

Emergence of Notions of Expertise: Novice Interpreters' Perception of Interpreting Quality

Gracie Peng

**Centre for Translation Studies
University of Leeds, UK**

Resumen

Tal y como Herbert (1978) y Mackintosh (1999) señalaron, los intérpretes de conferencia nacen, sino se hacen. El incremento del número de escuelas de interpretación por todo el mundo no sólo hace patente la gran demanda de intérpretes cualificados que hay, sino que pone de manifiesto la importancia que tiene la formación para que los intérpretes presten servicio de calidad. A pesar de ello, las investigaciones que se han llevado a cabo en el campo de la interpretación de conferencia se han centrado principalmente en la calidad aplicada a situaciones profesionales (Buhler, 1986; Kopczynski, 1994; Kurz, 1993; Mose 1996), mientras que se ha ahondado muy poco en la aplicación de criterios de calidad con fines pedagógicos (Gile, 2001). En particular, la percepción de los intérpretes principiantes sobre lo que aporta calidad a sus interpretaciones es aún un campo sin explorar. Esta ponencia pretende reflejar cómo conciben y describen estos intérpretes lo que es una "buena o mala" interpretación en diferentes momentos de su proceso de aprendizaje y cómo esta percepción va evolucionando a medida que su formación avanza. Los datos se recopilaban a partir de cuestionarios abiertos, o con una cierta estructura, rellenos por un grupo de aprendices de intérprete con diferentes combinaciones de lenguas a nivel de posgraduados. La recopilación de datos se realizó en tres ocasiones, correspondientes a fases distintas del período de formación: antes de que éste comenzase (semana 0) y, posteriormente, dos veces durante dicho período (semanas 5 y 10), para determinar cómo varía la percepción inicial de los estudiantes principiantes acerca de la calidad a medida que van formándose. Asimismo, esta ponencia se propone presentar una valoración cualitativa de los resultados de dicho estudio, teniendo en cuenta factores tales como el bagaje inicial del estudiante, su motivación y los objetivos que pretende conseguir al participar en este programa. Por último, pero no por ello menos importante, pretende dar indicaciones para llevar a cabo futuras investigaciones sobre las normas de calidad que rigen la formación de los intérpretes, de tal manera que los aprendices se conviertan en profesionales reflexivos.

1 Introduction

1.1. Significance and Purpose of Interpreter training

The rapid growth of number of interpreting schools and programmes for the past decade around the world marks the increasing need for professional interpreting service.

Professional interpreters, the providers of quality interpreting services, are made not born (Herbert, 1978; Mackintosh, 1999), which also states the significance of training for interpreters. Training interpreters, also in a general sense of higher education, means

preparing people as reflective practitioners for special professional employment in the future (Aktins, Beattie, & Dockrell, 1993). To become a reflective expert, one has to go through a learning cycle including stages of cognition, association and finally autonomy with constant quality practice over time (Anderson, 1995). In training interpreters, there is no exception. At first, it is vital for trainee interpreters to know what interpreting is and what kinds of skills they are to learn for quality performance to come; secondly, they would try to associate their knowledge of interpreting skills with what they can actually perform. Later with constant practice either on their own or with their peers during the training, they will manage to perform well enough to pass the qualification exam to earn their degrees or certificates. They will then enter the profession and start to practice for several years and with their professional experiences and skills acquired over time, they will finally become experts. Moser-Mercer (1997) investigates the skill components of professional interpreters and two other studies explore the many differences between expert and novice interpreters (Ericsson, 2000/01; Moser-Mercer, Frauenfelder, Casado, & Kunzli, 2000). The cognitive stage, when novices are about to acquire understandings of relevant features of an expertise, however, has not received much attention. The development of awareness of quality performance for novice interpreters, consequently, becomes the issue that our project aims to address.

1.2. Significance of learner awareness

Learners' awareness of quality interpreting as well as a shared meta-language to describe interpreting performance are worth investigating. For one thing, they are vital for better interaction between teaching and learning. As Kiraly states (2000), teaching and learning is not a one-way transmission process; it is, however, a 'mutually beneficial process of shared perspectives' - this applies to the training of interpreters as well. Interpreter training has long been trainer-centred, where professional interpreters as trainers serve as the main source of authority and expertise, passing on knowledge and skills to novices. Yet when their comments are too 'technical' with high-level terms such as register, coherence, etc novices do struggle following those comments and would not be able to benefit fully from them. With better awareness of quality issues and attributes concerning quality interpreting performance, novice interpreters would not only develop better understanding of the comments and suggestions from their trainers but also be able to engage in better discussion with the trainers and among themselves. In other words, the interaction between training and learning is thus facilitated.

In addition, the learner awareness in question is important for reflective learning to take place if autonomous learning is to be promoted in the field of interpreter training.

Developing reflective skills is one of the most important learning results for most professional trainings. Without awareness of quality issues, novice interpreters would have nothing as the basis to reflect on their performances. Last but not least, learner awareness plays an important role in facilitating collaborative learning among interpreter trainees. In its significance for one to become a reflective practitioner, learner awareness is the foundation for collaborative learning to come into place. It is a common practice that novice interpreters spend much time practicing with their peers outside class and very often they comment on each others' performances as feedback. It is observed, however, that novices could not benefit much from such practices due to the lack of consensus regarding quality criteria and even of consistency in utilising and understanding criteria attributes. For instance a common opinion like 'you didn't sound very smooth' can be problems of pace, hesitation due to poor understanding of the speech, poor language structure due to grammatical errors, and many other issues.

By looking into the issues of learner awareness in this study, we hope to gain a better understanding of the development of learner awareness for novice interpreters and what training plays in the formation of consensus and a shared meta-language among novices over time.

1.3. Aim

Having understood the significance of novices' awareness of quality and their cognitive development in this regard, we aim to answer three important questions as follows. For one thing, it is essential to uncover what is quality interpreting in the eye of novice interpreters. What they perceive might be very different from what professionals behold, so we need to identify the gap in between. Despite the possible gap between the professional and the novices, we also need to consider whether novices agree or disagree with each other on issues under discussion. Most important of all, we aim to look whether training helps to clarify confusion and to enhance mutual understanding both between trainers and trainee interpreters and among the novices themselves.

2 Literature Review

Interpreting quality has been an important issue attracting much attention over the past decade and many studies have tried to define the elements of quality interpreting from different perspectives. By reviewing most, if not all, major studies conducted in two mainstreams: quality in the professional world (Bühler, 1986; Kahane, 2000; Kurz, 1993; Moser, 1996) and quality criteria for educational purposes (Gile, 2001), we find that even

the same attribute is given different interpretations as studies varied. We would thus, like to refer to some of the studies mentioned above in order to give a clearer and more comprehensive picture of the varied definitions of quality in interpreting studies.

2.1. Professional standards

In the professional world, quality of conference interpreting is determined by both subjective and objective factors. Objective factors such as working conditions, environments and professional ethics can be tackled with ease (AIIC, 1990; 1991). Regarding the quality of interpreters' performance, LTNO^[i] (2001) in the UK, AIIC^[ii] on the international scene and SCIC^[iii] within the European Commission all set criteria for recruiting or training new interpreters. The Admissions Committee of AIIC adopts Bühler's criteria (1986), as listed below, in judging the performance of its candidates.

1. Sense consistency with original message
2. Logical cohesion of utterance
3. Correct grammatical usage
4. Completeness of interpretation
5. Fluency of delivery
6. Native accent
7. Pleasant voice

The criteria are not further specified, which means they cannot be operationalised by trainees. For example, 'pleasantness of voice' is clearly open to subjective judgements. Moreover, 'native accent', although stressed in this set of criteria, has been shown not to be a major concern for users of interpreting services (Bühler, 1986). Since in reality interpreters are often asked to work into a working language other than their mother tongue, the native accent standard is not realistic and, arguably, not vital. As for 'sense consistency with original message', it is again ill-defined and thus difficult to attain or evaluate. As to 'fluency of delivery', is it intended to capture maintaining the flow of the utterance or making sense, or both? All in all, the criteria suggested by AIIC's Admissions Committee lack clear definition and proper organisation, which indicates room for improvement.

