

Evaluating House's (2015) Model for Professional Translation Quality Assessment

OPEN ACCESS

*Corresponding author
Raneen Aed Rasheed Khider
Raneen.aed@gmail.com

RECEIVED :03 /10/2025

ACCEPTED :11/12/ 2025

PUBLISHED :15/04/ 2026

Raneen Aed Rasheed Khider/ University of Duhok-Collage of Languages-
Department of Translation

Alya' Mohammed Hussein Ahmed Al-Rubai'i/ University of Duhok-Collage
of Languages-Department of Translation

Abstract

Translation quality assessment models have been a central focus in the field of applied translation studies. They systematically assess translations by examining key aspects of translation quality, such as accuracy, fluency, terminology, style, and grammar. This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness, strengths, and weaknesses of House's (2015) model. The model, widely recognized as it is highly influential in translation quality assessment, has not been evaluated for its broader effectiveness and limitations. It was originally tested by House herself to a limited number of English-German text samples only. This lack of comprehensive evaluation leaves an important gap in understanding its applicability and workability in practice. The research methodology involved selecting six English translated into Arabic. These translated texts were assessed according to House's (2015) model criteria, followed by an evaluation of the model through a structured questionnaire by professional evaluators. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were adopted to analyze the data. The findings showed that House's (2015) model was effective, reliable, and suitable for analyzing both literary and non-literary text types. It offered a comprehensive approach to assessing translation quality by taking into account linguistic, contextual, and functional elements, and provides a structured framework for evaluating various text types.

Keywords

Evaluation
House's model
Translation quality
assessment



About the Journal

Zanco Journal of Humanity Sciences (ZJHS) is an international, multi-disciplinary, peer-reviewed, double-blind and open-access journal that enhances research in all fields of basic and applied sciences through the publication of high-quality articles that describe significant and novel works; and advance knowledge in a diversity of scientific fields. <https://zancojournal.su.edu.krd/index.php/JAHS/about>

1. Introduction

Translation quality assessment (TQA) is a branch of applied translation studies that focuses on examining translation quality. It involves evaluating the quality of translated texts using defined criteria (Mason & Laver, 2018). According to Williams (2004), evaluation is the systematic assessment of the quality, value, or effectiveness of something. In the field of TQA, evaluation involves applying models that assess the accuracy, fluency, and effectiveness of translations produced by humans or machines (Reiss, 2000). However, researchers continue to face the challenge of determining which frameworks accurately capture the intended meaning and other aspects of translation. This challenge has led to the development of various TQA models, designed to measure how well translations convey the tone, style, and meaning of the original text using a variety of metrics and frameworks.

Both theoretical and practical models have been proposed by scholars, such as Larson (1998) and House (2015): Theoretical models offer structured frameworks for understanding translation quality, while practical models provide techniques and tools for applying these frameworks (Lauscher, 2014). Despite the availability of these models, most studies have focused on applying them descriptively rather than evaluating their effectiveness. Although TQA models have made important theoretical and practical contributions to translation studies, most have only been tested by their authors. Testing a model merely demonstrates that the model can be applied, whereas evaluating examines its workability and applicability for different text types. Evaluation provides a broader perspective on the models' strengths and limitations, moving beyond single-scholar application. House's (2015) model, widely recognized as it is highly influential in TQA, has not been evaluated for its broader effectiveness and limitations. The model was tested by House herself to a limited number of English-German text, leaving its broader effectiveness and applicability unexamined. This lack of systematic evaluation represents an important gap in the TQA field.

Accordingly, this study examines the strengths and limitations of House's (2015) model for determining its effectiveness in professional translations. The study aims to evaluate whether House's (2015) model provides a systematic approach to professional translation and clearly defined criteria for professional translation. Identify the time efficiency, strengths, and weaknesses of House's (2015) model. Evaluate the effectiveness of House's (2015) model in professional translation contexts. Evaluate the workability, applicability and objectivity of House's (2015) model to both literary and non-literary text types.

This study attempts to answer the following questions in relation to evaluating House's (2015) TQA model: To what extent does House's (2015) model provide a systematic and clearly defined criteria to professional translation? How time-efficient is House's (2015) model and what are its main strengths and limitations in professional translation. How effective is House's (2015) model in assessing professional translations? How workable, applicable, and objective is House's (2015) model when applied to both literary and non-literary text types?

This study focuses on English-Arabic translations, including three literary and three non-literary texts. It is limited to professional translations rather than the student translations. Only six translated texts were used as study materials. It examines the evaluation of House's (2015) model in assessing translation quality. It includes participation of six professional evaluators who evaluated the models using the structured questionnaire.

The study offers a grounded, practice-based perspective on House's (2015) model effectiveness in real-world contexts, providing a deeper theoretical and practical understanding of the model. The findings can guide professional translators and academics in applying the model more effectively across different text types. Additionally, the study contributes to the field of applied translation studies supporting the development of more effective evaluation methods and guiding future research on improving and adapting TQA models.

2. Literature Review

Translation quality assessment (TQA) is a structured process for assessing a translated text, examining its quality, accuracy and suitability compared to the original source. It provides

framework for identifying errors in grammar, spelling, style, and cultural appropriateness, ensuring the target text (TT) conveys the intended message of the source text (ST) (Drugan,2013). TQA has long been a central focus in translation studies and remains critical for both scholars and professionals. Over the past few decades, TQA has evolved alongside translation theories. Early approaches in the 1960s and 1970s, focused on linguistic equivalence, emphasizing fidelity to the ST. In the 1980s and 1990s, functionalist models emerged, emphasized communication purpose and communicative purpose, audience, and the skopos theory. From the 2000s onward, empirical and corpus-based approaches gained more prominent, integrating professional practice and emphasizing evidence-based assessment (Drugan,2013). However, assessing translation quality remains challenging due to subjectivity, context-dependence, difficulty in identifying errors, and the absence of established criteria across languages and professional industries.

Several models have been developed and adapted for TQA, including Reiss (1971), House (1977), Al-Qinai (2001), Williams (2004), Al-Rubai'i (2006), Colina (2015), and Bittner (2020). Most models were initially tested by the scholars who proposed them, but usually on a limited number of texts, with few exceptions, such as Colina (2015) and Bittner (2020), whose models were tested and evaluated by various evaluators including professional translators, bilingual speakers, and academic specialists. Other influential theoretical frameworks, such as Larson (1984, 1998) and Nord (1991, 2005), were not originally designed as TQA models but rather as functionalist or linguistic approaches to translation. These frameworks were not tested by the scholars themselves, but they were adopted and applied by researchers to assess translation quality.

Larson (1984, 1998) proposed a meaning-based approach that distinguished between surface meaning and deep meaning. She emphasized three criteria: *accuracy*, *clarity*, and *naturalness*. Although the model was not originally designed for TQA, it has been applied by researchers, such as Sultan (2023), who demonstrated that the model was truly effective in TQA, particularly in highlighting the intricacies of news translation. Nord (1991,2005) developed a functionalist model grounded in Skopos theory. This model of text analysis in translation included both extratextual and intertextual factors, by analyzing both the ST and TT, and then comparing them. The model outlined key criteria for TQA, namely fidelity, flexibility, and equivalence. Although the model was not originally developed for TQA, it has been applied in this field by researchers, such as Naguib (2021), whose study demonstrated the effectiveness of Nord's (1991, 2005) model in TQA.

Other models were designed specifically to the field of TQA. Reiss' (1971) model distinguished between three categories of texts: expressive, operative, and informative. The core concept of her model is equivalence (Reiss, 2000). In collaboration with Vermeer (1984), they incorporated Skopos theory, highlighted functional adequacy, coherence, and cultural appropriateness, language accuracy, coherence, and functional adequacy (Reiss, Nord, & Vermeer, 2014). The model has been applied by researchers, such as Al-Ukaily (2011). The application revealed certain inconsistencies, often stemming from conservative translation traditions and ethical standards, highlighting the influence of ST elements in the translation process. Larose's (1989, 1994, and 1998) model focused on two primary areas: textual and extra-textual factors. He emphasized the role of clients, the context of translation, and numerous other elements of translation quality. This model has been applied in TQA to various text types, distinguishing between three levels: micro-structural, macro-structural, and super-structural.

AL-Qinai (2000) created his practical model to focus on textual analysis that incorporates seven parameters which are essential for an empirical TQA, these are: *textual typology*, *formal correspondence*, *thematic coherence*, *cohesion*, *dynamic equivalence*, *lexical properties*, and *grammatical equivalence*. The model assessed translations based on defined criteria, such as formal correspondence, efficacy, and style shift, using original English texts and their Arabic translations, as well as identifying points of convergence between STs and TTs (AL-Qinai, 2000). Williams (2004) introduced a model for TQA based on argumentation theory. The model assessed the "shifts of argument" in both ST and TT, applying argumentation theory to highlight key aspects and examine the relationship between error severity and full-text analysis. The model focused primarily on translation products and did not pay attention for other factors, such as the role of translator and

client needs (Drugan, 2013).

Al Rubai'i (2006) introduced a model based on Hatim and Mason's (1990) comprehensive framework of context, which included communicative, pragmatic and semiotic dimensions. The model consists of two phases: analysis of the ST, followed by a comparative assessment of the translated text against the ST. The model has been tested by Al Rubai'i (2006) on English-Arabic texts, revealing its reliability, consistency, and coherence. The model has not been extensively applied in subsequent research. Colina's (2015) model evaluated translations based on their function and textual adequacy, focusing on four components: TT, functional adequacy, non-specialized content, and specialized terminology. The evaluation process involved assessing the translation independently, and then comparing it with the ST to ensure it meets the translation brief (Colina, 2015). Alaskar (2023) applied this model to evaluate a literary translation, demonstrating its practical value across different text types. More recently, Bittner (2020) developed a comprehensive model for evaluating translation quality, based on the argumentation theory. The model integrated argumentation-centered approach and decision-making frameworks, considering multiple factors that influence the TQA, including client roles, deadlines, glossaries, motivation, translator-related factors, competence, and the use of tools (Bittner, 2020).

