The Relationship between Learning Objectives and Student Performance in the Course 'On-Sight Translation': A Data-Driven Analysis

Barış Can AYDIN

Department of English Translation and Interpretation, Çağ University, Mersin, Türkiye

Abstract	Original Research Article

On-Sight translation, which is one of the most essential courses in the majority of the undergraduate programs of Translation and Interpretation regardless of the source and target languages, is a course that requires authentic assessment methods including using a rubric since the course is a qualitative one, which requires the assessment of not only grammatically correct translation of the source text but also several other criteria including the coherence of plausibility, quality of the delivery, faithfulness as well as oral communication skills. Thus, the learning outcomes, objectives, materials, and assessment methods of the course are designed to meet the aforementioned requirements. This study deals with the relationship between the course outcomes and assessment results of the course entitled TRN205 On-Sight Translation at the Department of English Translation and Interpretation at Çağ University, Mersin, Türkiye in the Fall Semester of 2022-2023 Academic Year, by analyzing midterm grades of 50 second-grade students.

Keywords: On-Sight Translation, Translation Assessment, Learning Outcomes, Rubric-Based Evaluation, Interpreter Training

INTRODUCTION

Oral translation or interpretation is a field of Translation Studies, which possesses its own norms and authentic features. This makes courses related to oral translation, such as consecutive translation, on-sight translation, simultaneous translation, etc. distinguished from the courses related to written translation area, in terms of curriculum and material design, learning outcomes, and assessment activities.

As Eruz (2003) asserts, it is necessary for a translation training program at an academic level to comprise several different applied translation activities besides the theoretical background of Translation Studies (p. 71). Since oral translation is a field that is mainly based on performance and application, in-class tasks and assessment activities related to oral translation such as translating a speech or a written text orally gain great importance in curriculum design, and assessment activities necessarily become a performance-based interpretation activity rather than simply reciting the theoretical knowledge that the curriculum of the course covers.

This study is mainly focused on the assessment activities of the course entitled TRN205 On-Sight Translation at the Department of Translation and Interpretation at Çağ University located in Mersin, Türkiye. The course is a second-grade course and in total 50 students in two different sections are enrolled in the course in the Fall Semester of the 2022-2023 Academic Year.

The purpose of the study is to demonstrate the relationship between the learning outcomes of the course asserted in the syllabus and the midterm exam grades of the enrolled students. Since the examination is based on the assessment of an on-

sight translation of a paragraph that is 100 to 140 words long through a special rubric, which is based on the rubric for interpretation suggested by Andrew Gillies (2013) in his book entitled *Conference Interpreting* and modified according to assessment criteria and requirements of on-sight translation by adding and omitting some categories (p. 37). The categories that the rubric includes are related to the learning outcomes and aim of the course, as well as the natural requirements of on-sight translation. The rubric for the midterm, which is on a scale of 100 points in total has four main categories, respectively; coherence and plausibility (25 points), faithfulness (30 points), and language (25 points), and such categories include 20 subcategories in total, which are all on the scale of 5-points.

In the chapter entitled Theoretical Background, the theoretical framework of oral interpreting and especially On-Sight Translation is presented through its development throughout history by underlying the role of education in the activity of oral interpreting as well as teaching oral and on-sight translation. Moreover, the assessment criteria of the on-Sight Translation course are described by referring to numerous articles on the assessment of translator and interpreter training.

The methodology of the study is mentioned in the chapter entitled Methodology in a detailed way.

The chapter entitled Case Study, which is the main body of this study provides detailed information on the course entitled On-Sight Translation at the Department of Translation and Interpretation at Çağ University by presenting details related to the syllabus of the course including course description, learning outcomes, course objectives, weekly lecture plan, and assessment methods. In the chapter in-class tasks were performed in both sections throughout the 2022-2023 Fall Semester Midterm, by mentioning the features of source texts and the reasons why they were chosen as course materials.

What is more, this chapter includes several details related to the assessment methods and processes of the course under the subheading of Assessment on Rubric and a detailed analysis of the

students' grades on the Midterm, by demonstrating the average of each category and subcategory and their relationship between learning outcomes are presented under the sub-heading 'Relationship Between Midterm Grades and Learning Outcomes' and results are evaluated in both quantitatively and qualitatively at the Discussion chapter of the study by criticizing the learning outcomes and assessment activities and their role in the curriculum design of the course.

The Conclusion chapter of the study summarizes the data achieved through the study and results and provides suggestions for further studies related to translation training and assessment of oral interpretation.

Materials that are utilized in this study, such as the syllabus of the course TRN205 On-Sight Translation, the Rubric for the Midterm of On-Sight Translation, and tables related to the analysis of the rubric for the enrolled students are presented in the appendix chapter of the study.

1. Theoretical Background

1.1. History of Oral Translation

Oral translation dates back as early as the human itself. Since people started to communicate verbally long before the invention of writing, it cannot be a coincidence that oral translation activities have a more rooted history compared with written translation activities. Despite the fact that it was not until the 20th Century that a university-level formal education for oral translation was established, the activities of oral translation continued throughout centuries thanks to the interpreters who learned to perform their occupation through practical experience or master-apprentice relationships.

The earliest proofs that demonstrate the appearance of translation date back to the third millennium BC in Ancient Egypt and Rome, which are rather related to commercial activities. Even though interpretation for diplomatic purposes gained importance in the following centuries and interpreters performed their occupation under different titles like 'dragomans' in ancient Egypt and 'language boys' in the Ottoman Empire, the

professional approach towards interpretation was revealed in the early 20th Century. The Paris Peace Conference held in 1919 can be considered a milestone in the history of oral interpreting because it was the very first example of the application of professional interpretation by Paul Mantoux, who interpreted for the Allied leaders (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 28).

Most of the professional translators were working at the League of Nations and its affiliate the International Labour Office (ILO) in Geneva, where the first specific training initiatives for note-taking in consecutive interpreting as well as the earliest initiatives for scientific research on interpreting and interpreters initiated (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 160).

The very first school for training business translators and interpreters was founded in Mannheim, Germany in 1930, then transferred to the University of Heidelberg, consecutively, schools for the same purposes were founded in Geneva and Vienna (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 28).

In the early 1940s, simultaneous interpreting was introduced at the Nuremberg Trial (1945-1946) and adopted by many international institutions such as the United Nations. This led to the foundation of several national and international professional organizations for translators and interpreters such as the International Federation of Translation (FIT) and the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) in 1953. Working conditions are innovated and facilitated by AIIC, thanks to the adoption of the code of ethics and professional standards in 1957 (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 28).

In 1959 AIIC adopted a 'school policy' for the training of translators at the university level. Translation and Interpretation schools undertaking to observe their criteria (i.e. that interpreting courses be designed and taught by practicing conference interpreters) joined together in the early 1960s from Conference of University Level Translator and Interpreter Schools (CIUTI) as a select group of recognized institutions. The schools, which are located in cities like Geneva, Heidelberg, Paris, Trieste, and Vienna, have a rather vocational profile (Pöchhacker, 2004, p. 31).

The First textbooks published related to interpreting were written by Hebert (1952), Rozan (1956), van Hoof (1962), and Seleskovitch (1968). Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, Curricula and education of the interpretation training programs in universities were occupation-based rather than academic-based (Pöchlacker, 2004, p. 31). According to Mackintosh (1999), in the 1980s, the curricula of interpretation training programs became more theory-oriented but the practice also remained its importance. Students are both oriented to practice their occupation as well as carry out academic research and graduation theses (p. 73, as cited in Pöchlacker, 2004, p. 31).

Moreover, interpretation has become an academic discipline that is worthy of doctoral research, and several master's theses and Ph.D. dissertations have been written which contributed to the development and progress of interpretation. Despite the fact that academic research related to interpretation gained importance in the academic environment, the conflict between academic and vocational representatives of the field continued for many years, the failed attempt to demote the Department of Translation and Interpreting at the University of Heidelberg to the level of a polytechnic is a good example for it. Thanks to the EU, the new structure of interpreter training programs at the university level, which comprises sign language, community-based interpretation, and international conference interpretation gained more importance than before (Pöchlacker, 2004, p. 33).

As Pöchlacker (2004) asserts:

> Though the turn of the millennium is a rather arbitrary, and Eurocentric, marker, it does coincide with some significant developments in interpreting studies, both in its European 'heartland' and beyond, which are likely to shape the prospects for further progress of the discipline over the new century (p. 44).

1.2. Theoretical Framework of On-Sight Translation

On-Sight Translation or Sight Translation is a type of oral translation, which is defined and

approached differently by several different theoreticians. As an illustration, Gile (2009) considered it as a 'hybrid or intermediate mode of translation', namely a mode of translation between "pure translation" and "pure interpreting", an oral translation of the written text (Agrifoglio, 2004; Gile, 2009; Viezzi, 1989 as cited in Obidina, 2014, p. 91).

Some, who followed the idea of scholars following the idea of J. Herbert (1952) such as Agrifoglio, (2004) and Komissarov (1990) have defined sight translation as a type of simultaneous interpreting (Obidina, 2014, p. 91) Yet another definition of 'sight translation by L. Barkhudarov (1979) one of the written-oral translation sub-varieties when no preliminary reading is provided and rendering of the text is almost simultaneous to silent reading (Barkhudarov, 1975, as cited in Obidina, 2014, p. 91).

Through the guidance of the aforementioned theoreticians, Obidina (2014) sets out some challenges of the on-sight translation that one can encounter when (s)he practices it. These challenges include textual elements such as punctuation, grammatical, syntactical, and lexicological deficiencies of the source text, as well as the challenges caused by the interpreter himself/herself like concentration and sharing attention between the visual input and audial output. Several other factors, including the length of the source text, and the lack of the author, which makes it impossible to consult anxiety for performance and time limitations are also among the handicaps of on-sight translation (p. 92).

Thus, formal training and performing activities that aim to overcome such challenges are undeniably necessary during the process of translation and interpretation training. That is why the great majority of bachelor's and master's degree programs include courses entitled 'Sight Translation' or 'On-Sight Translation in their curricula.

1.3. Teaching On-Sight Translation

Pöchlacker (2004) accentuates that teaching sight translation as a special form of interpreting in the simultaneous mode is underestimated during the process of translator and interpreter training at the academic level by underlying the fact that most authors have considered interpreting at sight as a preliminary exercise, or even an aptitude test, rather than a curricular component (p. 186). Some scholars including Viezzi (1990) discussed the similarity of task demands assumed for sight translation and simultaneous interpretation from a process-oriented perspective (as cited in Pöchlacker, 2004, p. 186).

Although Pöchlacker (2004) also considered on-sight translation as an integral part of an interpreter's translational competence even though the implications of input processing by reading rather than listening remain unclear (p. 186)." Furthermore, Pöchlacker (2004) underlined the importance of on-sight translation by asserting that: "interpreting at sight in combination with simultaneous interpreting, as in the case of a speaker reading a text that the interpreter has available in the booth, involves a high degree of complexity that has yet to be addressed in detail from a didactic perspective (p. 186)."

Some scholars recognize sight translation as a useful method of language learning and recommended to improve translation and communication skills among others, such as A. Schjoldager, who consider it to be rather harmful and controversial for the learning process (Obidina, 2014, p. 93).

The article entitled *"Are L2 learners more prone to err when they translate?"* by A. Schjoldager (2004), which is related to the foreign language education system in Denmark and the author's own experiences as a teacher, underlines the role of on-sight translation in Denmark's education system, which is a necessity in both teaching and assessing the foreign language (Obidina, 2014, p. 93). Scholdage (2004) concludes her article by suggesting the investigation of this aspect in a more detailed way, since empirical evidence would be of great help to those who use on-sight translation as a teaching tool, those who teach translation, and also methodologists and educators (Schjoldager, 2004 as cited in Obidina, 2014, p. 93).

