 2016); collating and generalizing their key ideas and provisions as well as synthesizing them in order to outline the approaches to specialized translation competence assessment.

Results and discussion. According to M. Williams, the assessment model should incorporate "clear statements of intended learning outcomes for a course, the types of knowledge and competencies being targeted, and the degrees of knowledge or competency

to be achieved, providing valuable information for a variety of stakeholders, including the students themselves, colleagues, and even prospective employers (Williams, 2013: 424)".

In the Ukrainian academic context of training bachelors of philology, general and professional competencies and corresponding expected learning outcomes are presented in the State Standard (Standard, 2019) and reproduced in the curricular of those academic subjects that ensure their implementation. For example, one of the specialized translation competencies "awareness of the principles and technologies of creating texts of various genres and styles in native and foreign languages (Standard, 2019: 9)" correlates with the following expected learning outcome: "to know principles, technologies and methods of creating oral and written texts of various genres and styles in native and foreign languages (Standard, 2019: 9)". We consider this formulation somewhat vague, as it lacks such details as genres and topics of texts, their length and complexity. These shortcomings do not make it possible to properly measure the achievement of the outcome. The solution to this problem can be seen in the application of a level-based approach to assessing the specialized translation competence, which will allow translator trainers not only to clearly outline the initial, intermediate and target levels of its mastery and, accordingly, to formulate the expected learning outcomes, but to demonstrate advancing from a lower level to a higher one.

To this end, we turn to the current documents such as the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2020) and the PETRA-E Framework (PETRA-E Framework, 2016).

The Companion volume of the CEFR published in 2020 contains a rather detailed description of different mediation activities, in particular, 7 ways of mediating a text: relaying specific information, explaining data, processing text, translating a written text, note-taking, expressing a personal response to creative texts, analysis and criticism of creative texts (Council of Europe, 2020: 90). In our research we distinguish 2 types of specialized translation according to the completeness of conveying the source text content in the target text: full and contracted,

the latter being split into fragmentary, summary and abstract ones (Strilets, 2019). Therefore, we get deeper insight into corresponding types of mediating a text, namely: translating a written text in writing which correlates with full translation, relaying specific information in writing associated with fragmentary translation, and processing text in writing which is close to summary and abstract translation. In addition, we analyze the descriptors of those levels which, according to our empirical data, are initial and target for trainee translators in the 4th year of their Bachelor program, when their specialized translation competence is formed based on the general translation knowledge and skills.

The CEFR comprises the following descriptors for translating a written text in writing:

C1 "can translate (into Language B) abstract texts on social, academic and professional subject in their field (written in Language A), successfully conveying evaluate aspects and arguments, including many of the implications associated with them, though some expression may be over-influenced by the original (Council of Europe, 2020: 103)".

C2 "can translate (into Language B) technical material outside their field of specialisation (written in Language A), provided subject matter accuracy is checked by a specialist in the field concerned (Council of Europe, 2020: 103)".

The highest level suggested by the CEFR for relaying specific information in writing is B2.2 which is described as follows: "Can relay in writing (in language B) the relevant point(s) contained in propositionally complex but well-structured texts (in Language A) within their fields of professional, academic and personal interest. Can relay in writing (in Language B) the relevant point(s) contained in an article (in Language A) from an academic or professional journal (Council of Europe, 2020: 94)".

Processing text in writing is presented by the following descriptors:

C1 "Can summarise in writing (in Language B) long, complex texts (in Language A), interpreting the content appropriately, provided they can occasionally check the precise meaning of unusual, technical terms. Can summarise in writing a long and complex text (in Language A) (e.g. an academic article, article providing political analysis, novel extract, editorial, literary review, report or extract from a scientific book) for a specific audience, respecting the style and register of the original (Council of Europe, 2020: 99)". Having omitted such text types as a literary review and a novel extract, we accept this formulation for the specialized translation training context.

