

Beyond the Dichotomy: A Proposed Integrated Model for Translation Quality Assessment

Qabas Noor Ali Jarallah*

English Language Department, Faculty of Arts and Science - Benghazi University, Al-Abayr Branch, Libya.

*Email: qabasnoor86@gmail.com

ما بعد الثنائي: نحو نموذج مُدمج لتقييم جودة الترجمة

قابس نور علي جارالله *

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية-جامعة بنغازي- كلية الآداب والعلوم الأبيار، ليبيا

Received: 20-03-2026	Accepted: 17-05-2026	Published: 28-05-2026
		
Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).		

Abstract

Translation quality assessment is regarded as one of the branches that still entertain a quite argumentative platform in the field of translation studies. Such a debate can be justified by different reasons, including that translation errors are not on a clear-cut scale like any other type of error. The other reason is the subjective nature of translation evaluation, as determining what is a good translation can differ depending on the view of the instructor. In order to solve this issue, different models and methods on how translation quality assessment should be conducted were proposed by different theorists and researchers. This study attempts to combine two methods of translation quality assessment, Hurtado Albir's (1995) error analysis-based method and Waddington's (2001) holistic method of assessment, and investigate how each method contributes to reducing subjectivity of assessment in order to integrate the strong points of each method and develop an integrated method in the middle ground of this dichotomy.

Keywords: Translation Quality Assessment, Translation Assessment, Error Analysis, Holistic Assessment, Subjectivity in Assessment, Integrated Model, Translation Studies.

المخلص

يُعدّ تقييم جودة الترجمة من أكثر الجوانب إثارة للجدل في مجال دراسات الترجمة، يعلّل هذا الجدل لعدة أسباب؛ منها أن أخطاء الترجمة لا تقع ضمن مقياس واضح وحاسم، كما هو الحال مع أنواع الأخطاء الأخرى. والسبب الآخر يعود إلى الطابع الذاتي لعملية التقييم فتحدد ما يمكن اعتباره ترجمة جيدة قد يختلف بالاستناد على وجهة نظر الأستاذ. من أجل حلّلت هذه المشكلة، اقترح عدد من المنظرين والباحثين نماذج وأساليب مختلفة حول كيفية إجراء تقييم جودة الترجمة. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى دمج أسلوبين تقييم جودة الترجمة: أسلوب Hurtado Albir's (1995) القائم على تحليل الأخطاء، وأسلوب Waddington's

(2001) الشمولي في التقييم، وذلك للتحقيق من كيفية مساهمة هذين الأسلوبين في الحد من الطابع الذاتي للتقييم، سعياً لدمج نقاط القوة فيهما لتطوير أسلوب مدمج يقع منتصف هذا الثنائي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تقييم جودة الترجمة، تقييم الترجمة، تحليل الأخطاء، التقييم الشمولي، ذاتية التقييم، نموذج مدمج، دراسات الترجمة.

1. Introduction

Translation quality is not easy to be defined due to the fact that there is no an agreed- upon definition to be applied universally. Different views of translation lead to different concepts of translation quality, as Schäffner (1999) states that "different approaches exist side by side, each of which focuses on specific aspects, looks at the product or the process of translation from a specific angle, and uses or avoids specific terminology" Schäffner (1999, p. 1).

According to Chesterman (1997), translation quality is mainly satisfying specific criteria that are set clearly before starting an assessment process, as for Nida (1960), the quality is decided by the response of the audience. Whereas the functionalists such as Reiss (2000) argue that quality is defined in terms of how well a translation meets the embodied function of the text in the target system culture.

Translation evaluation was and still a debatable matter in the discipline of translation studies, Bowker (2000) argues that evaluation can be quite problematic due to the inevitable subjectivity among evaluators. Zequan (2003) points out that through the history of translation what should be held as the criterion for translation quality assessment is an argumentative aspect in translation studies. The complexity of this notion is acknowledged by Halliday (2001) "It is notoriously difficult to say why, or even whether, something is a good translation." Halliday (2001, p. 14)

Nida (1984) argues that text should have the same effect on the receivers as the original text has on its audience. Nida (1984) uses this principle as the main yardstick for assessing how receivers respond to a translation. Reiss (1971) makes a significant suggestion in order to improve translation assessment, which is that instead of just criticizing translation, the criticism must be joined with the evaluator's suggestion for improving translation. Reiss (1971) claims that evaluation is not the matter of taste or feeling, and it is not suitable to reject translation without having a clear justification.

House (2001) approaches translation quality assessment from a functional perspective and presents a model based on Hallidayan systemic functional linguistics. According to House (2001), a statement of quality is made when the analysis of the ST profile of a register includes the function and purpose of the ST. The function should clarify the relation between the sender and the receiver, i.e., both the ST and TT profiles are compared to detect any errors or mismatches.

Nemours scholars have made attempts to reach a model that could help in assessing and evaluating the quality of the translated text, TQA models can be quantitative or qualitative. Some of these scholars have produced qualitative models such as Reiss (2000), and others have proposed quantitative models such as Williams (2009), and some others have combined both, such as Nord (1997) and House (1981,1997, and 2015). All the different attempts and models are based on different theories, and one of the challenges that each of them is facing can be summed up in questions like Is it valid? Is it reliable? Can it be used on all different types of texts? Can it be used in a pedagogical setting? Which one is better to use in a certain setting?

The main aim of this study is to develop an integrated translation quality assessment model based on combining two different methods of assessment. The researcher adopted two methods

based on different approaches: the first is Hurtado Albir's (1995) error analysis method, and the second is Waddington's (2001) holistic method of assessment. The justification for choosing these specific methods can be explained in two points, 1. From reading different papers, the researcher noticed that these methods are frequently used in pedagogical settings as well as that they have been proven to be valid and reliable to use. 2. Both of these methods take into account a good translation solution along with errors in translation and grade the student in this manner, not only looking at the negative impact of an error.

2 Translation Quality Assessment (TQA) in Pedagogical Setting

The move towards more objective approaches and methods for assessing a translation gave a little justice for assessing students' translation, theorists pay more attention to the assessment of published translations. Medadian (2015) explains this phenomenon in two points:

First professional translation institution sees students' translations in a lower rank and they are not as valuable and influential as the literary works. The second point theorist assumed that the models that they have presented for assessing professional translation can be adopted and applied for pedagogical purposes". Medadian (2015, p.41-42).

According to Medadian (2015), some of these models consist of hundreds of parameters, which impose difficulty in their applicability by a classroom teacher who is supposed to correct a pile of examination papers in a limited time at the end of the term". Medadian (2015) aimed to rectify this problem by developing a translation quality assessment model that could combine practicality along with objectivity of the assessment. Medadians' (2015) new model was a combination between the error-counting model and the holistic assessment model by the infusion of easy-to-manage multi-parameter error analysis along with structured holistic parameters. Medadian (2015) successfully proposed a model suitable for the summative assessment of the student's translation competence. The core of this study stems from this notion.

3 Comparison Between TQA Methods and Approaches

The availability of various approaches and methods in this field triggered different questions among theorists and researchers in both professional and pedagogical translation settings. Questions such as, "How can we say this is the best method/approach to be used?", "What is the extent of the objectivity provided by each method of assessment?", "Which method can be described as more practical?". Also, to test and study how students' translation is evaluated and to put these types of assessments used under analysis and discussion.

Stejskal (2006) recognizes the existence of two main methods used for the evaluation of translation quality, either to be based on error counting or holistic assessment. Each and every method has been promoted by different scholars, adopting qualitative or quantitative approaches. Khodabadeh (2007) views error analysis as a method that uses multiple techniques for systematic identification and categorizing mistakes.

Waddington (2001) conducted a comparison of four different methods of assessment, error analysis, holistic, and a combination of the two approaches, which are used for the evaluation of 64 university students. Waddington (2001) compares the results obtained from each method conducted in the study for the sake of answering questions regarding the validity, reliability, and accuracy of those methods. In terms of reliability, he states that the error analysis-based method is more reliable than the holistic approach, and the combination of the approaches would produce more accuracy. As for the validity, all four methods have proved to be equally valid in spite of the considerable differences that exist between them. According to Waddington

(2001), method of assessment can give the best results only when the methods are well prepared and applied in a specific, organized manner.

Conde (2012) conducts a study about quality and quantity in translation evaluation, pointing out issues regarding the assessment of translation in an academic environment and the fact that most instructors tend to focus on quantity rather than quality of errors. Justifying this issue by expressing that analytical methods are the most popular among instructors. Arguing that quantitative error assessments sometimes neglect the importance of location, effects, and causes.

To sum up, a quote from House (2009) asserts that "every translation quality assessment presupposes a theory of translation. Different theories offer different quality yardsticks for translation evaluation purposes". House (2009, p. 222).

4. The TQA Methods Conducted in this Study

This section will include detailed information regarding the two methods of translation quality assessment the researcher is aiming to combine in order to propose an integrated translation quality assessment model.

4.1 Hurtado's Error Analysis Method

The first method conducted in this study is Hurtado's (1995) method. This method includes three main categories, each one having a list of possible errors as follows:

1. Inappropriate rendering, which affects the understanding of the source text; they are divided into eight categories: 1. Mistranslation, 2. Wrong meaning, 3. Nonsense, 4. Addition, 5. Omission, 6. Unresolved extra-linguistic references, 7. Loss of meaning, and 8. Inappropriate linguistic variation (register, style, dialect, etc.).
2. Inappropriate renderings that affect expression in the target language; these are divided into five categories: spelling, grammar, lexical items, text, and style.
3. Inadequate renderings that affect the transmission of either the main function or secondary functions of the source text.

4. The last category describes the plus points to be awarded in solving translation problems.

The scoring mechanism is divided into two levels, serious errors (–2 points) and minor errors (–1 point), depending on the negative effect of each error on the translation. As for the awarded points mentioned in the fourth category, they are divided as follows: good (+1 point), exceptionally good solutions (+2 points).

Table 1. In the following is a detailed table of Hurtado's error analysis method of evaluation.

(1) Inappropriate renderings which affect the understanding of the source text		Minor Error	Serious Error
Mistranslation		1–point	2–points
Wrong meaning		1–point	2–points
Nonsensical		1–point	2–points
Addition		1–point	2–points
Omission		1–point	2–points
Unresolved extra linguistic references		1–point	2–points
Loss of meaning		1–point	2–points
inappropriate linguistic variation	Register	1–points	2–points
	style	1–points	2–points
	Dialect	1–points	2–points

(2) Inappropriate renderings which affect expression in the target language	Minor Error	Serious Error
Spelling	1-point	2-points
Grammar	1-point	2-points
lexical items	1-point	2-points
Text and Style	1-point	2-points
(3) Inadequate renderings which affect the transmission of the following	Minor Error	Serious Error
The main function of the source text	1-point	2-points
Secondary functions of the source text	1-point	2-points
(4) The plus points	Good Solutions	Exceptionally Good Solutions
	1+point	2 +points

4.2 Waddington's Holistic Method of Assessment

The second method conducted in this study is Waddington's (2001) holistic method. According to Waddington (2001), this method focuses on translation content, which provides the instructor a space to give a high or low grade for the participant in accordance with the requirements of a particular level.

This method mainly encompasses three main aspects: the accuracy of the transfer of source text content to the target text, the quality of expression in the target language, and the degree of task completion. Each aspect has five levels determining the accuracy of transfer ST content and quality of expression in TL. The fifth level i.e., the highest level in the model, will be rated as *successful*, and the first level i.e., the lowest, will be rated as *totally inadequate*. The scoring mechanism for this method is out of ten and each level has two options for the instructor to choose from, the fifth level for instance the instructor has the choice to put either 10 or 9, the fourth level either 7 or 8 up to the first level where the choice is between 1 or 2.

In the following is a detailed table of the Waddington (2001) method.

Table 2: Waddingtons' (2001) holistic method of evaluation

Level	Accuracy of transfer ST content	Quality of expression in TL	Degree of task completion	Mark
Level 5	Complete transfer of ST information; only minor revision needed to reach professional standard.	Almost all the translation reads like a piece originally written in (Arabic). There may be minor lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Successful	
Level 4	Almost complete transfer; there may be one or two insignificant inaccuracies; requires certain amount of revision to reach professional standard.	Large sections read like a piece originally written in (Arabic). There are a number of lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Almost completely successful	

Level 3	Transfer of the general idea(s) but with a number of lapses in accuracy; needs considerable revision to reach professional standard	Certain parts read like a piece originally written in(Arabic), but others read like a translation. There are a considerable number of lexical grammatical or spelling errors	Adequate	
Level 2	Transfer undermined by serious inaccuracies; thorough revision required to reach professional standard.	Almost the entire text reads like a translation; there are continual lexical, grammatical or spelling errors	Inadequate	
Level 1	Totally inadequate transfer of ST content; the translation is not worth revising	The candidate reveals a total lack of ability to express himself adequately in English	Totally inadequate	

5. The Methodology

The procedures involved in conducting this study were divided into two stages; the first stage was applying the two methods of evaluation chosen in this study, 1 A quantitative-based Hurtados' (1995) method. 2.A qualitative-based Waddingtons' (2001) holistic method, based on the translation provided by the participant of the study. A student from the graduate studies department at the Benghazi University Faculty of Languages, Linguistic and Translation Studies section. In order to examine the main differences in the results obtained from applying each method.

The second stage was an attempt to combine two methods of translation quality assessment, Hurtado Albir's (1995) error analysis-based method and Waddington's (2001) holistic method of assessment, in order to integrate the strong points of each method and develop an integrated method in the middle ground of this dichotomy.

5.1. The Original text

• NASA Extends Contract for Commercialization of Low-Earth Orbit

NASA has extended a contract to companies around the United States to provide spaceflight hardware, software, and mission integration and operations services on a commercial basis for the agency's International Space Station Program in support of the commercialization of low-Earth orbit. This Research, Engineering, Mission Integration Services Contract (REMIS) contract funded by the International Space Station Program supports NASA's Strategic Plan for the Commercialization of Low-Earth Orbit. The plan seeks to foster the development of a robust, self-sustaining, and cost-effective supply of United States commercial services to, in, and from low-Earth orbit that accommodates both public and private demands.

5.2. The Application of the Two Methodes of Evaluation

This section will include the first stage of the practical part of this research; two methods were applied as a tool of evaluation.

5.2.1. Hurtados'(1995) Error Analysis Method of Evaluation

• Participant translation

مددت ناسا العقود المبرمة مع كافة الشركات بالولايات المتحدة لتوفير معدات وبرمجيات الاجهزة لرحلات الفضاء واستكمال البعثات وخدمات التشغيل بناء علي برنامج الأسس التجارية لوكالة الفضاء الدولية لدعم تسويق قانون مدار الارض. دعمت هذه العقود "الابحاث الهندسية وخدمات استكمال البعثات" من قبل برنامج محطة الفضاء الدولية التي بدورها تدعم خطة ناسا

الاستراتيجية للأسس التجارية لقانون مدار الأرض. كما تهدف الخطة لتعزيز تجهيزات الخدمات التجارية وتطويرها واكتفائها ذاتيا وجعلها فعالة من حيث التكلفة لقانون مدار الأرض لتتمكن من استيعاب كلا المتطلبات العامة والخاصة.