As Doğan (2017) asserts: "Oral translation from the written text may be required in any environment where consecutive and simultaneous interpretation is provided; In addition to this, interpreting from written text also offers a very useful exercise in interpreting education." (pp. 58-59) Doğan (2017) also underlines the importance of On-Sight Translation for preparing students for other types of

oral translation including Consecutive Translation or Simultaneous Translation: "On-sight translation, may be required in any environment where consecutive and simultaneous interpretation is provided; moreover, interpreting from the written text also offers a very useful exercise in interpreting education (p. 59).

1.4. On-Sight Translation and Assessment

Assessment, which is one the essential elements of education has mainly four purposes, respectively: 'accounting for learners' performance in relation to one or more competencies, encouraging students' control of the learning process, gauging the success of teachers' pedagogical practices taking learners one step closer to the qualification they are working towards (Presas, 2012, p. 143)."

As Orlando (2011) asserts, the definition of translation is the main issue to consider in the assessment process of translation, either oral or written. By referring to Larose (1998), Orlando (2011) accentuates that the term 'translation assessment' refers to two different situations, respectively; "transformation process of a source text (ST) into a target text (TT) or for the result of this transformation, it is crucial to make a clear distinction between the process and the product (as cited in Orlando, 2011, p. 296)."

Obidina (2014) emphasizes the importance of sight translation assessment as the following:

Its high demand on the market also adds to the assessment of the relevance of sight translation in different stages of foreign language learning programs and interpreter and translator training programs. It would be worthwhile to investigate and develop proper sight translation quality assessment mechanisms starting from the institutional level and further to the national level as a part of the improvement of the quality assurance apparatus in secondary and higher education (p. 95).

Since translation is rather a subjective topic and several alternatives for each source text can be produced as a target text, the assessment of translation cannot be checked through an 'answer key' like a Mathematics or History exam. However, for a fair assessment of the translation process, several standards and principles should also be put forward. Thus, rubrics are essential to provide and guarantee objectivity and fairness in the assessment process of almost every oral or written translation course.

Particularly in Sight Translation, rubrics are necessary, since the process of on-sight translation requires the assessment of not only the equivalence of source and target texts but the interpreter himself/herself as a whole with several factors including his/her attitudes towards the process of translation, the quality of speech and intonation, as well as his/her proficiency level at the source and target languages.

According to Mertler's (2001) definition, rubrics are "scoring guides, consisting of specific pre-established performance criteria, used in evaluating student work on performance assessments (Mertler 2001, as cited in Presas, 2012, p. 144)."

Presas (2012) mentioned two different types of rubrics: holistic rubrics and analytic rubrics. The main difference between the aforementioned types of rubrics is the fact that "In holistic rubrics, performance-assessment criteria are combined in a single descriptive scale so that the scores obtained reflect the overall quality of the performance or process assessed, while in analytic rubrics each of the assessment criteria is considered separately and evaluated based on its own descriptive scale (Mertler, 2001, as cited in Presas, 2012, p. 144)."

Last but not least, Presas, suggests translation trainers, namely instructors, to consider four criteria when they choose a course material, namely the source text for a proper translation course. Firstly, instructors should take the students' knowledge and opportunities to access the material into consideration. Secondly, tasks are not necessarily had to assess all the competence mentioned in the syllabus of the course, but rather concentrate on specific ones. Thirdly, the instructor should have his/her own principles for choosing the correct source text for the text and finally, it can be beneficial for students to write a brief, which summarizes the whole process of translation (Presas, 2012, p. 146).

2. Methodology

This study investigates the relationship between the learning outcomes and assessment results in the On-Sight Translation course by analyzing midterm exam scores. The methodology is structured around the five research questions, ensuring a systematic approach to data collection and analysis.

2.1. Research Design

The study follows a mixed-method approach, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative data analysis. The primary focus is on numerical assessment data, supplemented by qualitative insights derived from rubric-based evaluations.

2.2. Research Questions and Methodological Approach

2.2.1. Relationship between Learning Outcomes and Student Performance

To assess whether the learning outcomes stated in the syllabus align with student performance, the study examines the midterm grades of 50 second-year students enrolled in TRN205 On-Sight Translation at Çağ University. The rubric categories (Coherence, Faithfulness, Delivery, and Language) are mapped to the intended learning outcomes to evaluate their effectiveness in measuring student competency.

2.2.2. Correlation between Rubric Components and Overall Performance

A category-wise breakdown of scores is conducted to identify how each rubric component contributes to the overall student grade. The study examines whether certain components, such as Delivery and Faithfulness, have a stronger impact on total performance compared to Coherence and Language.

2.2.3. Challenges Faced by Students in On-Sight Translation

The study analyzes patterns of student performance to determine which aspects of on-sight translation pose the greatest challenges. Particular attention is given to areas where students score the lowest, identifying key difficulties in oral delivery, fluency, and accuracy in translation.

2.2.4. Impact of Class Size on Student Performance

To determine whether class size influences student success, midterm scores from two different sections—Section A (34 students) and Section B (17 students)—are compared. An independent t-test is used to evaluate whether the observed differences in average performance are statistically significant.

2.2.5. Effectiveness of the Assessment Rubric

The study examines the variance in scores across different rubric categories to determine whether the rubric is an effective tool for distinguishing between strong and weak performers. A statistical variance analysis is conducted to see whether some categories contribute disproportionately to final grades. However, inter-rater reliability is not assessed in this study, which is noted as a limitation.

2.2.6. Data Collection

The participants of this study consist of 50 second-year students enrolled in the On-Sight Translation course during the 2022-2023 Fall Semester. The assessment tool used for evaluating their performance is a customized rubric, adapted from Andrew Gillies' (2013) framework for conference interpreting and modified to meet the specific requirements of on-sight translation assessment. The data sources include midterm exam scores, a category-wise breakdown of grading, and the course syllabus' defined learning outcomes. Ethical considerations were taken into account by ensuring student anonymity and all data was analyzed following institutional research ethics guidelines.

