KORKUT ATA TÜRKİYAT ARAŞTIRMALARI DERGİSİ
Uluslararası Dil, Edebiyat, Kültür, Tarih, Sanat ve Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi
The Journal of International Language, Literature, Culture, History, Art and Education Research

Sayı/*Issue* 15 (**Nisan**/*April* 2024), s. 994-1011.
Geliş Tarihi-*Received*: 14.03.2024
Kabul Tarihi-*Accepted*: 05.04.2024
Araştırma Makalesi-*Research Article*
ISSN: 2687-5675
DOI: 10.51531/korkutataturkiyat.1452692

Exploring Undergraduate Students' Viewpoints on Corrective Feedback Implementations in Interpreting

Sözlü Çeviride Düzeltici Geribildirim Uygulamalarına İlişkin Lisans Öğrencilerinin Bakış Açılarının İncelenmesi

Sevda BALAMAN*

Abstract

Considering the importance of interpreting as an effective communication tool, the critical role of systematic error-treatment practices, which might ultimately enable the construction of more accurate renditions, is undeniable. However, the number of studies addressing the feedback mechanism, especially in the interpreter training domain, is quite low in the relevant literature. In this vein, the current research, based on a mixed-method research design, aims to portray the perceptions regarding the multidimensional characteristics of the error feedback process from the lens of interpreter candidates. The quantitative data were gathered with the participation of a total of 102 undergraduate-level students majoring in the Translation and Interpreting Department. In the data analysis procedure, firstly the Principal Components Analysis was conducted and 7 sub-dimensions based on the corrective error feedback were extracted. The qualitative data were collected with the participation of 10 students in the semi-structured interviews. The findings gathered with these two methods revealed that the participants had a favourable opinion of obtaining feedback regarding their performances. Notably, while most of the participants reported the highest endorsement on the explicit type of feedback and receiving corrective feedback oriented to all error types, they indicated the least agreement on peer and delayed feedback types. The resulting information may further broaden teachers' insights into designing a learning environment congruent with students' perspectives, eventually leading to more efficient learning outcomes.

Keywords: Corrective feedback, error, error correction**,** interpreting.

Öz

Sözlü çevirinin etkili bir iletişim aracı olarak önemi düşünüldüğünde, nihayetinde daha doğru çeviriler oluşturulmasını sağlayabilen sistematik hata düzeltme uygulamalarının kritik rolü yadsınamaz. Fakat, geri bildirim mekanizmasını bilhassa sözlü çevirmen eğitimi alanında ele alan araştırma sayısı ilgili alan-yazında oldukça azdır. Bu bağlamda, karma yöntemli bir araştırma tasarımına dayanan bu çalışma, sözlü çevirmen adaylarının gözünden, hata geribildirim sürecinin çok boyutlu özelliklerine dair algıları ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Nicel veriler, Mütercim-Tercümanlık bölümünde öğrenim gören toplam 102 lisans düzeyinden öğrencinin katılımıyla elde edilmiştir. Verilerin analizi sürecinde, ilk olarak Temel Bileşenler Analizi yapılmıştır ve düzeltici hata geri bildirimi konusunda 7 alt boyut

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Mütercim ve Tercümanlık Bölümü, Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, e-posta: sbalaman@cumhuriyet.edu.tr, ORCID: 0009-0004-2390-7323.

elde edilmiştir. Nitel veri ise, 10 öğrencinin katılımıyla yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşmeler şeklinde toplanmıştır. Bu iki yöntemle elde edilen bulgular, katılımcıların performanslarına ilişkin geri bildirim alma konusunda olumlu görüşe sahip olduklarını ortaya koymuştur. Dikkat çekici bir şekilde, katılımcıların çoğu, açık geri bildirim türü konusunda ve tüm hata türlerine yönelik olarak düzeltici geri bildirim alma noktasında en fazla olumlu görüş bildirirken, akran geri bildirimi ve gecikmeli geri bildirim türleri konusunda en az olumlu katılım göstermiştir. Ortaya çıkan bilgiler, öğrencilerin bakış açılarıyla uyumlu bir öğrenme ortamı tasarlama konusunda öğretmenlerin görüşlerini daha da genişletebilecek ve sonuçta daha verimli öğrenme sonuçlarına yol açacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Düzeltici geribildirim, hata, hata düzeltme, sözlü çeviri.

1. Introduction

Through accepting the pivotal role of interpreters as linguistic intermediaries in transmitting a message between the groups in the international arena, conference interpreting manifested in a few modes (Setton & Dawrant, 2016a), has received a growing emphasis as a research avenue for the last decades (Abdel-Latif, 2020). As confirmed in much of the previous research, it is fraught with certainty that spoken-language interpreting is a challenging skill to acquire (Setton & Dawrant, 2016b), because as a multifaceted task, this profession inevitably entails the mastery of speaking and communication skills in both source and target languages (Setton & Dawrant, 2016a), alongside operating various strategies such as memorizing, paraphrasing, or summarization, to name a few (Motta, 2011). Therefore, committing errors seems an unavoidable situation for interpreting trainees (Mirzaee & Razavi, 2021), who undergo layered processes and engage in numerous concomitant sub-tasks by taking advantage of different techniques and actions, simultaneously orchestrated to yield a rendition within a short period (Motta, 2011).

In line with this, there is ample consensus that feedback provision is a critical component of the interpreter training (Behr, 2015; Domínguez-Araújo, 2019; Lee, 2018), yet it tends to be neglected as a research target. Despite a bulk of earlier studies that accumulate on analysing error correction (EC) across a range of language learning contexts (e.g., Ellis, 2009; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Ha, Murray, & Riazi, 2021; Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013; Zhu & Wang, 2019), far less is known in the interpreting field. This points out a need for rigorous research which addresses corrective feedback (CF) in the interpreting framework where a two-way language process is involved (Abdel-Latif, 2020). In response to this gap, this mixed-method study sets out to analyse student-interpreters' reflections on the feedback component for its fuller and more precise description, particularly within interpreting. The delineation of learners' perspectives on various axes of the EC mechanism will possibly demonstrate the in/congruence between their expectations and the prevalent CF implementations in class, ultimately resulting in better applications of the feedback tool in the interpreting domain.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Corrective Feedback (CF) and Factors Affecting its Impact

Adams, Nuevo, and Egi broadly define CF as "an interlocutor's reaction to a learner's non-target-like utterance and is a source of negative evidence for the learner" (2011, p. 42). Despite the unanimity regarding the criticality of CF in learning echoed in different research studies (e.g., Domínguez-Araújo, 2019; Ellis, 2009; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Lyster et al., 2013), its potency hinges upon a number of dynamics (Domínguez-Araújo, 2019; Lee, 2018). The internal dichotomy of these elements covers learner differences such as proficiency (Yang, 2016), age (Lyster & Saito, 2010), affective points (Ha et al., 2021), and learners' beliefs about CF (Zhu & Wang, 2019). This line of research, notably in

language acquisition, confirms that the efficacy of feedback is inextricably relied on such individual variables.

External factors fall into a category where feedback-pertinent facets such as feedback types, its timing or source, and error categories to be dealt with are addressed (Ellis, 2009). Relevant to this external schema, the theoretical and practical underpinning of the previous research is mostly guided by Hendrickson's (1978, p. 389) scrutiny of the CF process in terms of five framing questions regarding whether and which errors to correct, as well as when, whom and how to correct them (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In this section of the paper, these critical topics will be delved into thoroughly, aligned with the key aspects presented by Hendrickson (1978) questioning the CF implementations, further addressed by other researchers such as Ellis (2009) and Zhu and Wang (2019).

This first prominent issue in Hendrickson's (1978, p. 389) questions, i.e., whether to correct errors or not, has gained much ground in the relevant literature. Insofar, it has been well evidenced in various instructional settings, particularly in language acquisition that CF is unquestionably more beneficial than no CF (Lyster et al., 2013). In this vein, the interpreting domain is not the exception to the trend (Lee, 2018) in that if it is compatible with the objectives, trustworthy, and constructive by valuing both the process and the end-product of the performance (Motta, 2011, p. 37), the provision of feedback is deemed as central to the student-centred interpreting process (Domínguez-Araújo, 2019). Lee (2018) and Domínguez-Araújo (2019) conclude that CF is a vital constituent of interpreting pedagogy since it not only spots the problems in a performance, but also offers alternative solutions for overcoming them.

Another issue about the CF is based on whether its timing is of any value for the process (Hendrickson, 1978, p. 389). Feedback in interpreting can be generated synchronously or asynchronously. The synchronous feedback is provided during the trainee's performance in a live interpreting practice or right after the interpreting turn. Conversely, the asynchronous feedback is not performed simultaneously with the interpreting activity, but comprises retrospective evaluations generated outside class in another period after the interpreting performance is over. The trainer generally observes the recorded outputs and gives feedback afterwards in person or electronically (Brimhall, 2022). In line with the dichotomy in feedback timing, Domínguez-Araújo notes that interpreting students generally favours the immediacy of feedback rather than the delayed counterpart (2019).

Recognizing the importance of EC and its timing initiates the mapping of which error patterns distorting the interpreting quality should be prioritized or ignored, depending on the layout by Hendrickson (1978, p. 390). Historically, the concept of error in interpreting was synchronized with deviations in accuracy, observable in omissions, substitutions, and additions (Barik, 1971). Then, the quality standardization of renditions has grounded on a broader spectrum that addresses different items, which range "from lexico-semantic core to socio-pragmatic sphere of interaction" (Pöchhacker, 2001, p. 413). In this sense, along with equivalence, congruence, and correspondence, pragmatic issues are also underlined within the hierarchical layers of interpreting (Kopczyński, 1994). But in any conceptualization, meaning-destructive errors are considered as essential while the others such as delivery problems are regarded as less serious (Bartłomiejczyk, 2010; Moser-Mercer, 2005). Likewise, sense consistency in the interpreting end-product, perceived as the most severe error pattern if lacking, is accepted as the core of the interpreting quality and similarly, the central parameter of the assessment criteria on many occasions (e.g., Peng, 2006). From a more didactic stance, it can be stated that the educators' own understanding of what constitutes an error or its severity inextricably

predicts their viewpoints on the quality of the interpreting and formulations of the relevant assessment criteria, suggestive of a triadic interplay between these three foci (Behr, 2015). In this regard, giving constructive feedback, as to the diverse attributes of the rendition, compatible with the endorsed interpreting quality ideals and the relevant assessment points, has been emphasized to achieve performance excellence (Peng, 2006).

Another contentious issue concerning CF relies on how it is offered (Hendrickson, 1978, p. 392). Within this scope, the main classification dwells on whether the feedback is generated in verbal or written mode. Oral CF is generally delivered through implicit and/or explicit feedback strategies (Ellis, 2009). In the first modelling, an obvious and direct feedback is not given for the erroneous usage; however, in the explicit feedback approach, a clear and noticeable correction is made (Ellis et al., 2006, pp. 340-341). Within the continuum of the implicit and explicit feedback schemata, oral CF patterns take either form of two categorization schemes, i.e., "input-providing" and "output-prompting" feedback types (Ellis, 2009, p. 8). The former refers to recasts and explicit corrections. In contrast, the latter is based on providing prompts, such as elicitations or clarification requests that guide the learners to construct the correct form of the erroneous response by themselves (Adams et al., 2011, p. 44). In the interpreter training, CF is largely provided verbally, whether it be in the implicit or explicit endpoint within the continuum, even though there have been a few attempts mapping out the feedback grids to yield detailed and efficient feedback for the trainees' renditions in the written mode (e.g., Peng, 2006; Schjoldager, 1996).

The source of feedback is the final issue researched within the scope of the EC (Hendrickson, 1978, p. 395). Feedback can be elicited by a trainer, a peer or the self (Holewik, 2021; Lee, 2018). Given its efficiency and practicality, teacher feedback is undoubtedly accepted as the main source of feedback in interpreting (Holewik, 2021; Lee, 2018). However, upon the departure from the product-oriented assessment prioritizing the mastery of the end-product, towards the process-based approach, which identifies the primacy of certain tactics and strategies as well as learner affective dimensions in impacting the performance outcome, alternative feedback models have received relative attention (Brimhall, 2022). Grounded in the tenets of student-centred learning which sees the assessment process as a learning act, one such modelling is self-assessment (Li, 2018, p. 49), where the interpreters give feedback on their own performances against the agreed criteria. It is confirmed that self-assessment benefits the interpreting-trainees in some ways, such as promoting active involvement in the learning (Holewik, 2021), cultivating self-regulation, self-reflection (Li, 2018), and covering deeply the instructional aims and expectations for which they are guided (Lee, 2005). Peer-feedback is also accepted as a viable methodology with its potential for incorporation into process-oriented interpreting classes. To date, it has been well evidenced that this type of feedback enables learners to internalize the role of the trainer, to tailor their output to the required evaluation criteria by gaining heightened awareness about the target elements in the assessment (Fowler, 2007), and to enhance their metacognitive skills (Lee, 2018). In sum, these two student-conducted feedback types are worth in pursuing autonomy and reflective thinking (Fowler, 2007; Holewik, 2021).