The evaluation

Table 3: Participant translation assessment via Hurtado's error analysis method

Source text	Target text	Type of error
low-Earth orbit	قانون مدار الأرض	Wrong meaning
cost-effective supply of United States commercial services to, in,	-----	Omission
		Inadequate renderings which affect the transmission of the main function of the source text

Source text	Target text	Plus points
mission integration	استكمال البعثات	Good solution
This Research, Engineering, Mission Integration Services Contract (REMIS) contract funded by the International Space Station Program supports NASA's Strategic Plan	دعمت هذه العقود "الابحاث الهندسية وخدمات استكمال البعثات" من قبل برنامج محطة الفضاء الدولية التي بدورها تدعم خطة ناسا الاستراتيجية	Exceptionally good solution
Final result	30/34	

5.2.2 Waddingtons' (2001) holistic method of evaluation

• Participant translation

مددت ناسا العقود المبرمة مع كافة الشركات بالولايات المتحدة لتوفير معدات وبرمجيات الاجهزة لرحلات الفضاء واستكمال البعثات وخدمات التشغيل بناء على برنامج الأسس التجارية لوكالة الفضاء الدولية لدعم تسويق قانون مدار الأرض. دعمت هذه العقود "الابحاث الهندسية وخدمات استكمال البعثات" من قبل برنامج محطة الفضاء الدولية التي بدورها تدعم خطة ناسا الاستراتيجية للأسس التجارية لقانون مدار الأرض. كما تهدف الخطة لتعزيز تجهيزات الخدمات التجارية وتطويرها واكتفائها ذاتيا وجعلها فعالة من حيث التكلفة لقانون مدار الأرض لتتمكن من استيعاب كلا المتطلبات العامة والخاصة.

The evaluation

Table 4: Waddingtons' (2001) holistic method of evaluation Waddingtons' (2001) holistic method of evaluation

level	Accuracy of transfer ST content	Quality of expression in TL	Degree of task completion	Mark
Level 3	Transfer of the general idea(s) but with a number of lapses in accuracy; needs considerable revision to reach professional standard	Certain parts read like a piece originally written in (Arabic) , but others read like a translation. There are a considerable number of lexical grammatical or spelling errors	Adequate	6

5.3 Results and discussion

Since the researchers' main intent is to remain objective during the evaluation process and follow carefully the instruction provided by each method, the feedback of the results obtained from each method was in some cases found to be different, what was considered excellent in the first method, Hurtados', was marked as average in the second, Waddingtons'. This occurrence can be explained in terms of the limitation of each method. In the first method, it's clear that the evaluation mechanism deals with each error separately and then counts the frequency of errors to give a final mark.

The second method, however, deals with errors differently; it's based on two statements in the text as a whole. According to Waddington's method of evaluation, the only inaccuracies allowed in the fourth and fifth levels are *insignificant inaccuracies*. This entails that if a translation has a significant error, it will fall automatically to the third or lower levels on this method.

The participants made one error and caused the translation to be graded differently.

- **Source text**

in support of the commercialization of *low-Earth orbit*.

- **Translation** لدعم تسويق قانون مدار الارض.

A significant error was made by the participant in the translation of the word *low* as قانون instead of منخفض this error was evaluated in two different ways.

According to Hurtados' method, this error falls into the category of wrong meaning, since each category of errors can be marked with -1point or -2points, the final result of the evaluation for the first example was 32 out of 34.

According to the second method, a significant error such as the one the participant made is not allowed in the fifth and fourth levels, causing the translation to be marked as a third level with 6 out of 10. Here is a reminder of the conditions that should be met in order for the translation to fit each category.

level	Accuracy of transfer ST content	Quality of expression in TL	Degree of task completion	Mark
Level 5	Complete transfer of ST information; only minor revision needed to reach professional standard.	Almost all the translation reads like a piece originally written in(Arabic). There may be minor lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Successful	

Level	Accuracy of transfer ST content	Quality of expression in TL	Degree of task completion	Mark
Level 4	Almost complete transfer; there may be one or two insignificant inaccuracies; requires certain amount of revision to reach professional standard.	Large sections read like a piece originally written in(Arabic). There are a number of lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.	Almost completely successful	

level	Accuracy of transfer ST content	Quality of expression in TL	Degree of task completion	Mark
Level 3	Transfer of the general idea(s) but with a number of lapses in accuracy; needs considerable revision to reach professional standard	Certain parts read like a piece originally written in (Arabic) , but others read like a translation. There are a considerable number of lexical grammatical or spelling errors	Adequate	

6. The Proposed Integrated Translation Quality Assessment Model (ITQA Model)

As it was observed, the two methods employed in the study belong to different approaches, the first is quantitative-based and the second is qualitative-based, and each of these methods displays a sort of impediment while dealing with the same error. The Hurtado method granted a high mark for the translation, neglecting the fact that the translation suffered from a serious error, because it's a grading system that tackles each error separately, and one serious error in a full text with good translation was not recognized despite the gravity of that error to the whole meaning of the text.