2.2.7. Data Analysis

The study employs both descriptive and inferential statistical methods to analyze student performance. Descriptive statistics include calculating the mean scores and standard deviations for each rubric category, providing insights into student performance distribution. Inferential statistics involve an independent t-test to compare the scores of the two sections and determine whether class size significantly impacts student outcomes. Additionally, a variance analysis is performed to assess how different rubric components contribute to overall performance, particularly identifying

whether some assessment categories weigh more heavily in final grades than others.

2.3. Limitations

Despite the structured approach, this study has several limitations. Inter-rater reliability was not assessed, meaning that potential inconsistencies in grading among different evaluators remain unaccounted for. Additionally, the study does not incorporate qualitative student feedback, which could have provided deeper insights into students' perceived challenges in on-sight translation. Furthermore, since the research is confined to a single university and one academic semester, the findings may not be generalizable to broader Translation Studies programs. Future research should consider a larger sample size, include multiple evaluators for reliability testing, and integrate student reflections to enhance the depth of analysis.

This methodology ensures that the research questions are addressed with a structured and replicable approach, offering insights into the relationship between learning objectives, student performance, and assessment validity.

3. Case Study

3.1. On-Sight Translation at the Department of Translation and Interpretation of Çağ University

The Department of English Translation and Interpretation at Çağ University was established on 21 November 2018 by the decision of the Executive Committee of the Higher Education Council within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The first academic year that students enrolled in the department was the 2019-2020 Academic Year.[1]

Since the department is among the brand-new English Translation and Interpretation departments in Türkiye, the curriculum of the bachelor's degree in English Translation and Interpretation was developed in 2018, by taking the curricula of the same departments in other public and private universities in Türkiye as an example. The academic staff of the department has majorly graduated from English Language Teaching and have lectured at the English Language and Culture department of Çağ University since 1997, they were all skilled and familiar with the topics related to education and especially foreign education, teaching methods, material design and assessments, teaching practice. Therefore, the curriculum and syllabuses of the courses at the Department of English Translation and Interpretation at Çağ University are prepared by considering all the aspects of education.

The course entitled TRN205 On-Sight Translation was opened for the very first time in the Fall Semester of the 2020-2021 Academic Year, for second-grade students. The syllabus of the course was developed by the academic staff of the department, who have been responsible for teaching the course since the 2020-2021 academic year. Their background in Translation Studies and Language Teaching has informed the course design, ensuring alignment with both theoretical and practical aspects of translator training.

The curriculum structure reflects an integration of translation theory with applied skills, following established pedagogical practices in translator and interpreter training. The course design takes into account industry standards and assessment methodologies widely recognized in interpreter education.

In the 2022-2023 Academic Year, 50 students enrolled in the course in two sections, which consisted respectively of 33 and 17 students. The imbalanced distribution of the students between two sections is because of the registrar's office's mistake of not imposing a quota of 25 students for each section, as well as students' own decisions related to their weekly schedule and shuttle hours. However, it gives us the opportunity to compare the relationship between the efficiency of the course and the number of students in two different sections.

The three-hours-a-week has 3 credits in the National Credit System and 4 credits in the European Credit Transfer System. The objective of the course in the syllabus is defined as: "The primary aim of this

---

course is to acquire the basic skills of on-sight translation as an introduction to simultaneous and consecutive interpretation."[2]

3.2. Learning Outcomes of the Course and Their Relationship between Program Outputs

As it is cited in the syllabus of the course, students who have completed the course TRN205 On-Sight Translation successfully will be able to:

1. Acquire the basic skills of sight interpreting to prepare them for simultaneous and consecutive interpretation. (This outcome corresponds to the program outputs 2, 6, and 7)
2. acquire paraphrasing, interpreting, chunking, parsing skills and memory strategies to be used for sight translation practices. (This outcome corresponds the program outputs 6 and 7)
3. Practice sight translation using various Turkish and English texts. (This outcome corresponds to the program outputs 2, 3, and 7)
4. Use specific terminology in Turkish and English (This outcome corresponds the program outputs 3 and 6)
5. Gain awareness and skills in finding solutions to problems that may arise during sight translation. (This outcome corresponds the program outputs 3 and 6)

The program outputs which are related to the learning outcomes of the courses are given on the website of Çağ University, like the curriculum of the English Translation and Interpretation Department and the syllabus of all courses including TRN205 On-Sight Translation.

Here is a detailed list of the Program Outputs at the Department of English Translation and Interpretation at Çağ University, those which are related to the learning outcomes of the course entitled On-Sight Translation are highlighted in bold:[3]

Students who have successfully completed the program:

PO 1. S/He has mastered the cultures of the languages in which s/he works; s/he has a general culture on a national and international scale.

PO 2. Turkish and English languages are used in different communication situations by mastering proper pronunciation and diction.

PO 3. S/He has the level of terminology and special field knowledge to be able to translate in the fields s/he works in.

PO 4. S/He has an awareness of Translation Studies approaches and their importance today.

PO 5. S/He is able to use information and translation technologies effectively.

PO 6. S/He is able to transfer written, oral, audio, and visual texts to the target language in accordance with the employer's demands, the characteristics of the text, the reception conditions, the terms used, the language of the area, and the local usage.

PO 7. S/He is able to evaluate and correct translations in terms of the content, visual characteristics, and appropriateness of the source text for its purpose.

PO 8. S/He follows national and international developments in the field of Translation Studies, continuously improves his/her professional knowledge and skills, and carries out relevant projects.

PO 9. S/He has the ability to think critically and creatively, solve problems, and analyze-synthesize-evaluate.

PO 10. S/He acts in accordance with the principles of professional ethics.

PO 11. S/He conducts interdisciplinary studies.

PO 12. S/He is able to cooperate with relevant sectors.

PO 13. S/He specializes in at least one of the areas of oral and/or written translation.

PO 14. S/He translates English-Turkish languages and can read, understand, analyze, and translate basic texts in a third language.

3.3. Course Contents: Weekly Lecture Plan and In-Class Task of the Course in the Fall Semester of 2022-2023 Academic Year

As it is given in the syllabus of the course, the first week of the course is an introductory lecture, which includes reviewing the syllabus reading; an introduction to the concept of sight translation and interpreting, and its place in the Translation Studies by oral lecture supported with a PowerPoint presentation.