SCIC, apart from the very famous criteria, 'booth worthy' recited by many of their interpreters, do not publish any specific criteria of their own. 'Booth-worthy' is definitely vague for novices to comprehend as a quality criterion, not to mention as a basis to develop their awareness of quality interpreting. The following list emerged from our consultation with two of its accredited interpreters.

8. Rigour and consistency
9. Faithfulness to original (substance and style)
10. Quality of communication with audience
11. Calm, regular delivery
12. Avoid literal / word for word translation
13. Correct, spontaneous use of target language

In these standards, 'consistency' appears to capture a different attribute of the interpret performance than 'sense consistency with original message' suggested by AIIC, which SI terms 'faithfulness of substance and style'. In addition, SCIC's take on delivery emphasises calmness and regularity, rather than fluency.

The Languages National Training Organisation has produced a set of National Standards Interpreting (LNTO, 2001). Element 5.2.1 lists performance criteria for 'one-way special assignments' (See appendix 7.3) but also includes considerations which pertain mostly to liaison interpreting ('reflect non-verbal communication') and consecutive interpreting ('take accurate notes'). It is striking that, in the case of simultaneous interpreting, both the criteria suggested and the language used are reminiscent of AIIC and SCIC: 'interpret meaning precisely and fluently', 'reflect the source language user's register', 'accurately interpret factual information, concepts and opinions', etc. However, LNTO makes no reference to 'delivery' as such.

Many subjective factors affect perceptions of the quality of conference interpreting, including expectations, backgrounds and roles of participants (delegates, audience, organisers and interpreters) in a communicative situation. Where there are people, there are variables. Such subjective factors have been investigated by a series of scholars (Bühler, 1986; Kahane, 2000; Kurz, 1993; Moser, 1996) who attempted to explore perceptions of conference interpreting quality (mainly simultaneous) from various perspectives. These studies lead us to conclude that, as in all service industries, the criteria for judging quality vary with the perceptions, expectations and attitudes of the end users and thus are liable to change.

2.1. Educational standards

Assessment criteria for training purposes are important sources to consult when discussing the quality of interpreting performance. To begin, we review the assessment criteria suggested by the European Masters in Conference Interpreting^[iv] (EMCI, 2000). In its core curriculum it states the assessment criteria for simultaneous interpreting as follows.

"At the end of the programme students will be able to provide a fluent and effective simultaneous interpretation of speeches of at least 20 minutes into the target language, accurately reproducing the content of the original and using appropriate terminology and register."

As formulated here, the criteria are too vague and thus components of the criteria for fir exams are further expanded as follows.

EMCI Final Exam Benchmark		Our attempt of further analysis and clarification	
<u>Content</u>	accuracy/fidelity	source text vs. target text	→ observable in output
	coherence/logical links	target text as a whole	
	cultural comprehension, general knowledge	→ inferable from output (cognitive resources and processes)	
	linguistic comprehension	→ observable in output (accuracy & fidelity)	
<u>Form</u>	concision, clarity grammar and usage appropriate vocabulary style, register	→ linguistic attributes (phonetic, grammatical, lexical, semantic) observable in output	
	delivery	→ fluency or presentation skills?	
<u>Skills</u>	communication	→ function of the output, judged by the end users	
	analysis, reasoning, problem-solving	→ inferable from output, yet not observable	

This set of criteria appears to be more structured than the other criteria in the earlier discussion, yet it is obvious that they can still easily cause confusion and, hence, require clearer definition. It became apparent to us that it would take much work to restructure benchmarks in a more systematic manner so that they would be explicit enough for trainees to follow.

Apart from EMCI, we consulted the assessment criteria used by a number of interpreter training schools. In addition to criteria such as those listed above, these schools also tend to include finer distinctions as well as variables concerning delivery and booth skills. For

instance, content was sub-divided into accuracy, faithfulness, completeness, terminology and making sense. Booth skills included technical issues like microphone use, which are easy for trainees to follow and observe when they work together.

Schjoldager (1996) produced a feedback sheet to enable trainees to judge their own and their peers' performance at simultaneous interpreting and for trainers to diagnose trainee performance in class. She endeavoured to make the criteria fully explicit and suggested 'ideal interpreting' should be as follows.

1. The listener can understand what the interpreter says and can bear to list to him/her.
2. The interpreter's language is adequate.
3. The interpreter's rendition is coherent and plausible.
4. The interpreter is a loyal communicator of the speaker's message.

In Schjoldager's feedback sheet, to help trainees become confident and more skilled at offering and receiving criticism, both strengths and weaknesses of students' performance are included. Moreover, explications of assessment criteria are listed, to help students better understand criteria written in 'high-language'. For instance, the explication of 'coherence reads, *'if an interpreter's performance lacks coherence, the listener loses interest in the message'*. This explication is over-simplified and might be misleading for trainees, since listeners might lose interests for various reasons and incoherence might cause more confusion than the loss of interest.

All in all, the review of literature from both professional and educational perspectives clearly reveals that even in the two established fields, quality criteria are not consistently addressed among professionals. In addition, the lack of consistency among the quality attributes is likely to cause confusion for novice interpreters when they hope to consult those standards for either self evaluation or peer feedback.

3 Methodology

3.1. Subjects

This study involved two groups of trainees at two different levels of training: novice and advanced. For novice trainee interpreters, we recruited 22 subjects with various language combinations from the MA in Interpreting and Translation Studies at Leeds University. We participating in this study, most had no work experience in interpreting, while a few had previously received some related training (university modules). For advanced trainees, v

included 15 advanced trainees from East Europe preparing to work for the European Parliament. With the support of the Parliament, they came to Leeds for a four-week English enhancement programme in summer 2003. All of the subjects were trained interpreters with work experience.

3.2. Questionnaires & Stages

Novice trainees answered our questionnaires at three different stages. Firstly, prior to any formal training in the postgraduate programme in Leeds (week 0), they were given the first questionnaire (A) on their views on good/bad interpreting performances. After completing the first questionnaire with minimal instructions given, they were then invited to complete a semi-structured questionnaire (B) on nine quality criteria commonly referred to in both training and professional circumstances (See appendix 6.1 & 6.2). During week 5 of their training, trainees were given the questionnaire (B) again, yet this time the questionnaire included only eight attributes instead of nine. We removed 'booth manner' as it was found that this item was highly confusing from the previous stage and they had not practiced much simultaneous interpreting in the interpreting booth either. In week 10, we organised a workshop and only involved the Chinese-English group novice trainees this time. An in-depth discussion on interpreting quality criteria was held with a list of performance criteria proposed by LNTO as a prompt (See appendix 6.3). As to the advanced trainees, they filled in both questionnaires during their stay in Leeds.

4 Results and Discussion

The results of the two sets of questionnaires with the two groups of trainees did not only answer our research questions but also provided us with abundant data for further discussion. Our findings clearly demonstrated that the notion of interpreting quality and capacity to describe interpreting performance did evolve as training progressed.

4.1. Questionnaire A (Novice vs. Advanced Trainees)

There was a big difference between novice and advanced trainees in the way of answering this questionnaire. For the advanced trainees, their responses followed the structure given by the instruction with further elaboration on the proposed criteria on their own. For the novice, the instruction of the questionnaire appeared to have been neglected and most subjects responded by giving random points they could recall on the spot without any organisation.