C2 "Can explain in writing (in Language B) the way that facts and arguments are presented in a text (in Language A), particularly when someone else's position is being reported, drawing attention to the use of understatement, veiled criticism, irony and sarcasm. Can summarise information from different sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation of the overall result (Council of Europe, 2020: 99)". These descriptors echo the competences typically attributed to summary translation.

The descriptors examined above can be considered a basis for describing the proficiency levels in such types of specialized translation as full, fragmentary, summary, and abstract with further modifications in accordance with their features, namely integrating the ability to use IT tools and specifying text genres common for a certain field (agriculture, construction , energy, oil and gas, etc.). In addition, our teaching experience shows that students demonstrate a higher proficiency in English into Ukrainian translation than that in Ukrainian into English. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct an empirical study to determine the weight of this difference and reflect it in the appropriate descriptors for the two combinations of the English-Ukrainian language pair.

In the CEFR descriptors, progression to a higher level is demonstrated by increasing text complexity, expanding genre diversity and thematic range, higher requirements to target text accuracy and its compliance with the target language rules. These aspects should be taken into account when determining the evaluation parameters for the assessment methods discussed below.

The PETRA-E Framework contains a 5-level descriptive scale of literary translation proficiency by 8 competencies: transfer, language, textual, heuristic, literary-cultural,

professional, evaluative, and research (PETRA-E Framework, 2016). Although this document is tailored for literary translation both in academic and professional environment, its content is worth analyzing to identify universal competences and those that should be omitted or modified according to the subject of our study.

Below are the descriptors of the specified competences at the LT2 (Advanced Learner) level, which we believe should be achieved by the 4th-year trainee translators.

1) "Transfer competence comprises the ability to recognize problems of textual understanding and text production and the ability to solve these problems in an appropriate way, and to account for the final result (PETRA-E Framework, 2016)". Its sub-competences' descriptors formulated as can-do statements include the following: understand literary source texts, identify literary translation problems, see the implications of translation strategies, apply translation strategies appropriately, produce a literary target text, justify individual choices and decisions, distinguish between different translation approaches (PETRA-E Framework, 2016). In general, these descriptors are applicable for the specialized translator training context provided "literary" is substituted with "specialized".

2) Language competence refers to "the grammatical, stylistic and pragmatic mastering of the source language" at CEF C1 (for reading) and the target language at CEF C2 (for reading and writing) (PETRA-E Framework, 2016). As for the "ability to apply literary styles and language varieties (PETRA-E Framework, 2016)" it should be reformulated as the ability to apply formal and semi-formal styles of specialized texts and to use general, academic and specialized vocabulary.

3) Textual competence consists of the knowledge of literary genres and styles and the ability to apply this knowledge in the analysis of source texts and the production of target texts. It comprises the following sub-competences: ability to analyze source texts, familiarity with literary genres, familiarity with the stylistic features of a source text, application of literary techniques, production of target texts with stylistic features, editorial skills of revising own texts. Here, "literary" should also be substituted with "specialized".

We consider pre-translation source text analysis an important tool for evaluating a number of students' sub-competences such as: to identify translation problems, to choose appropriate translation strategies and other ones depending on the particular text analysis task.

4) Within heuristic competence we highlight "the ability to gather in an efficient way the linguistic and thematic knowledge needed for translation" and "the ability to develop strategies for an efficient use of (digital) information sources (PETRA-E Framework, 2016)" while referring "the ability to apply textual criticism and to differentiate between text editions (PETRA-E Framework, 2016)" to literary translation. Consequently, most of the can-do statements, except for those associated with literary translation, are relevant for specialized translation, namely: find specific reference material, use digital tools, apply digital search strategies relevant for translation, and use reference material (PETRA-E Framework, 2016).

5) In the context of our research, literary-cultural competence should be altered to cross-cultural one and should encompass the ability to apply knowledge about the source and target culture while making a specialized translation; and the ability to handle cultural differences.