Among all TQA approaches, House's (1977, 1997, and 2015) model is particularly influential. The model is grounded in equivalence and informed by pragmatic theories and studies in other fields. The first model (1977) was strongly linguistically oriented, based on register analysis (field, tenor, mode) and posited two types of translation: overt and covert. Overt translation helps readers understand the original work within its cultural context, while covert translation functions as if it were originally written in the new language. House (1997) expanded the concept of cultural filter, emphasizing how translations may adapt cultural elements for the target audience. House's (2015) model was updated to include the broader integration of pragmatic and discourse analysis tools. It included three analytical stages: analysis of the original text based on Halliday's (1978) framework, comparison of STs and TTs, and statement of quality, identifying errors and mismatches between the ST and TT. The updated model aims to better understand the cultural differences between the original and target audience.

House's (2015) model has been tested by her on a limited set of English-German texts. Several researchers applied House's (2015) model in different text types, such as Madkour (2016), Al-Haddad (2018), Kullab et al. (2023), and Al-Aizari (2023). However, these applications generally focus on demonstrating the model's usability rather than systematically evaluating its effectiveness, workability, or applicability in professional translation across different text types. Although widely recognized, there remains a lack of independent empirical evaluation by professional evaluators, particularly for languages other than English-German, which limits understanding of the model's broader strengths and weakness, leaving a gap in understanding its practical workability and limitations.

To conclude, the aforementioned literature review showed that many TQA models have been developed for TQA. Most of them, including House's (2015) model, were tested only by their authors on limited texts, and rarely evaluated by professional evaluators – except Colina's (2015) and Bittner's (2020). However, House's (2015) model, based on equivalence and register analysis was criticized for being limited and time-consuming, and these criticisms remain theoretical rather than based on empirical testing. This underscores the need to evaluate House's (2015) model in professional translation, to examine its strengths, and weaknesses.

3. Methodology and Data Collection

3.1 Research Design

A quantitative and qualitative research design was used in this study, along with an empirical application and evaluation of House's (2015) model. This design allowed for both numerical evaluation and qualitative insights into the model's applicability, workability, and objectivity. The study was guided by House's criteria of translation quality assessment (TQA), focusing on the evaluation of the model itself rather than specific translation results.

3.2 Participants

According to Colina (2015), a professional evaluator in TQA is characterized by a combination of deep linguistic and cultural expertise, a solid understanding of translation theories and practices, and the capacity to apply objective assessment criteria. Such an evaluator can detect different types of translation errors, judge the fluency, accuracy, and suitability of a translated text, and offer constructive feedback to enhance its quality. Based on this, the study involved six evaluators, divided into two groups: the first group consisted of three academic-professional translators — actively engaged in both scholarly research and professional practice; they are referred to as Evaluators A. The second group included three industry-based professional translators with extensive experience (more than ten years) in commercial translation; they are referred to as Evaluators B. The two groups of evaluators were chosen to provide a balanced evaluation of TQA model, ensuring cross-validation, reducing individual bias, and incorporating theoretical and practical insights in the evaluation process.

3.3 Research Materials

The study employed six STs and their corresponding translations, alongside a descriptive overview of House's (2015) TQA model, as evaluative materials (see Appendices A and B). Three literary texts were selected for their distinct narratives and styles. The first text is a fictional work titled "Girl" by Jamaica Kincaid (1978), translated by Zeina Al Halaby (2021), published by *Aljumhuriya*. The second text is an excerpt from a folktale called "The King of Love" by Thomas Frederick Grane (n.d.), which was translated by Muhammad Abdelfattah (n.d.), published by *Translators Avenue*. The third text is the famous monologue "to be or not to be" spoken by Hamlet from William Shakespeare's play (1992 /1600), which was translated by the well-known translator Jabra Ibrahim Jabra (1979). These three texts were selected for their diverse narrative techniques, cultural contexts, and stylistic features, which allow for a comprehensive evaluation of translation quality across different literary genres.

Three non-literary texts were chosen for their informational and functional nature. The first text is a technological text titled "Mobile Phones and the Internet" by the OECD, translated by Muhammad Abdelfattah (n.d.), published by *Translators Avenue*. The second text is a medical text titled Alzheimer's Disease written by Alzheimer's association, which was translated by Heba Abad (n.d.), published by *Translators Avenue*. The third text is a scientific excerpt from Danial Goleman's (1996) book *Emotional Intelligence*, titled "the seat of all passion", which was translated by the well-known writer and translator Layla Al Gebaly (2000). see appendix B. These non-literary texts were selected for their factual content, varied register, and practical communicative purpose, ensuring the evaluation covers different text types.

3.4 Research Instrument

The research instrument used in this paper is a questionnaire, which served as the primary data collection. The questionnaire consisted of six close-ended questions measured on a 5-point Likert scale, typically ranging from strongly agree, agree, neutral, strongly disagree, and disagree. In addition, three open-ended questions were used to allow the participants to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the model (see Appendix C). This questionnaire-based method can be found in Jezhny and Bapir's (2021) study on students' knowledge of academic writing.

Cronbach's alpha was conducted to ensure the validity of the questionnaire. Cronbach's alpha was 0.87 as shown in Table 1 below, which statistically proved that the items were appropriate, clear, and valid for the purpose of the study. The questionnaire was approved by six jury members whose recommendations served as the foundation for its validity.

Table 1. The validity of questionnaire

Cronbach's alpha	Items no.
0.85	12
0.89	6
0.87	18

3.5 Data Collection and Procedure

The evaluators completed the tasks using the model's criteria and post-evaluation questionnaire. Responses were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative analysis focused on statistics and descriptive analysis on significant differences. The qualitative analysis examined open-ended responses, identifying themes and insights. The analysis offered a more in-depth evaluation of House's (2015) model, focusing on its strengths and weaknesses. The evaluators were asked to perform the following tasks:

- Acquainting themselves with House's (2015) TQA model as outlined in the accompanied description.
- Applying the criteria of the model to selected translated texts (three literary and three non-literary).
- Using the structured questionnaire to evaluate House's (2015) model based on the provided guidance.

The evaluation was conducted individually over a period of one week to one month, allowing evaluators sufficient time to carefully apply the model to all texts. All instructions were standardized, and follow-up discussions were held to clarify any ambiguities, ensuring consistency and reliability throughout the evaluation process.

4. Data Analysis Results

The questionnaire served as the primary data for analyzing the strengths and limitations of the House's (2015) translation quality assessment (TQA) model. It was analyzed through using both quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative analysis focused on the closed-ended items and was conducted using SPSS, while the qualitative analysis emphasized the open-ended items analyzed through thematic analysis. To ensure the reliability of evaluators' consistency, inter-rater agreement between the two groups of evaluators (A and B) was calculated using Microsoft Excel.

4.1 Quantitative Analysis Results

The application of House's (2015) model in Table 2 was statistically significant, as the p-value was less than the significant level (0.05). In addition, the value of the tabulated (T) T-test was lower than the computed (C) T-test. Therefore, House's (2015) model provided clear and well-defined criteria, a systematic method for identifying the various types of errors in translation, and it effectively ensured accuracy in assessing professional translations. The model ensured a high level of objectivity, and it was efficient (i.e., time-saving) in assessing professional translations. The model was applicable to the literary and non-literary text types.

Table 2. The application of House's model

Categories	No. of evaluators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Theoretical mean	T-test		Significance level	P-value
					C	T		
Q 1	6	4.45	0.548	3	19.9	2.015	0.05	0.000
Q2	6	4.5	0.548	3	19.901	2.015	0.05	0.000
Q3	6	3.38	0.753	3	12.3	2.015	0.05	0.000
Q4	6	3.5	1.378	3	6.2	2.015	0.05	0.002
Q5	6	3.5	1.643	3	5.22	2.015	0.05	0.003
Q6 A	6	4.5	0.821	3	6.33	2.015	0.05	0.000
Q6 B	6	4.5	0.821	3	6.33	2.015	0.05	0.000

4.2 Qualitative Analysis Results

Table 3. showed the qualitative analysis conducted in this study. The model was evaluated by the two groups of evaluators (A and B). Thematic analysis was employed to interpret their responses.

Table 3. The thematic analysis

Themes1: Systematic framework and comprehensiveness of the model	
Evaluators A	House's (2015) model is a systematic and comprehensive approach that provides well-defined criteria for assessing translation quality.
Evaluators B	The model is a systematic approach that preserves the original text's characteristics. The evaluators agreed that combining multiple models and approaches can yield more effective results, depending on the context and text type. The model identifies errors through comparative analysis of STs and TTs, focusing on understanding and explaining translations, promoting an analytical approach over a judgmental one.
Theme 2: Contextual sensitivity	
Evaluators A	The model considers linguistic, contextual, and functional factors, providing a systematic framework for evaluating various types of texts. According to the evaluators A, the assessor's guidelines on cultural adaptation are not provided, and they must have a strong academic background in systemic functional linguistics. It is functional in the sense that it gives room to adaptations in translation. In addition, the evaluators highlighted that the model lacks reference to figurative language and tends to be more general in terms of text typology. It is somehow descriptive in nature.
Evaluators B	House's (2015) model is a powerful tool for analyzing STs and TTs, emphasizing functionality and purpose, providing guidance on translation in various contexts, being grounded for academic and professional translations. It has cultural adaptation.
Theme 3: The applicability	
Evaluators A	The model is linguistically oriented. Its comparative nature makes it applicable to different types of texts whether literary or non-

	literary ones. House's model is a valuable tool for assessing TQA, focusing on covert and overt translation, and is applicable to certain types of translations with cultural issues.
Evaluators B	The model is not suitable for highly creative texts like poetry due to its functionality and lack of balanced cultural and audience adjustment, and its multilayer linguistic analysis may not be time-saving.
	Theme 4: Complexity and challenges
Evaluators A	Evaluators A noted that the model is complex and delicate, analyzes register aspects in literary texts but requires highly qualified, professional evaluations for translation, considering specific parameters for accurate assessment.
Evaluators B	Evaluators B highlighted that House's (2015) model of cultural filter improves translation complexities but introduces human interpretation, potentially reducing objectivity and allowing subjective interpretations. Due to the subjective nature of the model, the evaluator's interpretation can vary, resulting in inconsistencies in evaluation.
	Theme 5: The limitations
Evaluators A	The model can be enhanced by integrating it with other models and Skopos theory for a more robust foundation for assessing TQ. Another perspective was offered by evaluators, the model is descriptive and effective in analyzing translation, but needs amendments to handle figurative language.
Evaluators B	Combining multiple models and approaches can yield more effective results, depending on the context and text type.

4.3 The Inter-Rater Reliability

The inter-rater reliability was examined within the group of Evaluators A. The agreement scores were calculated using Excel as shown in Table 4. The quantitative analysis revealed that Q1 and Q6 (A) demonstrated perfect agreement, with a score of 1.00, which is remarkable. Q2, Q5, and Q6 (B) exhibited good reliability, with a value of 0.67, suggesting reasonable consistency. In contrast, Q3 and Q4 showed no agreement at all, with a score of 0.00.

Table 4. Inter-rater reliability of evaluators A

Categories	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Std Deviation	Agreement	Range
Q 1	5	5	5	0.00	1.00	0
Q 2	5	5	4	0.57	0.67	1
Q 3	3	5	4	1.00	0.00	2
Q 4	3	5	4	1.00	0.00	2
Q 5	5	5	4	0.57	0.67	1
Q 6 A	5	5	5	0.00	1.00	0
Q 6 B	5	5	4	0.57	0.57	1

Table 5. showed a high-level of agreement confirmed the inter-rater reliability among Evaluators B. Each row corresponds to an individual evaluator; the number of evaluators is three.

The data help illustrate the agreement within the same group of evaluators. The quantitative analysis results indicated that Q1 demonstrated strong agreement, with a perfect score of 1.00, which is noteworthy. Q2, Q3, and Q6 (B) showed moderate agreement at 0.67, reflecting fair consistency. Meanwhile, Q4, Q5, and Q6 (A) exhibited no agreement, scoring 0.00.

Table 5. Inter-rater reliability of evaluators B

Categories	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Std Deviation	Agreement	Range
Q 1	4	4	4	0.57	1.00	0
Q 2	5	4	4	0.57	0.67	1
Q 3	4	3	4	0.57	0.67	1
Q 4	4	1	4	1.73	0.67	3
Q 5	2	1	4	1.52	0.00	3
Q 6 A	5	1	3	0.57	0.00	4
Q 6 B	4	5	4	0.57	0.67	1

The inter-rater reliability examined through comparative responses of Evaluators A and B. It showed a higher p-value compared to the significant value level 0.05. According to the results of p-value and T-test between both groups, the comparison result was statistically no significant. As shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Inter-rater reliability between Evaluators A and B

Categories	Evaluators	No. of academic evaluators	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-test		Significance level	P-value
					C	T		
Q 1	Evaluators A	3	5.00	0.00	2	2.66	0.05	0.116
	Evaluators B	3	3.67	0.57				
Q2	Evaluators A	3	4.67	0.57	0.71	2.77	0.05	0.519
	Evaluators B	3	4.33	0.57				
Q3	Evaluators A	3	4.00	1.00	0.50	2.77	0.05	0.649
	Evaluators B	3	3.67	0.57				
Q4	Evaluators A	3	4.00	1.00	0.87	2.77	0.05	0.447
	Evaluators B	3	3.00	1.73				
Q5	Evaluators A	3	4.66	0.57	2.47	2.77	0.05	0.104
	Evaluators B	3	2.33	1.52				
Q6 A	Evaluators A	3	5.00	0.00	2.47	2.77	0.05	0.104
	Evaluators B	3	2.66	0.57				

		B							
Q6 B	Evaluators	3	4.67	0.57	2.47	2.77	0.05	0.104	
	A								
	Evaluators B	3	4.33	0.57					

The tables showed a high level of agreement within individual evaluator groups and across groups of evaluators in evaluating House's (2015) model. This indicates that the evaluators applied the criteria consistently across both literary and non-literary texts. The evaluators showed consistent agreement in applying and evaluating the model. This finding might not fully align with previous finding by Colina (2015) who demonstrated a robust approach of integrating evaluators from different background, such as translators, bilingual, and academics. She emphasized that all evaluators' background plays a crucial role in consistent scores. In this study, by applying the same model criteria to the same texts, the evaluators achieved consistent results, highlighting the consistency of the evaluation process.

5. Findings and Discussion

The main goal of this study was to investigate the evaluation of translation quality assessment (TQA) model: House' model (2015). Prior to completing the evaluation, the evaluators themselves applied the model's criteria. This aligns with the best practice in TQA of Bittner (2020). Two main findings emerged from the data analysis: (A) The quantitative findings of House's (2015) model. (B) The qualitative findings of the model.