Results of the questionnaire showed several interesting findings for the novice interpreters. First of all, it was apparent that many subjects confused good interpreting performance with good interpreters. Many of them elaborated on how an interpreter should have (e.g. knowledge, language competence, memory, communication skills, note-taking skills, good memory, quick reaction, etc) or should be (professional and confident), instead of how interpreting performance should be to be judged as good or bad (as originally inquired by the questionnaire). In other words, apart from the quality features of interpreters, the observable features from interpreting performance (e.g. clarity, fluency, specific language features such as intonation, pronunciation, accent, voice, pace, etc) were merely raised randomly or even hidden in the description of ideal interpreters.

In addition, it is observed that the diversity in understanding the proposed attributes among the novice subjects was huge. 'Knowledge', the most commonly raised attribute, was interpreted by the novices as general knowledge, cultural/societal knowledge, current affairs, knowledge on specific fields, wide range of knowledge, etc. Work ethics, morality, preparation for assignments, relevant education, posture, body language (eye-contact, in particular) and even lifelong learning were synonyms of professionalism.

As to the more 'observable' features, a similar level of confusion arose, too. Take 'clarity' as an instance, it comprised definitions such as clear and logical, clear and concise, clear diction and delivery, correct grammar, clear voice and language, and even a clear mind. In turn 'accuracy', it included accurate information, accurate language (grammar & pronunciation), accurate translation and accurate messages. To describe 'language', they used terms such as target/source language, active/passive language, A/B languages, translation into/from etc, to differentiate the two languages involved in the interpreting process. In addition, they viewed 'language' differently, too, that vocabulary (proper words), grammar, idioms, fluency, and pronunciation are categorised as separate features, with little or no connection with the attribute of 'language'. Intonation and accent, likewise, are features of a language too, yet they were listed as individual criteria, but not as the subordinate attributes of 'language'.

All in all, despite that the novices were aware of few essential features of interpreting performance (languages, clarity, accuracy, etc), they apparently lacked an efficient and systematic way to describe interpreting performance and a consensus on interpreting quality. Without an efficient and systematic way to describe interpreting performance, the description of either good interpreters or good interpreting tended to be loose and disorganized with limited yet diverse vocabulary. Without a consensus on interpreting quality, the general picture of good interpreting performance was rather sketchy for the subjects.

Interestingly, the novices appeared to be more interested and capable of describing interpreters instead of interpreting performance. Perhaps this is because that before joining this training programme, they might have already considered this issue to find out whether they themselves were the right candidates to make good interpreters in the future. How to tell the difference between good and poor interpreting performances, however, seemed to be beyond their experience and understandings for the time being.

In short, the results of the first questionnaire indicated that the advanced trainees were more capable of giving a systematic description of quality interpreting, while novice trainees confused 'good performance' and 'good interpreter'. The advanced trainees appeared to have in mind a hierarchy when describing the attributes of quality interpreting and they seemed very much aware of the need of users. For the novices, many of them described how knowledgeable / fluent / confident an interpreter should be, with little discussion of particular interpreting performance.

4.2. Questionnaire B (Stage 1 vs. 2; Novice vs. Advanced)

The second questionnaire demonstrated the understanding of nine terms commonly used to discuss interpreting performance in both training and professional environments. For the novice groups, we observed that the diversity of understanding and description of many of the proposed attributes was huge at stage one (week 0). For instance, many claimed that 'Cohesion and Coherence' was about 'making sense, connectors, sounding fluent, grammatical, good syntax, convincing'. We can clearly spot a lack of both consensus among the trainees and thus a lack of consistent description of this attribute. In addition, it was apparent that little distinction was made among different attributes at this stage. 'Fluent Delivery' and 'Coherence and Cohesion' appeared to be synonyms. Many responded that 'Coherence' was about 'being fluent, smooth, or making sense; in the meanwhile, 'Fluent Delivery' was realised by 'good delivery, no pause, being smooth or flowing target language'.

In week 5 (stage two), however, the novices seemed to reach an agreement both cognitively and meta-linguistically, regarding many of the confusing attributes they encountered previously. Take 'voice' for instance, many identified 'loudness, pleasantness and confidence' as the indicators of quality voice in week 0; while after five weeks of training, the three common features were replaced significantly by 'voice projection, clarity of articulation, intonation'. From this 'voice' attribute, we saw a change of understanding this specific attribute, that loudness was not the major issue anymore and sounding pleasant and confident were not satisfying descriptions for the novices any longer. The attribute of 'Coherence & Cohesion', likewise, became a clearer notion for novices after five weeks of training.

weeks of training. We saw a consensus regarding this feature emerging, that a majority subjects mentioned 'discourse structure and linking words' in their responses. The notion 'Register' for novices, in particular, was unknown to more than half of the subjects in week 0; while at this stage we saw some agreement emerge. For the 5-week old novices, 'Register' meant 'appropriateness of language to suit the situations, using proper vocabulary'. This is clearly a progress of awareness.

In comparison, the advanced trainees appeared to have developed a common understanding of these attributes. Again taking 'Cohesion and Coherence' for instance, all of the returned questionnaires indicated that this attribute was about the structure of a discourse. It was realised by the means of linking words/linkage for the benefit of the users to comprehend the message. 'Fluency and Delivery', however, was still confusing for even advanced trainees; there was no consensus regarding this attribute.

4.3. Difficult notions: Register and Coherence & Cohesion

At stage 3 (week 10), we held a workshop to discuss quality issues with the Chinese-English group. To encourage an in-depth discussion, we used the LNTO criteria (See Appendix 6 as a prompt. It was observable that subjects had become quite critical about the criteria proposed by LNTO. For instance, when subjects were invited to comment on the criterion that follows, all of them criticised it for being too vague and of no significant benefit for them as a benchmark to reflect on their performance accordingly.

When you interpret one-way, you must show that:

you interpret the meaning of a sustained presentation:

☞ precisely and fluently in the target language

☞ maintaining a consistently satisfactory performance throughout the assignment

Critical comments include vagueness, over-generalisation, and of no help. In addition the novices at this stage had started to practice both consecutive and simultaneous interpreting and were very aware of the difference in between. Some even suggested that the criteria to judge interpreting performance of the two modes should be different. They suggested it would be of much help to have a 'dos and don'ts' or an explicit list of criteria concerning interpreting performance as a reference for self-evaluation and peer-feedback.

The in-depth discussion also revealed that some notions of quality interpreting still remain very unclear for this group even after 10 weeks of training. Register, for one, is the most difficult for them to explain. The closest understanding of 'register' among them went as 'Register is about word choice to make things sound either formal or informal'. Others were rather hesitating but endeavoured to explain it. 'It is very difficult to explain, it can be interpreters' voice', 'It's about style, very mysterious', and 'it's the meaning of phrases', claimed by some novices. As to 'Coherence & Cohesion', they meant 'linking words' for novices at this stage and seemed to lose their original differentiation.

It is thus, important to investigate why novices still struggled to comprehend and explain notions like Coherence & Cohesion and Register. According to them, the two criteria were referred frequently during the training in the comments from the trainers and were not clear concepts to them. Despite so, it seems that those notions were not clearly addressed pedagogically and consequently novices were only able to provide sketchy pictures concerning the two vital notions. The workshop in the workshop at stage 3 in this study led to an explicit explanation of standards concerning interpreting quality at the end. After a thorough discussion of those notions with examples given, the subjects appeared to reach much clearer understandings of the notions in question in no time.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

We can conclude that the awareness of quality for interpreting performance is a process of evolution. Novices progressed much in both cognition and capacity of describing what a quality interpreting performance involves. Cognitively, their awareness of quality interpreting performance develops from some local features like pronunciation to a wider coverage with a hierarchical structure. Regarding the meta-language in use, the varied yet limited terms to describe interpreting performance at first not only became more unified but also increased noticeably over time. It is however, important to mark that explicit explanation and evidence-based discussion with examples of certain concepts such as register, coherence and cohesion would certainly help clarify confusion and accelerate the formation of consensus.

The conclusion of this project indicates space for further research to take place such as collaborative learning and learner autonomy in interpreter training. We also identify an urgent need for a tool comprising explicit quality criteria that novice interpreters can benefit from during the development of their interpreting skills. To address the pedagogical need and to further a collaborative learning culture for interpreter training, we consulted most of the literature on interpreting quality from the professional, educational and linguistic-informed perspectives, and have come up with a self and peer-assessment grid where

quality attributes regarding interpreting performance are captured and organised hierarchically (See Appendix 6.4). It is expected to serve as a tool to facilitate and regulate the process of both reflective (self-monitoring) and collaborative (peer-feedback) learning for future interpreters. In short, with the understanding of the process of awareness acquisition we draw from this project, plus a proper curriculum and training support, we expect better interaction between teaching and learning to take place in the near future.

6 Appendix

6.1. Questionnaire A

What makes for a good/bad interpreting performance? Please list all the criteria that you find important and describe their characteristics against which a good/bad interpreting performance is judged.

Criteria	Characteristics	Good/Bad interpreting performance



6.2. Questionnaire B

2. What is your understanding of these terms in the table when you receive/us them as the feedback to interpreting performance?

Terms	Your Understanding
Accuracy	
Cohesion & Coherence	
Communication	
Completeness	
Delivery & Fluency	
Register	
Terminology	
Voice	
Booth manner	

6.3. LNTO performance criteria

Element Int 5.2.1 Interpret one-way specialist assignments

When you interpret one-way, you must show that:

1. you interpret the meaning of a sustained presentation:
 - ? precisely and fluently in the target language
 - ? maintaining a consistently satisfactory performance throughout the assignment
2. you reflect the source language user's:
 - ? register, tone and speed of production
 - ? attitude, irony, sarcasm and innuendo
 - ? non-verbal communication
 - ? social and cultural norms
 - ? role and relationship with the audience
3. you accurately interpret:
 - ? factual information, concepts and opinions
 - ? standard language and any regional or national dialects
 - ? complex language, specialist terminology and jargon
4. you paraphrase the meaning of complex terminology and phrases, if there is no direct equivalent in the target language
5. your conduct is consistent with the professional code of conduct
6. you support effective communication throughout the assignment and take action if communication breaks down

6.4. Assessment Grid for Tomorrow's Interpreters

The image shows two assessment grids for interpreters. The left grid is a 'Self & Peer-Assessment Grid for Tomorrow's Interpreters' and the right grid is an 'Assessment Grid for Tomorrow's Interpreters'. Both grids evaluate various skills and knowledge areas for interpreters.

Self & Peer-Assessment Grid for Tomorrow's Interpreters

Category	Sub-category	Item	Rating
Communication (TT/Signage or similar)	Oral	Accuracy: Accents (Esp. English, etc.); Fluency in source language	
		Intelligence	
	Written	Intelligence: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		Intelligence: (TT/Signage or similar)	
Language	TT/Signage	TT/Signage: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		TT/Signage: (TT/Signage or similar)	
	Other	Other: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		Other: (TT/Signage or similar)	
Technical	TT/Signage	TT/Signage: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		TT/Signage: (TT/Signage or similar)	
	Other	Other: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		Other: (TT/Signage or similar)	
Personal	TT/Signage	TT/Signage: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		TT/Signage: (TT/Signage or similar)	
	Other	Other: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		Other: (TT/Signage or similar)	

Assessment Grid for Tomorrow's Interpreters

Category	Sub-category	Item	Rating
Communication (TT/Signage or similar)	Oral	Accuracy: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		Intelligence: (TT/Signage or similar)	
	Written	Intelligence: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		Intelligence: (TT/Signage or similar)	
Language	TT/Signage	TT/Signage: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		TT/Signage: (TT/Signage or similar)	
	Other	Other: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		Other: (TT/Signage or similar)	
Technical	TT/Signage	TT/Signage: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		TT/Signage: (TT/Signage or similar)	
	Other	Other: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		Other: (TT/Signage or similar)	
Personal	TT/Signage	TT/Signage: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		TT/Signage: (TT/Signage or similar)	
	Other	Other: (TT/Signage or similar)	
		Other: (TT/Signage or similar)	

References

- Aktins, M. J., Beattie, J., & Dockrell, W. B. (1993). *Assessment issues in higher education*. London: Employment Department, Future & Higher Education Branch.
- Anderson, J. R. (1995). *Cognitive Psychology and its Implication*. New York: W.H. Freeman
- Bühler, H. (1986). Linguistic (semantic) and extralinguistic (pragmatic) criteria for the evaluation of conference interpretation and interpreters. *Multilingua*, 5(4), 231-235.
- EMCI. (2000). *What is emci?* European masters in conference interpreting. Available at: <http://www.emciinterpreting.net/whatis.htm> [2003, May 12].
- Ericsson, K. A. (2000/01). Expertise in interpreting: An expert-performance perspective. *Interpreting*, 5(2), 187-220.
- Gile, D. (2001). Quality Assessment in Interpreter Training Courses (L'Evaluation de la qualite de l'interpretation en cours de formation). *Meta*, 46(2), 379-393.
- Herbert, J. (1978). How Conference Interpretation Grew. In H. Sinaiko (Ed.), *Language Interpretation and Communication* (pp. 5-10.). New York: Plenum Publishing.

- Kahane, E. (2000). *Thoughts on the Quality of Interpretation*. AIIC. Available at: <http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm/page197.htm> [2002, 6 November].
- Kiraly, D. (2000). *A Social Constructivist Approach to Translator Education: Empowerment from Theory to Practice*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Kurz, I. (1993). Conference Interpretation: Expectations of Different User Groups. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 5, 13-21.
- LNTO. (2001). *The National Standards in Interpreting*. London: Languages National Training Organisation.
- Mackintosh, J. (1999). Interpreters are Made not Born. *Interpreting (Special Issue on History of Interpreting)*, 4(1), 67-80.
- Moser, P. (1996). Expectations of Users of Conference Interpretation. *Interpreting*, 1(2), 145-178.
- Moser-Mercer, B. (1997). Skill Components in Simultaneous Interpreting. In C. Taylor (Ed.), *Conference Interpreting: Current Trends in Research* (pp. 123-148). Amsterdam/Philadelphia.: John Benjamins.
- Moser-Mercer, B., Frauenfelder, U. H., Casado, B., & Kunzli, A. (2000). Searching to Define Expertise in Interpreting. In K. Hyltenstam (Ed.), *Language Processing and Simultaneous Interpreting* (pp. 107-131). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schjoldager, A. (1996). Assessment of Simultaneous Interpreting. In V. Appel (Ed.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 3* (pp. 187-195). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

[i] **The Languages National Training Organisation**

[ii] **Association Internationale des Interprètes de Conférence was established in 1953 and now has more than 2000 members in 80 countries worldwide and full recognition of the European Union, N/A World Bank, United Nations and most other major international organizations.**

[iii] **Le Service Commun Interprétation-Conférences (SCIC) provides quality interpretation in meetings arranged by the European Commission and the other Institutions it serves, and provides a conferer organising capacity to Commission services. With 450 staff interpreters and 2000 accredited freelance interpreters, SCIC is the biggest provider of conference interpreting services in the world.**

[iv] **EMCI is a masters-type university programme launched as a pilot project by the joint efforts of SCIC and the European Parliament in 1997 to address the need of qualified conference interpreters in less common language-combinations as a result of EU enlargement. A group of eight university-level institutions drew up a core curriculum for interpreter training at postgraduate level.**