6) Professional competence is defined as "the ability to gather knowledge about the working field and to show the appropriate attitude expected by the working field (PETRA-E Framework, 2016)". Having rejected purely literary translation sub-competences such as familiarity with publishers and literary funds, we enlist those relevant for specialized translation: familiarity with financial, ethical, and legal aspects; familiarity with current translation approaches; networking skills; entrepreneurial skills (meeting deadlines) (PETRA-E Framework, 2016).

7) A trainee translator with evaluative competence "can estimate quality of translations by others" and "interpret differences between translations of the same text (PETRA-E Framework, 2016)"

8) Research competence comprises the ability to "apply research methodologies", "distinguish and name existing translation techniques", "analyze translations on an academic level", "familiarity with translation theories" and "schools of thought in

translation studies (PETRA-E Framework, 2016)".

The above descriptors modified according to the focus of our research can serve a basis for developing both formative and summative assessment tests, criteria-based analytic scales for different translation tasks, as well as self-assessment and peer-assessment grids.

In the academic setting, a translator trainer should get deeper insight into the translation process which requires applying a process-oriented approach both to teaching and assessing. This approach has been explored by S. Cheng from a problem-solving perspective (Cheng, 2019).

The process-oriented approach to assessing translation competence is aimed at providing information on students' current proficiency, in particular their ability to use resources, to adhere to guidelines, to determine difficulties of translating a particular source text (user's manual, specification, report, contract, website, academic paper etc.) and find ways of overcoming them, to evaluate a source text in order to select appropriate global and local translation strategies, in particular, ICT-based ones.

The process-oriented approach is better manifested during formative assessment, the purpose of which is to receive feedback on the effect of specialized translation knowledge acquisition and skill formation. In this respect we suggest applying the method of translation text analysis which we consider appropriate for developing and assessing specialized translation competence, in particular such its components as extra-linguistic, text-typology, cross-cultural, and strategic sub-competences. A translator trainer should elaborate the content of text analysis task and use it both as a teaching and assessment tool. Another appropriate tool for process-oriented self- and peer-assessment is a can-do grid comprising the described above sub-competences.

Since the end product of specialized translators' activity – the target text – mirrors the level of their professional competence formation, a product-oriented approach to evaluation should be considered. This approach which has long been theoretically and empirically studied by scholars and confirmed by practicing translators is also reflected in professional translation quality standards. It is implemented through holistic and analytic assessment methods.

Advocating for the holistic method which implies evaluation based on the overall impression, M. Garant argues that "contemporary translation instructors tend to approach assessment at the discourse level and not at the sentence or word level (Garant, 2009: 12)", they move away from the previous practice of overemphasizing grammatical errors and lean towards the idea of encouraging students to develop their translation skills through this approach (Garant, 2009: 13). Although this method is feasible it features high subjectivity and therefore is recommended to be used with certain caveats at the final stage of translation training (Korol, 2020: 55).

Analytic methods include analytic proper, error count, check-list, and norm-referenced ones (Korol, 2020: 55 – 56).

Applying analytic proper method L. Chernovatyi presents 11 criteria for assessing translation of an abstract as a scientific-technical text type: appropriate translation strategy (word-by-word translation, sense translation, combined), sense equivalence of source text (ST) and target text (TT), sense equivalence of ST and TT keywords, functional equivalence of ST and TT, intention-affective equivalence of ST and TT, compliance with language and speech standards of the target language, terminology accuracy, relevance to discourse and genre characteristics, justified use of translation techniques, compliance with ST nature and recipients' expectations, meeting customer's requirements (Chernovatyi, 2013: 235 – 242). This method is rather popular among translator trainers due to its feasibility and objectivity while developing and validating assessment criteria are considered to be its drawbacks (Korol, 2020: 56). It is recommended to be applied for formative and summative assessment of contracted translation (Korol, 2020: 56), which is implemented by V. Ihnatenko and V. Borshchovetska (Ihnatenko & Borshchovetska, 2020).

H. Mei and H. Chen suggest elaborating check-lists for each translation task. For example, making use of China's Standards of English (CSE) (levels 5 and 6) they have selected the following items for assessing

translation of a popular science article from Chinese into English:

– Can translate short popular science articles, conveying the key information

– Can convey detailed information in the exposition

– Can properly translate expressions for a series of nouns in accordance with the grammatical rules of the translation

– Can flexibly adjust the word order according to the way of expression in English

– Can flexibly use translation skills such as omissions to remove repetitions in the original

– Can add conjunctions indicating logical connections implied in the original according to English sentence patterns (Mei & Chen, 2022: 6).

In our research, we regard this check-list exclusively as an example, as it is focused on CSE 5 – 6 correlating with CEFR B1 – B2. A check-list for assessing specialized translation should include the discussed above elements of PETRA-E LT2 and CEFR C1 – C2 and be applied for formative self- and peer-assessment.

The error count assessment method is followed by S. Fokin (Fokin, 2016). Referring to other scholars' findings, he has summarized 3 types of errors and suggested the following 100-point scale evaluation system of non-specialized text translation by the 4th-year students, taking into account penalty points depending on error severity.

Meaning-related errors:

– changing the content to the opposite; changing the illocutionary force of the message - 10 points

– changing denotative meaning - 7,5 points

– changing the essential nuances of the meaning while preserving the main denotative meaning; errors related to untaught translation techniques; errors that do not significantly distort the content, leading to a potentially ambiguous reading of the fragment – 2-3 points

Violating target language standards:

– grammatical, lexical, and spelling inconsistencies with the target language standards - 5 points

– punctuation errors; errors related to untaught translation techniques - 2,5 points

– errors in the graphic presentation of the text, minor spelling errors - 1 point

Style:

– reproducing the connotative meaning of figures of speech and stylistically marked units + 3 points

– neutralization of figures of speech and connotatively marked units – 3 points (Fokin, 2016: 317).

The most frequent sense-related errors made by the 4th-year trainee translators when rendering English specialized texts into Spanish have been classified and analyzed by E. Vázquez y del Árbol (Vázquez y del Árbol, 2014). In the scientific-technical translation exam the author observed the following: incorrect meanings, calques, anglicisms, omissions, nonsenses, and over-translations (Vázquez y del Árbol, 2014: 5).

This method is suitable for formative assessment focused on translation difficulties (Fabrychna, 2021; Korol, 2020).

The norm-referenced method is grounded on "the idea of assessing translation competence on the basis of items (Eyckmans & Anckaert, 2017: 43)". J. Eyckmans and Ph. Anckaert (Eyckmans & Anckaert, 2017) promote its variation – the Calibration of Dichotomous Items (CDI). Featuring validity and reliability this method is complicated to implement and is fit for standardized tests.

Nowadays, scholars tend to use different assessment methods' merits by combining them in one model. A multidimensional summative assessment model designed by A. Hurtado Albir and S. Pavani comprises assessment tasks with specific assessment rubrics, a portfolio, and a traditional summative assessment test for criterion-referenced and competence-based assessment (Hurtado Albir & Pavani, 2018). We consider it applicable (with some limitations) for evaluating trainee translators' sub-competence acquisition.

R. Mateo suggests combining two opposite but complementary approaches – a top-down and a bottom-up ones – to assess the target text at the macro-textual level through rubrics by allotting bonus points and at the micro-textual one through metrics by subtracting penalty points. Focusing his research on the translation service industry, the author states that "the application of this componential tool will supply the rater with two quality indicators, one of a qualitative nature (rubric) alongside a quantitative one

(metric) (Mateo, 2014: 90)".

R. Mateo's model echoes M. Williams' holistic-componental one tailored for the academic setting (Williams, 2013). The latter takes into account professional standards when formulating expected learning outcomes and provides indicators demonstrating 5 levels of competence acquisition. Being acceptable in general, this model needs modifying according to the above-mentioned peculiarities of our study, in particular, competencies and expected learning outcomes.

Conclusions. Assessing specialized translation competence of 4th-year students majoring in Philology is a complex multifaceted process that is grounded on the level-based, process-oriented and product-oriented approaches. The level-based approach should be implemented through defining the initial and target levels of specialized translation proficiency separately for English-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-English language pairs and taking into account the CEFR global scale descriptors (Council of Europe, 2020) concerning translating a written text in writing, modified with regard to text type, translation variation (full, fragmentary, summary, abstract), and ICT skills; as well as the PETRA-E Framework (PETRA-E Framework, 2016) competence-based descriptors, altered in accordance with specialized translation features, in particular, terminology and subject matter knowledge and relevant skills. The process-oriented approach is better manifested during formative assessment, the purpose of which is to receive feedback on the effect of specialized translation knowledge acquisition and skill formation. It is implemented through the check-list method and translation text analysis. The product-oriented approach involves evaluating the target text using holistic, analytic (analytic proper, error count, check-list, and norm-referenced) and combined methods depending on translation variation, type and purpose of assessment. Further research should be focused on developing an appropriate model for assessing specialized translation competence of the 4th-year trainee translators.

References

Al-Jarf, R. (2021). Critical analysis of translation tests in 18 specialized translation courses for undergraduate students. European Journal of Education and Pedagogy, 2(3), 1-7. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2021.2.3.86

Cheng, S. (2019). Exploring process-oriented translation competence assessment: rationale, necessity, and potential from a problem-solving perspective. In E. Huertas-Barros, S. Vandepitte, & E. Iglesias-Fernández (Eds.), Quality Assurance and Assessment Practices in Translation and Interpreting (pp. 199-225). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-5225-3.ch009

Chernovatyi, L. M. (2013). Methodology of teaching translation as speciality: textbook for translation majors. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha, 376 p.

Council of Europe (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment – Companion volume. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing. URL: https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4

Eyckmans, J., & Anckaert, Ph. (2017). Item-based assessment of translation competence: Chimera of objectivity versus prospect of reliable measurement. Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies, 16, 40–56.

Fabrychna, Ya. (2021). Current researches on the issue of assessment in translation didactics. Foreign Languages, 4, 16–28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32589/1817-8510.2021.4.248289

Fokin, S. B. (2016). Criteria for evaluation of general text translation in accordance with n-point system. Language and conceptual world views. Kyiv: Kyiv University, 56 (2), 311 – 320. URL: http://postup.zzz.com.ua/Fokin_Kriter_otsinky_perekladu.pdf

Garant, M. (2009). A case for holistic translation assessment. Kalliokoski, J., T. Nikko, S. Pyhäniemi & S. Shore (toim.) 2009. AFinLA-e Soveltavan kielitieteen tutkimuksia, 1, 5–17. URL: http://ojs.tsv.fi/index.php/afinla/article/viewFile/2612/2402

Hurtado Albir, A., & Pavani, S. (2018). An empirical study on multidimensional summative assessment in translation

teaching. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 12 (1), 25–47. DOI: 10.1080/1750399X.2017.1420131

Ihnatenko, V., & Borshchovetska, V. (2020). Special aspects of gist and abstract translation quality assessment. Foreign Languages, 3(103), 12–17. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32589/1817-8510.2020.3.218988

Korol, T. (2020). Assessment of prospective philologists' translation performance: evaluation methods review. Innovative Pedagogy, 26, 54–57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32843/2663-6085/2020/26.10

Korol, T. (2023). Reflective approach to prospective philologists' translation competence assessment. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series5.2023.92.2.08

Kübler, N., Mestivier, A., & Pecman, M. (2018). Teaching secialised translation through corpus linguistics: translation quality assessment and methodology evaluation and enhancement by experimental approach. *Meta*, 63(3), 807–825. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/1060174a

Mateo, R. M. (2014). A deeper look into metrics for translation quality assessment (TQA): a case study. Miscelánea: a Journal of English and American Studies, 49, 73-94.