The Waddington method, on the other hand is the extreme opposite to the previous method, if the translation has one significant error, they are often dropped to a Level 3 (Adequate), even if they showed brilliant translation skills in other difficult parts of the text. This can have very harsh consequences due to the fact that this method is designed to be used pedagogically. In educational environments, students should be judged wisely allowing one error to take down a whole translation even if it was a good one is unfair, but also granting a student with an almost full mark with a translation that suffers from a serious error is also unfair, so therefore this work attempts to provide a middle ground.

6.1. The ITQA Model

This model, from the name, is a mix between Hurtado's (1995) and Waddingtons' (2001) methods of assessment. It will be divided into two sections. The first section will be called the Micro-level Accuracy, which will be based on the Hurtado method. The second section will be called Macro-level Functionality, which will be based on Waddington, (2001) method.

- **The first section: The Micro-level Accuracy**

This section will focus on the lower levels of language, i.e., lexical, cohesion and coherence. The evaluation will be similar to on Hurtado's (1995) process of evaluation, which means errors will be divided in two sections, minor and serious errors. For a minor error, the deduction will be one point, for a serious error, the deduction will be two points. The Hurtado's (1995) reward system will also be included in the form of plus rewards, but in terms of percentage not points (10% or 20%), of the total grade already achieved for creative or exceptionally accurate solutions.

- **The second section: The Macro-level Functionality**

This section will focus on the higher level of language, the overall function of translation. It will also focus on the accuracy of the transfer and the quality of the expression. The evaluation

will be similar to Waddingtons' (2001) process of evaluation, which means it will use a 5-level holistic scale.

- **The Scoring of ITQA Model**

Table 5: The Scoring of ITQA Model

Component	Percentage	Focus
Micro-level Accuracy	50%	lexical, cohesion and coherence
Macro-level Functionality	50%	the overall function of translation

- **The Justification for the Integration**

This model was created in order to overcome the limitations presented by each method in isolation. From one side of the coin in Hurtados' method, the serious error was overlooked due to the nature of the evaluation. Integrating Waddingtons' holistic levels will highlight that the seriousness of this error cannot be marked with an almost excellent grade. On the other side of the coin, one significant error, according to Waddingtons' method leads to a complete drop from excellence to almost a failure the Hurtados' method will prevent that by the rewarding system allowing the student to recover from a serious drop, according to Waddingtons' method.

6.1.2. The ITQA Model Rubric

Table 6: The Proposed Integrated Translation Quality Assessment

Section 1: Micro-level Accuracy					Minor Error	Serious Error
Wrong meaning					1-point	2- point
Spelling					1-point	2-points
Grammar					1-point	2-points
lexical items					1-point	2-points
Text and Style					1-point	2-points
The plus rewards					10% Good Solutions	20 % Exceptionally Good Solutions
Section 2: Macro-level Functionality						
level	Accuracy of transfer ST content		Quality of expression in TL		Degree of task completion	Mark 50%
Level 5	Complete transfer of ST information; only minor revision needed to reach professional standard.		Almost all the translation reads like a piece originally written in(Arabic). There may be minor lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.		Successful	50%
Level 4	Almost complete transfer; there may be one or two insignificant inaccuracies; requires certain amount of revision to reach professional standard.		Large sections read like a piece originally written in (Arabic). There are a number of lexical, grammatical or spelling errors.		Almost completely successful	40%
Level 3	Transfer of the general idea(s) but with a number		Certain parts read like a piece originally written in(Arabic).		Adequate	30%

	of lapses in accuracy; needs considerable revision to reach professional standard	but others read like a translation. There are a considerable number of lexical grammatical or spelling errors		
Level 2	Transfer undermined by serious inaccuracies; thorough revision required to reach professional standard.	Almost the entire text reads like a translation; there are continual lexical, grammatical or spelling errors	Inadequate	20%
Level 1	Totally inadequate transfer of ST content; the translation is not worth revising	The candidate reveals a total lack of ability to express himself adequately in English	Totally inadequate	10%

- The evaluation process by the new Translation Quality Assessment Integrated model to the participant Performance

Table 7: participant translation assessment via The Proposed Integrated Translation Quality Assessment

Error/Reward	Participant's Performance		The evaluation	Mark out of 34
Serious Error	"Low-Earth orbit" "قانون مدار الارض" (Wrong Meaning)		-2 points	32
Serious Error	Omission of "cost-effective supply..." (Lexical/Text)		-2 points	30
Plus Reward	"REMIS" complex sentence structure (Exceptional)		+20% of 30	+6
Plus Reward	"mission integration" "استكمال البعثات" (Good)		+10% of 30	+3
Final Total	(34/34)			34/34
level	Accuracy of transfer ST content	Quality of expression in TL	Degree of task completion	50%
Level 3	Transfer of the general idea(s) but with a number of lapses in accuracy; needs considerable revision to reach professional standard	Certain parts read like a piece originally written in (Arabic) , but others read like a translation. There are a considerable number of lexical grammatical or spelling errors	Adequate	30%

- **Final Statement on ITQA Evaluation**

The Two Sections	The scoring	Performance Level
Micro-level Accuracy	50 / 50	Exceptional (with recovery)
Macro-level Functionality	30 / 50	Adequate
Final Grade	80 / 100	B-

The combination of the two stages overcomes the separate assessment imposed by Hurtados' method by integrating Waddingtons' Holistic view of errors. Moreover, the combination allowed the participant to make a recovery from the serious error judged by Waddington's method. By acknowledging the brilliant translation skills spotted throughout the translated text. It is fair to say they're the results of the integrated model Start on the middle ground between the two statements of evaluation provided by each method separately.

7 Final Remark

Seeking objectivity in translation quality assessment has always been a topic of debate, ranging from complete subjectivity in the matter of evaluation with no regard to any objectivity to approaches that treat translation assessment like a math equation with strict categories of right and wrong, to methods aiming to develop a comprehensive holistic view towards the assessment. Each of these parties carry with them strongpoints that should be considered. The main aim of this study was to bring a rule or two from distant perspectives and examine if mixing them would actually be advantageous.

The results of such a mix were quite promising and indicate that translation quality assessment field should take into consideration applying more than one approach within the evaluation of the same text in order to provide a fuller statement of evaluation. Further studies should be conducted with this proposed integrated model to test its validity and reliability even, more as well as studies with different approaches and models.

References

- Bowker, L. (2000). A corpus-based approach to evaluating student translations. *The Translator*, 6(2), 183–210.
- Castilho, S., Doherty, S., Gaspari, F., Moorkens, J., & Way, A. (Eds.). (n.d.). *Translation quality assessment: From principles to practice*. Springer International Publishing.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory*. John Benjamins.
- Conde, T. (2012). Quality and quantity in translation evaluation: A starting point. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 13(1), 67–80.
- Elmgrab, R. (2013). Evaluation of translation errors: Procedures and criteria. *IPEDR*, 62, 58–65. <https://doi.org/10.7763/IPEDR.2013.V62.13>
- Garant, M. (2009). A case for holistic translation assessment. *AFinLA-e: Soveltavan Kielitieteen Tutkimuksia*, 1, 5–17.
- Hague, D., Koby, G., Lommel, A., & Melby, A. (2014). Defining translation quality. *Revista Tradumàtica: Tecnologies de la Traducció*, 12(1), 413–420.

- Halliday, M. (2001). Towards a theory of good translation. In E. Steiner & C. Yallop (Eds.), *Exploring translation and multilingual text production: Beyond content* (pp. 13–18). Mouton de Gruyter.
- House, J. (1997). *Translation quality assessment: A model revisited*. Gunter Narr Verlag.
- House, J. (2001). Translation quality assessment: Linguistic description versus social evaluation. *Meta*, 46(2), 243–257.
- House, J. (2009). *Translation*. Oxford University Press.
- House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present*. Routledge.
- Karwad, A. I. (2025). Challenges students encounter when translating idiomatic expression: A case study of Faculty of Education students. *Journal of Libyan Academy Bani Walid*, 1(2), 229–242. <https://doi.org/10.61952/jlabw.v1i2.43>
- Khodabandeh, F. (2007). Analysis of students' errors: The case of headlines. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 3(1), 6–21.
- Khosravani, Y. (2019). *Translation quality assessment (TQA) of subtitles*. Peter Lang.
- McAlester, G. (2000). The evaluation of translation into a foreign language. In C. Schäffner & B. Adab (Eds.), *Developing translation competence* (pp. 229–241). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Medadian, G., & Nezhadansari, D. (2015). Translation quality assessment model for undergraduate student translations: Objectivity versus manageability. *Kalby Studijos / Studies About Languages*, 26, 40–54.
- Newmark, P. (1991). *About translation*. Multilingual Matters.
- Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Brill.
- Nida, E. (1984). *Signs, sense, translation*. Bible Society of South Africa.
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. St. Jerome.
- Omar, H. S. (2026). Integrating digital technologies in teaching media translation in Libyan media programs: From passive reception to interactive learning. *Journal of Libyan Academy Bani Walid*, 2(1), 258–272. <https://doi.org/10.61952/jlabw.v2i1.392>
- Reiss, K. (1971). *Translation criticism: Potentials and limitations: Categories and criteria for translation quality assessment*. St. Jerome.
- Riazi, A. M. (2003). The invisible in translation: The role of text structure in translation. *Translation Journal*, 7(2). Retrieved July 15, 2021, from <https://translationjournal.net/journal/24structure.htm>
- Samir, A., & Tabatabaee-Yazdi, M. (2020). Translation quality assessment rubric: Model-based validation. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 10(2), 101–128.
- Schäffner, C. (Ed.). (n.d.). *Translation and norms*. Multilingual Matters.
- Shiyab, S. (2013). Translation quality assessment: A perspective on pedagogy. *Arab World English Journal*, 2, 42–50.
- Stejskal, J. (2006). Quality assessment in translation. *The ATA Chronicle*. Retrieved October 25, 2021, from <https://www.multilingual.com>
- Waddington, C. (2001). Different methods of evaluating student translations: The question of validity. *Meta*, 46(2), 311–325.
- Waddington, C. (2017). Should translations be assessed holistically or through error analysis? *Hermes: Journal of Linguistics*, 14(26), 15–37.

Zequan, L. (2003). Register analysis as a tool for translation quality assessment. *Translation Journal*, 7(3). Retrieved September 15, 2021, from <http://accurapid.com/journal/25register.htm>

Abdulmunam Ramadan Mohammed Swise. (2026). Metaphor Translation Challenges among Libyan EFL Students: A Case Study at the University of Gharyan. *Libyan Journal of Educational Research and E-Learning (LJERE)*, 2(1), 498-509. <https://doi.org/10.65417/ljere.v2i1.102>

Fadia Al-Hashmi Al-Massri. (2026). A Comparative Study of Human vs. Generative AI Translation of English Poetry into Arabic: Assessing Stylistic Fidelity and Creative Nuance. *Libyan Journal of Educational Research and E-Learning (LJERE)*, 2(1), 260-278. <https://doi.org/10.65417/ljere.v2i1.84>

Rima Subhi Husain Taher. (2025). The Effectiveness of AI-Driven Translation Technologies in Mediating Cultural Understanding: A Case Study of English Language Teaching Practices in Libyan Higher Education. *Libyan Journal of Educational Research and E-Learning (LJERE)*, 1(2), 01-16. <https://doi.org/10.65417/ljere.v1i2.8>

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of **JLABW** and/or the editor(s). **JLABW** and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.