To conclude, depending on Hendrickson's (1978) ground-breaking scrutiny of the CF process, it can be noted that feedback-generation is a complicated process driven by various elements (Domínguez-Araújo, 2019; Lyster et al., 2013). To ensure the operation of the constructive feedback, it is worthwhile to conduct studies probing the CF implementations through its mediating dynamics.

In this sense, Balaman (2021) reviewed the previous research conducted in the interpreter training with a specific reference to the assessment and feedback issue. In the research, the vital components of renditions were reviewed and alternative assessment techniques were elaborated depending on the empirical findings obtained in different educational contexts in light of the earlier literature. In the Turkish context, the design of assessment rubrics to rate the interpreting outputs was also addressed in a few studies. For example, Aytaş and Köktürk (2021) conducted a study which presented a sample exam, notably targeting interpreter candidates. In this sense, a specific scoring rubric was formulated to measure the interpreting performances. This rubric was a four-point measurement tool, composed of seven different dimensions related to interpreting performances. The validity and reliability scores were obtained, confirming the psychometric qualities of the tool. Doğan, Arumi-Ribas, and Mora-Rubio (2009) also implemented a series of pilot studies where three tools were presented to evaluate metacognitive orientations in interpreting. Out of these tools, the self-assessment sheet was intended for presenting certain parameters operating in the metacognitive framework, structured through think-aloud procedures and retrospective interviews performed with 25 interpreting students at Hacettepe University. This inventory can facilitate reflectivity by one's specifying strong and weak sides of own interpreting practices, in a self-assessment format through inner speech. Durukan (2018) also presented a measurement tool for consecutive interpretation performances, addressing different sub-components of renditions in an analytical evaluation scale format. In sum, these three rubrics mentioned above can be utilized effectively for rating interpreting performances in formal and in-class assessment procedures.

In the Turkish setting, interpreter trainers' opinions were also consulted in terms of current in-class approaches and implementations in Bayraktar-Özer's PhD dissertation (2022). The research was conducted with 26 participants working at universities, by providing extensive data from various standpoints adopted in interpreter training classes. In the findings, it was revealed that one-to-one feedback was employed commonly for customizing the learning process. In the results, it was also noted that the product-oriented assessment type was adopted more frequently than its counterpart, i.e., the process-oriented evaluation approach when correcting errors. This study added a lot to the literature by addressing how the feedback issue is being handled in interpreting classes from different aspects. However, students' reflections on prevalent EC applications in order to meet their needs and expectations can also yield important contributions to the assessment and feedback issue in the interpreter training domain.

In this vein, in the international platform, Lee (2018) elaborated feedback practices in an interpreting post-graduate setting by noting participants' positive reflections on various types of feedback and their respective experiences (pp. 166-167). Similarly, in three post-graduate interpreting programs, Domínguez-Araújo (2019) asked both trainers and trainees to report on their reflections regarding the CF implementations. The researcher concluded that as confirmed in both participating groups despite their divergent ideas in many aspects of the feedback tool, CF needs to be provided in "honest, concise and meaningful" ways (Domínguez-Araújo, 2019, p. 135). Notably, these studies yield insightful findings on the underlying feedback mechanism employed in the interpreting pedagogy, by including trainees' voices as to the main functions of feedback to fine-tune the correction approaches. The resulting information from these studies might enable trainers to avoid broad generalizations that assume learners perceive CF in the same way that they intend to (See, Domínguez-Araújo, 2019; Lee, 2018). However, more empirical research which exclusively addresses undergraduate-level students is needed. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, this current research will be the first of its kind

in the Turkish setting, by consulting students' ideas on this critical issue. Therefore, this study, directed by the Research Question (RQ) below, might contribute a lot to the existing literature in this vein:

RQ: What are the interpreting students' viewpoints regarding feedback implementations within interpreting?

3. Methodology

This section presents information about the participants of the current study and an overview of how data were collected, which instruments were utilized and the data analysis procedures.

3.1. Participants

This research was conducted in a four-year Translation and Interpreting Department at a Turkish university, in the spring term of the 2021-2022 academic year. The quantitative data were gathered from a questionnaire administered to a group of undergraduate-level students. In total, 102 students completed the instrument. The demographics of the participants are shown below:

Table 1. Participants' demographic profiles

Demographic information	Percentage	Frequency
Gender		
Male	40.2%	41
Female	59.8%	61
Age		
18-21	28.4%	29
22-25	67.6%	69
26-30	1%	1
30+	2.9%	3
Level		
2nd year	44.1	45
3rd year	29.4	30
4th year	26.5	27

This department offers a multilingual program where students are exposed to the theoretical and practical applications of translation and interpreting courses provided in English and French, each of which is from and/or into the direction of Turkish language. From the second year onwards, students in the department are expected to enrol in two interpreting courses given in the two language pairs in each academic term. These courses are given in the compulsory status at this department. As illustrated in Table 2, when this study was conducted, students at each level were registered in the following courses:

Table 2. Interpreting courses taken by the participants

Level	The name of the course/s	Direction of interpreting
Second-year	Two Sight Translation Courses	Turkish-to-English and Turkish-to-French
Third-year	Two Consecutive Interpreting Courses	Turkish-to-English and Turkish-to-French
Fourth-year	Two Simultaneous Interpreting Courses	Turkish-to-English and Turkish-to-French

Before this study, the participants at each level had already completed one semester of training in the required courses shown above in the reverse directionality of interpreting in each language pair. Although the input-processing systems are different in these three interpreting types, the end-product in each mode is ultimately based on delivering an oral translation of an input (Setton & Dawrant, 2016a). Therefore, this study has addressed the EC mechanism in these three interpreting modes, irrespective of variation in their implementations and textual characteristics.

In this research, another participant group is the interviewees. The interviews were conducted with ten students from the sample group who had responded to the questionnaire. These interviewees were from the second-year (n = 3), the third-year (n = 4), and the fourth-year (n = 3) students in the department. The selection of the interviewees was based on the convenience sampling (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012).

3.2. Instruments

The instruments of this study include two different data-collection tools. The first instrument is a 36-item questionnaire, originally designed and validated by Zhu and Wang (2019) for assessing learners' beliefs about CF implementations in the English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) setting, alongside three demographic information questions asking participants' gender, age, and class. This tool is composed of 6-point Likert scale items, ranging from 1 *(Strongly Disagree)* to 6 *(Strongly Agree)*. As Zhu and Wang's (2019) questionnaire aimed at addressing EFL settings, the wording of its items was slightly changed in a way that better suits the target of this current study, i.e., the interpreting context.

The items in Zhu and Wang's (2019, pp. 148-149) scale were translated by the researcher into Turkish. Then, the translated version was reviewed by a foreign language lecturer with a Master's degree in language education. Based on the feedback obtained in this process, the necessary modifications were made by clarifying the ambiguous expressions.

The second instrument is the semi-structured interview protocol guided by the following sources of reference: the headings elaborated in Zhu and Wang's questionnaire (2019, pp. 148-149), along with the main controversial themes regarding the CF mechanism, i.e., whether and which errors to correct, as well as when, whom and how to correct them, addressed by Hendrickson (1978, p. 389), Ellis (2009, p. 4), and Zhu and Wang (2019, pp. 141-143). The researcher of this current study asked seven questions alongside their sub-questions in the interviews.

3.3. Data Collection Procedure

After the ethical approval was officially obtained from the Scientific Research Ethics Committee at the university where the researcher of this study currently works (Document No: E-60263016-050.06.04-168795), the data were gathered in two phases. In the first phase, a questionnaire (Zhu & Wang, 2019), with three additional demographic profile questions, was administered to the participants via the Google Forms application. This instrument was conducted in Turkish to prevent any misunderstanding of the items. A consent form was attached on the first page of the tool, indicating the aim and the nature of the research as well as ensuring anonymity, confidentiality, and voluntariness. In total, 102 students from three levels voluntarily responded to the instrument.

In the second phase of the research, ten students who had completed the questionnaire were invited to participate in the semi-structured interviews. The

researcher carried out the interviews after each interviewee gave the written consent to take part in. Each interview was conducted individually and audio recorded. The interviews were held in Turkish to avoid any comprehension problems and later, the researcher translated the exemplary quotes reported in the study into English.

3.4. Data Analysis

The survey data were analysed using the IBM Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) program, Version 25. Firstly, the Principal Components Analysis (PCA) was performed to reduce the data into more latent constructs represented in the 36 items in the questionnaire. The derived factors were labelled as the sub-scales of the instrument. Then, the descriptive statistics were calculated to obtain an overall score of the students' views on CF, as well as the averages of the sub-components extracted via the PCA. The data gathered from the follow-up semi-structured interviews were transcribed verbatim and subjected to thematic analysis. Quotations were coded and the similar patterns in the responses were classified under each interview question.

4. Findings

4.1. Principal Components Analysis (PCA)

The PCA with Varimax rotation was run on the 36-question scale, to validate the instrument. The recommendation for the adequacy of the sample size to obtain reliable results with the PCA is a minimum of 100 cases (Gorsuch, 1983; Kline, 1994), indicating that the number of the participants in this current research met this criterion in this sense. The suitability of the PCA was checked before further analyses were conducted through a set of guidance. In this sense, the overall Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure was assessed as 0.76 for the preliminary scale, confirming that the KMO score was acceptable, as suggested by Kaiser (1974). Additionally, Bartlett's test of sphericity was found to be statistically significant ($p < .0005$), indicating that the data could be factorized.

The PCA initially extracted ten components with eigenvalues greater than one, suppressing coefficients greater than 0.50. The data were checked in terms of cross-loadings. The PCA was computed a few times in the analyses, dropping the cross-loaders until resulting in a simple factor structure (Costello & Osborne, 2005). As such, four cross-factor loading variables were removed in several iterations. In addition, three items out of the remaining 32 variables did not load on any factors; therefore, they were also excluded from the study in different computations. Following their removal, it was observed that one factor had only one item and one factor with two-item loadings did not represent a unified scale dimension. Therefore, these three items were also removed from the study. The factor analysis was rerun with their elimination and seven factors with 26 items were retained for the further analysis of the survey data. The scree plot check and the interpretability of the factors also confirmed the retention of the seven components revealed. The overall KMO score was recalculated and found to be 0.77 for the 26-item finalized version of the scale, displaying that the score was acceptable in line with Kaiser's (1974) recommendation. Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant ($p < .0005$). The seven components accounted for 26.1%, 9.6%, 8.1%, 6.6%, 5.4%, 5.0%, and 4.7%, of the total variance, respectively. Overall, the seven-factor solution accounted for 65.8% of the total variance.

As for the reliability measures, it was found that the 26-item instrument met satisfactory reliability Cronbach alpha score (.818). The reliability measurements of seven factors ranged between .614 and .852. Although the recommended value for the internal consistency is .70 (Kline, 2005; Nunnally, 1978), the coefficient is still acceptable for the

exploratory research when exceeding the .60 alpha score (Robinson, Shaver, Wrightsman, 1991). Therefore, it can be concluded that this instrument ensured the basic psychometric qualities.

The labels of factors extracted in this research were highly guided by the conceptualizations of components derived in the study by Zhu and Wang (2019). The third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh components were labelled the same as the relevant clusters in Zhu and Wang's (2019) research. Partly inspired by the label of the first cluster in the research by Zhu and Wang (2019, p. 148), in this current research, the first factor which had seven items was labelled *Attitudes toward teacher-generated explicit CF* because this cluster mainly contained variables about learners' willingness to receive explicit CF in interpreting, generated by the teacher. In this component, although some items did not specifically mention the explicit correction method, it is thought that stating a desire for the teacher's direct correction of an erroneous utterance, rather than waiting for intuitively deducing it from the covert evidence indicates a degree of explicitness. Therefore, this component was labelled in this way. The second factor was named *Error types to be corrected*, because the items in this component seem to share a similar focus, by identifying some error types for which students are willing to receive feedback. The third factor labelled "*Uptake"* had loadings from the items mainly based on "learners' reaction shortly after error correction was provided" (Zhu & Wang, 2019, p. 147). The fourth factor was labelled "*Peer CF"* because it obtained three items revolving around the idea of learners' positive reflections on taking feedback from their peers (Zhu & Wang, 2019, p. 147). The fifth factor was named "*Gravity of errors"* since it was composed of three items, all of which tend to reflect "learners' CF attitudes irrespective of the seriousness of errors" (Zhu & Wang, 2019, p. 149). The sixth factor was labelled as "*Output-prompting CF"* (Zhu & Wang, 2019, p. 147), as it included three items about learners' positive views on certain corrective strategies guiding learners to elicit corrections by themselves (Ellis, 2009). The seventh factor contained two items based on the timing of feedback; therefore, it was labelled "*CF timing"* (Zhu & Wang, 2019, p. 147). These seven factors were accepted as the subscales of the tool and formed the basis for the further statistical analysis of the survey data.

4.2. Learners' Viewpoints on CF Implementations in Interpreting

4.2.1. Quantitative Data

The descriptive statistics were calculated in the survey data to explore participants' reflections on CF practices, for an overall score of the questionnaire and for the sub-scales. The interpreting of the averages was based on the cut-off points determined according to a framework that postulates that each interval space of six points is equal and spans .82, except for one range (Pimentel, 2019, p. 189). The cut-offs and their descriptions are shown below:

Table 3. Ranges and their meanings (Adapted from Pimentel, 2019, p. 189)

The lowest	The highest	Description
1.00	1.82	Strong disagreement
1.83	2.65	Disagreement
2.66	3.48	Slight disagreement
3.49	4.31	Slight agreement
4.32	5.14	Agreement
5.15	6.00	Strong agreement

In this study, the overall average of the 26-item questionnaire was found to be relatively high (*Mean*= 4.57; *SD*= 0.50). Based on the cut points above (Table 3), this mean

value fell in the *agreement* range, suggesting that the participants were favourably disposed toward CF practices in interpreting. The descriptive computations were also made for the subscales, which were formed on the basis of the extracted factors via the PCA. Table 4 indicates the relevant information as follows:

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of the Subscales

Subscale	Mean	Standard Deviation
Factor 1: Attitudes toward teacher-generated explicit CF	5.22	.63
Factor 2: Error types to be corrected	5.18	.63
Factor 3: Uptake	5.00	.77
Factor 6: Output-prompting CF	4.49	1.04
Factor 5: Gravity of errors	4.32	.97
Factor 4: Peer CF	3.05	1.34
Factor 7: CF timing	2.93	1.37

Table 4 displays that the responses for CF implementations fluctuated from the mean ratings of 2.93 to 5.22 (from *slight disagreement* to *strong agreement* intervals according to cut-points in Table 3). The highest average score (*M*= 5.22, *SD*= .63) was assessed in the *Attitudes toward teacher-generated explicit CF* subscale, which collapsed into the *strong agreement* range (See Table 3), which suggests that students highly endorsed on receiving teacher-generated explicit feedback for their interpreting performances. Following this, the subscale of *Error types to be corrected* obtained the next highest mean score (*M*= 5.18, *SD*= .63). According to the cut-scores above (Table 3), this average also clustered in the *strong agreement* range, which indicates that the participants were positive about receiving CF in certain error types such as vocabulary or grammar errors. Another high score, which was in the *agreement* interval, was also obtained in the *Uptake* scale (*M*= 5.00, *SD*= .77), implying that students reported having positive ideas regarding "the effect of repeating correct forms after CF" (Zhu & Wang, 2019, p. 150). The average score (*M*= 4.49, *SD*= 1.04) calculated in subscale *Output-prompting CF* also corresponded to the *agreement* range (Cut-points in Table 3), demonstrating that students agreed on being guided by certain strategies such as clarification requests to correct their errors by themselves.

Although not as high as the other subscales mentioned above, the subscale of *Gravity of errors* obtained a mean score of 4.32 (*SD*= .97), which collapsed into the *agreement* interval (See Table 3 for ranges). This implies that students were still willing to receive the correction of an error irrespective of its seriousness. The subscales of *Peer CF (M*= 3.05, *SD*= 1.34*)* and *CF timing* (*M*= 2.93, *SD*= 1.37) got the lowest average scores. For the *peer CF* subscale, this low score displays that the students tended to slightly disagree on being corrected by their peers. As for the subscale of *CF timing*, it should be noted that the two items in this scale represent learners' attitudes toward receiving delayed feedback. A low score obtained in this component implies that the students disagreed slightly on receiving delayed feedback for their interpreting performances, indicating their more positive stance for taking immediate CF.

4.2.2. Qualitative Data

Interviews were mainly intended to cross-validate the questionnaire findings by collecting in-depth information about the students' perspectives on CF in interpreting. Firstly, interviewees' general opinions about feedback implementations in their interpreting courses were unearthed by asking whether errors in their renditions should be corrected or not. All of the interviewees were of the opinion that CF should be

conducted for their interpreting performances. By and large, their reasons were associated with the positive impact of feedback on gaining more awareness of the correct version of the error. A sample quotation is below:

> *Student 3:* They (errors) should be definitely corrected […] because others in the class will acquire the erroneous form if the errors are not fixed by the teacher and they (errors) will remain in their minds. But when corrected, maybe s/he will learn the correct version and it will be retained in this way.

However, two students underlined that CF can sometimes lead to stress if it is conducted by interrupting their utterances or after each mistake. Therefore, they suggested the provision of feedback in suitable conditions.

Secondly, the question concerning which errors should be corrected was directed to the interviewees by addressing certain error types such as meaning, grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation errors. As a sub-question, the participants were also asked whether all errors should be corrected or not. A majority of the respondents reported their willingness for the correction of all their errors. The following excerpt typifies such responses:

Student 10: I think all (errors) should be corrected because grammar affects meaning and when meaning is deformed, some misunderstanding can happen. Sometimes with pronunciation errors, a simple word can mean very differently. Therefore, it would be more suitable to fix all errors.

Additionally, some participants tended to prioritize meaning-changing errors in receiving feedback. However, three of such students insisted that the correction of all errors should be the first option. They furthered that meaning-based errors should be given more importance, if this is not be the case. All in all, it is evident that for a majority of the students, feedback targeting all errors is a plausible option. However, deviation from the meaning seems another essential point to be paid attention to in interpreting.

The third interview question drew participants' reflections on the correct timing of CF, along with three alternatives, i.e., after the relevant activity, to the end of the class, or after the class. At this point, all interviewees unanimously indicated a strong agreement on the immediate feedback to be given right after the related task. A sample response is below:

> *Student 9:* When my performance is over, and you correct me, it becomes more memorable. Because when you correct it (the error) at the end of the class, I may not remember what I have said exactly. So, it should be corrected immediately.

Indeed, most of the interviewees' non-preference for the delayed feedback was tied to its likelihood that leads them to forget the problematic point in the utterance. Another pattern drawn from their responses was based on the positive associations between the immediate feedback and long-lasting learning.

The fourth interview question aimed to gather students' viewpoints about receiving explicit or implicit correction types. In this sense, students were guided through certain examples for the sake of clarity. Except for one student who advocated the exposure to the implicit correction method, a vast majority of the participants (9/10) favoured explicit correction methods. For example:

> *Student 4:* I definitely think that they should not be corrected implicitly. The teacher should explicitly state what the error is. It both contributes to the student's learning and enables others in class to learn (the correct form) simultaneously.

The fifth question aimed to gather participants' views about the error corrector. The students were asked whether they would prefer teacher or peer feedback in interpreting classes. Except for one participant who was positive for the application of both feedback types, nine interviewees endorsed on the efficacy of teacher-led feedback practices rather than the counterpart. For example:

> *Student 1:* It depends on the context. But it would be better to be corrected by a professional. (…) They (classmates) may have missing knowledge and be lacking in teaching methods. They cannot teach to the person who has committed the error well.

A similar pattern underlined in interviewees' beliefs for the value of teacher feedback than peer-feedback was dependent on their peers' lack of knowledge and the potential to lead to incorrect use. Moreover, some students (3/10) reported that being corrected by a peer can sometimes be hurtful for the student who commits an error, if it is not carried out in suitable conditions.

The sixth question asked in the interviews was about learners' ideas about input-providing teacher corrections or output-prompting CF. Three interviewees were positive about the applications of output-prompting feedback types. For example:

> *Student 5:* I think by encouraging and directing students to find the correct form would be more suitable because, in the reverse situation (…), it would not be a permanent correction.

In this vein, one of these three students also stated that their confidence is promoted and that they might add to their knowledge when they find the correct usage. Some students also appreciated that both methods could be applied within a process, from the student-led corrections to teacher-feedback practice. They underlined that firstly, students should be provided some opportunities to correct their own errors, but if it is not possible, the teacher should provide the corrections. There were also others (3/10) who thought that teacher corrections were more helpful. In this sense, one student reported that output-prompting CF might waste time (Student 8). Being asked for correction several times can also be overwhelming (Student 6). As seen, although the general tone of many respondents translates into the utility of output-promoting strategies in interpreting corrections, it seems that few others rigorously supported the application of the counterpart.

The last interview question was meant to determine participants' conclusions regarding the positive or negative impacts of CF on learning, by asking whether receiving feedback is effective or not. Unanimously, all interviewees positively approached being corrected. A sample excerpt is below:

> *Student 6:* It is necessary to overcome our incorrect uses in interpreting. We learn the correct form, and try to use this correct version next time.

In sum, as alluded to above, under the right circumstances, giving feedback proves to be an efficient method that contributes a lot to the students' learning process.

5. Discussion

This study, through the PCA, revealed seven underlying components of the CF mechanism, which corroborate with the corresponding themes in the relevant literature, specifically in Zhu and Wang's (2019) study. In this sense, it can be noted that the learners' belief system regarding the CF is multidimensional, characterized by different interacting elements (Lee, 2018).

Overall, the findings showed that the participants exhibited a high level of approval for receiving feedback. It is an important part of the interpreting process, potentially eliminating errors by gaining more awareness of the erroneous utterances. This result lends support for the previous research (e.g., Domínguez-Araújo, 2019, Lee, 2018) showing that the students had excessively favourable opinions of the CF implementations in interpreting. More notably, as revealed in the quantitative and qualitative analyses, students indicated the highest agreement on the efficacy of the explicit feedback type, which mainly takes two forms, i.e., metalinguistic explanation and explicit correction (Ellis et al., 2006). This finding is aligned with the earlier studies in language learning settings (e.g., Ha et al., 2021; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). The plausible explanation for the highest rate of this feedback type can be that explicit feedback is "straightforward, easy to understand" (Ha et al., 2021, p. 252), and unambiguous. As suggested in the interviews, students may not easily notice the corrected form of an error if it is not overtly stated. Another possible reason can be associated with the washback effect of the interpreting evaluation frameworks worldwide, where the product-oriented assessment perspective is largely adopted. However, the process-based evaluation is also critical in such performance-based practices. In the former, i.e., the product-oriented approach, the measurement is generally dependent on only the final output (Iglesias Fernández, 2011), where the accuracy element is invariably seen as the core constituent of the quality (Peng, 2006; Pöchhacker, 2001), often overlooking the primacy of the whole learn-to-interpret process (Iglesias Fernández, 2011). In this respect, because ensuring accuracy in renditions will eventually help them score high in the assessment, the participants might have shown a solid eagerness to receive feedback explicitly.

This possible explanation may also be supported by most of the learners' positive reflections in the interviews on receiving feedback for all their interpreting errors. Due to the crucial role of the accuracy element in measuring interpreting outputs (Peng, 2006; Pöchhacker, 2001), the interviewees might have indicated a strong agreement on the correction targeting all types of errors, irrespective of their gravity. This finding is in line with the results of the earlier research (e.g., Ha & Nguyen, 2021; Katayama, 2007; Zhu & Wang, 2019), which showed that students in different learning contexts regarded all errors, including less serious ones, as worthy of correction.

Regarding the reflections on the output-prompting feedback types, it seems that some students tended to welcome this type of feedback, congruent with the previous research (e.g., Ha et al., 2021; Zhang & Wang, 2019). Their positive approach can be attributed to its role in leading to permanent learning with more gains in the long run, as hypothesized in the output theory by Swain (1985). Interestingly, when thought the highest agreement level is in the teacher-generated explicit feedback type (Factor 1), it may not be expected to receive an approval for this feedback model. However, it is underlined in some of the interviews that even though the participants were willing to be given opportunities for self-repair, when possible, they regard that the efficacy of the teacher correction should not be denied as the ultimate source of feedback.

In the same line, the students were slightly indisposed towards the peer feedback type, as evidenced in the descriptive statistics and interview comments. This result matches the findings of some earlier studies (e.g., Ha & Nguyen, 2021; Lee, 2018; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014), confirming that peer feedback is not as favourable as the teacher feedback type, although there exist some other research revealing that peer feedback is appreciated as an effective and reliable assessment modelling (e.g., Fowler, 2007; Lee, 2017, 2019). In this sense, the slight disagreement score rated in this study can be attributed to the idea that students might not completely trust their peers' linguistic competence (See,

Mahvelati, 2021). Accordingly, they might have thought that they could be misguided by their peers' feedback. Also, in contrast to the teacher's constructive feedback addressing the big picture of the performance and offering remedies to the problems, students' inclination toward overrating the details and micro-level accuracy elements might account for the participants' less credence to the peer feedback (Lee, 2018). As revealed by Bayraktar-Özer (2022), interpreter trainers do not frequently provide the rating criteria for students that will enable them to evaluate the outputs in peer-assessment sessions. As such, trainees might give less credible feedback to their peers' performances, possibly impacting their overall perception of the potential of peer feedback implementations in the negative direction. As an additional note, the students in this current study did not have enough experience in receiving or sending feedback to each other for their renditions, which might eventually affect their evaluation regarding the value of the peer feedback for the interpreting classrooms adversely. All in all, considering that peer feedback is the hallmark of student-centred instruction, by promoting learning in collaboration (Mahvelati, 2021), it seems critical to train students on how to give proper feedback for their peers' performances by applying an analytical evaluation scale. In this sense, trainers should create an environment where learners can rigorously engage in peer feedback activities, as complementary to the feedback given by the teacher, i.e., the major corrector of errors (Lee, 2018).

Another strand of this research is based on the ideal feedback timing according to students' evaluations. Quantitative and qualitative findings displayed that the participants preferred immediate feedback over the delayed feedback method. This finding supports those of the earlier research conducted in the language instruction settings (e.g., Ha et al., 2021; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014; Zhu & Wang, 2019) and in the interpreting contexts (e.g., Domínguez-Araújo, 2019; Setton & Dawrant, 2016b). The possible reason is that students can possibly forget their erroneous utterances when feedback is not given right after the activity is completed, which might negatively impact the efficiency of the feedback (Domínguez-Araújo, 2019).

6. Conclusion

This research has scrutinized the key aspects of the feedback component from the students' lens, which might ultimately generate more constructive feedback, compatible with their needs and expectations. The findings revealed that most of the participants favoured receiving feedback for the errors in their renditions. Specifically, the majority of the participants reported that CF should be performed in the explicit correction type and should address all error types in the outputs, irrespective of their severity. Another notable result is that the participants indicated the least endorsement on the delayed feedback and peer feedback types. In this sense, the findings might broaden the insights into the multidimensional nature of the error-correction mechanism within the interpreting field, situated in a complex array of feedback dynamics operating throughout the whole process (Domínguez-Araújo, 2019; Lee, 2018). In sum, the resulting information might enable teachers in this field to make more informed decisions about designing learning environments which can take optimum advantage of the feedback tool, admitted as the pillar of performance-based activities (Behr, 2015; Ellis, 2009).

However, this study is not without limitations, despite the value of displaying the mediating elements in the interpreting process. Firstly, the small sample size may not have captured all factors interacting in the feedback construct. Therefore, a line of future research can be conducted with more participants across different instructional contexts, which might help to generalize the findings more reliably. Moreover, although various individual characteristics might differentially affect learners' opinions on the CF, this

issue is not dealt with in the analyses of this study. To this end, a new study can be conducted to illustrate whether certain individual differences, such as the students' proficiency level, impact the results. Lastly, because this study has relied on the findings derived from a questionnaire and interviews performed with a small number of the students, a long-term quasi-experimental study aiming to see how different axes of the feedback construct influence its efficacy can yield more reliable outcomes.

References

Abdel-Latif, M. M. M. (2020). *Translator and Interpreter Education Research: Areas, Methods and Trends*. Singapore: Springer.

Adams, R., Nuevo, A. M., & Egi, T. (2011). Explicit and Implicit Feedback, Modified Output, and SLA: Does Explicit and Implicit Feedback Promote Learning and Learner-Learner interactions? *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(s1), 42–63.

Aytaş, G., & Köktürk, Ş. (2021). Sözlü Çevirmenliğe İlk Adım: SÖBES [The First Pace Towards Interpretering: SOBES]. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching, 9*(1), 79-98.

Balaman, S. (2021). A Comprehensive Review of Systematic Assessment Techniques in Interpreting. *Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi Uluslararası Filoloji Ve Çeviribilim Dergisi [Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University International Philology and Translation Studies]*, 3(1), 23-45.

Barik, H. C. (1971). A Description of Various Types of Omissions, Additions and Errors of Translation Encountered in Simultaneous Interpreting. *Meta, 16*(4), 199-210.

Bartłomiejczyk, M. (2010). Effects of Short Intensive Practice on Interpreter Trainees' Performance. In D. Gile, G. Hansen & N. Pokorn (Eds.), *Why Translation Studies Matters*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 183–194.

Bayraktar-Özer, Ö. (2022). *Current Pedagogical Tendencies and Practices in Interpreter Training: A Study on Turkey (Unpublished PhD Dissertation)*. Ankara: Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University.

Behr, M. (2015). How to Back students- Quality, Assessment & Feedback. In D. Andres & M. Behr (Eds), *To Know How to Suggest…: Approaches to Teaching Conference Interpreting*, Berlin: Frank & Timme, 201-217.

Brimhall, A. R. (2022). *Student Perspectives on Feedback in a Spanish Medical Interpreting Course (*Unpublished Master's Thesis). Brigham Young University, the USA.

Costello, A. B. & Osborne, J. (2005). Best Practices in Exploratory Factor Analysis: Four Recommendations for Getting the Most from Your Analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 10*(7), 1-9.

Doğan, A., Arumí-Ribas, M. & Mora-Rubio, B. (2009). Metacognitive Tools in Interpreting Training: A Pilot Study. *Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty of Letters, 26*(1), 69-84.

Domínguez-Araújo, L. (2019). Feedback in Conference Interpreter Education: Perspectives of Trainers and Trainees. *Interpreting, 21*(1), 135-150.

Dörnyei, Z. & Csizér, K. (2012). How to Design and Analyse Surveys in Second Language Acquisition Research. In A. Mackey, & S. M. Gass (Eds), *Research Methods in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 74-95). Wiley-Blackwell.

Durukan, E. (2018). *Çeviri Öğretimi- Hedef ve Ölçme*. İstanbul: Hiperyayın.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(2), 339-368.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal, 1*(1), 3-18.

Fowler, Y. (2007). Formative Assessment: Using Peer and Self-Assessment in Interpreter Training. In C. Wadensjö, B. E. Dimitrova, & A-L. Nilsson (Eds.), *The Critical Link 4: Professionalisation of Interpreting in the Community,* (pp. 253–262). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Google Forms (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.google.com/forms/about/

Gorsuch, R. L. (1983). *Factor Analysis (2nd Ed.)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ha, X. V., Murray, J. C., & Riazi, A. M. (2021). High School EFL Students' Beliefs about Oral Corrective Feedback: The Role of Gender, Motivation and Extraversion. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 11*(2), 235-264.

Ha, X. V. & Nguyen L. T. (2021). Targets and Sources of Oral Corrective Feedback in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms: Are Students' and Teachers' Beliefs Aligned? *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 697160.

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching: Recent Theory, Research, and Practice. *Modern Language Journal, 62*(8), 387–398.

Holewik, K. (2021). Peer Feedback and Reflective Practice in Public Service Interpreter Training. *Theory and Practice of Second Language Acquisition, 6*(2), 133-159.

IBM Corporation (2017). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows (Version 25.0) [Computer software]. Armonk, NY: IBM Corporation.

Iglesias Fernández, E. (2011). Under Examination Do All Interpreting Examiners Use the Same Criteria? *The Linguist, 50*(2), 12-13.

Kaiser, H. F. (1974) An Index of Factorial Simplicity. *Psychometrika, 39*, 31–36.

Katayama, A. (2007) Students' Perceptions of Oral Error Correction. *Japanese Language and Literature, 41*(1), 61–92.

Kline, P. (1994). *An Easy Guide to Factor Analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modelling* (2nd ed.). New York: Guildford.

Kopczyński, A. (1994). Quality in Conference Interpreting: Some Pragmatic Problems. Quality in Conference Interpreting: Some Pragmatic Problems. In M. Snell-Hornby, F. Pöchhacker & K. Kaindl (eds.), *Translation Studies. An Interdiscipline: Selected Papers from the Translation Studies Congress, Vienna, 1992*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, (pp. 189-198).

Lee, Y.-H. (2005). Self-Assessment as an Autonomous Learning Tool in an Interpreting Classroom. *Meta: Translators' Journal, 50*(4).

Lee, S.-B. (2017). University Students' Experience of 'Scale-referenced' Peer Assessment for a Consecutive Interpreting Examination. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 42*(7), 1015–1029.

Lee, J. (2018). Feedback on Feedback: Guiding Student Interpreter Performance. *The International Journal for Translation & Interpreting Research. 10*(1), 152–170.

Lee, S.-B. (2019). Scale-Referenced, Summative Peer Assessment in Undergraduate Interpreter Training: Self-Reflection from an Action Researcher. *Educational Action Research, 27*(2), 152-172.

Li, X. (2018). Self-Assessment as 'Assessment as Learning' in Translator and Interpreter Education: Validity and Washback. *Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 12*(1), 48–67.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(1), 37–66.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral Feedback in Classroom SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 265-302.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in Second Language Classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46*(1), 1-40.

Mahvelati, E. H. (2021). Learners' Perceptions and Performance Under Peer Versus Teacher Corrective Feedback Conditions. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 70*, 100995.

Mirzaee, A. & Razavi, M. S. M. (2021). Directionality and Error Typology in English-Persian Simultaneous Interpreting: A Descriptive-Analytic Corpus-Based Study. *New Voices in Translation Studies, 25*, 54-80.

Moser-Mercer, B. (2005). Remote Interpreting: The Crucial Role of Presence. *Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée*, 81, 73–97.

Motta, M. (2011). Facilitating the Novice to Expert Transition in Interpreter Training: A Deliberate Practice Framework Proposal. *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai Philologia, 54*(1), 27-42.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Peng, K.-C. (2006). *The Development of Coherence and Quality of Performance in Conference Interpreter Training* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). University of Leeds, the UK.

Pimentel, J. L. (2019). Some Biases in Likert Scaling Usage and Its Correction. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research, 45*(1), 183-191.

Pöchhacker, F. (2001). Quality Assessment in Conference and Community Interpreting. *Meta: Translators' Journal, 46* (2), 410–425.

Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1991). Criteria for Scale Selection and Evaluation. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes* (pp. 1–16). New York: Academic Press.

Schjoldager, A. (1996). Assessment of Simultaneous Interpreting. In C. Dollerup & V. Appel (Eds.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 3: New horizons*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 187–195.

Setton, R. & Dawrant, A. (2016a). *Conference Interpreting. A Complete Course*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Setton, R. & Dawrant, A. (2016b). *Conference Interpreting. A Trainer's Guide*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in Its Development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA.: Newbury House.

Yang, J. (2016). Learners' Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences in Relation to Their Cultural Background, Proficiency Level and Types of Error. *System, 61*, 75-86.

Zhang, L. J., & Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL Learners' Anxiety Level and Their Beliefs About Corrective Feedback in Oral Communication Classes. *System, 42*, 429-439.

Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English Language Learners' Beliefs About Oral Corrective Feedback at Chinese Universities: A large-scale survey. *Language Awareness, 28*(2), 1–29.