Mei, H., & Chen, H. (2022). assessing students' translation competence: integrating China's Standards of English with cognitive diagnostic assessment approaches. Frontiers in Psychology. 13:872025. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.872025

Nikolaeva, S., & Korol, T. (2021). Prospective philologists' translation assessment triangulation: screen video recording and think aloud protocol combination. Advanced Education, 8(18), 30-41. DOI: https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.228550

PETRA-E Framework of Reference for the Education and Training of Literary Translators. URL: https://petra-educationframework.eu/

Standard of Higher Education of Ukraine for the first (Bachelor's) degree in 03 Humanities (field of knowledge), 035 Philology (specialty). (2019). Kyiv: Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine.

Strilets, V. V. (2019). Peculiarities of teaching contracted scientific and technical translation. Pedagogical Process: Theory and Practice. Series: Pedagogy, 3–4 (66–67), 84–89.

Vázquez y del Árbol, E. (2014). specialised translation assessment: uncommon senses and other stories. Lebende Sprachen, 59 (1), 1–18. DOI: 10.1515/les-2014-0004

Williams, M. (2013). A holistic-componential model for assessing translation student performance and competency. Mutatis Mutandis, 6 (2), 419–443.

Підходи до оцінювання компетентності в письмовому перекладі

Валентина СТРІЛЕЦЬ
кандидат педагогічних наук,
доцент кафедри іноземної філології і перекладу
Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України,
03041, Героїв Оборони, 15, Київ, Україна
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0806-0289

Анотація. Актуальність. Важливим компонентом системи формування компетентності в письмовому галузевому перекладі є оцінювання рівня її сформованості, що має враховувати новітні напрацювання науковців, вимоги ринку праці та сучасні як міжнародні, так і вітчизняні освітні стандарти. **Мета** статті – проаналізувати підходи до оцінювання компетентності в письмовому перекладі і визначити ті, які відповідають оцінювання рівня сформованості компетентності в письмовому галузевому перекладі у студентів 4-го курсу спеціальності «Філологія». Автор застосовує такі теоретичні **методи** дослідження, як аналіз наукових праць із оцінювання перекладу та освітніх стандартів, а саме Загальноєвропейських рекомендацій з мовної освіти і Проєкту PETRA-E, зіставлення, узагальнення і синтез їхніх основних положень для обґрунтування підходів до оцінювання компетентності в письмовому галузевому перекладі.

Обговорення. Реалізація рівневого підходу здійснюється через визначення початкового і цільового рівнів володіння письмовим галузевим перекладом окремо для англійсько-української й українсько-англійської мовних пар та врахування дескрипторів глобальної шкали

Загальноєвропейських рекомендацій з мовної освіти в частині письмового перекладу тексту, модифікованих з урахуванням типів текстів, виду письмового перекладу (повного, фрагментарного, реферативного, анотованого) й інформаційно-технологічних умінь; а також компетентнісно-орієнтованих дескрипторів Проєкту PETRA-E, змінених згідно з особливостями галузевого перекладу, зокрема, термінологічними й предметними знаннями, навичками і вміннями. Підхід, орієнтований на процес, найкраще проявляється під час поточного контролю, метою якого є отримання зворотного зв'язку про ефективність засвоєння знань, формування навичок та розвитку вмінь. Він реалізується за допомогою таких методів, як контрольний лист та перекладацький аналіз тексту. Підхід, орієнтований на результат, передбачає оцінювання тексту перекладу за допомогою холістичного, аналітичних (власне аналітичного, еротологічного, на основі контрольного листа та нормо-орієнтованого) та комбінованого методів, вибір яких залежить від типу письмового перекладу, виду й мети контролю.

Висновки. Оцінювання рівня сформованості компетентності в письмовому галузевому перекладі у студентів 4-го курсу спеціальності «Філологія» – це складний багатогранний процес, який базується на рівневому підході, а також на підходах, орієнтованих на процес і результат. Вони реалізуються з урахуванням модифікованих дескрипторів Загальноєвропейських рекомендацій з мовної освіти й Проєкту PETRA-E, а також типу письмового перекладу, виду й мети контролю.

Ключові слова: майбутні перекладачі, галузевий переклад, компетентність у письмовому перекладі, рівень володіння.