The second and third weeks of the course cover numerous warm-up activities text analysis and searching for the main idea; fast reading skills, skimming and scanning exercises as well as strategies in sight interpreting such as Paraphrasing, Chunking, Parsing, Approximation, Condensing, Expanding, etc. also supported through a PowerPoint presentation related to the topic as well as paperback exercises and in-class tasks, which are discussed and 'corrected' in the classroom after they are finished.

In the other weeks before the midterm exam, students practice On-Sight Translation of the given source texts, which are one or two pages long and related to current issues like news (Like the Acquisition of Twitter by Elon Musk in October 2022, or the terrorist attack in Istanbul on November 13, 2022, or the war between Russia and Ukraine, Protests in Iran, etc.) sports events (Like 2022 FIFA World Cup in Qatar). Furthermore, other topics like healthcare (Like A Brochure Related To 'Things to Do Before Surgery), and the judiciary (A Brochure Related To 'Getting Ready For A Restraining Order Court Hearing) in which On-Sight Translation is widely used. Sources texts are retrieved from websites of popular news networks such as BBC News, Reuters, Voice of America, Associated Press, and many others.

The purpose of choosing such kinds of texts is to prepare students for the translation market after their graduation and provide them with the opportunity of gaining adequate experience in the texts which are possible for them to encounter in their professional life as translators and interpreters.

The language of the source texts was English, and students were supposed to on-sight translate them into Turkish. The in-class tasks for translating Turkish source texts into English were performed after the midterm exam, which took place in the seventh week on November 24 and 25, 2022.

During the application of class tasks, students either work with each other as pairs or translate each sentence of the paragraph of the source text out loud in the classroom, depending on the text type. The reason behind forcing students to on-sight translate the texts out loud in the classroom is to make them less anxious and nervous in terms of public speaking, which is an inevitable component of oral translation. In both performances, students can skim and scan the texts for one to ten minutes depending on the length and difficulty level of the source texts, and can ask the meaning of the words that they are unfamiliar with either the lecturer or dictionary.

However, in the midterm and final exams of the course, students do not have such kind of opportunity since they are supposed to attend the exam as prepared for it by reading several documents on the topic and enlarging their vocabulary by learning specific terminology related to the topic.

3.4. 2022-2023 Fall Semester Midterm

The midterm exam of the course TRN205 On-Sight Translation took place in two sessions for two sections of the course on November 24, 2022, Thursday for Section A (which includes 34 students) and November 25, 2022, Friday for Section B (which includes 17 students).

In the exam, using any kind of electronic devices (including mobile phones, kindles, etc.) and paperback dictionaries was not allowed, and students

had the right to skim and scan the text for a minute and ask the meaning of a maximum of 5 words to the lecturers before starting to on-sight translate the source texts.

Almost one week before the exam, students are informed both during the class and through the WhatsApp group of the class related to the details of the exam and the rubric of the exam was shared via WhatsApp on the same day, and questions related to the exam are kindly answered by the lecturers of the course.

Below is the English translation of the Turkish message related to the Exam instructions of the course TRN205 On-Sight Translation:

Hello friends,
I will give explanations about the Midterm of the TRN205 On-Sight Translation course.
- You will be responsible for texts between 100 and 140 words in the midterm, (less than half a page)
- Topics of texts: "Qatar 2022 World Cup", "Iran Protests", "Electric Car", "Elon Musk's Twitter Acquisition" and "Social Media"
- You will translate from English to Turkish
- Each of you will have a total of 5 minutes to review and translate the text.
- Everyone's exam entrance time is written on the list, but you still need to be ready 10-15 minutes before the exam, in front of classroom no. 305, where the exam will take place. (The list will hang on the door)
- Thursday's group will take the exam on Thursday, 24 November, and Friday's group will take the exam on Friday, 25 November. (The exams of both groups will start at 10:00)

- Assessment criteria (Rubric – Assessment Criteria) will be shared in this group before the exam.
I wish you all success.

The Midterm exam was completed without any problem and after the announcement of the results at the online student information system of Çağ University, none of the students objected to their grades. Only three students demanded to see the points on their rubrics and there was no further commentary on the difficulty of the exam. The majority of the enrolled students asserted that the exam was much easier than they expected.

3.5. Assessment on Rubric

The rubric for the midterm was based on the rubric for interpretation suggested by Andrew Gillies (2013) in his book entitled Conference Interpreting and modified according to assessment criteria and requirements of on-sight translation by adding and omitting some categories (p. 37).

As already mentioned in the Introduction chapter, the rubric for the midterm, which is on a scale of 100 points in total, has four main categories, respectively; coherence and plausibility (25 points), faithfulness (30 points), and language (25 points), and such categories include 20 subcategories in total, which are all on the scale of 5-points.

The rubric was fulfilled by the instructor during the exam session simultaneously with the student, who on-sight translated the given source text.

Below are the categories of the rubric and the average of the student's grades for each category in two different sections:

Table 3.1 Averages of students' grades according to categories

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	AVERAGE OF SECTION A (34 STUDENT)	AVERAGE OF SECTION B (17 STUDENT)
1. Coherence and plausibility (25pts)		
Does it make sense as a whole? (5 pts)	4,15	4,35
Were there any non-sequiturs? (Irrelevant sentences?) (5 pts)	4,12	4,14
Are there unfinished sentences? (5 pts)	4,03	4,24
Is there any disambiguation in Turkish? (5 pts)	4,12	4,18
Overall evaluation on coherence and plausibility (5 pts)	4,18	4,41
Average of the total points given to the category (Out of 25):	**20,61**	**21,35**
2. Faithfulness (20 pts)		
Are there any serious omissions? (5 pts)	4,15	3,71
Are there unjustified changes? (5 pts)	3,97	3,71
Are there unjustified additions? (5 pts)	4,33	4,00
Overall evaluation on faithfulness (5 pts)	4,24	4,12
Average of the total points given to the category (Out of 20):	**16,70**	**15,53**
3. Delivery (30 pts)		
Can everything be acoustically understood? (5 pts)	4,18	4,12
Are there fillers? (5 pts)	3,73	3,35
Is the intonation unnatural? (5 pts)	3,91	4,00
Are there too many corrections? (5 pts)	3,82	3,82
Is the interpreter convincing? (5 pts)	3,82	3,76
Overall evaluation on delivery (5 pts)	3,94	3,65
Average of the total points given to the category (Out of 30):	**23,39**	**22,59**
4. Language (25 pts)		
Are there mispronunciations? (5 pts)	4,97	5,00
Are there grammatical mistakes? (5 pts)	4,61	4,94
Is there source language interference? (5 pts)	4,12	4,35
Is the language un-idiomatic? (5 pts)	4,06	3,94
Overall evaluation on language (5 pts)	4,42	4,65
Average of the total points given to the category (Out of 25):	**22,30**	**22,88**
AVERAGE OF THE TOTAL GRADE (OUT OF 100)	**83,55**	**82,35**

3.6. Discussion: Relationship between Midterm Grades and Learning Outcomes

According to the average of the total grades, the major problem that students experience during the process of On-Sight translation is the way they deliver the translation of the source text to the target audience. Because, in both sections, the category of delivery has the lowest grades on average.

Therefore, it can be easily said that students' on-sight translations during the exam are not convincing and sound too unnatural to the audience, and it affects the fluidity since there are so many fillers and corrections. This situation is also risky for an interpreter, since (s)he can seem as if (s)he does not possess the adequate level of proficiency for on-sight or other kinds of oral translation. Therefore, it is understood that students are not adequately prepared for simultaneous and consecutive interpretation, which is the first learning outcome of the course.

The category of faithfulness is the second lowest-graded category in both sections. This can be interpreted as the lack of adequate vocabulary and cultural background affecting the quality of translation and leading students to end up with an equivalent translation. In order to acquire paraphrasing, interpreting, chunking, parsing skills, and memory strategies to be used for sight translation practices, which is the second learning outcome of the course, students should be more faithful to the source text and acquire adequate vocabulary and grammar knowledge for ending up with more equivalent target texts in both Turkish and English. Therefore, it can be a little bit doubtful for students, whether they are totally professional at practicing sight translation using various Turkish and English texts and using specific terminology in Turkish and English, namely whether they have acquired the third and fourth learning outcomes of the course.

Since all students enrolled in the course TRN205 On-Sight Translation are native Turkish speakers, the category of language remains the one with the highest average points among the other categories. Despite the fact that some translations sound a little bit unidiomatic, we can achieve the result that students do not face any problems with their native language.

When the average of the total grades, namely the whole grades out of 100 are considered, it can be easily said that the majority of the students gained awareness and skills in finding solutions to problems that may arise during sight translation, which is the fifth learning outcome of the course.

3.7. Relationship Between Learning Outcomes and Student Performance

The study investigated whether the learning outcomes stated in the syllabus were reflected in students' midterm exam performance. The results suggest a partial alignment between intended learning outcomes and student achievement. While students demonstrated strong performance in linguistic accuracy, their weaknesses in Delivery and Faithfulness indicate that further instructional emphasis is needed in these areas. This finding suggests that while students are acquiring some of the intended competencies, their ability to deliver on-sight translations in a fluent and convincing manner needs improvement. The inclusion of more targeted practice sessions on public speaking and stress management may help bridge this gap.

3.8. Analysis of Rubric Components and Performance Correlation

A review of student scores across different rubric categories revealed moderate variance in performance, with Delivery being the most challenging category, followed by Faithfulness. This suggests that students struggled with maintaining fluency and confidence while performing their translations. However, coherence and linguistic accuracy were relatively stronger, indicating that students were able to construct grammatically sound sentences but faced difficulties in oral presentation and content fidelity. Future research could use correlation analysis to further explore how individual rubric components contribute to overall translation quality.

3.9. Challenges Faced by Students in On-Sight Translation

Based on the midterm results, the main challenges encountered by students were related to

oral delivery and faithfulness to the source text. The low scores in these areas indicate issues such as anxiety, lack of confidence, and difficulties in processing the source text while simultaneously producing a fluent translation. These findings align with previous research emphasizing that on-sight translation requires both linguistic competence and strong oral communication skills. To address these challenges, it may be beneficial to incorporate oral rehearsal exercises, peer review sessions, and confidence-building activities into the curriculum.

3.10. Impact of Class Size on Student Performance

The statistical analysis comparing the midterm performance of students in Section A (34 students) and Section B (17 students) revealed no significant difference between the two groups. The independent t-test yielded a t-statistic of -0.589 with a p-value of 0.559, which is well above the standard significance threshold of 0.05.

This suggests that class size did not play a major role in influencing student performance. While smaller class sizes are often associated with better student engagement and individualized feedback, this study's findings indicate that other factors—such as students' prior knowledge, self-preparation, or engagement with course materials—might have had a greater impact on their success. Future research could further investigate this aspect by incorporating qualitative measures such as student surveys or instructor interviews to explore additional factors affecting learning outcomes.

3.11. Effectiveness of the Assessment Rubric

Regarding the effectiveness of the assessment rubric, a variance analysis of the different scoring categories (Coherence, Faithfulness, Delivery, and Language) was conducted. The results showed that Section A had a variance of 6.449, while Section B had a variance of 8.856. This moderate variance suggests that some components—particularly *Delivery* and *Faithfulness*—played a more substantial role in differentiating student performance. The fact that certain students struggled more with these criteria indicates that these aspects of on-sight translation require greater instructional emphasis in the curriculum.

Although the rubric appears to be a valid tool for distinguishing between high and low performers, certain limitations should be acknowledged. The study did not assess inter-rater reliability, meaning it is unclear whether different evaluators would score students consistently using the same rubric. Additionally, there was no external validation of the rubric to determine whether it accurately captures the essential skills required for on-sight translation. Future studies should incorporate reliability testing—such as having multiple graders evaluate the same set of student performances—to ensure the rubric's consistency and fairness. Furthermore, expert validation from translation and interpretation specialists could help refine the rubric's categories to better reflect real-world translation demands.

