

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: ____/____/____

Lg Evaluated: _____ Task: _____ Evaluator: _____

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 1) CHANNEL [phonetics] How often did the target text maintain the appropriate channel? [Was there any auditory noise or visual distraction?] | | |
| Auditory / Visual Noise? __ Clothing / Hair / Cosmetics: | Mixed between channels or significant noise Occasionally in appropriate channel Mostly in appropriate channel or occasional noise Rarely had intrusion of noise or inappropriate channel Purely in the correct channel without noise | 1 - 2 - - 3 - - - 4 - - - - 5 |
| Movements: | | |
| 2) CLEARLY ARTICULATED [phonology] How clearly was target text articulated? [Was every word clearly & correctly articulated? Did the clarity match source text?] | | |
| Errors (Misproductions)? __ Visual Space / Volume? __ Self-Corrections/Repetitions? __ | Unclear; many ambiguities / misproductions Occasionally clear; many ambiguities / misproductions Generally clear; few ambiguities / misproductions Rarely any ambiguities / misproductions Clear; no ambiguities / misproductions | 1 - 2 - - 3 - - - 4 - - - - 5 |
| 3) COMFORTABLY PACED [phonology] How fluently was target text produced? [word boundaries distinct but not “choppy” (disfluent) or “oversmooth” (slurred)] | | |
| Uncomfortable Rate? __ Distorted Transitions? __ False Starts or Hesitations? __ | Rarely matched / transitions disfluent or slurred Occasionally matched / transitions often disfluent / slurred Generally matched / transitions sometimes disfluent / slurred Nearly always matched / transitions rarely disfluent / slurred Completely matched / transitions never disfluent or slurred | 1 - 2 - - 3 - - - 4 - - - - 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? __ Source Lg Interference? __ Grammatical Relationships? __ | Sentences incomplete / consistently violated target lg rules Sentences generally incomplete / often violated target lg rules Sentences occasionally inc. / not follow rules consistently Sentences rarely incomplete and rarely violated target lg rules Sentences complete and followed target lg rules consistently | 1 - 2 - - 3 - - - 4 - - - - 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? __ Inappropriate Vocabulary? __ Source Lg Interference? __ | Vocabulary rarely reflected meanings or register Vocabulary occasionally reflected meanings or register Vocabulary generally reflected meanings and register Vocabulary rarely misrepresented meanings or register Vocabulary consistently reflected meanings and register | 1 - 2 - - 3 - - - 4 - - - - 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? __ Connection of Ideas Unclear? __ Source Language Interference? __ | Non-comparable organization & connections between ideas Rarely exhibited comparable organization & connections Frequently mismatched org. / connections between ideas Rarely mismatched organization / connections between ideas Reflected the same organization & connection between ideas | 1 - 2 - - 3 - - - 4 - - - - 5 |

Vocabulary Notes:

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 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? __ | Audience would NOT believe the presenter Audience would mostly doubt the presenter Audience would have doubts about the presenter Audience would mostly believe the presenter Audience would likely believe the presenter | 1 - 2 - - 3 - - - 4 - - - - 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? __ | Insufficient adjustment / depended entirely on source culture Needed major adjust. / depended heavily on source culture Often needed adjustment / often depended on source culture Needed minor adjustment / depended a bit on source culture Complete adjustment / looked like a source text in target lg | 1 - 2 - - 3 - - - 4 - - - - 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? __ | Affect / inflection rarely matched Affect / inflection occasionally matched Affect / inflection generally matched Affect / inflection were rarely unmatched Affect / inflection completely matched | 1 - 2 - - 3 - - - 4 - - - - 5 |
| 10) CORRECT INFORMATION [pragmatics] How accurate was the information (and intentions) of the target text as compared to the source text? <u>Skewing?</u> __ <u>Omissions?</u> __ <u>Additions?</u> __ <u>Intrusions?</u> __ <u>Anomalies?</u> __ | | |
| | Did not match information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss majority of text Did not match information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss most main points Rarely matched information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss many main points Rarely matched information or intentions of source text / Consumers would miss some main points Occasionally matched / Consumers would understand most main points but miss most details Occasionally matched / Consumers would understand most main points but often miss details Rarely mismatched source text / Consumers would understand most main points and most details Rarely mismatched source / Consumers would understand all main points and most of the details Matched source text / Consumers would understand every main point and nearly every detail Matched source text / Consumers would understand every main point and every detail | 0.5 1 1.5 2 2.5 3 3.5 4 4.5 5 |
| Maximum Score (based on Line 10) | | Earned |
| 05 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 | | Score: _____ |

Additional Comments: