

Ten Cs Target Text Evaluation Form

Developed by Brian Cerney – 2003 This form may be freely copied and distributed if this line of information is included

Interpreter: _____ Date: _____ / _____ / _____

1) CHANNEL [phonetics] How often did the target text maintain the appropriate channel? [Was there any auditory noise or visual distraction?]		
Auditory / Visual Noise? ___	Mixed between channels or significant noise	1
Clothing / Hair / Cosmetics: ___	Occasionally in appropriate channel	- 2
	Mostly in appropriate channel or occasional noise	- - 3
Movements: ___	Rarely had intrusion of noise or inappropriate channel	- - - 4
	Purely in the correct channel without noise	- - - - 5
2) CLEARLY ARTICULATED [phonology] How clearly was target text articulated? [Was every word clearly & correctly articulated? Did the clarity match source text?]		
Errors (Misproductions)? ___	Unclear; many ambiguities / misproductions	1
Visual Space / Volume? ___	Occasionally clear; many ambiguities / misproductions	- 2
Self-Corrections/Repetitions? ___	Generally clear; few ambiguities / misproductions	- - 3
	Rarely any ambiguities / misproductions	- - - 4
	Clear; no ambiguities / misproductions	- - - - 5
3) COMFORTABLY PACED [phonology] How fluently was target text produced? [word boundaries distinct but not “choppy” (disfluent) or “oversmooth” (slurred)]		
Uncomfortable Rate? ___	Rarely matched / transitions disfluent or slurred	1
Distorted Transitions? ___	Occasionally matched / transitions often disfluent / slurred	- 2
False Starts or Hesitations? ___	Generally matched / transitions sometimes disfluent / slurred	- - 3
	Nearly always matched / transitions rarely disfluent / slurred	- - - 4
	Completely matched / transitions never disfluent or slurred	- - - - 5
4) COMPLETE CLAUSES & SENTENCES [morphology & syntax] How complete were the clauses and sentences of the target text? [Was the grammar of the target as complete as the source text?]		
Incomplete Clauses/Phrases? ___	Sentences incomplete / consistently violated target lg rules	1
Source Lg Interference? ___	Sentences generally incomplete / often violated target lg rules	- 2
Grammatical Relationships? ___	Sentences occasionally inc. / not follow rules consistently	- - 3
	Sentences rarely incomplete and rarely violated target lg rules	- - - 4
	Sentences complete and followed target lg rules consistently	- - - - 5
5) CONCEPTUAL & APPROPRIATE VOCABULARY [semantics & register] How well did target text vocabulary reflect the meaning of the source text for the given audience?		
Inaccurate Vocabulary? ___	Vocabulary rarely reflected meanings or register	1
Inappropriate Vocabulary? ___	Vocabulary occasionally reflected meanings or register	- 2
Source Lg Interference? ___	Vocabulary generally reflected meanings and register	- - 3
	Vocabulary rarely misrepresented meanings or register	- - - 4
	Vocabulary consistently reflected meanings and register	- - - - 5
6) COHESIVE ORGANIZATION [discourse] How organized was the target text? Did it match the organization of the source text? [Would consumers make similar predictions?]		
Mismatch of Organization? ___	Non-comparable organization & connections between ideas	1
Connection of Ideas Unclear? ___	Rarely exhibited comparable organization & connections	- 2
Source Language Interference? ___	Frequently mismatched org. / connections between ideas	- - 3
	Rarely mismatched organization / connections between ideas	- - - 4
	Reflected the same organization & connection between ideas	- - - - 5

Vocabulary Notes:

Ten Cs Target Text Evaluation Form

Developed by Brian Cerney – 2003 This form may be freely copied and distributed if this line of information is included

Lg Evaluated: _____ Task: _____ Evaluator: _____

7) CONFIDENT PRESENTATION [stylistics] How confident was the presentation of the overall target text? [Were there multiple requests for clarification? Would consumers have doubts about the abilities of the person performing the target text? Did the confidence of the target match the source?]																					
Doubt/uncertainty? __ Clarification requests? __ General nervousness? __	<table> <tr> <td>Audience would NOT believe the presenter</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Audience would mostly doubt the presenter</td> <td>- 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Audience would have doubts about the presenter</td> <td>- - 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Audience would mostly believe the presenter</td> <td>- - - 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Audience would likely believe the presenter</td> <td>- - - - 5</td> </tr> </table>	Audience would NOT believe the presenter	1	Audience would mostly doubt the presenter	- 2	Audience would have doubts about the presenter	- - 3	Audience would mostly believe the presenter	- - - 4	Audience would likely believe the presenter	- - - - 5										
Audience would NOT believe the presenter	1																				
Audience would mostly doubt the presenter	- 2																				
Audience would have doubts about the presenter	- - 3																				
Audience would mostly believe the presenter	- - - 4																				
Audience would likely believe the presenter	- - - - 5																				
8) CULTURAL ADJUSTMENT [syntax, semantics, discourse & register] How appropriate was the message for target consumers? [Monolinguals need significant adjustment; bilinguals need less adjustment]																					
Dependence on source culture? __ Dependence on source lg? __	<table> <tr> <td>Insufficient adjustment / depended entirely on source culture</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Needed major adjust. / depended heavily on source culture</td> <td>- 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Often needed adjustment / often depended on source culture</td> <td>- - 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Needed minor adjustment / depended a bit on source culture</td> <td>- - - 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Complete adjustment / looked like a source text in target lg</td> <td>- - - - 5</td> </tr> </table>	Insufficient adjustment / depended entirely on source culture	1	Needed major adjust. / depended heavily on source culture	- 2	Often needed adjustment / often depended on source culture	- - 3	Needed minor adjustment / depended a bit on source culture	- - - 4	Complete adjustment / looked like a source text in target lg	- - - - 5										
Insufficient adjustment / depended entirely on source culture	1																				
Needed major adjust. / depended heavily on source culture	- 2																				
Often needed adjustment / often depended on source culture	- - 3																				
Needed minor adjustment / depended a bit on source culture	- - - 4																				
Complete adjustment / looked like a source text in target lg	- - - - 5																				
9) COMPOSED WITH EQUIVALENT AFFECT [stylistics, register] How appropriate was the emotional and emphatic communication surrounding the target text?																					
Too Much Emotion? __ Not Enough Emotion? __ Powerless Language? __	<table> <tr> <td>Affect / inflection rarely matched</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Affect / inflection occasionally matched</td> <td>- 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Affect / inflection generally matched</td> <td>- - 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Affect / inflection were rarely unmatched</td> <td>- - - 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Affect / inflection completely matched</td> <td>- - - - 5</td> </tr> </table>	Affect / inflection rarely matched	1	Affect / inflection occasionally matched	- 2	Affect / inflection generally matched	- - 3	Affect / inflection were rarely unmatched	- - - 4	Affect / inflection completely matched	- - - - 5										
Affect / inflection rarely matched	1																				
Affect / inflection occasionally matched	- 2																				
Affect / inflection generally matched	- - 3																				
Affect / inflection were rarely unmatched	- - - 4																				
Affect / inflection completely matched	- - - - 5																				
10) CORRECT INFORMATION [pragmatics] How accurate was the information (and intentions) of the target text as compared to the source text? Skewing? __ Omissions? __ Additions? __ Intrusions? __ Anomalies? __																					
	<table> <tr> <td>Did not match information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss majority of text</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Did not match information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss most main points</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rarely matched information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss many main points</td> <td>1.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rarely matched information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss some main points</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Occasionally matched / Consumers would understand most main points but miss most details</td> <td>2.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Occasionally matched / Consumers would understand most main points but often miss details</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rarely mismatched source text / Consumers would understand most main points and most details</td> <td>3.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rarely mismatched source / Consumers would understand all main points and most of the details</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Matched source text / Consumers would understand every main point and nearly every detail</td> <td>4.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Matched source text / Consumers would understand every main point and every detail</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </table>	Did not match information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss majority of text	0.5	Did not match information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss most main points	1	Rarely matched information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss many main points	1.5	Rarely matched information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss some main points	2	Occasionally matched / Consumers would understand most main points but miss most details	2.5	Occasionally matched / Consumers would understand most main points but often miss details	3	Rarely mismatched source text / Consumers would understand most main points and most details	3.5	Rarely mismatched source / Consumers would understand all main points and most of the details	4	Matched source text / Consumers would understand every main point and nearly every detail	4.5	Matched source text / Consumers would understand every main point and every detail	5
Did not match information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss majority of text	0.5																				
Did not match information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss most main points	1																				
Rarely matched information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss many main points	1.5																				
Rarely matched information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss some main points	2																				
Occasionally matched / Consumers would understand most main points but miss most details	2.5																				
Occasionally matched / Consumers would understand most main points but often miss details	3																				
Rarely mismatched source text / Consumers would understand most main points and most details	3.5																				
Rarely mismatched source / Consumers would understand all main points and most of the details	4																				
Matched source text / Consumers would understand every main point and nearly every detail	4.5																				
Matched source text / Consumers would understand every main point and every detail	5																				
Maximum Score (based on Line 10) 05 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50	Earned Score: _____																				

Additional Comments: