DEVELOPING AND VALIDATING TWO TRANSLATION RUBRICS TO GUIDE STUDENT SELF- AND PEER ASSESSMENT

DESENVOLVIMENTO E VALIDAÇÃO DE DUAS RUBRICAS DE TRADUÇÃO PARA ORIENTAR A AUTOAVALIAÇÃO E AVALIAÇÃO POR PARES DOS ESTUDANTES

Witri Handayani*
Politeknik Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia
wietripnp@gmail.com

Yenni Rozimela**
*Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, indonesia
yennirozi@gmail.com

Harris Effendi Thahar**
*Universiyas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia
harrispadang@gmail.com

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

Abstract

Translation assessments are prone to being subjective. Therefore, utilizing specific translation rubrics is highly recommended to guarantee the quality and objectivity of translation assessment. This study aims to design and validate two translation rubrics: the Student-Centered Rubric (SCR) and the Translation Rubric (TR). These rubrics are designed to assess translation accuracy on grammatical, stylistic, vocabulary, and holistic levels. SCR focuses on self- and peer assessment to allow the learners to discover and rectify their translation mistakes, specifically, stimulating higher-order thinking. Meanwhile, the TR assesses a complete translation concerning its grammar & style, general meaning & context, word choice & spelling, legibility, and consistency. This study used research and development methods, specifically the ADDIE model, in developing and evaluating educational innovations in the original settings. The expert evaluation conducted to validate the SCR and TR rubrics showed a high validity score of 92.3%. Findings suggest that both rubrics are suitable for evaluating translation competence, placing the SCR on the process and the TR on the product. These rubrics have the potential to substantially improve translation competence among students and foster active learning. Further development in the clarity of communication and feedback will enhance the effectiveness of the rubrics in translation assessment.

Resumo

As avaliações de tradução tendem a ser subjetivas. Por isso, recomenda-se vivamente o uso de rubricas específicas de tradução para garantir a qualidade e a objetividade na avaliação. Este estudo tem como objetivo projetar e validar duas rubricas de tradução: a Rubrica Centrada no Estudante (RCE) e a Rubrica de Tradução (RT). Essas rubricas foram desenvolvidas para avaliar a precisão da tradução em níveis gramatical, estilístico, vocabular e holístico. A RCE enfatiza a autoavaliação e a avaliação por pares, permitindo que os alunos identifiquem e corrijam seus erros de tradução, com ênfase especial no estímulo ao pensamento de ordem superior. Já a RT analisa a tradução completa quanto à gramática e estilo, significado geral e contexto, escolha de palavras e ortografia, legibilidade e consistência. Este estudo adotou métodos de pesquisa e desenvolvimento, especificamente o modelo ADDIE, para criar e avaliar inovações educacionais em contextos reais. A avaliação por especialistas, realizada para validar as rubricas RCE e RT, resultou em um alto índice de validade de 92,3%. Os resultados indicam que ambas as rubricas são adequadas para avaliar a competência em tradução, com a RCE focada no processo e a RT no produto. Essas rubricas têm potencial para melhorar substancialmente a competência tradutória dos alunos e promover o aprendizado ativo. Desenvolvimentos adicionais na clareza da comunicação e no feedback aprimorarão

1 INTRODUCTION

Translation plays a vital role in facilitating communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries. With the growing need for professional translation services across the globe, it is paramount that both students and professionals in the translation field possess the required fluency and accuracy. One of the most difficult challenges in teaching translation is evaluating the translation's quality, which in many instances is the result of how well the meaning in one language is translated into another language and its associated culture.

Traditional evaluation methods, such as holistic grading systems or assessment criteria based on attendance records, fail to provide defined feedback for translators and lack the granularity and consistency required. The development of structured, transparent assessment rubrics can fill this gap by providing an objective measurement standard that can be utilized by educators and evaluators to assess the translation quality (Baker, 2018).

Throughout the years, different frameworks for translation evaluation have been suggested. The most relevant methods center on accuracy, fluency, and the cultural context. For instance, House (2015) created a model of translation quality assessment, which analyses the fidelity of the translation to the source text and the acceptability of the target text in the source culture. On the other hand, some scholars like Pym (2010) have advocated for more natural form describers where the focus is on the texture of the language and the ease of reading the translation, arguing the case of fluency.

Recent research has shown that a structured process for both the self-evaluation and the peer-evaluation of translated texts can enhance the level of learner responsibility, self-awareness of successes or short falling in learning, and the gradual development of autonomy for prospective professional translators and interpreters (Robinson et al., 2006). As learners are provided structured and explicit evaluative criteria to assist their self-evaluation of their own translated work and their peers, they tend to become more adept at making evaluations about the quality of their own translated products as well as that of

others in the class, thus increasing the overall quality of translations produced in the course of the learning process (Al-Emara, 2016; Zhan et al., 2023). Research has also indicated that the implementation of collaborative peer evaluations in translation classrooms provides not only better translation outcomes, but also provides increased self-confidence, motivation, and an increased feeling of belonging to a community of practice among students in translation and interpreting classrooms (Lin, 2021).

Overall, this study (RQ1) designs two translation rubrics, a Student-Centered Rubric (SCR) and a Translation Rubric (TR), and (RQ2) validates their effectiveness through expert reviews and pilot testing. By creating two independent rubrics, this study intends to tackle the multifaceted translation evaluation and help offer a more comprehensive one, and underlines the value of combining both rubrics to improve translation assessment practice quality.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Translation quality assessment has been a major focus in translation studies, with some scholars proposing various rubrics and evaluation criteria. These rubrics must apply to both students and instructors. To carefully answer research questions, the following literature is necessary to be included.

2.1 Translation assessment rubrics

Recent translation assessment should involve the students' active participation from the beginning of the lesson. This will engage them more in the translation process and help them gain their translation competency step by step, so their translation results can reach an acceptable level. In other words, both process and result are important aspects of translation assessment.

Khanmohammad & Osanloo (2009) have discussed several experts' models of translation assessment, including the rubrics. They underlined that the first step in translation assessment is to create the quality model and then transform it into a set of metrics that measure each element of that quality. Similarly, Williams (2013) believes that there are three steps in the assessment: (1) setting the criteria, (2) selecting indicators for making valid judgments against the criteria, and (3) making a judgment of

performance level or grade. Muzii (2007) mentions that a comprehensive set of criteria must assess the quality of translation from several perspectives during the production processes, since a single, all-encompassing metric is troublesome and useless due to not revealing all problems. Therefore, a reliable and valid rubric for translation assessment would be necessary to address the above issues (Khanmohammad & Osanloo, 2009).

As an assessment tool, rubrics give the instructors a more accurate description of individual performance. Meanwhile, as a learning tool, they can stimulate the students' skills to form judgments about the standard of high-quality work. These statements agree with Muhammad et al. (2018), who state, "Rubrics can teach as well as evaluate." In addition, Steven & Levi (2023) mention that there are four elements arranged in a rubric: (i) task description, which describes the performance and expected behavior from the assignment given; (ii) scale, which consists of a minimum of three scales and less than six criteria, (iii) dimension which contain the element to be assessed and (iv) description of dimension, assessment criteria or descriptor.

Moreover, to create a purposeful rubric, an overview of the existing rubrics is necessary. Farahzad in Khanmohammad & Osanloo (2009) differentiates between two kinds of rubrics. They are based on the text, the sentence, and the clause as the translation unit. The first one consists of accuracy, appropriateness, naturalness, cohesion, and style of discourse/choice of words, which can be applied holistically in percentage. The second one has division (accuracy and appropriateness & cohesion and style) and sub-division sentences, main clause, sub-clause, transitional, appropriate use of pronouns, linkages, choice of words, and grammatical structures, which can be seen in Table 1, while Table 2 offers more detail element of criteria based on sentence and clause.

Table 1

A Rubric Based on the Text

Items	Score
Accuracy	20 percent
Appropriateness	20 percent
Naturalness	20 percent
Cohesion	20 percent
Style of discourse/ choice of words	20 percent

Table 2

Farahzad's Model Based on Sentence and Clause

Accuracy and appropriateness				Cohesion and style			
Sentences	Main clause	Sub-clause	Transitional	Appropriate use of pronouns	Linkages	Choice of words	Grammatical structure

In addition, Khanmohammad & Osanloo (2009) discussed Sainz's rubric of the student-centered approach, which encourages the students to analyze their own translation mistakes and possible corrections with the correction chart as seen in Table 3.

Table 3

Sainz's Rubric on Student-Centered Approach

Mistakes	Possible Correction	Source	Type of Mistake

Under the *Mistakes*, the word, phrase, or sentence in their translation that is analyzed as incorrect is written. Under *Possible Correction*, they try to write a 'no mistake' version. The *source* of the students' correction is written under the Source column, stating where or from whom they got the review. *The type of Mistake* column is filled in with the mistake they can recognize from their translation result, and then classify and revise it. It functions as a good exercise for them to upgrade their awareness and translation skills.

Furthermore, Khan Mohammad & Osanloo (2009) also discuss Beeby's rubric, which marks the exam with 20 points, which:

- 10 points are for ten specific translation problems that have been selected from the text
- 10 points are for the language (1 point for incorrect syntax, tense, agreement, and word order; ½ points for incorrect articles, prepositions, and spelling

Nine translation elements were selected to measure translation competence, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Beeby's Competence-based Rubric

Translation elements	headlines	typography	transfer competence	discourse competence	syntactic differences	relevance	lexical errors	cultural transfer	extra-linguistic knowledge
Points									

It is clear from the aforementioned models' examples that no one model can be used for all types of translation needs, whether business or academic. The goal and target of the translation itself will determine this. Additionally, the needs and circumstances of the pupils dictate the rubric's criteria. As a result, each instructor is free to establish the scoring range and rubric criteria that best suit their research goals as well as the needs and circumstances of their students.

2.2 Validation of translation rubrics

The reliability and effectiveness of rubrics greatly depend on their validation, which is a crucial step in the process. According to Brown and Abeywickrama (2010), a validation condition is achieved when the intended purpose is accurately achieved. It follows that with translation rubrics, it is imperative that all components dealing with translation quality- accuracy, style, clarity, and contextual appropriateness- are evaluated.

Unlike other forms of academic research, validation research is highly professional and includes reviewing expert evaluations and measuring rubric assessments against the actual performance in the translation. For instance, Lee and Lee (2015) conducted a study to validate rubrics for assessing students' translations. They applied expert reviews to validate how reliable a rubric designed to measure linguistic accuracy and contextual understanding was. They concluded that the rubric captured both technical and interpretive translation, which provided the criteria the researchers were looking for in validating the rubrics.

This and other studies, such as those done by Albir (2007) on the assessment of translation quality using rubrics, confirm that expert validation is key in ensuring the rubrics have all the relevant aspects of translation quality. She advocates for the alignment

of the rubric categories with professional standards by expert evaluators so that the developed translations reflect the actual world translation.

At this stage, input from professional translators would be essential to improve the design of the rubric to make it relevant to actual translation work. In this case, Rubric validation could also rely on statistical analysis, where inter-rater reliability tests are performed to check whether participants evaluating the rubric actually use it similarly. Norris (2006) argues that translation assessment rubrics must possess considerable inter-rater reliability for their validation. This means that the rubric is capable of giving uniform evaluations, which translates in most cases to a lack of objectivity when evaluating the translations. Several analyses have been done using statistical tools, particularly the Cronbach's alpha method of Barger and Rojas (2013), which included translation rubrics in the evaluation, concluding that well-designed rubrics are reliable among some evaluators.

Moreover, three experts have contributed valuable insight into rubric validity. Each offers relevant indicators for rubric validity. The work on rubrics by Moskal and Leydens (2000) deals with several methods to assess validity. Emphasis is placed upon content validity and construct validity. It encompasses how much the rubric captures all the assorted features of translation practice. While it speaks of what the translation tasks are expected to deliver: accuracy, style, and so on, the construct validity is to say that the rubric is measuring those outcomes. By applying their work as a base for the rubric development, one can ensure that the rubric meets translation-specific skills and results. It will further confirm that the rubric measures what it is meant to measure.

While discussing assessment practices, Stevans and Levi (2005) mention inter-rater reliability and the importance of clear, univocal criteria for rubric development. The biggest indicator highlighted regarding the validity of a rubric is reliability – whether or not different evaluators using the same rubric will score a student's work as equally valuable. This validation point is a precise central component because it guarantees that the rubric consistently measures the desired qualities in the translation. In translation rubrics, particularly, this reliability could be of considerable utility when it comes to scoring more subjective aspects of such translations as style or precision.

In addition, Nitko's (2004) work in educational assessment, however, centers on the larger topic of rubric development and validation. Nitko considers the validity of a rubric to be based on construct validity – whether the rubric measures the quality of

translation skills – and criterion-related validity – whether the rubric agrees with other outputs about the quality of translation, such as professional standards and other tests given beforehand. Besides that, Nitko can offer ways of judging their practicality: validity in the sense of whether the rubric is understandable, usable, and effective in an educational setting, consequently contributing to overall validity.

From these three experts' opinions, the indicator components that can be utilized are content, construct, and criteria. Each component consisted of several statements. The details of indicators for translation rubric validity can be seen in Table 5 below.

Table 5

Indicator for Translation Rubric Validity

Sources	Components
Moskal & Leydens (2001)	**Content**
	The rubric can be used for every genre of the text
	The description of the rubric suitable for every genre of the text
Stevans & Levi (2005)	The description of the rubric is clear and different from each other
Nitko (2004). Educational assessment of students (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.	The rubric includes all aspects of students' translation result assessment in criteria grammar & style, meaning & content, choice of words & spelling, legible translation and consistency; and provides feedback for students' ability improvement
	Student-center rubric in the translation assessment model has included students' self-assessment of the translation result in criteria to recognize the mistake and how to overcome the mistake and provide feedback for students' improvement
	The rubric is appropriate for the learning objective of translating the subject
	Construct
	The description of each level of the rubric represents the level of performance from the lowest to highest score
	Numerical scales illustrate the level of students' performance
	The rubric informs the students about the assessment procedure for the students' translation result
	The rubric is fair to all students and free of bias
	The rubric provides feedback from the lecturers which includes students' superiority, lack and gives motivation to students' translation ability
	Criteria
	The criteria of the rubric are clear and easy to understand
	The criteria of the rubric are different from one another

Then, the data was analyzed by applying the formula proposed by Riduwan (2010) as below:

$$\text{Validation Score} = \frac{the\ total\ score\ of\ validation}{the\ maximum\ score} \times 100\%$$

The result was then converted into the percentage range proposed by Riduwan (2010) as written in Table 6:

Table 6

Category of Validity Score

Percentage	Category
81-100	Very Valid
61-80	Valid
41-60	Fairly Valid
21-40	Less Valid
<20	Invalid

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design

This research is part of a research series in translation that uses research and development methods and adopts the ADDIE model, which consists of five steps: analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation (Aldoobie, 2015). The current research builds upon the prior findings and refines the product-based data and feedback collected during the earlier phase, as published in the preceding study. Specifically, this research discusses only the continuation design and development part of the ADDIE model since the analysis and the first step of design have been published in the proceedings of ICOLP 1 (Handayani et al., 2021), IJIELT (Handayani, 2025), and ICOLP 2 (Handayani et al., 2022).

3.2 Participants

The participants in this research were consistent with those from the previous study, comprising third-year students from the English Department of Politeknik Negeri Padang. The selection of the same participant pool ensures continuity and comparability of data across both phases of the research.

3.3 Data collection

The data utilized in this research include both newly collected information and validated data drawn from previously published articles. Specifically, data related to need analysis, curriculum demands, and early design stages were reused with necessary updates to construct the rubrics. Meanwhile, to answer the research question about the rubrics' validity, the indicator for translation rubric validity in Table 5 is given to two validators.

3.4 Data analysis

The data analysis in this study also extends from previous research. Initial findings, such as the results of need analysis questionnaires and expert validations, were reanalyzed alongside newly collected data to ensure comprehensive development. Both qualitative and quantitative techniques were employed consistently with the methods applied in the previous phase, ensuring methodological continuity.

4 RESULTS

Two focuses discussed here are the construction of the translation rubrics and their validations. To develop a comprehensive rubric, content analysis of existing rubrics was performed, alongside observations of students' needs. These observations helped to pinpoint the most relevant aspects of translation that needed to be addressed in the rubrics. Both of the research results are presented below.

4.1 The construction of two translation rubrics

Two rubrics are being constructed here for the translation assessment. They are the student-centered translation rubric and the translation process. The purpose of the rubrics was to evaluate the quality of student translations across multiple aspects, including grammar, style, vocabulary, and overall accuracy in conveying meaning. The scope of the rubrics was designed to address both the **process** and **product** of translation.

The initial rubric is called the student-centered rubric (SCR) (Table 7). This SCR, which had the same name but a different applied approach, was a version of Sainz's as cited in Khanmohammad & Osanloo (2009). For each translation, mistakes were identified, their positions in the target text (TT) were noted, and the type of mistake was categorized. This rubric helped assess students' awareness of their translation errors, their ability to locate mistakes, and their capability to suggest corrections.

Table 7

The Student-Centered Translation Rubric (SCR)

No	Mistakes	Position in theTT	Type of Mistake	Possible Correction	Source

Note:
Term description:
Mistake = the mistake you identify in the TT
Position in The TT = in which part of the sentence the mistake has been found
Type of mistake = how you categorized the mistake (e.g. spelling error)
Possible correction = how the sentence/word is supposed to be
Source = from where or whom do you know the possible correction

SCR was designed to be utilized during the learning process. Students can use it to evaluate both their own and their peers' translation performance. This rubric is completed with a term description and notes for an extra description of the mistakes.

The second rubric for translation was encouraged by Farahzad as cited in Khanmohhammad & Osanloo, 2009), which was a rubric of translation elements. Although the primary form of Farahzad's rubric (holistic), some categories of translation elements like grammatical structure, choice of words, linkages, appropriate use of the pronouns, and transitions were used. The translation rubric (TR) employed an analytic rubric style and had five (5) categories of translation elements: grammar & style, translation general meaning & context, choice of words & spelling, legible translation, and consistency. For assessment criteria, it utilizes the criteria from unacceptable to advanced, completed with points 1-5 to strengthen the scoring categorization. The result of the assessment criteria was then converted to a 1-100 point scale, scoring based on the lecturer's characterization preference. Feedback was also given for the written additional command over the scoring. The complete description of the translation rubric is shown in Table 8.

Table 8

The Translation Rubric (TR)

Translation elements	Assessment Criteria				
	Advanced 5	**Excellent 4**	**Acceptable 3**	**Deficient 2**	**Unacceptable 1**
Grammar & Style	Almost no grammatical error & complete transfer sentences in TL; the style is highly appropriate for the topic	Less mistake in grammatical usage & the sentence of the TL is clear; the style is appropriate for the topic	Have awkward grammatical usage but the sentence of the TL can be understood; the style is moderately appropriate for the topic	Limited grammar knowledge with mostly wrong usage; the TL style is rarely appropriate for the topic	Inadequate grammar knowledge; almost no sense of TL style
Translation general meaning & context	Perfectly translated ST to the correct meaning in TT; have no sense of the translation	Mostly translated ST to correct meaning in TT; few contexts are inappropriate	Sometimes translated ST to correct meaning in TT; some contexts are inappropriate	Rarely translated ST to the correct TT meaning; most contexts are inappropriate	Extremely poor translation result; fail to transfer the meaning and context of the ST
Choice of words & Spelling	Highly appropriate choice of words; almost no spelling error	Wide range use of vocabulary with less mistakes in equivalent choice of words; few spelling errors	Moderately rage use of vocabulary with some unsuitable choice of words; some miss spelling exists	A large number of unsuitable choice of words; many miss spelling words	Inappropriate use of vocabulary; a large number of misspelled words
Legible translation	TT is neat, clear and easy to read and understand	TT is neat and easy to read but unclear in some part	TT is sometimes easy to read but quite messy and unclear	TT is mostly messy and unclear but easy to read in a few part	TT is so difficult to read, scrawl on and rub out
Consistency	The translation is faithful in the ideology used, the usage of specific terms and method	The translation is mostly maintaining the term of ideology used, the usage of specific terms and method	The translation is sometimes maintaining the term of ideology used, the usage of specific terms and method	The translation is rarely maintaining the term of ideology used, the usage of specific terms and method	The translation has a sense of no ideology used, the specific term is unidentified and no method

Feedback:

_____

The TR focused on the overall quality of the final translation or the product. It measured students' proficiency in various translation elements as mentioned above. These

elements were chosen based on their relevance to successful translation and the skills students need to develop. The explanation of the target skills can be seen below:

➢ Grammar and style: Choosing appropriate grammar and style is necessary for producing a fluent, readable translation. The rubric assessed students' ability to adhere to grammatical norms in both the source and target language.

➢ General meaning and context: Getting the meaning and context of the source language translated to the target language accurately is an important aspect of translation. This element looked for evidence that the general meaning was translated correctly and there was no distortion of meaning taken from the source.

➢ Word Choice and Spelling: The accuracy of vocabulary, i.e., the correct word choice and spelling, is one of the main characteristics of translation. This characteristic was interested in the appropriateness of vocabulary used and the presence of spelling errors.

➢ Legibility: This assessed how clear and easy to read the translation was. If a translation was messy or unclear, it would score poorly in this category.

➢ Consistency: The rubric also considered how students applied the same words, phrases, and style throughout the translation to ensure the consistency of the translation ideologically and terminologically.

The TR used a numerical scale (1-5) of:

• 5 (Advanced): The translation displays superior proficiency with zero errors in grammar, style, or meaning.

• 4 (Excellent): Very good translation with only small errors.

• 3 (Acceptable): An acceptable translation with occasional visible difficulties.

• 2 (Deficient): A poor quality translation with frequent errors.

• 1 (Unacceptable): Nearly impossible to read translation with major errors in meaning and structure.

4.2 Validation of the Rubrics

After constructing SCR and TR, the next step was to validate the rubrics by utilizing the indicators of validation in Table 5. Two translation experts were validating the rubrics separately. They were from different universities and had many contributions to their expertise. The result of the expert judgment is displayed in Table 9.

Table 9

Validation Result of the Translation Rubrics

No.	Components	Validator 1	2	Mean	Criteria
Content					
1	The rubric can be used for every genre of the text	5	5	5	Very Valid
2	The description of the rubric suitable for every genre of the text	5	5	5	Very Valid
3	The description of the rubric is clear and different from each other	5	5	5	Very Valid
4	The rubric includes all aspects in students' translation result assessment in criteria grammar & style, meaning & content, choice of words & spelling, legible translation and consistency; and provide feedback for students' ability improvement	5	5	5	Very Valid
5	Student-center rubric in translation assessment model has included students' self-assessment to the translation result in criteria recognize the mistake and how to overcome the mistake and provide feedback for students' improvement	5	5	5	Very Valid
6	The rubric is appropriate with the learning objective of translation subject	4	4	4	Valid
Construct					
7	The description of each level of the rubric has represent the level of performance from the lowest to highest score	4	5	4.5	Valid
8	Numerical scales illustrate the level of students' performance	5	5	5	Very Valid
9	The rubric informs the students about assessment procedure of the students' translation result	5	1	3	Fairly Valid
10	The rubric is fairness to all students and free of bias	5	5	5	Very Valid
11	The rubric provide feedback from the lecturers which includes students' superiority, lack and give motivation to students' translation ability	4	3	3.5	Fairly Valid
Criteria					
12	The criteria of the rubric are clear and easy to understand	5	5	5	Very Valid
13	The criteria of the rubric are different from one another	5	5	5	Very Valid
Total				60	
Percentage: 60/65 x 100%				**92.3%**	Very Valid

The outcome in Table 9 offers an analysis of the evaluation of SCR and TR, which is divided into three components: Content, Construct, and Criteria. Each component consists of sub-questions that were evaluated for validity by two validators using the scale of 1-5. The summary results give percentage scores for the validity of the rubric.

Every item in the 'content' category was assessed as "Very Valid" with a score of 5, which proves that the rubric is multidimensional and applicable for different genres of translation texts with unambiguous descriptions. It also contains all the necessary and

adequate features of assessment, like grammar, style, meaning, spelling, consistency, and feedback that helps the student to improve. The only one that got a slightly lower score (4) about the adequacy of the rubric concerning the learning objective of the translation subject still remains "Valid".

The 'construct' categorization is generally accurate concerning most items considered "Very Valid" (scores of 5). The items pertaining to the decisiveness of the performance levels, the scope of the numerical scales denoting student achievements, and the equity were all regarded as valid to a high degree. One item (Rubric informing students about the assessment procedure) was rated "Fairly Valid" (score of 3) because of a wide range split between 5 and one ratings 5 and 1. This indicates there was no consensus on the validity of the rubric explaining the assessment process, and therefore, agreement was split. Another item concerning the lecturer's feedback in relation to the student's stated academic prowess earned the same rating (3.5), suggesting reluctance as to how the rubric's feedback was offered.

Meanwhile, in the 'criteria' categorization, both items earned a "Very Valid" rating (5). It showed that the criteria incorporated within the rubric are comprehensive and simple, ensuring clarity in understanding the assessment.

Overall, the rubric scored 60 out of 65, which gives it a validity rating of 92.3%, classified as "Very Valid." This indicates that the rubric is quite good in evaluating translation work, with only minor concerns in communication regarding the assessment dialogue and feedback from lecturers. To conclude, the rubric remains valid and effective, but some factors require attention, particularly in the clarity of the assessment procedure and feedback from the lecturers.

5 DISCUSSION

After presenting the research results, a deep analysis compared to experts' opinions on related subjects is necessary to accurately value the research results. Below is the discussion of the subject matter.

5.1 Construction of SCR and TR

The Student-Centered Translation Rubric and Translation Rubric (SCR and TR) serve as benchmarks for the Single Competence assessment to measure the multifaceted skill of translation. These rubrics aim to facilitate the evaluation of translation competence, covering various aspects such as error awareness, language proficiency, and general execution. The methods these rubrics were approaches to design and structure their respective algorithms denote signifying importance, telling us how translation assessment rubrics should be constructed.

In SCR, students ought to take part in evaluating themselves, other learners, and also their peers, which strongly underlined the focus on the students. SCR supports explanation and self-referencing, which, according to Khanmohammad and Osanloo (2009), fosters metacognitive capabilities essential for sharpening translation competencies. SCR prompts self-appraisal by asking students to describe errors, find them in TT, classify them, and explain how they would revise them. This follows the pedagogical approach of formative assessment, which helps learners shift from inadequate performance to autonomous, skilled learners (Boud, 2013).

The SCR's focus on error identification, including grammar, word choice, spelling, and contextual meaning, matches with the error analysis method in translation studies (Ellis, 2016). This approach also involves studying the nature and origins of the errors in students' translations, which is one of the steps in the language learning process. The rubric helps learners by providing prompt feedback on categorized errors, which is crucial for nurturing an active learning environment.

Moreover, the design of the student-centered rubric stems from the concepts of peer assessment, which has received a great deal of attention in translation pedagogy. Evidence suggests that peer assessment improves overall learning by fostering collaboration, critical engagement, and deeper consideration of the translation process (Topping, 2009). Such peer evaluation allows learners to appreciate various considerations and formulate judgments relating to different levels of translation quality, thus enhancing their skills as translators.

In contrast to SCR, TR provides a more traditional, result-oriented rubric. It appraises the final product of translation based on five key categories: grammar & style, general meaning & context, word choice & spelling, legibility, and consistency. This

rubric reflects the approach of the analytic rubric in educational assessments, which fragments performance into detailed elements that are independently measured (Andrade, 2000).

The Grammar & Style section checks learners' mastery of grammatical rules and applicable style. This part of the rubric corresponds to grammatical competence, which is an important part of communication sub-competence in translation theory (Pym, 2014). Pym emphasizes knowing the grammar and style of both the source and the target languages in the context of translation. The rubric describes the students' ability to observe language rules and flows in the translation spatially.

In General, meaning & Context, capturing the meaning from the source language and expressing it in the target language seamlessly is one of the principles of translation evaluation. In the view of Munday (2016), the dynamic equivalence principle - that the target text should convey the same sense as the source text – remains fundamental in translation. These aspects are illustrated in the TR's focus on whether the translation means correctly within the context of the original text. The scoring system of the rubric complacently depicts these varying degrees, emphasizing meaning fidelity as a prerequisite for quality translation regardless of the level judgment starts at, termed "unacceptable" to "advanced".

In vocabulary choice & spelling, the word choice accuracy is very important in a text because false friends and other semantic issues may shift the text's meaning. For instance, Baker (2018) mentions that spelling and word choice are one of the most prevalent problems in translation work. This rubric, as one of the aspects of form, correctness, and language accuracy, makes sure that learners use appropriate words, spelling, and grammatical forms relevant to the context and register of the original text.

The next criterion, readability, is essential for any piece of writing. Legibility, as defined by Kussmaul (2000), a translation's readability and comprehensibility, contributes to the usefulness of the text, particularly in professional settings where clarity and ease of understanding are essential.

The last criterion is consistency. The TR's focus on consistency concerns the need for learners to be psychologically consistent in their terminology, style, and tone throughout the translation. This links to the idea of coherence in translation by Schäffner (2016), which asserts that a translation must be regarded as a cohesive whole, not as a jumble of unrelated elements.

To sum up, the Student-Centered Rubric (SCR) and the Translation Rubric (TR), which emphasize both the process and product of translation, provide a combination procedure for the translation assessment. These rubrics provide a complete framework for evaluating students' translation by utilizing key principles of translation theory, error analysis, and formative assessment. By making some adjustments in how feedback and clarity are communicated, these rubrics have the ability to significantly increase the experience of translation learning, stimulating the students' autonomous learning instinct and translation competence.

5.2 The validation of both rubrics

Regarding content, structure, and criteria, the evaluation results reveal that both rubrics (SCR and TR) were regarded as "very valid." Content validity, or the degree to which the rubric covers all pertinent aspects of translation, construct validity, or how well the rubric reflects the construct of translation competency, and criterion-related validity, or how the scores of the rubric correlate with other measures of translation quality, such professional evaluations or final grades, define the validity of a rubric (Kane, 2013)

Under this framework, both criteria, especially those related to student learning and translation competency, showered great validity. From error identification and correction (SCR) to general translation quality (TR), the items in both rubrics tackled important areas of translating. The great emphasis on feedback, a fundamental component of formative assessment, supports the validity of the rubrics even more. Nonetheless, as the results show, the TR's item on the capacity of the rubric to notify students about the assessment process got a lower score, suggesting a possible development area in clarity and communication.

Furthermore, both criteria seem to fit constructivist learning theory, which stresses students' active participation in the course of education. Students can increase their meta-cognitive skills and translation competency by means of self-assessment (SCR) and feedback grounded on well-defined criteria (TR) (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Although the rubrics got high validity ratings, several areas, especially with regard to how the rubrics explain the assessment process and offer comments, were found to need improvement. This result is consistent with recent research in assessment design, which advises rubrics to be both transparent and consistent in their instructions (Panadero & Jonsson, 2013).

Moreover, the components of peer feedback and cooperative learning will help to enhance the student-centered character of the rubrics, fostering greater involvement with the translation process and enhancing the whole learning environment.

6 CONCLUSION

Two translation rubrics, the Student-Centered Translation Rubric (SCR) and the Translation Rubric (TR), have their development and validation presented in this study. Each rubric aims to holistically evaluate the factor of translation quality using various aspects of collaborator references, such as grammar, style, vocabulary, and overall meaning. The SCR highlights the quality-assessing aspect of translation in the form of student self-assessment and peer feedback, thereby supporting metacognitive processes that benefit from formative assessment. By recognizing and correcting their errors, students learn from the drafting process and make improvements to their translation competence.

Conversely, the TR judges the finished translation product according to quality with five specific factors to evaluate: grammar and style, general meaning and context, word choice and spelling, legibility, and consistency. The TR attempts to strictly evaluate translation accuracy and fluency and is, therefore, a more traditional and product-centered rubric and assessment. The TR follows the analytic rubric model that subdivides performance into measurable components and, thereby, can reasonably adjudge the overall score through different measures that align with quality factors to maximize the rubric as an avenue for evaluating and reporting on the final quality of student translations.

The expert validation of the rubrics presented the results of a 92.3% level of validity for both rubrics, indicating they are a valid assessment of translation competency overall. Experts noted that both rubrics have demonstrated strengths, and particularly noted that the rubrics were comprehensive and aligned well with critical translation studies theorists. Experts noticed a small area of improvement for clarity in assessment activities and communication of feedback.

To sum up, the SCR and TR are effective rubrics for a balanced process/product assessment in translation. These rubrics additionally help support student learning through supportive and thoughtful feedback, provided that assessment and

communication are minimally modified and adjusted for feedback. The use of rubrics, as noted, can strengthen translation

REFERENCES

Albir, A. H. (2007). *Teaching translation: A pedagogical perspective*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Aldoobie, N. (2015) 'ADDIE Model', *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 5(6), pp. 68–72.

Al-Emara, F. (2016). Is Self-assessment a Credible Indicator of Translation Competence?. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on Translation*, (5).

Andrade, H. (2000). **Using rubrics to promote thinking and learning**. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2000*(80), 35-44. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.8004

Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. Routledge.

Barger, M., & Rojas, P. (2013). The evaluation of translation quality using rubrics. *Translation Studies Review, 12*(3), 52-68.

Boud, D. (2013). **Enhancing learning through self-assessment**. Routledge.

Brookhart, S. M., & Nitko, A. J. (2019). *Educational assessment of students* (8th Edition). Pearson Upper Saddle River, NJ. https://lazytrader.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/9780134807072-p.pdf

Brown, J. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. Pearson Education.

Ellis, R. (2016). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. This updated book provides a comprehensive analysis of error analysis and language acquisition.

Handayani, W., Rozimela, Y., & Thahar, H. E. (2021, December). Students' Perception on E-Portfolio for Assessing Translation Skill. In *Proceeding of International Conference on Language Pedagogy (ICOLP)* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 247-252).

_____. (2022, December). The framework of e-portfolio assessment model for translation study. In *Proceeding of International Conference on Language Pedagogy (ICOLP)* (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 415-424).

Handayani, W., Saptopramono, H., & Apriyanti, D. (2025). Lecturers' Perceptions on the Utilization of Translation Rubrics for Guiding Peer and Self-Assessment in Higher Education. *Indonesian Journal of Integrated English Language Teaching*, *11*(1), 1-9.

House, J. (2015). *Translation as Communication across Languages and Cultures*. Routledge.

Kane, M. T. (2013). *Validating the interpretations and uses of test scores*. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 50*(1), 1-73. https://doi.org/10.1111/jedm.12000. This paper addresses the contemporary application of validity in assessments and rubrics.

Khanmohammad, A., & Osanloo, M. (2009). **Rubrics for translation assessment**. *Translation & Interpreting Studies, 4*(2), 125-146.

Kussmaul, P. (2000). **Teaching translation: A practical course**. John Benjamins Publishing.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages*. Oxford University Press. This work offers an updated interpretation of Vygotskian principles in language learning.

Lee, J., & Lee, K. (2015). Validation of a translation assessment rubric. *Translation and Interpretation Studies Journal, 9*(2), 72-85.

Lin, Z., Song, X., Guo, J., & Wang, F. (2021). Peer feedback in translation training: A quasi-experiment in an advanced Chinese–English translation course. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 631898.

McKenney, S., & Reeves, T. C. (2013). Educational design research. In *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 131-140). New York, NY: Springer New York.

Moskal, B. M., & Leydens, J. A. (2000). Scoring rubrics: What, when and how? *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 7*(3).

Muhammad, A., Lebar, O., & Mokshein, S. E. (2018). Rubrics as Assessment, Evaluation and Scoring Tools. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *8*(10), 1417– 1431. https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v8-i10/5309

Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). Routledge. Munday's work provides an updated look at translation theory and practice, aligning with current trends and research.

Muzii, L. (2007). Adaptation, translation, and multimediality. *Online Translation Journal*, *1*(4),46–58. https://scholar.google.co.id/scholar?hl=id&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=muzii+2007+translation&btnG=

Nitko, A. J. (2004). *Educational Assessment of Students* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Norris, J. M. (2006). *Assessing translation quality: A case study of rubrics in translation education*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Panadero, E., & Jonsson, A. (2013). **The use of rubrics for formative assessment purposes in educational settings: A review**. *Educational Research Review, 9*, 129-144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2013.01.002

Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring Translation Theories*. Routledge.

_____. (2014). *The translation studies reader* (3rd ed.). Routledge. This book is a modern and comprehensive compilation of essential translation studies theory and practice.

Riduwan, M. (2010). *Skala Pengukuran Variabel-Variabel Penelitian (edisi ke-9)*. Yogyakarta:PustakaPelajar. https://scholar.google.co.id/scholar?hl=id&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=riduwan+2010+skala+pengukuran+variabel-variabel+penelitian&btnG=

Robinson, B. J., Lopez Rodriguez, C. I., & Tercedor Sánchez, M. I. (2006). Self-asesment in translator training. *Perspectives*, *14*(2), 115-138.

Schäffner, C. (2016). *The role of the translator in cultural exchange*. John Benjamins Publishing. This provides a contemporary discussion on the role of translators and translation studies in a global context.

Stevens, D, & Levi, A. (2005). Introduction to rubrics, p.vii. "Grading Guidelines & Rubrics." *Assessment@ Bond* 1: 44. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/196606718. pdf#page=46

. (2023). *Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback, and promote student learning*. Routledge.

https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003445432

Topping, K. J. (2009). **Peer assessment**. *Theory into Practice, 48*(1), 20-27. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577569

Zhan, Y., Yan, Z., Wan, Z. H., Wang, X., Zeng, Y., Yang, M., & Yang, L. (2023). Effects of online peer assessment on higher-order thinking: A meta-analysis. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *54*(4), 817-835.

Zhang, L. (2017). The role of rubrics in translation assessment: Student perspectives. *Journal of Translation Studies, 15*(2), 22-39.

Authors' Contribution

All authors contributed equally to the development of this article.

Data availability

All datasets relevant to this study's findings are fully available within the article.

How to cite this article (APA)