4. Conclusion

On-Sight Translation is a subfield of oral translations, which is distinguished from other courses in terms of assessment activities and learning objectives. Since the course is a performance-based one, the assessment process is not limited to grammatical, syntactical, and lexical aspects of the texts, but it also includes several other criteria for assessment including delivery, usage of voice, memory techniques, and fluidity of speaking the target language, and many more. Therefore, it is essential to use a rubric specially designed for the purpose and learning outcomes of the course in all kinds of assessment activities including the midterm, final, and even in-class tasks.

The quantitative and qualitative analysis of the midterm results of the course entitled TRN205 On-Sight Translation at Çağ University, Mersin, Türkiye are presented and discussed in this study, and it is understood that there is a correlative relationship between the course learning outcomes and performance of students in the assessment activities. In further studies, more detailed rubrics and sever can be utilized and other factors that affect the validity and reliability of the assessment processes can be taken into consideration in order to end up with better and more detailed results related to the assessment process and curriculum design of the on-sight translation course.

In summary, the results of this study highlight key areas for improvement in both assessment and instruction. The findings indicate that while class size does not significantly impact performance, certain challenges related to delivery and faithfulness in translation persist. Addressing these issues through targeted pedagogical strategies—such as increased practice in public speaking, greater focus on vocabulary retention techniques, and peer assessment exercises—could help enhance student outcomes. Additionally, further research should explore the development of more comprehensive assessment methods, including holistic and analytic rubrics that balance linguistic accuracy with performance-based evaluation.

REFERENCES

Çağ University. (n.d.). *Course outline - TRN205 On-Sight Translation.* Retrieved March 19, 2025, from https://www.cag.edu.tr/en/course-outline-30

Çağ University. (n.d.). *Program definition - English Translation and Interpretation.* Retrieved March 19, 2025, from https://www.cag.edu.tr/en/program-definition-25

Doğan, A. (2017) *Sözlü Çeviri Çalışmaları ve Uygulamaları.* Siyasal Kitabevi

Eruz, S. (2003) *Çeviriden Çeviribilime.* Multilingual Yayınları.

Gilles, A. (2013) *Conference Interpreting: A Student's Practice Book.* Routledge.

Mackintosh, J. (1983) "*Relay Interpretation: An Exploratory Study,*" MA dissertation, Birkbeck College, University of London.

Mertler, Craig A. (2001) 'Designing Scoring Rubrics for your classroom', Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation 25. Available at http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=25 (last accessed June 2012).

Obidina, V. V. (2015). "Sight Translation: Typological Insights into the Mode." *Journal of Siberian Federal University.* Humanities & Social Sciences (1): 91-98. DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-2015-8-1-91-98

Orlando, M. (2011). "Evaluation of Translations in the Training of Professional Translators: At the Crossroads between Theoretical, Professional and Pedagogical Practices". *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer 5* (2), 293–308. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2011.10798822

Pöchhacker F. (2004) *Introducing Interpreting Studies.* Routledge.

Presas M. (2012) "Training Translators in the European Higher Education Area" *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer,* 6(2), 139-169, DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2012.10798834

ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Code	Course Title		Credit	ECTS
TRN250	On-Sight Translation		(2-2) 3	4

Prerequisites		None		
Language of Instruction		English	Mode of Delivery	Synchronous /Asynchronous
Type and Level of Course		Compulsory/Graduate/Second Semester		
Lecturers	Name(s)	Lecture Hours	Office Hours	Contacts
Course Coordinator				

Course Objective	The primary aim of this course is to acquire the basic skills of on-sight translation as an introduction to simultaneous and consecutive interpretation.

		Students who have completed the course successfully will be able to:	Relationship	
			Prog. Output	Net Effect
Learning Outcomes of the Course	1	acquire the basic skills of sight interpreting to prepare them for to simultaneous and consecutive interpretation.	2&6&7	3&5&5
	2	acquire paraphrasing, interpreting, chunking, parsing skills and memory strategies to be used for sight translation practices	6&7	4&5
	3	practice sight translation using various Turkish and English texts	2&3&6	3&5&5
	4	use specific terminology in Turkish and English	3&6	5&5
	5	gain awareness and skills in finding solutions to problems that may arise during sight translation	6&9	4&5

Course Description:
This course enables the students to practice sight translation skills.

Course Contents: (Weekly Lecture Plan)			
Weeks	Topics	Preparation	Teaching Methods
1	Reviewing the syllabus reading; introduction to the concept of sight translation and interpreting, and its place in Translation Studies.	Obidina, V. V. (2015). "Sight Translation: Typological Insights into the Mode." Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences (1): 91-98. DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-2015-8-1-91-98	Lecture/Discussion
2	Text analysis and searching for the main idea; fast reading skills, skimming and scanning exercises	Materials provided by the instructor	Lecture/Practice
3	Strategies in sight interpreting: Paraphrasing, Chunking, Parsing, Approximation, Condensing, Expanding, etc.	Materials provided by the instructor	Lecture/Practice
4	Sight interpreting exercises from English into Turkish on the topic of the week	Materials provided by the instructor	Practice
5	Sight interpreting exercises from English into Turkish on the topic of the week	Materials provided by the instructor	Practice
6	Sight interpreting exercises from English into Turkish on the topic of the week	Materials provided by the instructor	Practice
7	Sight interpreting exercises from Turkish into English on the topic of the week	Materials provided by the instructor	Practice

8	Sight interpreting exercises from Turkish into English on the topic of the week	Materials provided by the instructor	Practice
9	Sight interpreting exercises from Turkish into English on the topic of the week	Materials provided by the instructor	Practice
10	Sight interpreting exercises from Turkish into English on the topic of the week	Materials provided by the instructor	Practice
11	Sight interpreting exercises from Turkish into English on the topic of the week	Materials provided by the instructor	Practice
12	Revision	Materials prepared by the instructor	Practice/Discussion

