

Dictionary
of Education
and Assessment
in Translation and
Interpreting Studies
(TIS)

Dictionary of Education and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies (TIS)

By

Vorya Dastyar

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Dictionary of Education and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting
Studies (TIS)

By Vorya Dastyar

This book first published 2019

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2019 by Vorya Dastyar

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-2148-6

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-2148-3

To Franz Pöchhacker

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ix
Introduction	xi
Entries A-Z	1
Bibliography	217

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Dictionary is a project I have completed in more than one year of intense writing. I have had the pleasure of communicating with a number of scholars in Translator & Interpreting Studies (TIS), and this has greatly helped me to broaden my horizons in my explorations into the field. With thought-provoking ideas and great inspirations from such fruitful communications with these distinguished scholars and colleagues, I believe that I had the right mindset to complete this project and have it see the light of day. My sincere thanks go to Franz Pöchhacker, Daniel Gile, Sylvia Kalina, Donald Kiraly, David Sawyer, Christina Schäffner, Cynthia Roy, Elisabeth Winston, Robin Setton, Andrew Dawrant, Elisabeth Tiselius, Catherine Chabasse, Stephanie Kader, Beate Herting, Maren Dingfelder Stone, Winibert Segers, Nadja Grbić, Michaela Albl-Mikasa, Binhua Wang, Veerle Dufrou, John Kearns, Defeng Li, Campbell McDermid, Jemina Napier, Cecilia Wadensjö, Mira Kadrić, Sabine Braun, and of course, Demi Krystallidou.

Also, a warm word of thanks to Cambridge Scholars Publishing for publishing this Dictionary.

I also thank my mother, Farokh, and my sister, Nina, for their great support and encouragement throughout my life and during this project.

VORYA DASTYAR

August 25, 2018

INTRODUCTION

The Rationale for the Present Volume & Its Title

The idea for Dictionary of Education & Assessment in Translation & Interpreting Studies (TIS) began to form in my mind in 2017 after I had published 6 books, 3 of which were dictionaries in the field of Translation and Interpreting Studies (TIS). I, like many others, began to feel that there is a need for a reference book on the topic of training and education in TIS because it is a hot topic, attracts special scholarly attention, and is an issue of growing importance in the field and in today's world. Besides, there is the urgent need for properly trained translators and interpreters, and this can be aided by publishing research monographs, articles, reference books, guidelines, etc. Obviously, training and education is linked with assessment. Training and education needs to be complemented with assessment in order to thrive.

This Dictionary aims to offer an in-depth, comprehensive coverage of key terms and topics with regard to training, educating, and assessing translators and interpreters in academic settings. Academic researchers in the field of TIS, translator and interpreter educators and trainers, (mainly) graduate and postgraduate university students in the field of TIS, practitioners and assessors will find this Dictionary a very useful reference book.

As for the title, in an attempt to choose between *training* and *education*, I opted for the latter to precede *assessment* because I would like this Dictionary to be viewed as the total sum of its parts, i.e. this Dictionary aims to contribute to proper education, rather than training, and assessment of translators and interpreters. Similarly, in trying to make my mind over whether I should choose *evaluation*, *testing*, or *assessment* to follow *education* in the title, I, while being aware that the term *evaluation* is frequently used as a misnomer for *testing*, decided to use *assessment* to enrich the title and the topic of the Dictionary with a term, which implies the objective of developing a multifaceted and, at the same time, clear picture of a phenomenon.

The Organization and Features of the Dictionary

This Dictionary is the fruit of more than a year of labour. First, it explains, in depth, key terms and topics on issues of education and assessment, in general (i.e. within the field(s) where these terms and topics were first introduced). Then, the definitions and the discussions of the terms and topics shift toward the field of TIS. Therefore, the present work adopts an inter-disciplinary approach to translator and interpreter education and assessment. As a crucial part of the development of the present volume, I identified the headwords after I checked the subject indices of many works of various types (dictionaries, encyclopedias, research monographs, journal articles, published and unpublished theses, etc.) on the topic of training, educating and assessing translators and interpreters, and after I checked a list of keywords that occurred to my mind, *in the Benjamins Translation Studies Bibliography*. Finally, I came upon a list of 245 terms. Based on their frequency of appearance and their overall key position in the literature, I decided to write on 116 entries, and leave total 129 entries as blind entries in the Dictionary.

I mention the following main features of the present Dictionary:

- 1) In-depth comprehensive coverage of key terms and topics with regard to training, educating, and assessment of translators and interpreters;
- 2) Cross-referencing and in-text referencing to enhance the integrity and the ease of use of the Dictionary. The in-text referencing has been taken care of by writing the key terms in SMALL CAPITALS wherever they occur for the first time within the text of a given entry;
- 3) Under almost all of the main entries (which are all, in turn, in capitals), several subheadings appear to give the reader a multifaceted coverage of the key terms and topics within TIS. This, however, does not apply to the blind entries.

The Bibliography

I have made every effort to compile one of the most comprehensive and relevant Bibliographies (running to more than 1600 entries) at the end of the present Dictionary, which comprises sources referred to throughout this work. Most of the sources in the Bibliography are in English (for the sake of readers' easy access to the references), but I have also, to some extent, included sources in other languages.

VORYA DASTYAR

August 25, 2018

ENTRIES

ABSOLUTE EXPERTISE→ EXPERTISE

ACCREDITATION

Definitions

The verb to accredit, from French *accréditer* meaning ‘to credit’, refers to the process of officially authorizing or certifying an organization or institution with regard to their level of COMPETENCE for the purpose of QUALITY ASSURANCE.

Accreditation in TIS

Accreditation is often used interchangeably with the term CERTIFICATION (Liu 2015b); however, terminologically speaking, it must be pointed out that, it is organizations (offering translator and interpreter education programs), not individuals (i.e. translators and interpreters), which gain accreditation (Dybiec-Gajer 2014; Mikkelsen 2013) as evidence of their compliance with national standards aiming at fully preparing graduates to enter the job market (Witter-Merithew 2018). However, in Australia and some other (mainly) English-speaking countries (e.g. New Zealand), accreditation is used to refer to determining the professional competence of an individual (Budin et al. 2013:144; Melby 2013:1).

Accreditation can be obtained through one of the following channels: passing an exam or qualification by testing, being officially acknowledged by a professional body (or an accrediting authority), or finishing a degree in translation that serves as an accreditation in itself (Šeböková 2010). Accreditation for translators and interpreters, as a benchmark for translator and interpreter competence, with national accreditation standards serving as instruments for quality management, is granted under the auspices of credentialing organizations: one may, by way of example only, mention 1) The National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI) in Australia, active for more than twenty years and with its translator accreditation scheme currently consisting of three different levels

of accreditation/competence/credentials as of June 2017: Recognized Practicing Translator, Certified Translator, and Certified Advanced Translator; and with its interpreter accreditation scheme currently consisting of five different levels of accreditation/competence/credentials as of February 2018: Recognized Practicing Interpreter, Certified Provisional Interpreter, Certified Interpreter, Certified Specialist Interpreter-Health or Legal, and Certified Conference Interpreter; 2) Shanghai Interpretation Accreditation (SIA), National Accreditation Examinations for Translators and Interpreters (NAETI) and China Accreditation Test for Translators and Interpreters (CATTI) all in China; 3) the National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators (NAJIT) as the professional organization of state and federal judiciary interpreters and translators; and 4) the United States Federal Court Interpreter Certification Examination (FCICE). One needs to point out, by way of example only, that five modes of gaining accreditation have been proposed by NAATI: direct testing; recognition of overseas qualifications (for conference interpreters); providing evidence of membership of a recognized international professional association of translators or interpreters; approved courses in translation and/or interpreting that conform to NAATI's standards such that an equivalent test is administered at the end of the COURSE; and providing evidence of advanced standing in the translating or interpreting profession (see Gentile 2015; Hlavac 2016). This is complemented by a system of revalidation with its own terms and conditions (Gentile 2015).

Challenges to accreditation in TIS

It is worth noting that not all countries have translator and/or interpreter accreditation systems/procedures, and in the ones which do, accreditation procedures, in general, are influenced by such factors as market requirements and PROFESSIONALIZATION (with the latter, modelled in IS by Tseng 1992, cited in Pöchhacker 2016:80, and being a recurrent theme in Biagini et al. 2017; for discussions on professionalization in TS, see Jääskeläinen et al. 2011; special issue of *InTRALinea* 16, 2014). Apart from that, professional accreditation and certification, the essential requirement for which through translation and interpreting programs is performance(-based) examination (Lee 2009), lacks attention in translator and interpreter TRAINING research, e.g. in Europe (see Yan et al. 2018: 50).

However, as far as NAATI accreditation system is concerned, it has never been the object of a systematic analysis in terms of issues of VALIDITY and RELIABILITY (Campbell & Hale 2003) (see also Eyckmans et al. 2009:73; Roberts-Smith 2009:32; Skaaden 2013:48; Stern

2011b) as two aspects of testing theory essential to performance or quality ASSESSMENT in TIS (Angelelli 2013a), and NAATI criteria for error deduction assessment have been criticized by some authors (e.g. Kim 2009).

What is more, as Hale et al. (2012) observe, currently, no international standard exists as for how credentialing organizations address issues of assessing and awarding certification.

ACCREDITATION TESTING→ CERTIFICATION
ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION→ MOTIVATION
ACHIEVEMENT TEST→ ASSESSMENT

ACTION RESEARCH

Definitions

The term action research, which emerged through the work of social psychologist Kurt Lewin (1946/1948), refers to a participatory enquiry and liberating practices and initiatives among individuals on a specific scale for the purpose of developing new practical knowledge and effective solutions to important enduring problems in their lives and community, and therefore, improving their overall well-being and QUALITY of life in more positive ways (Reason & Bradbury 2008). Action research, which is typically undertaken *with* participants rather than *on* participants (Heron & Reason 2006), is characterized by four key components: equal relationship and adequate preparation among all participants and stakeholders; communication characterized by frequent attentive listening and truthfulness during the process of data gathering and analysis; teamwork and continuous participation; and inclusion of as many pertinent participants and stakeholders as possible (Lamkin & Saleh 2010).

Action research applied to TIS

Action research is common to the field of EDUCATION, and can be thought of as a practice with the potential of influencing issues of teaching and learning in particular, and those of redesigning education in general (see Rowell et al. 2017, pa. 4). Applying action research to student translator classroom is a relatively new phenomenon (Mitchell-Schuitevoerder 2014). In TS, studies classified as action research (e.g. Galán-Mañas & Hurtado Albir 2010) have focused on translator TRAINING and education as the applied branch of TS. More recently, action research has been advocated as a good source of insights, innovation, and change into translator (Crezee &

Burn 2019; Nicodemus & Swabey 2016; Rodríguez de Céspedes 2018) and interpreter (Cirillo & Niemants 2017; Crezee & Burn 2019; Krouse 2010; Napier et al. 2013; Nicodemus & Swabey 2016; Pöchhacker 2010a, 2011b, 2016:194, 217; Slatyer 2015a, 2015b) education and ASSESSMENT.

ADAPTIVE EXPERTISE→ EXPERTISE

ADMISSION TESTING→ APTITUDE TESTING

AMOTIVATION→ MOTIVATION

ANALYTIC SCORING→ RUBRIC

ANTICIPATION

Definitions & typologies

The term anticipation, from Latin *anticipation*(n-), from the verb *anticipare* meaning ‘to have in advance’, is the most widely discussed (coping) STRATEGY of SI. It refers to the process of intelligent prediction of constituents of the original text that are not available to the interpreter yet for the purpose of speech planning, i.e. entire discourse comprehension, message development and delivering good performance (Liontou 2012, 2013, 2015; Yao 2017). Chernov (2004), making anticipation, as a mechanism of probability prediction, the core of his theoretical MODEL of comprehension in SI, highlights linguistic and extralinguistic redundancy of discourse and interpreter’s inferencing ability as key factors leading to the probability of the interpreter’s use of anticipation mechanism, with implications for (simultaneous) interpreter TRAINING (Wilss 1978). Anticipation is of two main types: linguistic anticipation (based on interpreter’s good knowledge of grammatical rules, collocations, and standard phrases) and extralinguistic anticipation (based on interpreter’s good knowledge of interpreting context, including speakers and the topic) (Gile 2009a).

Anticipation & its use in interpreter training

Anticipation, as the skill of predicting what might come next, is not exclusive to simultaneous interpreting, though. Anticipation can, in fact, be important in consecutive interpreting too (Li 2015b:174), as this strategy can be facilitated or accelerated in the source speech comprehension process aided by NOTE-TAKING (Ito 2017). Apart from its use in interpreting modes, anticipation is a widely discussed strategy with regard to conference interpreting and training conference interpreters in particular; however,

since interpreting settings come with more or less clear-cut boundaries, trainers should note that the strategy of anticipation is far from being appropriate e.g. for interpreting asylum interviews due to the critical conditions, under which any of interpreter's incorrect renditions in the target language may jeopardize asylum seeker's asylum request (see Stachl-Peier & Pöllabauer 2017).

APTITUDE

General definitions

With cognitive skills at its core, the term aptitude, from Late Latin *aptitudo*, from *aptus* meaning 'fitness', is the more complex correlate of the term ability, and one component of COMPETENCE. Therefore, as a desirable, however multidimensional and elusive construct, it needs to be approached from all angles. Aptitude has different meanings in different fields of study: for example, Kuncel & Klieger (2008:47-48) define aptitude in three different ways within the broad panorama of the field of educational psychology: the first one is focused on its link with learning outcomes only, and the other two also take the nature of an aptitude into consideration: 1) aptitude, with regard to learning outcomes only, may refer to individual differences as related to subsequent learning at a particular point in time most commonly discussed in reference to cognitive abilities in educational or TRAINING contexts; 2) aptitude may refer to individual differences resulting from innate and environmental factors; and/or 3) aptitude may refer to innate and largely unchanging individual differences within normal circumstances. Aptitude with regard to second language acquisition (SLA) refers to multitude of factors that come into contact with various situational factors and are intended to predict particular phenomena that characterize the success of SLA (Dekeyser 2013; Robinson 2013; VanPatten & Benati 2015).

Aptitude in TIS

Aptitude is rarely discussed in discussions of APTITUDE TESTING in TS (see under *aptitude testing*). In IS, it has been suggested that interpreting aptitude is noticeable particularly in the interpreter's speech restructuring analysis and synthesis skills (Russo & Pippa 2004). However, many authors (Bontempo 2012; Shlesinger & Pöhhacker 2011:1; Yan et al. 2018:155-167) point out that aptitude is an under-researched topic in IS, i.e. it is a gray zone. In fact, very few studies have so far been conducted for the purpose

of providing insights into interpreting aptitude and interpreter training, mainly focused on four interpreting-aptitude-related variables: language background; knowledge background; social-communicative ability; and certain cognitive-affective factors (Yan et al. 2018:127-128), without which, succeeding as an interpreter will be unlikely (Macnamara 2008). Along the same lines, in general, essential components of interpreter aptitude may be itemized as memory; information retrieval; comprehension; analysis; processing; and cognition (see Wallace 2012). One must add the often overlooked interpersonal skills (IPS) to the list (Angelelli 2004; Macnamara 2008). In fact, the important factor of IPS, e.g. emotional stability, has been the focal point of little empirical research on aptitude for interpreting (see Bontempo 2012).

