GROUP ASSESSMENT OF A TRANSLATION PROJECT: EMPIRICAL SURVEY RESULTS

Tetiana Korol
National University "Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic"

Abstract: *A translation project is regarded as one of the most promising alternative training and assessment tools in the contemporary translation classroom, rooted in experiential and collaborative approaches. It offers numerous opportunities for students to test and improve their translation competence under terms and conditions that closely resemble actual professional practices. As a result, translation projects are being increasingly implemented in Ukrainian universities to train future philologists. However, their use raises the issue of objective and reliable evaluation of both translation flow and product. This study presents the experience of the group project involving 36 fourth-year students from Poltava University of Economics and Trade, who translated English business case studies into Ukrainian. The author analyses various group assessment models, highlighting their strengths and weaknesses. Based on the study's findings, hybrid evaluation frameworks that combine different proportions of hetero-, peer-, and self-assessment to be employed in the translation classroom are suggested.*

Keywords: *translation project; group assessment; prospective philologists; target text quality evaluation; group dynamics assessment.*

Introduction

Translation training belongs to one of the most demanded and rapidly developing areas of philology education in Ukraine and all over the world. It requires continuous search for new training methods and techniques as well as active implementation of a wide range of alternative assessment tools to reflect and meet the emerging trends and standards of the international language industry.

The translation project appears to be particularly promising in this context as it represents an authentic, team collaborative activity aimed at the provision of language services tailored to customers' needs and requests, and conducted under clearly determined terms and conditions. Its effectiveness relies on the simulation of real-life translation assignments, clear distribution of participants' roles and responsibilities, compilation of a translation brief with explicit guidelines, defining deadlines and incentives, and requiring the presentation of the final translation product (target text) to the end users. (González Davies 216–224). When applied in the translation classroom, the translation project embodies the principles of experiential approach, offering students numerous opportunities to test and develop their translation competence under terms and conditions that mirror widely accepted professional practices. On the other hand, the performance of a group

translation project stipulates and promotes students' active cooperation creating favorable conditions for the development of their leadership, interpersonal and social skills within the provisions of collaborative approach to translation training. All these factors contribute to the popularity of translation projects in the translation classroom in general, and group translation projects in particular. According to the survey carried out among 41 translation course instructors at 16 Ukrainian universities in 2020, they were named as the most widely used alternative assessment tools in the translation classroom by almost 49% of the respondents (Korol Current Assessment Practices 147).

Current methodological studies on the translation projects are mainly focused on the theoretical foundations of their implementation (Kiraly); structure and components (González Davies); distribution of roles and responsibilities as well as the criteria for their performance assessment (Maruenda-Bataller, Santaemilia-Ruiz; Plaza-Lara); students' attitudes and reflections on their participation in different types of translation projects (Li et al.; Korda; Kellett); delivery of feedback on group performance (Massey, Braendli); translation project use as a basis for curriculum design (Mitchell-Schuitevoerder); the development of an electronic platform for their realization (Babych et al.); the examination of the peculiarities of telecollaborative translation projects (Prieto-Velasco and Fuentes-Luque; Marczak and Krajka); CAT-tools involvement into translation project performance (Marczak); realization of audiovisual translation projects devoted to subtitling TED Talks (Comas-Quinn and Fuertes Gutiérrez; Korol TED Talks Translation), dubbing films and series (Beseghi).

Despite its comparatively wide spread, a group translation project still poses a number of issues that need to be addressed to foster its full-scale implementation into translation training. One of them is the objective and reliable evaluation of both the translation process and final product, taking into account all the influencing factors. In this respect, translation project requires the involvement of different assessment agents through the development and introduction of various assessment forms, including group assessment. The latter appears to be both particularly suitable and challenging in this respect, due to its obvious authenticity and complexity. On the one hand, its employment provides active participation of all the involved parties in the assessment flow and allows them to manage and affect its outcomes, enhancing their objectivity and comprehensiveness. On the other hand, group assessment in the translation classroom necessitates the development of reliable procedures for its effective implementation that take into account a number of influencing factors.

That is why the given paper aims to analyse, verify and evaluate various algorithms for group assessment of a translation project from qualitative perspectives.

Theoretical Background

According to Forsell et al. (2021), *group assessment* belongs to the authentic forms of assessment and envisages equal evaluation / grading of all the team members based on the outcomes of their collaborative activity. Its main drawback is considered to be the lack of an objective method for assessing each team member's individual performance and contribution to collective outcome, which may generate emotional tension or even pressure within the group. This form of assessment also fosters positive interdependence among the team members and mitigates individual responsibility for the completion of the given task (Meijer et al. 1227). As a result, some team members do not perform their responsibilities due to insufficient motivation or uncertainty about the significance of their individual contribution to the achievement of overall outcomes. This phenomenon is known as *free-riding* in social psychology. The other team members tend to put in less effort participating in team projects compared to working on individual translation tasks. This situation is called *social loafing*. Finally, one team member may end up completing all the tasks on their own assigned as the project for the whole group. This phenomenon was named *sucker effect* (Meijer et al. 1227). If not identified and addressed in a timely manner, these behaviour patterns may distort effective group dynamics and performance, as well as lead to biased final assessment judgements. Therefore, each team member should regularly provide and receive feedback on their performance from different parties involved and use it for review and revision purposes (Pietrzak).

Group project use as a high-stakes assessment tool may lead to the students' achievement orientation caused by the desire to get as high grades as possible. It can result in both the unfair allocation of responsibilities among the team members and unequal individual contributions to the collective outcomes, thereby undermining the concept of collaborative learning itself (Meijer et al. 1228). Tumpa et al. claim that this situation can be partially managed by optimizing group size: the larger the group, the more complex the mechanisms of group dynamics. Another way to address this problem is to introduce penalty and reward points for team members based on their contribution to the collective product. In this vein, Hurtado Albir (272) argues that all team members should be involved in reporting on the project with regard to the following aspects: (1) planning team meetings; (2) setting deadlines for task completion; (3) allocating tasks and responsibilities within the team; (4) conducting team meetings and reporting their outcomes;

(5) problems encountered during the project and their solutions; (6) evaluating each member's individual performance and the overall team performance; (7) providing suggestions for the improvement of future group projects.

In an attempt to overcome these pitfalls, we consider *group assessment of a translation project* as a complex evaluation of team activity in terms of both process and product, conducted by all parties involved, namely: (1) the teacher and/or a potential customer (hetero-assessment); (2) students who are members of other groups or teams, individually and collectively (external peer assessment); (3) students who are members of the same group or team, expressing their opinions both individually and collectively (internal peer assessment) (Sivan); (4) each team member, regarding their individual contribution to the collective product (self-assessment) (Korol Ways of Collaborative Approach).

Consequently, group assessment is understood as an effective and dynamic combination of hetero-, peer-, and self-assessment procedures (Race, 7). In case of a translation group project, assessment involves two constructs: (1) the quality of the produced target text as the outcome of team performance; (2) the level and quality of group dynamics manifested during the project (Frykedal and Chiriac). This two-sided nature of the assessment construct requires finding a proper balance between the teacher's evaluation, mainly focused on the explicitly represented product, and the students' ones primarily revolving around hidden and latent group dynamics display.

The quality of a translation product can be assessed using holistic and analytic scales, which focus on its global features (achieved through the team's collective effort) and local features (determined by the skills and diligence of individual team members responsible for a particular task). In this case, individual contribution is reflected in the collectively produced target text. However, there is always a risk of overestimating a team member's individual contribution for the sake of their teammates, or, conversely, underestimating some members due to the insufficient contributions and competence of their colleagues.

Group dynamics is characterized by features such as emotional expressiveness, openness and readiness for communication, as well as the quality of interpersonal relationships within the team. It is strongly influenced by team members' self-assessment and self-efficacy beliefs, sense of belonging to the team, extraversion, flexibility, and level of translation competence (Frérot et al.).

The level and quality of group interaction during translation project performance are manifested at both *the group level* (e.g., ability to collaborate productively) and *individual level* (e.g., the responsibility and dedication of each team member to common goals and objectives) (Frykedal and Chiriac).

A guided report is one of the promising tools for evaluating group dynamics according to the suggested outline. Its analysis provides information on individual behavioural patterns, models of interpersonal interaction, and strategies to address problems of different types. The team's translation product presentation can also implicitly reveal group processes and serve as a supplementary assessment method. Another tool for monitoring group dynamics is a triangulated survey completed by all team members at the end of the project (Frykedal and Chiriac). In any case, the teacher should constantly monitor team members' activity by analyzing the number and quality of their posts addressing both translation and technical problems in team chats and designated communication groups. Thus, through effectively planned group assessment in the translation classroom, we have the opportunity to evaluate students' skills in group interaction and teamwork, which are essential components of their personal translation subcompetence.

According to Race, a teacher can assess group projects using different models. The *first* and the most widely spread one is *assigning the same grade* for the translation project *to all team members* based on the evaluation of the quality of the resulting target text. Although this model completely mirrors the approach used for group project assessment in professional settings, it appears suitable only for some aspects of formative assessment in the translation classroom (Meijer et al.), due to its limited accuracy in reflecting individual contributions and its complete neglect of group dynamics.