5.1 Quantitative Findings

1. The model's application was statistically significant. The model provided clear and well-defined criteria, making it workable in professional translations without confusion. For example, the field (subject matter) was preserved well in text (*Girl* = *يا بنتي*). In addition, the social role and relationship were also maintained, reflecting the same social and power relationships. This supports House's (2015) claim that the model was based on functional-pragmatic linguistics and is used in systematic way to assess the TQ by introducing a comparative analysis between ST and TT. However, the model was considered complex and workable for evaluating professional translations (Drugan, 2013).

2. The model provided a systematic method for identifying the various types of errors through comparative analysis of ST and TT, such as the grammatical errors, lexical errors, and stylistic errors. For instance, the text (*To be or not to be*), whose translation rendered to (*اكون ام لا اكون*) instead of the correct (*اكون او لا اكون*). The translator used "ام" to add rhetorical flair to the phrase. The translator might try to convey broader philosophical, rhetorical, and semantic layers, making the translation more accurate. This support House's (2015) claim that the model prioritized identifying errors rather than recommending a translation and focusing on inconsistencies rather than evaluating its competence or suitability.

3. The model effectively ensured accuracy in professional translations based on Halliday's (1978) systematic-functional grammar, which examined language according to its context and function. The model examined register analysis (field, tenor, and mode) to identify shifts and mismatches in meaning between ST and TT. It centered on whether the TT served the same function as the ST as noted in text (*Mobile Phones and the Internet*).

4. The findings showed that House's (2015) model was relatively objective. The model was structured and systematic. However, it needed human interpretations particularly in assessing functional equivalence. For instance, the translator Arabized text (*Girl* = *يا بنتي*) rather than maintaining the Caribbean context.

5. The model was time-consuming in assessing professional translations. The model required a comparative analysis of both texts. It required time to systematically analyze the register and identify errors. In addition, the model required distinction between the overt and covert translation. This supports what Drugan (2013) claimed.

6. The model was applicable to the literary and non-literary texts. The model was flexible for both text types due to accuracy, clarity, and function. It ensured that the communicative purpose was persevered across genres. It was useful for poetry, drama, and narrative. This supports the claim of Aizari's study (2023), which found that House's (2015) model was applicable and useful in the translation of literary work.

5.2 Qualitative Findings

The findings of qualitative evaluation were structured through five major themes. Both groups generally agreed that the model has a systematic framework for evaluating texts based on linguistic, contextual, and functional factors. The model was a powerful tool for analyzing STs and TTs, providing guidance in various contexts and incorporating cultural adaptation. The model was linguistically oriented and applicable to various types of texts, including literary and non-literary texts. It focused on covert and overt translation and addresses cultural issues. However, the model is less effective for creative or culturally nuanced translations. due to its functionality and lack of balanced cultural and audience adjustment.

Furthermore, the model was complex and required professional evaluations. It introduced human interpretation, potentially reducing objectivity and allowing subjective interpretations, leading to potential bias and inconsistent evaluation. The evaluators suggest integrating the model with other models and Skopos theory for a stronger foundation in assessing translation quality. Combining multiple models can yield more effective results. The model was effective in analyzing translation but needs amendments for figurative language. This is confirmed by Munday (2016) and other recent studies that have applied the model, such as Askari and Rahim (2015) who stated that there are numerous models, approaches, and techniques for assessing translation quality, but none are as structured as House's (2015) model. They further noted that the model was even more systematic and accessible. Thus, our study aligns with their findings regarding the model's systematic analysis, but it might differ when it comes to its level of complexity.

6. Conclusion

The study evaluated House's (2015) translation quality assessment (TQA) model by examining its systematic structure, time efficiency, and applicability to different text types. The model is effective for assessing translation quality across both literary and non-literary texts. It provides clear criteria that preserve subject matter and social roles, enables functional-pragmatic comparison between source and target texts, and identifies various error types, including grammatical, lexical, stylistic, and cultural errors. The model maintained a degree of objectivity; however, it is complex, time-consuming, relies on human interpretations, and may struggle with highly creative or culturally nuanced texts despite its systematic criteria and applicability across text types. Despite these limitations, it offers a reliable and methodical application and informing future research in TQA.

References

- Al-Aizari, A.A.A., 2023. The application of House's (2015) translation quality assessment model to Arabic-English translation. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 4(3), pp.139-158. available at: <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlts.v4i3.349> [Accessed: 5 April 2025].
- Alaskar, H. F., 2023. *Translation quality assessment: An application of Colina's TQA model*. Unpublished master's thesis. Imam Mohammad ibn Saud Islamic University. available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/> [Accessed: 5 April 2025].
- Al-Haddad, S.H.A., 2018. Applying house's translation quality assessment model (2015) on literary texts. *مجلة جامعة الملكة أروى*, 21(21), pp.22-22. available at: <https://doi.org/10.58963/qausrj.v1i21.177> [Accessed: 10 April 2025].
- Al-Qinai, J., 2000. Translation quality assessment. Strategies, parameters and procedures. *Meta*, 45(3), pp.497-519. available at: <https://doi.org/10.7202/001878ar> [Accessed: 10 November 2024].
- Al-Rubai'i, A., 2006. *Translation criticism: A model for assessing the translation of narrative fictional texts*. Durham: School of Modern Languages and Cultures, University of Durham.
- Al-Ukaily, B.M.M., 2011. Translation assessment of three selected Arabic translations of William Golding's *Lord of the Flies*. *Unpublished master's thesis*. Al-Mustansiriyia University, Baghdad.

- Alzheimer's Association, n.d. *Alzheimer's disease* (trans. H. Abad). Translators Avenue. available at: <https://www.translatorsavenue.com/alzheimers> [Accessed: 15 April 2025].
- Askari, M. and Rahim, M.S., 2015. Evaluation of House's model of quality assessment. *Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 7(3), p.1419-1428. available at: <https://doi.org/10.24297/jssr.v7i3.6628> [Accessed: 15 February 2025].
- Bittner, H., 2019. *Evaluating the evaluator: A novel perspective on translation quality assessment*. Routledge.
- Colina, S., 2015. *Fundamentals of translation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crane, T.F., n.d. *The king of love* (trans. M. Abdelfattah). Translators Avenue. available at: <http://translatorsavenue.com/CV/Muhammad.Abdulfattah.pdf> [Accessed: 5 April 2025].
- Drugan, J., 2013. *Quality in professional translation: Assessment and improvement* (Vol. 9). A&C Black.
- Goleman, D., 1996. *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Great Britain.
- Goleman, D., 2000. *التكواء العاطفي* (L. Al Gebaly, Trans.). *دار العلم للملايين* (Original work published 1996).
- Halliday, M. a. K., 1978. *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Hodder Education.
- Hatim, B. and Mason, I., 1990. *Discourse and the translator*. Routledge.
- House, J., 1977. *A model for translation quality assessment*. TBL-Verlag Narr.
- House, J., 1997. *Translation quality assessment: A model revisited*. Gunter Narr Verlag.
- House, J., 2015. *Translation quality assessment: past and present*. Routledge.
- Jekhny, K.A. and Bapir, N.S.M., 2021. The assessment of university students' knowledge on academic writing. *Zanco Journal of Human Sciences*, 25(1), pp.265-278.
- Kincaid, J., 1978. *Girl*. *The New Yorker*, 26 June. Available at: <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1978/06/26/girl> [Accessed: 5 April 2025].
- Kincaid, J., 2021. *Girl* (trans. M. Alhayek). *Aljumhuriya*, 28 January. Available at: <https://aljumhuriya.net/ar/2021/01/28/يا-بنتي،-أو-محاولة-لتعريب-أمومة-كازيني/> [Accessed: 5 April 2025]. (Original work published 1978).
- Kullab, R., Daghigh, A.J. and Kadhim, K.A., 2023. The Applicability of House's (2015) Translation Quality Assessment Model on Fiction: Evidence from Mahfouz's Midaq Alley. *Journal of Modern Languages*, 33(2), pp.2-24. available at: <https://doi.org/10.22452/jml.vol33no2.2>
- Larose, R., 1989. *Théories contemporaines de la traduction*. Presses de l'Université.
- Larose, R., 1994. Qualité et efficacité en traduction: réponse à FW Sixel. *Meta*, 39(2), pp.362-373. available at: <https://doi.org/10.7202/003405>
- Larose, R., 1998. Méthodologie de l'évaluation des traductions. *Meta*, 43(2), pp.163-186. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.7202/003410>
- Larson, M. L., 1984. *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. University press of America.
- Larson, M. L., 1998. *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. University press of America.
- Lauscher, S., 2014. Translation quality assessment: Where can theory and practice meet?. In *Evaluation and Translation* (pp. 149-168). Routledge.
- Madkour, M. (2016). The application of functional linguistic models for assessing quality of translation: a descriptive analytical study. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(6), 87-117. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n6p87>
- Mason, I. and Laver, J., 2018. *A Dictionary of translation and interpreting*. Routledge.
- Mossop, B., 2014. *Revising and editing for translators*. Routledge.
- Munday, J., 2016. *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications (4th ed.)*. Routledge.
- Naguib, M.M., 2021. Assessing the Arabic Translation of Selected Walt Disney Bedtime Stories (2014): A Pragmatic-Stylistic Approach. *CDELTA Occasional Papers in the Development of English Education*, 74(1), pp.227-258. available at: <https://doi.org/10.21608/OPDE.2021.195325> [Accessed: 5 May 2025].
- Nord, C., 1991. Scopus, loyalty, and translational conventions. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 3(1), pp.91-109. available at: <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.3.1.06nor> [Accessed: 5 April 2025].
- Nord, C., 2005. *Text analysis in translation: Theory, methodology, and didactic application of a model for translation-oriented text analysis*. Rodopi.
- OECD, n.d. *Mobile phones and internet* (trans. M. Abdelfattah). Translators Avenue. Available at: https://translatorsavenue.com/article_details.php?id=43&language_id=1 [Accessed: 13 June 2025].
- Reiss, K. (2000). *Translation criticism – potentials and limitations: Categories and criteria for translation quality assessment* (E. Rhodes, Trans.). Routledge.
- Reiss, K., Nord, C. and Vermeer, H. J., 2014. *Towards a general theory of translational action: Skopos theory explained*. Routledge.
- Shakespeare, W., 1992. *Hamlet* (Act 3, Scene 1). In G. R. Hibbard (Ed.), *The Arden Shakespeare: Hamlet* (3rd ed.). Methuen. (Original work published 1600)
- Shakespeare, W., 1979. *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (J. Jabra, Trans.). Beirut: Arab Institute for Studies and Publishing. (Original work published 1992/1600)
- Sultan, F.M.D., 2023. The Application of Larson's Model of Translation Quality Assessment to the Translation of Arabic Journalistic Texts into English. available at: <https://doi.org/10.33899/radab.2022.135432.1667> [Accessed: 13 January 2025].
- Watson, R., 2010. *Future minds: How the digital age is changing our minds, why these matters, and what we can do about it* (A. Muhammad Dawwah & A. Amer, Trans.). National Center for Translation.

- Williams, M., 2004. *Translation quality assessment: An argumentation-centered approach*. University of Ottawa Press.

Appendices

A: The description of House's (2015) model

The theoretical framework

House's (2015) model for TQA is rooted in the principle of equivalence and is informed by pragmatic theories and interdisciplinary research, particularly Halliday's (1978) systemic-functional framework, register theory, stylistics, and discourse analysis. She distinguishes between two types of translation: overt and covert. House's main focus is the cultural filter, which is employed to adapt the translation in a way that reflects the sociocultural norms and communicative expectations of the target audience.

Table A1 the criteria of House's model

<i>Register analysis</i>	<i>Description</i>
<i>Field</i>	It reflects the type of social interaction and the subject matter being discussed, including whether the subject is addressed in broad terms or with specific details (Halliday, 1985).
<i>Tenor</i>	It refers to the characteristics of the people involved—the speaker (addresser) and the listener (addressee)—and the type of relationship between them, including their social power, social distance, and emotional involvement. Tenor also reflects their social attitudes and the style of communication, whether formal, consultative, or informal (Halliday, 1985; House, 1977).
<i>Mode</i>	It refers to whether the communication occurs through spoken or written channels, and also to how much interaction is possible or encouraged between the writer and the reader (Halliday, 1985).
<i>Genre</i>	It refers to type of text. Recognizing a text's genre is essential for analysis, as it provides the foundation for proper evaluation. As Halliday (1985) points out, genre connects texts to the broader linguistic and cultural context in which they are produced.
<i>Cultural filter</i>	The concept of the cultural filter introduced by House (1977) is used to identify differences in social and stylistic norms between source and target cultures in translation. It emphasizes that any changes made to the original should be based on real, observable cultural differences, especially when aiming for functional equivalence in covert translations.

In simpler terms, the model is focused on analyzing, describing, and comparing texts, considering their cultural and situational contexts. It also connects texts to others with similar goals, using genre and corpus studies. This analysis follows a theory that distinguishes between different translation purposes, specifically overt and covert translations. It is important to note that this model is about understanding and explaining translations, not about judging them as 'good' or 'bad' based on personal beliefs or social, political, or ethical standards. House (2015) identified two types of translation: covert and overt.

- Covert translation is a type of translation that reads like an original text in the target language, as if it could have been written independently rather than being recognized as a translation (House, 1977).
- Overt translation is a type of translation used when the ST is closely connected to its original language and culture (House, 1977). This type of translation is suitable particularly for translating the literary texts.

The analytical process

House's (2015) model based on a systematic functional linguistics, involves the following steps for applying and testing the model:

- Analysis of the ST, focusing on field, tenor, mode and genre. Identifying key features, such as medium, participation, social role relationship, social attitude and province.
- Comparison of the ST and TT, by comparing the STs and TTs across five features: medium, participation, social role relationship, social attitude, and province. This also includes identifying whether a covert or overt translation approach has been applied appropriately.
- Statement of quality: identifying errors and mismatches between the ST and TT, highlighting areas where functional equivalence may not have been achieved.

B: Text Samples: six STs (three literary and three non-literary) and their corresponding translations used in this study are available at the following link.

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vSCFb4iWipdRGMu2PztO1u3lg5YLnsstrF3vorPezddSG4z7biYDfiQAbcgJYTfw/pub>

C: The Designed Questionnaire used in this Study for Evaluating of House's (2015) Model:

1. The model provides clear and well-defined criteria that can be applied to the assessment of professional translations without confusion.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

2. The model provides a systematic method for identifying errors.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

3. The model effectively ensures accuracy in assessing professional translations.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

4. The model ensures a high level of objectivity in assessing professional translations.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral

- Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
5. The model is efficient (i.e., time-saving) in assessing professional translations.
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neutral
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
6. A. The model is applicable to the literary text type.
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neutral
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
- B. The model is applicable to the non-literary text type.
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neutral
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
7. What are the weaknesses of the model?
-
8. What are the strengths of the model?
-
9. If you have any other thoughts, please feel free to share them.
-
-