Textbook	
Related links	
Recommended Reading	Obidina, V. V. (2015). "Sight Translation: Typological Insights into the Mode." Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences (1): 91-98. DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-2015-8-1-91-98

ASSESSMENT METHODS

Activities		Notes
Midterm Exam	40%	
Effect of The Final Exam	60%	

ECTS TABLE

Contents	Number	Hours	Total
Hours in Classroom (Zoom app.)	14	3	42
Hours out of Classroom	14	2	28
Midterm Exam/Tasks	1 (1+1)	20	40
Final Exam	1	15	15
		Total	149
		Total / 30	**125/30=4,16**
		ECTS Credit	**4**

Students (Group B /Thursday)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	AVERAGE
1. Coherence and plausibility (25pts)																																		
Does it make sense as a whole?	4	3	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	3	3	3	4	4	4,15
Were there any non-sequiturs? (Irrelevant sentences?)	5	4	3	3	5	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	2	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	3	3	5	4	4,12
Are there unfinished sentences?	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	4	4	3	5	4	4,03
Is there any disambiguation in	4	5	5	3	3	5	4	5	3	4	3	5	4	4	4	3	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	3	3	5	3	4,12
Overall evaluation on coherence and plausibility	4	3	3	3	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	3	4	3	4	4	4,18
TOTAL:	21	18	18	16	19	23	20	24	18	18	18	21	15	17	19	17	25	24	25	25	24	24	25	25	20	20	24	25	18	17	15	23	19	20,61
2. Faithfulness (20 pts)																																		
Are there any serious omissions?	5	3	3	3	4	5	3	5	4	4	3	5	3	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	3	5	5	2	3	3	5	4	4,15
Are there unjustified changes?	4	3	3	3	4	5	4	5	4	3	3	4	4	4	5	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	3	4	4	3	3	2	4	4	3,97
Are there unjustified additions?	5	4	4	5	4	5	3	5	3	3	4	5	5	3	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	3	3	3	4	5	4,33
Overall evaluation on faithfulness	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	5	3	3	4	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	4	4	5	4,24
TOTAL:	18	13	13	15	16	19	13	20	14	13	14	19	16	15	20	14	20	20	20	20	18	19	18	20	20	12	19	19	11	12	12	17	18	16,70
3. Delivery (30 pts)																																		
Can everything be acoustically understood?	4	3	3	3	4	5	4	5	5	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	3	4	3	3	5	4,18
Are there fillers?	5	3	3	3	3	5	4	4	4	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3,73
Is the intonation unnatural?	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	5	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	4	3	2	3	5	3,91
Are there too many corrections?	5	3	4	4	4	5	4	5	2	2	3	2	3	3	4	3	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	2	3	4	3,82
Is the interpreter convincing?	4	3	3	3	3	5	3	5	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	4	5	4	4	5	3	3	5	5	3	3	5	5	3	4	2	3	4	3,82
Overall evaluation on delivery	4	3	3	3	5	5	3	5	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	3	5	5	3	3	3	3	4	3,94
TOTAL:	26	18	18	19	22	29	22	29	21	16	21	23	17	18	19	21	29	30	28	30	26	26	30	29	21	21	27	28	20	20	15	18	25	23,39
4. Language (25 pts)																																		
Are there mispronunciations?	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4,97
Are there grammatical mistakes?	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	4	5	3	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	5	4,61
Is there source language interference?	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	3	2	4	4	4,12
Is the language un-idiomatic?	3	3	4	4	4	5	4	5	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	3	3	4	4	4	4,06
Overall evaluation on language	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	2	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	3	3	4	5	4,42
TOTAL:	20	23	22	23	23	25	22	25	19	18	21	23	18	19	20	20	24	24	25	25	25	24	24	24	25	25	24	24	20	17	19	22	23	22,30
GRAND TOTAL	85	82	71	73	80	96	77	98	72	65	74	86	66	67	98	72	98	98	98	100	94	97	97	98	86	78	94	96	69	66	61	80	85	83,55

Students (Group A / Friday)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	AVERAGE
1. Coherence and plausibility (25pts)																		
Does it make sense as a whole?	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	4,35
Were there any non-sequiturs? (Irrelevant sentences?)	4,4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	3	4,14
Are there unfinished sentences?	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	4	5	5	3	3	4,24
Is there any disambiguation in Turkish?	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4,18
Overall evaluation on coherence and plausibility	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	4,41
TOTAL:	24	20	20	20	23	23	21	19	16	25	24	24	20	24	22	20	18	21,35
2. Faithfulness (20 pts)																		
Are there any serious omissions?	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	4	3	5	5	3	4	3,71
Are there unjustified changes?	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	5	5	5	3	4	5	4	3	3,71
Are there unjustified additions?	5	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	5	5	5	3	4	5	4	4	4,00
Overall evaluation on faithfulness	5	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	5	5	5	3	5	5	4	4	4,12
TOTAL:	19	12	14	12	14	15	13	14	12	20	20	19	12	18	20	15	15	15,53
3. Delivery (30 pts)																		
Can everything be acoustically understood?	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	3	4	4,12
Are there fillers?	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3,35
Is the intonation unnatural?	5	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	3	4	4,00
Are there too many corrections?	5	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	4	3	4	4	4	4	3,82
Is the interpreter convincing?	5	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	5	5	5	3	4	4	3	3	3,76
Overall evaluation on delivery	5	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	5	5	5	3	4	4	3	3	3,65
TOTAL:	29	20	19	21	19	23	20	20	21	29	29	26	20	25	23	19	21	22,59
4. Language (25 pts)																		
Are there mispronunciations?	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5,00
Are there grammatical mistakes?	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4,94
Is there source language interference?	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	3	4	5	4	4	5	4	5	4	4,35
Is the language un-idiomatic?	5	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	5	5	4	4	3	3	5	4	3,94
Overall evaluation on language	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4,65
TOTAL:	25	23	21	22	24	24	23	20	20	24	25	23	23	23	21	25	23	22,88
GRAND TOTAL	97	75	74	75	80	85	77	73	69	98	98	92	75	90	86	79	77	82,35