The *second model* is *grading individually each task fragment* completed by the assigned team member, as reflected in the collective translation product. Since this model provides higher validity and reliability in assessing individual performance, it is suitable for higher-stakes assessment. However, it appears to contradict the basic principles of collaborative approach to translation training, as it overlooks interpersonal interactions and their impact on final group performance (Meijer et al). Moreover, it fails to evaluate the comparative efficiency of translation project performance across teams, as would be expected in professional settings.

The *third model* involves *assigning a total* group *grade* for all aspects of the completed project, which is then *allocated among team members* according to their collective assessment of each member's contribution to the team product. Despite its greater complexity, this algorithm appears to be quite reasonable, since it considers the product from two perspectives and incorporates social aspects of teamwork. However, it is feasible only for mature teams, as it heavily depends on their group dynamics and interpersonal relationships (Meijer et al, 2020). Its effective implementation should be guided by clearly formulated rules and transparent criteria for the allocation of grades.

The *fourth model* allows for *differentiated grading*, in which *one portion* of the overall grade *is assigned by the teacher to each team member*, while *the remaining portion* is discussed and *collectively allocated* among the team members. Although this algorithm is even more complex, it helps mitigate, to some extent, the negative manifestations of group dynamics.

The *fifth model* involves *assigning a general grade* to each team member *by a teacher*, with *additional points awarded for the completion of an individual task* based on the project materials.

These models are gradually being modified and adapted to the current needs of the translation classroom. For example, group project performance can be assessed as follows: all team members receive the same grade for their shared translation product, with additional individual points awarded based on an analysis of statistical reports in wiki sources, which allow monitoring of the changes made to the target text by each team member (Caple and Bogle). It should be noted that this model is readily applicable to the translation classroom, utilizing both Wiki sources and various CAT tools.

Another promising assessment model was suggested by Gunning et al. It enables assigning individual grades to team members by contrasting the overall team grade for project performance with the average peer assessment results within the team. If the average peer assessment grade, known as the group skill factor, falls within 81–100% of the overall team grade, the individual team member receives that grade. If it falls within the range of 55–80%, the individual final grade is calculated by multiplying the overall team grade by the average peer assessment score. If it falls within 0–54%, the individual final grade is set to 0, indicating the student's poor participation in the translation project.

The online resource CATME (https://info.catme.org/features/peer-evaluation/), developed by Purdue University, can serve as a valuable, however, paid digital tool for facilitating group evaluation according to the universal teamwork dimensions (contributing to the team's work, interacting with the teammates, keeping the team on track, expecting quality, having relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities) and their descriptors. By collecting and comparing the results of peer-, self-assessment sessions and their average values, it automatically defines each student's role in the teamwork. CATME differentiates between low-effective team members (those who receive ineffective rates both in self- and peer-assessment), overconfident (those who rate themselves highly in self-assessment but receive ineffective ratings from peers), highly effective (highly rated by both self and peers), underconfident (those who are rated as highly effective by teammates but who underrate themselves), manipulator (who rate themselves as highly effective and who rate teammates as ineffective in disagreement with the teammates), conflict (there is considerable disagreement among the various raters about the

effectiveness of an individual student), clique (the ratings show that subsets of the team rate members of their subset high and members of other subsets low). This classification can serve as a framework for processing and interpreting assessment results and for making final decisions about the group assessment model to be applied.

Thus, to ensure effectiveness and objectivity, the arrangement and implementation of group assessment should meet the following requirements: **(1)** it should be applied to translation tasks that cannot be completed individually due to such objective factors as significant volume of the source text, tight deadlines, or the lack of necessary experience, knowledge, and skills of individual students; **(2)** teams should be formed based on each member's proficiency and interpersonal compatibility; **(3)** secure psychological climate in a team should be established and maintained; **(4)** team members, especially novice, should receive timely scaffolding and support from all competent parties concerning different aspects of translation task performance and group interaction at different stages of the translation project performance; **(5)** diversity of ideas should be fostered and welcomed within a team; **(6)** the conditions that facilitate the effective reflection should be provided (Garvin et al., 3); **(7)** the students should be previously trained to participate in the team work and invited to compile their own team rules to regulate the behaviour and interaction during the projects (Tumpa et al.); **(8)** the quality of the translation product should be assessed from two perspectives: the overall quality, comparable to the evaluation of other teams' performance, and the quality of specific aspects that reflect the performance and responsibilities of individual team members; **(9)** group dynamics should also be assessed from two perspectives: the team's ability to collaborate and cooperate productively (group level) and each member's diligence, dedication, and responsibility (individual level); **(10)** the selected assessment model should align with the specific requirements of the translation classroom; **(11)** group assessment should occupy its proper place within the overall assessment framework of the translation classroom, potentially accounting for no more than 30% of all planned assessments in a course (Naomi et al.).

Table 1 summarizes different aspects of group assessment arrangement and implementation in the translation classroom in the form of a matrix.

<table>
<tr><th>Criterion</th><th colspan="6">Group Assessment Characteristics</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td colspan="6">2</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">I. Assessment type</td><td colspan="6">I.1. formative</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">I.2. summative</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">II. Assessment construct</td><td rowspan="2">II.1. focused</td><td rowspan="3">focused on</td><td colspan="4">II.1.A. specific aspect of the target tex quality</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">II.1.B. specific aspect of the grou dynamics</td></tr>
<tr><td>II.2. combined</td><td colspan="4">II.2. specific aspects of the target tex quality and group dynamics</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">II.3. complex (focused on both the target text quality an group dynamics)</td></tr>
<tr><td>III. Variation of the assessment construct</td><td colspan="6">III.1. constant (the assessment construct remains unchange throughout the assessment sessions)</td></tr>
<tr><td>III.2. dynamic (the assessment constructs change over time being gradually added, removed, or modified throughout th assessment sessions)</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="5">IV. Methods of Team Formation</td><td colspan="6">IV.1. occasional</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">IV.2. selective</td><td rowspan="4">Team Initiator</td><td colspan="4">IV.2.B. based on students' preferences</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">IV.2.A. Teacher Team Formation Criteria</td><td>IV.2.A.a. Similarities and differences in students' affective and emotional characteristics</td><td rowspan="3">• homogeneous</td></tr>
<tr><td>IV.2.A.b. Proficiency in English and Ukrainian</td></tr>
<tr><td>IV.2.A.c. Translation competence proficiency</td></tr>
<tr><td>IX.2.A.d. Individual learning style</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">V. Stability of the team</td><td colspan="6">V.1. stable (the team composition remains unchanged throughout the entire series of group projects.)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">V.2. mobile (the team composition remains changes periodically)</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">VI. Assessment Method</td><td colspan="6">VI.1. qualitative (feedback delivery)</td></tr>
<tr><td>VI.2. quan titative</td><td>Gr ad e</td><td colspan="4">VI.2/3.A. full</td></tr>
</table>

Table 1. Matrix of Group Assessment Characteristics in the Translation Classroom (compiled by the author)

This matrix can serve as a framework for designing and implementing various group translation projects, aligning their assessment with the specific needs and requirements of a given translation classroom.

Methods and Methodology

Research design

This study adopted a qualitative research design. It was focused on collecting and analyzing data about participants' attitudes toward five group assessment models: **(1)** heteroassessment of collective team performance; **(2)** heteroassessment of individual performance of team members based on particular indicators of the translation product; **(3)** heteroassessment of collective team performance evaluating the quality of the target text and combining it with the team's internal allocation of the remaining points among members, based on their individual contributions to the team's outcomes; **(4)** combined assessment: the final grade consists of 40% heteroassessment results, 30% peer-assessment results, and 30% self-assessment results; **(5)** combined assessment: the final grade consists of 40% heteroassessment results, 30% peer-assessment results, and 30% external inter-team assessment results. The survey was administered with the help of Google Forms. Based on the received results, guidelines for selecting an appropriate group assessment model for the translation project implementation in the translation classroom were drafted.

Participants

The survey took place at the end of the autumn semester of the 2020-2021 academic year at Poltava University of Economics and Trade, Ukraine. It involved 36 fourth-year undergraduate students (28 women and 8 men), aged between 21 and 24, and majoring in Translation. All experiment participants were native speakers of Ukrainian, and their English language proficiency was estimated at B2+ to -C1 levels according to the CEFR scale. They had been studying their Translation Practice course for four semesters. By the beginning of this survey, they had been trained to perform different types of partial translation and full translation performance in the Business Administration domain from English into Ukrainian.

At the beginning of the survey, the students were introduced to the objectives and procedure of the intended study and were invited to participate in it voluntarily. Informed consent forms were distributed to them in class, and the return rate was 100%, since all the students signed them and agreed to participate in the study without any coercion. They were informed about the possibility to withdraw at any time. Confidentiality and anonymity were

ensured by the researcher. This research was based on convenience sampling, involving a relatively small cohort of available participants.

