An Alternative Assessment Model to Improve a Translated Text from Indonesian into English

Marwan Tanuwijaya, Aditya Cahyo Nugroho, Pratama Ahdi and Novita Dewi
https://doi.org/10.24071/ijels.v2i1.348

ABSTRACT

The main aspect of translation is how one's expression in one language is replaced with an equivalent representation in another language. The representation should be equivalent in terms of its stylistic, referential, and linguistic features. Whether there is a need for a translation text to be classified as "weak," "fair" or "good," its acceptability and the means of determining it as well as how to improve one's translation quality were what we investigated in this article. National and international translation standards now exist, but there are no generally accepted objective criteria for evaluating the quality of translation. Therefore, such an assessment is needed to reveal the quality of the translation of a text from Indonesian into English. This article aimed to assess it using an alternative instrument and suggestions on how to improve translation quality which the authors adapted from NAATI (National Accreditation Authority of Translators and Interpreters). They adopted the stylistic, referential, and linguistic components of NAATI's translation quality assessment. Based on the limited data that they had, a number of improvement procedures were recommended.

Keywords: assessment, text, translation quality and improvement

INTRODUCTION

In our current world there is almost no more limitation in that technology is developing rapidly. People have access to a lot of different things especially information. There is a lot of information accessed by people from the media. The media can be written media such as newspapers, books, or magazines, audio-visual media such as television and radio, and online media such as the internet. In accessing them, however, people still encounter obstacles in terms of language.

Therefore, the existing technology provides vast information which is not only from one area/country that means one language but also from many countries with their own languages. Ramis (2006:1) says that "still, the language barrier is the only obstacle for this vast information to be fully shared by all users". Ramis (2006) states that accessing information optimally requires people to be literate in more than one language. It becomes problems for those who only master one or two languages. In this context, translation plays an important role to help people to access and understand the information from other languages. People finally do not have to master many languages because translation has done the job.

Bell (1997:6) defines translation as the replacement of a representation of a text in one language by a representation of an equivalent text in a second language. Translators should find the closest equivalence of words, sentences, paragraphs, or a whole text from a Source Language (SL) to a Target Language (TL). The most important part of translation is to transfer the message from the source language to the target language as accurately as possible in terms of its referential, stylistic and linguistic features.

The ever-developing technology has also affected how translators do their job. Currently, translation can be done both manually and automatically. Nababan (1999:134) states that manual translation is fully done by human meanwhile automated translation is done by a computer system which is in practice, with or without human assistance. Ramis (2006:2) explains the latter which we call Machine Translation (MT) has been the focus of research in translation since 1950s. From the research, United States, Canada, and European countries have developed several systems of MT. The Systems are among others Météo, Systran, Eurotra, Ariane, and Susy.

As the focus of this article is to assess the translation quality from Indonesian into English and make suggestions on its improvement, a tool to assess the quality of the translation is needed. It attempts to answer two questions. What is an adequately valid, reliable, practical assessment tool to measure the translation quality like? How can the components of the tool be used as the bases for improving such translations?

INDONESIAN-ENGLISH TRANSLATION

Assessing the quality of translation remains one of the most difficult areas in the study of translation. This is due to the fact that there are no absolute standards for the quality of translations. Many translation theorists have tried to solve this problem by presenting certain models or criteria to assess the quality of translations, but most of these criteria have failed either because of their impracticality or because the assessments obtained are not reliable.

Before moving further to the discussion on the assessment of the quality of translations, it would be better to discuss the definition of translation in order to create a basic foundation in the formulation of the assessment model.

Translation

Many scholars in the translation studies have tried to define 'translation'. The term 'translation' itself has several meanings: it can refer to the general subject field, the product (the text that has been translated) or the process (the act of producing the translation, otherwise known as 'translating') (Munday, 2001: 5).

In its general definition, 'translation' can be defined as: the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL) (Catford, 1965: 20). The basic for this definition is that relation between languages can generally be regarded as two directional, though not always symmetrical. Translation, as a process, is always uni-directional: it is always performed in a given direction, 'from' a Source Language 'into' a Target Language.

Another definition of 'translation' can be drawn out as (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 1997: 3):

> An incredibly broad notion which can be understood in many different ways. For example, one may talk of translation as a process or a product, and identify such sub-types as literary translation, technical translation, subtitling and machine translation; moreover, while more typically it just refers to the transfer of written texts, the term sometimes also includes interpreting.

There are many issues related to the discussion of translation and translation studies. One of the most contradictory issues is the assessment of translation quality. The difficulty exists since there are no absolute standards for the quality of translation. Consequently, one finds that examiners differ in the way they assess translations. Some of them lean to give qualitative assessments while others prefer to give quantitative assessments. A qualitative assessment is a kind of assessment where a description of the quality of a translation is given in impressionistic terms such as excellent, very good, good, poor or bad. A quantitative assessment is a kind of assessment where a mark is given to describe the quality of a translation. (Tawbi, 1994: 9)

In line with those challenges, this article proposed an alternative model of assessment of translation quality. In the model, the translated text will be measured through several levels of assessment to investigate the errors made. Errors can occur for different reasons in a translated text. Therefore, to be able to deduct the correct number of marks, a basic distinction must be made among the errors which are caused by inadequate competence in the linguistic, referential or stylistic aspects of the target language. (Tawbi, 1994: 26)

In addition, it should be determined whether a certain error is affecting a phrase, sentence, or the whole text. To that effect, a specific number of marks will be deducted. Therefore, in this proposed model of assessment, translator's errors are classified into three structural levels: text, sentence, and word / phrase level (see Appendix 1).

RELATED STUDIES ON THE ASSESSMENT OF TRANSLATION

There have been several studies conducted to formulate or propose a model for assessing translation quality. One of which is a study conducted by Hassan Tawbi. In his Graduate Paper in Translation entitled *Translation Quality Assessment,* he proposes a model for assessing the quality of translation based on several parameters along with their advantages and drawbacks. His objects of the study are several translations which are

analyzed using several models of translation assessment, both qualitative and quantitative. Tawbi analyzes several assessment models including marking proposed by Nida and Taber (1982), House (1977), Miller and Beef-Center (1958) and one marking model which is used in Australia, National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI).

His study comes to a conclusion that NAATI marking scales are practical and can assess candidates' translations in a short time and can give an assessment which is acceptable to some extent. He then continues to provide possible development of the NAATI marking guidelines. However, his study does not offer any suggestions in terms of giving feedback in improving the quality of respondents' translations (Tawbi: 19).

Another study related to the translation quality assessment is a report prepared by Prof. Sandra Hale, from School of International Studies, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, The University of New South Wales entitled "*Improvements to NAATI testing: Development of a conceptual overview for a new model for NAATI standards, testing and assessment*". In her report (Hale, 2012, p. 7) dedicated to The National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI), she writes about the importance of NAATI marking models in the study of translation in Australia. Besides that, in her report she also makes 17 recommendations in an attempt to establish a new conceptual model of marking assessment. (Hale: 7)

Translator Group

In an attempt to propose an alternative assessment model to improve a translated text, a translation test was given to a small group on September 16, 2015. They were ten Indonesian graduate students with a BA degree in English education or English literature. They were asked to translate a one page text from Indonesian into English (See Appendix 7) in 35 minutes. The authors deliberately chose a difficult text to elicit the students' translating problems to the full so that they would have optimum data to analyze.

ASSESSMENT TOOLS

This study proposed two translation assessment tools: one rating scale and one rubric. The authors adopted the components of the marking guideline table of NAATI (See Appendix 3), but devised their own marking calculation in that for every space/area of assessment they were supposed to give a maximum score of 10 each or a total of 90 for all. A translator's actual total score was then referred to the rubric to determine the translation quality in terms of its being good, fair or weak.

Naturally, the authors strived to be as objective as possible in designing and applying translation assessment models, and to be successful, they had to ensure that their models and procedures passed the test of validity, reliability and practicality. According to Brown (2001: 23), the qualities of a test include its validity, reliability and practicality. **Validity** means the test ability to measure or test what must be measured or tested. **Reliability** simply means the stability of the test score or the extent to which an evaluation produces the same results when administered repeatedly to the same population under the same conditions. A test cannot measure anything well unless it measures consistently. **Practicality** means usability of a test. Practicality of a test involves three aspects; (1) Economical in time and financial, (2) Easy for administrating and scoring, (3) Easy for interpreting.

The authors' three sets of scores for every translator were next subject to the PPMC statistics process for their inter-rater reliability. There is a positive correlation among Rater 1's, Rater 2's, and Rater 3's

sets of scores, they have a statistically significant linear relationship, and the association is large in strength (r= 0.88, 0.90, and 0.95; p= 0.00 and 0.01<0.05). In other words, the differences among the three sets of scores are not statistically significant, and therefore the use of the authors' alternative translation quality assessment instrument has been verified in terms its reliability.

ANALYSIS RESULTS

Out of the ten translators, eight obtained "fair" rating and two "weak" (See Appendix 4). Comparatively, the linguistic aspect of translation was the most challenging for the ten participants with an average score of 55.40 (out of 90), that of stylistic came in the middle, 56.40, and referential, 56.90 (See Appendix 6). When it came to the most mistakes made in a specific area, the following different order was discovered (See Appendix 5). Stylistic quality stood out in that the most mistakes were made in the area of inappropriate vocabulary (38%). Linguistic quality followed in the area of incorrect grammar or punctuation (33%) and wrong vocabulary and spelling (13%). The referential quality came last in the area of unjustified omissions or additions (11%).

TRANSLATION IMPROVEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

This part contains the authors' recommendations based on the results of their analyses of the ten assessed translated texts. They started with their general recommendations which apply to all the translators. They ended it with individual ones.

a. General Recommendation

When it came to *Stylistic Quality*, the authors did not find any problems with the *inconsistency of style across the text*. In terms of the *inappropriate collocations*, we found only three mistakes which made up only 2 % of the total mistakes and considered it insignificant to justify a discussion. However, in the area of *inappropriate vocabulary* there were 51 mistakes or 38% of the total mistakes, the highest percentage of mistakes made.

The following is the authors' improvement recommendation to avoid mistakes in the area of inappropriate vocabulary. The quick solution to this is by translating a word using at least two free online translation software sites. If both propose the same translation, and the translation is in line with context of the text, then it is the appropriate word. For example, the word "penganiayaan" is translated "persecution" both by Google Translate and Bing Translator. "Persecution" is unfair and cruel treatment of people and has something to do with a race or belief, and the word refers to the Jewish people in the source text, so it must be the appropriate word. The next word in the text is "pembantaian". Google Translate's version is "slaughter" and Bing Translator's is "massacre". So, either one is appropriate or both are inappropriate. Slaughter refers to the unfair and cruel killing of people, not specific enough. "Massacre" is even more general in that it is the killing of a lot of people. Therefore, both are inappropriate. Looking the generic word "killing" up in a thesaurus will lead us to the appropriate one. Doing so for example at http://thesaurus.babylon.com/ will result in a myriad of its synonyms and related words. One of them is "genocide" the very word we need as it has something do with killing a group of people with the same nation, race or religion. Since the word is still used to describe the Jewish people, it is the appropriate word.

In terms of *Referential Quality*, there was only one mistake or 1 % of the total mistakes made in the *incorrect interpretation* criterion. Making this an issue was deemed unnecessary. The same

applied to the three mistakes or 2 % of the total made in the area of *inversion or deviation of meaning*. However, the authors would like to make a recommendation on the 15 mistakes or 11% of the total in the area of *unjustified omissions or additions* in that they should be more precise and thorough in their future translating work.

With regard to *Linguistic Quality*, no problem existed in *incorrect reproduction*. However, 44 mistakes or the second highest percentage, 33%, of mistakes were made in the next criterion of *incorrect grammar or punctuation*. For this the authors suggest that the translators make sure that grammar check feature of their Microsoft Word is on and editing those mechanics before submitting the translated work will be an advantage. The last criterion of *wrong vocabulary and spelling* contained 18 mistakes or 13 % of the total. Their recommendation for the issue of not knowing the vocabulary or instead of retaining the Indonesian words is to use Google Translate and Bing Translator, and for the spelling to make sure the spelling check feature their Microsoft Word is on.

b. Individual Recommendation

Case 1. For the raw average score of 34.67, z= -1.09. S/he was comparatively the weakest in all the three evaluated aspects and therefore rated as weak according to our rubric. This translator's main problem was his/her obvious lack of vocabulary which resulted in not being able to translate such a simple phrase as *Timur Tengah* into the Middle East. Therefore, improving his/her English in general and vocabulary in particular will be a good step towards being a better translator.

Case 2. For the raw average score of 53.33, z= -0.06. In line with his/her a little below average score for the stylistic aspect there was room for improvement in terms of his vocabulary size or richness, e.g. the use of massacre instead of genocide ‘

Case 3. For the raw average score of 71.33, z=0.94. This translator was definitely an above average achiever with the highest score in the group. Apart from some minor phrase level grammatical errors, e.g. directed by instead of toward, s/he should also try to enhance his/her vocabulary size, e.g. the use of torture instead of persecution. With practice, s/he is a very potential translator.

Case 4. For the raw average score of 62.67, z= 0.46. S/he was another above average achiever. Apart from some minor phrase level grammatical errors, e.g. anti-modern semitism instead of modern anti - Semitism, s/he should also try to enhance his/her vocabulary size, e.g. the use of slaughter instead of genocide.

Case 5. For the raw average score of 57.33, z= 0.16. In line with his/her assessment results, the weakest area of this slightly above average translator was the linguistic aspect, especially grammar, e.g. “rights onto independence” instead of “rights for independence” and “I myself has been…” instead of “ I myself have been..,”

Case 6. For the raw average score of 57.33, z= 0.16. This translator was an average translator in the group. Main areas of improvement are vocabulary size, e.g. “persecution and genocide” instead of “torture and massacre” and grammar, e.g. “suppression and denial” instead of “alienations (No “s”, please) and threatens (Not verb, but the noun: threats, please.). In “I was trained hardly…” , first it is a wrong use of the word “hardly”, and second, it was not needed.

Case 7. For the raw average score of 57.67, z= 0.18. S/he was a slightly above average achiever. Apart from two below standard translation parts, "tyranny" instead of "persecution" two quite different words and the wrong use of tense "…model which becomes…" instead of "…model that has been/become…, s/he did acceptably well in the rest of the translation.

Case 8. For the raw average score of 58, z= 0.20. The authors found small glitches in the translation of this slightly above average achiever such as spelling mistakes ,e.g. "existence" instead of "existance", "orientalism" instead of "Orientalism" as well as vocabulary richness problems, e.g. "persecution and genocide" instead of "torture and slaughter", and "…intellectuals have to…" instead of "…intellectuals has to…"

Case 9. For the raw average score of 52, z= -0.13. S/he was the second below average or weakest translator. The authors found such spelling mistakes as "defencing" instead of "defending", "slautered" instead of "slaughtered" as well as vocabulary richness problems, e.g. the idea of "genocide" instead of "slaughter", and a below standard translation of "a literature comparatist(?)" instead of "comparative literature".

Case 10: For the raw average score of 58, z= 0.20. S/he was rated as fair or an average translator in the group. The authors found small glitches such as spelling mistakes, e.g. "wether" S/he was comparatively the weakest in all the three evaluated aspects and therefore rated as weak according to our rubric. This translator's main problem was his/her obvious lack of vocabulary which resulted in not being
instead of "whether", "fourty" instead of "forty" as well as vocabulary richness problems, e.g. "genocide" instead of "killings", and "…model which become …" instead of "…model which becomes …" which should have actually been "… model which/that has been/become…", and last but not least "entire" cannot be the subject and means "seluruh" not "sebagian besar" in the original text in her following translation of "I have spent the entire of my life…".

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposed instrument is adequately valid in that it measures what it is meant to, i.e. translation quality and at the same time its features are also our entry points for translation quality improvement. Its reliability has been verified using the PPMC statistics. Last but not least, it is practical in that at the most one page each for the rating scale and the rubric is more than enough with the possibility of reducing them to one page. Moreover, it is economical in terms of time and cost and easy when it comes to administrating, interpreting and scoring.

Translating is challenging. To be a good translator, one has to have a good command of both the source and the target language in terms of their linguistic, referential and stylistic features. In terms of the ten translations that we analyzed, the most outstanding problem lay in their vocabulary richness which is actually a stylistic issue, i.e. vocabulary appropriateness which in turn reduced the referential quality of the translations. The linguistic features play the least important role when it comes to the getting the message across as accurately as possible. Hence, to some extent the correct order is stylistic, referential, and linguistic quality of translation.

It is even more challenging for assessors to rate someone else's translation. Therefore, the authors suggest that at least two assessors are needed to produce an accountable assessment of a

translation work. They have experienced this before, during and after the assessment process and have come to the conclusion that they still have much to learn.

Last but not least, due to the time constraint the authors should admit that this article should be regarded as a proposal with pilot data at best. First, they based their assessment model on the NAATI model. Second, they had only ten translators. Hence, they hope that a future researcher will go the extra mile of developing their work at least into a proper research report. Should that happen, they would be more than delighted to assist in whatever way they possibly can. They can be contacted at marwantan@hotmail.com spiritus.nugroho7@gmail.com , and www.pratamaahdi.com@gmail.com.

REFERENCES

Bell, Roger T. (1997). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice.* London: Longman.

Brown, H. Douglas. (2003). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices.* London: Longman.

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hale, S. (2012). *Improvements to NAATI testing: Development of conceptual overview of a new model for NAATI standards, testing and assessment.* The University of New South Wales.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications.* New York: Routledge.

Nababan, M Rudolf. (1999). (translated). *Teori Menerjemah Bahasa Inggris*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Ramis, Adri`a de Gispert. (2006). *Introducing Linguistic Knowledge into Statistical Machine Translation.* Barcelona: Universitat Polit`ecnica de Catalunya.

Shuttleworth, M., & Cowie, M. (1997). *Dictionary of Translation Studies.* Manchester: St. Jerome.

Tawbi, H. (1994). Translation Quality Assessment. *Unpublished Journal*.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Three Structural Levels of Translator's Errors (Tawbi, 1994, p. 27)

	LEVEL		
	TEXT	**SENTENCE**	**WORD/PHRASE**
STYLISTIC (INAPPROPRIATE STYLE)	INCONSISTENCY OF STYLE ACROSS THE TEXT	INAPPROPRIATE COLLOCATIONS	INAPPROPRIATE VOCABULARY
REFERENTIAL (MISTRANSLATION)	INCORRECT INTERPRETATION	INVERSION OF MEANING DEVIATION OF MEANING	UNJUSTIFIED OMISSIONS ADDITIONS
LINGUISTIC (INCORRECT LANGUAGE)	INCORRECT REPRODUCTION	INCORRECT GRAMMAR INCORRECT PUNCTUATION	WRONG VOCABULARY WRONG SPELLING

Appendix 2: Correlations of Three Raters' Scores

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Rater1	57.5000	11.01766	10
Rater2	55.8000	9.29516	10
Rater3	55.4000	8.28922	10

Correlations

		Rater1	Rater2	Rater3
Rater1	Pearson Correlation	1	.949**	.902**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	10	10	10
Rater2	Pearson Correlation	.949**	1	.882**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.001
	N	10	10	10
Rater3	Pearson Correlation	.902**	.882**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	
	N	10	10	10

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Decision: r= 0.882, 0.902, and 0.949; p= 0.00 and 0.01<0.05
The H_o is rejected; The H_a is accepted.

Conclusion: There is a positive correlation among Rater 1's, Rater 2's, and Rater 3's sets of scores, they have a statistically significant linear relationship, and the association is large in strength (r= 0.88, 0.90, and 0.95; p= 0.00 and 0.01<0.05). In other words, the differences among the three sets of scores are not statistically significant, and therefore the use of our alternative translation quality assessment instrument has been verified.

Correlations between Raters 1, 2 and 3

Rater 1 and Rater 2	r = .95
Rater 1 and Rater 3	r = .90
Rater 2 and Rater3	r = .88

Appendix 3: Rubric for Assessing Translation Quality, adapted from NAATI assessment model (Tawbi,1994,p.27)

Good (72-90)	*Stylistic Quality:* the consistency between the style and register of the original text and the translated text is evident at the text, sentence, and word/phrase level.
	Referential Quality: the consistency of the translator's correct interpretations of the ideas of the original text is evident at the text, sentence, and word/phrase level.
	Linguistic Quality: the consistency of the translator's ability to reproduce a linguistically correct text, sentences, and words/phrases in the target language to convey meanings of the source language.
Fair (54-71)	*Stylistic Quality:* the adequate consistency between the style and register of the original text and the translated text is evident at the text, sentence, and word/phrase level.
	Referential Quality: the consistency of the translator's adequately correct interpretations of the ideas of the original text is evident at the text, sentence, and word/phrase level.
	Linguistic Quality: the consistency of the translator's adequate ability to reproduce a linguistically correct text, sentences, and words/phrases in the target language to convey meanings of the source language.
Weak (0-53)	*Stylistic Quality:* the inadequate consistency between the style and register of the original text and the translated text is evident at the text, sentence, and word/phrase level.
	Referential Quality: the consistency of the translator's inadequate correct interpretations of the ideas of the original text is evident at the text, sentence, and word/phrase level.
	Linguistic Quality: the consistency of the translator's inadequate ability to reproduce a linguistically correct text, sentences, and words/phrases in the target language to convey meanings of the source language.

Appendix 4: Miscellaneous Scores of Our Ten Translators															
No.	Name	Stylistic			Sub Total	Referential			Sub Total	Linguistic			Sub Total	Average Score	Summary
		Text	Sentence	Word / Phrase		Text	Sentence	Word / Phrase		Text	Sentence	Word / Phrase			
1	Case 1	3.67	4.00	2.67	31.00	4.33	4.33	4.67	40.00	4.00	3.67	3.33	33.00	34.67	Weak
2	Case 2	6.00	5.33	5.67	51.00	6.33	6.33	5.67	55.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	54.00	53.33	Fair
3	Case 3	8.33	7.67	7.67	71.00	8.33	7.67	8.00	72.00	8.00	7.67	8.00	71.00	71.33	Fair
4	Case 4	7.67	7.00	6.67	64.00	7.00	6.67	6.67	61.00	7.33	7.00	6.67	63.00	62.67	Fair
5	Case 5	6.67	6.00	6.00	56.00	6.67	6.33	6.33	58.00	6.67	6.33	6.33	58.00	57.33	Fair
6	Case 6	7.00	6.33	6.33	59.00	6.67	6.33	6.00	57.00	6.33	6.33	6.00	56.00	57.33	Fair
7	Case 7	7.00	7.00	6.33	71.00	6.33	6.00	5.67	54.00	6.67	6.33	6.33	58.00	57.67	Fair
8	Case 8	7.00	6.33	6.33	59.00	6.33	6.33	6.67	58.00	6.67	6.00	6.33	57.00	58.00	Fair
9	Case 9	6.33	5.33	6.00	53.00	6.33	6.00	6.00	55.00	5.67	4.67	5.67	48.00	52.00	Weak
10	Case 10	6.67	6.67	6.33	59.00	7.00	6.33	6.33	59.00	6.33	6.67	5.67	56.00	58.00	Fair
11	TOTAL	66.33	61.67	60.00	564.00	65.33	62.33	62.00	569.00	63.67	60.67	60.33	554.00	562.33	
12	AVERAGE	6.63	6.17	6.00	56.40	6.53	6.23	6.20	56.90	6.37	6.07	6.03	55.40	56.23	

Appendix 5: Percentage of Mistakes Made in the Ten Translated Texts

	LEVEL		
	TEXT	**SENTENCE**	**WORD/PHRASE**
STYLISTIC (INAPPROPRIATE STYLE)	INCONSISTENCY OF STYLE ACROSS THE TEXT *N0 PROBLEMS FOUND.*	INAPPROPRIATE COLLOCATIONS *3 MISTAKES OR 2% OF THE TOTAL MITAKES.*	INAPPROPRIATE VOCABULARY *51 MISTAKES OR 38 % OF THE TOTAL MISTAKES*
REFERENTIAL (MISTRANSLATION)	INCORRECT INTERPRETATION *1 MISTAKES OR 1 % OF THE TOTAL MISTAKES*	INVERSION OF MEANING DEVIATION OF MEANING *3 MISTAKES OR 2% OF THE TOTAL MISTAKES*	UNJUSTIFIED OMISSIONS ADDITIONS *15MISTAKES OR 11% OF THE TOTAL MISTAKES*
LINGUISTIC (INCORRECT LANGUAGE)	INCORRECT REPRODUCTION *N0 PROBLEMS FOUND.*	INCORRECT GRAMMAR INCORRECT PUNCTUATION *44 MISTAKES OR 33 % OF THE TOTAL MISTAKES*	WRONG VOCABULARY WRONG SPELLING *18 MISTAKES OR 13% OF THE TOTAL MISTAKES*

Appendix 6: Z Scores of the Ten Translators' Average Scores

Descriptives

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
VAR00001	12	54.3608	18.02443
Valid N (listwise)	12		

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
VAR00001	12	54.3608	18.02443
Zscore(VAR00001)	12	.0000000	1.00000000
Valid N (listwise)	12		

	VAR00001	ZVAR00001
1	34.67	-1.09245
2	53.33	-0.05719
3	71.33	0.94145
4	62.67	0.46099
5	57.33	0.16473
6	57.33	0.16473
7	57.67	0.18359
8	58.00	0.20190
9	52.00	-0.13098
10	58.00	0.20190
11	9.00	-2.51663
12	81.00	1.47795

Appendix 7: The Source Text that Was Translated into English

Terjemahkanlah teks di bawah ini. (Please translate this passage into English.)

Saya telah menghabiskan sebagian besar waktu hidup saya selama 35 tahun untuk membela hak-hak rakyat Palestina menuju kemandirian nasional. Meski demikian, saya juga memerhatikan keberadaan orang-orang yahudi, apakah mereka juga menderita karena penganiayaan dan pembantaian. Intinya, yang paling penting, perjuangan untuk mewujudkan kesetaraan di Palestina/Israel seharusnya diarahkan pada tujuan manusiawi, yaitu koeksistensi, serta tidak adanya penindasan dan pengucilan.

Bukan suatu hal yang kebetulan jika saya menunjukkan bahwa orientalisme dan anti-semitisme modern memiliki akar tujuan yang sama. Oleh karena itu, para intelektual independen masa kini perlu menyediakan model-model alternatif sebagai pengganti bagi model-model sebelumnya yang hanya didasarkan pada rasa saling bermusuhan, yang hingga saat ini masih berlaku di Timur Tengah dan di beberapa tempat lain.

Sekarang. Ijinkan saya berbicara tentang suatu model alternatif yang menjadi bagian penting dalam kajian saya selama ini. Sebagai seorang humanis dalam bidang kesusastraan, saya pribadi sudah terlalu tua. Empat puluh tahun yang lalu, saya digembleng dalam bidang sastra bandingan, suatu gagasan terkemuka yang — pada akhir abad XVIII dan awal abad XIX — sudah mulai berkembang dan dikaji di Jerman. Sebelum itu, saya perlu mengakui kontribusi yang luar biasa dari Giambattista Vico, seorang filsuf dan filolog Neopolitan yang gagasan-gagasannya telah endahului pemikir-pemikir Jerman seperti Herder dan Wolf, yang kemudian diikuti oleh Goethe, Humboldt, Dilthey, Nietzche, Gadamer, dan para filolog Romantik Abad XX seperti Erich Auerbach, Leo Spitzer, dan Ernst Robert Curtius.