Data collection and procedure

Based on the course syllabus, the survey participants were expected to perform one group translation project in the last three weeks of the autumn term, 2020-2021 academic year. According to the translation brief, the students were commissioned by the Department of Marketing at Poltava University of Economics and Trade to translate a business case study titled "Creative inspiration: 9 mini cases studies of marketing campaigns and business ideas sparked by unorthodox inspiration" (https://surli.cc/ycxlci) from English into Ukrainian. The target text was intended to be used as a training material for future marketing experts. The specific request concerned the additional compilation of a marketing term glossary and the creative localization of images while preserving their marketing value. This translation project was used for summative assessment purposes (with the grades accredited toward the credit test); it was relatively authentic and represented a full-cycle medium-term out of class translation task with minimal teacher's involvement and full students' autonomy. Students were supposed to form teams of three members each and use free CAT-tool OmegaT to manage their translation projects (Korol Translation Project).

During *the first week of the project* (preparatory stage), its brief (containing a detailed style guide) was introduced and discussed by the students under the teacher's direction. At this stage, the assessment criteria were compiled (see Table 2) and the mechanisms of the five assessment models were explained to the participants.

Criterion	Descriptors	Portion of the total grade
1	**2**	**3**
Target Text Quality (64%)		
1. Formatting of the target text	□ Full compliance with the style guide; □ partial compliance with the style guide; □ no compliance with the style guide.	**10%**
2. Rendition of the source text sense and meaning in the target text	□ Complete rendition of source text information without any unjustified omissions; □ mostly complete rendition of source text information, with several minor omissions; □ incomplete rendition of source text information with some significant omissions.	**18%**
3.Target text presentation in the target language	□ The target text demonstrates correct spelling, terminology, grammar structures, and punctuation; □ the target text contains minor spelling, terminology, grammar and / or punctuation mistakes; □ the target text contains significant spelling, terminology, grammar and / or punctuation mistakes.	**18%**
4. Target text pragmatic equivalence to the source text	□ The target text fully conveys the author’s intention, it is easy to read and use, contains creative language solutions; □ the target text adequately conveys the author’s intention and is relatively easy to read and use, though it shows a lack of creative language solutions; □ the target text fails to convey author’s intention and is difficult to read and use, it has no creative language solutions.	**18%**
Teamwork Dynamics and Effectiveness (36%)		
1. Completion of the assigned responsibilities by the team members	□ Team members translated the assigned passage and actively fulfilled all their additional responsibilities;	**12%**

Table 2. Criteria of Group Assessment of the Translation Project (compiled by the author)

The students formed 12 teams of 3 members each based on the teacher's recommendations and students' preferences. Each team member was supposed to complete an equal portion of the translation and take on specific responsibilities: **(1)** project manager – arranging and managing team workflow and taking final strategic decisions; **(2)** terminologist and technical assistant – compiling glossary and searching for term equivalents, and supporting team members in using OmegaT; **(3)** editor – revising and reviewing the target text to ensure its coherence and cohesion at different levels. Each team was free to choose the optimal distribution of responsibilities. Viber groups were established for sharing necessary materials, discussing the workflow and troubleshooting by the team members. The teacher was invited to each Viber group to monitor the process and observe group dynamics phenomena.

The second week (implementation stage) was devoted to the translation performance itself, including source text analysis by the team members, spotting potential translation problems, solving them collectively through productive discussions and application of effective search strategies, generating a translation draft and compiling the final version of the target text. The deadline was quite challenging, requiring high performance speed and generated additional pressure.

The third week of the project (summative stage) focused on assessing the project outcomes according to the five assessment models presented above. During this week, team project performance was evaluated using various methods. The students were required to reflect on their experience of participating in the group translation project, as well as to share their opinions on the different assessment models through an online survey. The survey contained 10 closed-ended questions presented with the help of Google Forms. It took up to 9 minutes to complete the survey online. The internal consistency reliability of the survey results was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha, calculated on https://www.cogn-iq.org/statistical-tools/cronbach-alpha.html. The received data were collated and interpreted.

Results

The target texts and groupwork dynamics of 12 teams participating in the survey were consecutively assessed with the help of 5 different models based on the application of the compiled criteria and descriptors (see Table 2) and reported to the students. They were invited to respond to 10 survey questions regarding their attitudes toward the applied assessment models. The received results are presented in Table 3.

№	Survey Question	Students' Answers
1	To what extent do the outcomes of this translation product reflect your actual translation skills and abilities? **a.** not at all objectively **b.** partially objectively **c.** moderately objectively **d.** mostly objectively **e.** completely objectively	 **a**. 2 students (6%) **b.** 3 students (8%) **c. 12 students (33%)** **d.** 9 students (25%) **e.** 10 students (28%)
2	Which assessment model was the most objective to your mind? **a.** heteroassessment of collective team performance **b.** heteroassessment of individual performance of team members **c.** heteroassessment of collective team performance, evaluating the quality of the target text and combining it with the team's internal allocation of the remaining points among members **d.** 40% heteroassessment results, 30% peer-assessment results, and 30% self-assessment results **e.** 40% heteroassessment results, 30% peer-assessment results, and 30% external inter-team assessment results	 **a.** 1 student (3%) **b.** 8 students (22%) **c. 12 students (33%)** **d.** 10 students (28%) **e.** 5 students (14%)
3	Whose grade was the most meaningful and influential to you? **a.** your teacher's **b.** your teammates' **c.** your own **d.** your peers' from other teams **e.** your teacher's and teammates' **f.** your teacher's and yours **g.** your teacher's and peers' from other teams	 **a.** 1 student (3%) **b.** 6 students (17%) **c.** 1 student (3%) **d.** 1 student (3%) **e. 16 students (44%)** **f.** 8 students (22%) **g.** 3 students (8%)
4	Have you managed to assess your teammates' performance objectively? **a.** definitely, yes **b.** I am not sure **c.** unfortunately, no	 **a. 18 students (50%)** **b.** 12 students (33%) **c.** 6 students (17%)

Table 3. Students' Attitudes to the Use of the Five Assessment Models of Group Translation Project Performance (compiled by the author)

As we can see in Table 3 above, 86% of respondents believe that group translation project promotes the manifestation and measurement of their translation proficiency. In this context, 75% of the survey participants opt for the assessment models involving the opinion of different assessment agents. Almost one third of them prefer heteroassessment of collective team performance combined with the team's internal allocation of the remaining points among its members. It allows for consideration of internal group dynamics, including both positive and negative effects. The second position (28%) belongs to the combination of hetero-, peer-, and self-assessment outcomes. The least popular model appeared to be heteroassessment of team performance based on the evaluation of the produced target text. However, 44% of the participants consider teacher's and teammates' grades as the most influential and meaningful to them. Half of the student cohort insisted on the objectivity of their peer assessments, while the other half doubted the objectivity of their peers' evaluations of their performance, mainly explaining this fact with personal attitudes and preferences. 72% of the respondents believed in the objectivity of teacher's assessment of the group project performance. The main factor hindering it was seen in the lack of actual information on the teamwork flow (50%). Self- and peer-assessment were named among the most difficult forms of assessment to be completed by the respondents. All the students are ready to use the assessment models involving different assessment agents in their future group translation projects.

The internal consistency reliability of the conducted survey was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha, calculated on https://www.cogn-iq.org/statistical-tools/cronbach-alpha.html. The developed survey scale has excellent reliability, with a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.9619 (N = 36), despite the moderate sample size. As a result, the received data effectively measure the construct of attitude toward different assessment models of group translation survey, as intended by the developed survey.

Conclusions

In spite of its complicated nature and procedure, group assessment widens the prospective philologists' opportunities to demonstrate their translation competence in real-life conditions. In addition, it promotes and evaluates the development of students' diverse social skills. The effective implementation of group assessment in the translation classroom should rely on a set of requirements. Firstly, it should be employed for the assessment of a translation team project in terms of both process and product. The assessment should be carried out by all parties involved: the teacher, the students, members of the same and other teams, acting both individually and collectively. Process

assessment should primarily focus on different aspects of group dynamics manifested during the project. They include the quality of group interaction, i.e. the ability to cooperate productively for translation problem-solving, and members' individual dedication to project objectives. Guided report on the project flow is considered to be the main tool for the internal peer assessment of team dynamics. It should be supplemented by the analysis of the team project presentation, teacher's observation outcomes, and students' responses to post-project survey.

Critical analysis of existing assessment models combining different forms of evaluation and grading allowed us to examine students' attitude to five models of group assessment: 1) heteroassessment of collective team performance; 2) heteroassessment of individual performance of team members based on particular indicators of the translation product; 3) heteroassessment of collective team performance evaluating the quality of the target text and combining it with the team's internal allocation of the remaining points among members, based on their individual contributions to the team's outcomes; 4) combined assessment: the final grade consists of 40% heteroassessment results, 30% peer-assessment results, and 30% self-assessment results; 5) combined assessment: the final grade consists of 40% heteroassessment results, 30% peer-assessment results, and 30% external inter-team assessment results. Each model adopted the same criteria of the translation project assessment: 1) target text quality (formatting, rendition of the source text sense and meaning, target text presentation in the target language, target text pragmatic equivalence to the source text); 2) teamwork dynamics and effectiveness (individual completion of the assigned responsibilities by the team members, participation in the team discussions, maintenance of a positive team climate). They should ensure greater objectivity and reliability of the assessment outcomes.

According to the survey results, all the applied assessment models provided quite reliable and objective information on the students' translation proficiency. However, the majority of the respondents opt for the assessment models involving different assessment agents. The model that appeared to be the most popular among the survey participants was the combination of heteroassessment of the collective team's performance (focused on the overall quality of the target text) and internal peer-assessment (team's internal distribution of points among its members based on their performance and contribution). The second most preferred option was the combination of hetero-, peer-, and self- assessment in a 4:3:3 ratio. Finally, about 22% of the survey participants viewed heteroassessment of the team members' individual performance as appropriate. This result highlights the importance of implementing team projects in translation training as a means of developing students' interpersonal skills as well as the abilities to accept peer feedback

and respond it appropriately. It is interesting to note that, for the assessment of their next translation project, students' preferences remained stable regarding the first two leading models but changed significantly with respect to the heteroassessment of the team members' individual performance. Instead, they indicated the readiness to apply the combination of hetero-, peer-, and external inter-team assessment results in a 4:3:3 ratio. This fact indicates a general trend toward involving multiple assessment agents with varying degrees of influence in evaluating a team's translation project performance, gradually shifting more responsibilities to students.

While this survey provided valuable insights into the use of different group assessment models in the translation classroom, it is important to acknowledge its limitation regarding the representativeness of the findings. The sample size of 36 four-year translation students may not be sufficient to generalize the results across other students' cohorts. Future studies could address this limitation by including a larger number of participants of other years of studies from universities in different regions of Ukraine and around the world. Furthermore, examining the statistical correlations among results from different assessment models could offer a clearer and more comprehensive picture of their effects on both students' attitudes toward group assessment and its overall reliability and validity. Therefore, future research could explore the optimal sequence of the three recommended assessment models for implementing group assessment in the translation classrooms. This could provide guidance for translation instructors on how to optimize these assessment procedures.

Works Cited

Babych, Bogdan, Anthony Hartley, Kyo Kageura, Martin Thomas, and Masao Utiyama. "MNH-TT: A Collaborative Platform for Translator Training." *Translating and the Computer 34* (2012): 1-18.

Beseghi, Mico. "Developing Students' Translation Competence and Intercultural Awareness through Subtitling: A Didactic Proposal." *Iperstoria. Journal of American and English Studies 12* (2018): 178-191. http://dx.doi.org/10.13136/2281-4582/2018.i12.343.

Caple, Helen, and Mike Bogle. "Making Group Assessment Transparent: What Wikis Can Contribute to Collaborative Projects." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 38(2)* (2011): 198-210. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.618879.

Comas-Quinn, Anna, and Mara Fuertes Gutiérrez. "Working with Online Communities: Translating TED Talks." *New Case Studies of Openness in and Beyond the Language Classroom*. Ed. Anna Comas-Quinn,

Andrew Beaven, and Benjamin Sawhill. Research-publishing.net, 2019. 101-113. https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2019.37.969.

de Kellett, Angela Uribe. "Real-World Translating: Learning through Engagement." *Innovative Language Teaching and Learning at University: Facilitating Transition from and to Higher Education*. Ed. Catherine Hampton and Silvija Salin. Research-publishing.net, 2022. 133-142. https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2022.56.1380.

Forsell, Johan, Karin Forslund Frykedal, and Eva Hammar Chiriac. "Teachers' Perceived Challenges in Group Work Assessment." *Cogent Education 8(1)* (2021). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.188647.

Frérot, Cécile, Aurélie Landry, and Lionel Karagouch. "Multi-Analysis of Translators' Work: An Interdisciplinary Approach by Translator and Ergonomics Trainers." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* (2020): 422-439. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2020.1839997.

Frykedal, Karin F., and Eva Hammar Chiriac. "Assessment of Students' Learning When Working in Groups." *Educational Research 53(3)* (2011): 331-45. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2011.598661.

Garvin, David A., Amy C. Edmondson, and Francesca Gino. "Is Yours a Learning Organization?" *Harvard Business Review* March 2008: 1-10.

González Davies, Maria. *Multiple Voices in the Translation Classroom: Activities, Tasks and Projects*. John Benjamins, 2004.

Gunning, Tiffany K., et al. "Who Engaged in the Team-Based Assessment? Leveraging EdTech for a Self and Intra-Team Peer-Assessment Solution to Free-Riding." *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education 19(38)* (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00340-y.

Hurtado Albir, Amparo. "The Acquisition of Translation Competence: Competences, Tasks, and Assessment in Translation Training." *Meta 60(2)* (2015): 256–280. https://doi.org/10.7202/1032857ar.

Kiraly, Don. "Project-Based Learning: A Case for Situated Translation." *Meta 50(4)* (2005): 1098-1111. https://doi.org/10.7202/012063ar.

Korda, Diamantoula. "Translation Training: The Use of Authentic Projects." *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E 10* (2023): 302-337. https://doi.org/10.51287/cttl202310.

Korol, Tetiana H. "TED Talks Translation as an Authentic Group Project: A Case Study of Implementation and Assessment." *Inozemni Movy [Foreign Languages] 4* (2020): 17-25. http://fl.knlu.edu.ua/article/view/219330/219083.

Korol, Tetiana H. "Ways of Collaborative Approach Implementation for the Assessment in Prospective Philologists' Translation Training."

Innovatsiina Pedahohika [Innovative Pedagogy] 25(1) (2020): 75-78. https://doi.org/10.32843/2663-6085/2020/25-1.14

Korol, Tetiana. "Current Assessment Practices in Ukrainian Translation Classroom: Teachers' Survey Results." *Advanced Education 21* (2022): 135-160. https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.266149.

Korol, Tetiana. "Translation Project as an Assessment Tool: Ukrainian Context." *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes 7(1)* (2019): 115-23. https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP1901115K

Li, Defeng, Chunling Zhang, and Yuanjian He. "Project-Based Learning in Teaching Translation: Students' Perceptions." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer 9(1)* (2015): 1-19. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2015.1010357.

Marczak, Mariusz, and Jarosław Krajka. "Translator Education in the Cloud: Students' Perceptions of Telecollaborative Experiences." *E-Learning Methodology – Implementation and Evaluation*. Ed. Ewa Smyrnova-Trybulska. Katowice: Studio Noa. Cieszyn: for University of Silesia, Faculty of Ethnology and Sciences of Education, 2016. 369-388.

Marczak, Mariusz. "Students' Perspective on Web 2.0-Enhanced Telecollaboration as Added Value in Translator Education." *New Directions in Telecollaborative Research and Practice: Selected Papers from the Second Conference on Telecollaboration in Higher Education*. Ed. Sake Jager, Malgorzata Kurek, and Breffni O'Rourke. Research-publishing.net, 2016. 245-252. https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2016.telecollab2016.514.

Maruenda-Bataller, Sergio, and José Santaemilia-Ruiz. "Project-Based Learning and Competence Assessment in Translation Training." *Technology Implementation in Second Language Teaching and Translation Studies*. Ed. María Dolores Carrió-Pastor. Springer Science+Business Media, 2016. 207-228.

Massey, Gary, and Barbara Braendli. "Collaborative Feedback Flows and How We Can Learn from Them." *Investigating a Synergetic Learning Experience in Translator Education*. Ed. Don Kiraly et al., V&R Unipress, Mainz University Press, 2015. 177-199.

Meijer, Hajo, Hoekstra, Rink, Brouwer, Jasperina, and Jan-Willem Strijbos. "Unfolding Collaborative Learning Assessment Literacy: A Reflection on Current Assessment Methods in Higher Education." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 45(8)* (2020): 1222-1240, https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1729696.

Mitchell-Schuitevoerder, Rosemary. "A Project-Based Syllabus Design". Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation. Durham University. http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/10830/.

Naomi, A., C. J. Woodley, Despina W., and M. Winchester. "Exploring Academics' Approaches to Managing Team Assessment." *International Journal of Educational Management* (2016): 1150-1162.

Pietrzak, Paulina. "Towards effective feedback to translation students: Empowering through group revision and evaluation". *inTRAlinea Special Issue: Challenges in Translation Pedagogy* (2014). https://www.intralinea.org/index.php/specials/article/2095

Plaza-Lara, Cristina. "Competences of Translation Project Managers from the Academic Perspective: Analysis of EMT Programmes." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer 16(2)* (2021): 203-223. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2021.1987085

Prieto-Velasco, Juan Antonio, and Adrián Fuentes-Luque. "A Collaborative Multimodal Working Environment for the Development of Instrumental and Professional Competences of Student Translators: An Innovative Teaching Experience." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer 10(1)* (2016): 76-91. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2016.1154344.

Race, Phil. *A Briefing on Self, Peer and Group Assessment*. York: LTSN Generic Centre, 2001.

Sivan, Atara. "The Implementation of Peer Assessment: An Action Research Approach". *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice 2* (2000): 193-213. https://doi.org/10.1080/713613328.

Tumpa, Roksana Jahan, Samer Skaik, Ghulam Chaudhry, and Miriam Ham. "Group-Based Assessments and Project Management Education: Towards a Dynamic Framework with Best Practices." *International Journal of Innovative Business Strategies (IJIBS) 6(2)* (2020): 425-33, http://dx.doi.org/10.20533/ijibs.2046.3626.2020.0054