Apart from that, so far, there has rarely been an attempt to develop an aptitude MODEL for the purpose of finding better and more reliant entrance exams for interpreting programs varying greatly in content and scope, and there is a scarcity of tools as far as interpreter ASSESSMENT within the field of signed language interpreting is concerned in particular, and this will have serious challenges (see Macnamara 2008). However, there is, at least so far, one exception to the rule: Chabasse's aptitude model for simultaneous interpreting, as part of her PhD (Chabasse 2009), in which Chabasse was able to follow all the students and to compare the final results of the students who did well in her test and also those who did not. Despite the fact that this model has already been put to test (see Chabasse & Kader 2014), it is, as Catherine Chabasse (personal communication, October 22, 2017) and Stephanie Kader (personal communication, October 4, 2017) acknowledge, the result of an empirical study with 25 students (reference group 8 professionals) but not empirically validated yet as the sample groups were too small to deliver replicable and representative results. In fact, the results of the study were only tentative.

It is worth noting that, in her review of the existing literature on aptitude testing, Russo (2014) concludes that there is a growing trend towards a more clear conceptualization of interpreting aptitude, ranging from holistic assumptions to scientifically sound measurements (e.g. aptitude predictors) (see also Wallace 2012, 2013 on the identification of specific modes of interpreting as potential predictors of successful performance on oral CERTIFICATION examinations for US court interpreters). Also, Pöchhacker (2014) concludes that aptitude for consecutive interpreting may be partly addressed by the so-called *SynCloze test*; he acknowledges, however, that, as for simultaneous interpreting, such a conclusion is to be considered just a hypothesis in need of testing. Issues of training, and those of training and aptitude in translation and interpreting research,

respectively, are usually linked with such important concepts as self-efficacy (Muñoz Martín 2014), the ability to handle anxiety or stress (Bontempo 2012; Cho & Roger 2010; Jiménez Ivars & Pinazo Calatayud 2001; Korpál 2016; Riccardi 2015b; Yan et al. 2018:151), etc.

APTITUDE TESTING

General definitions & important distinctions

In educational psychology, the term APTITUDE test refers to a standardized test (e.g. tests of intelligence) designed to measure, assess, or predict abilities and qualities of individuals to learn or to successfully perform a specific type of task (Christ & Skaar 2008; Miller et al. 2009; Slavin 2018). Aptitude tests do not aim to predict an individual's learning up to a particular point in time, but they do aim to predict learning potential (or preparation to learn) and the knowledge this individual has acquired both inside and outside pedagogical settings (Slavin 2018). One must point out that, in most (if not all) professions, it is past performance that can best predict future performance in the same activity (Ebel & Frisbie 1991). In case of lack of such past performance, or its incomplete, conflicting, or dated nature, aptitude tests, whose purpose is predictive, are administered to individuals in different fields (Ebel & Frisbie 1991). Hence the idea for aptitude testing in general. Despite both aptitude tests and achievement tests measuring learned abilities, the former must be distinguished from the latter in that, it is the former in which, the scope of the test content is broader, and using which, predicting future performance over a wide range of activities becomes possible (Miller et al. 2009). An important distinction must be made between the traditional dominant trend of linguistic aptitude testing (starting in language learning with the work of John Carroll) and the renewed interest in aptitude testing with an explanatory power in second language acquisition (SLA) (Smith & Stansfield 2017).

Aptitude testing in TIS

Aptitude tests are tests used in admission screening procedures, where final decisions must be made as to which (teachable) candidates, based on their performance on the aptitude test, should be admitted to translator and (spoken-and signed-language) interpreter TRAINING programs (Pöschhacker & Liu 2014; Timarová 2015a; Turner 2015). Hence the idea for aptitude testing in TIS. Aptitude testing in TIS context is twofold: it may refer to tests required by a translation company as part of its ASSESSMENT procedure for the purpose of hiring freelance translators, often done

typically by making applicants do a trial translation; or it simply refers to the process of testing whether a candidate is suitable for translating and/or interpreting as study programs at institutes and universities (most germane to this volume), and it normally starts before candidates start their training (Beate Herting, personal communication, October 11, 2017). Interpreter aptitude tests, advocated as an essential component of any interpreter training COURSE (Galindo Almohalla 2013; Skaaden & Wattne 2009), aim to identify the best candidates for training, and this is what some authors (Angelelli 2007; Bontempo 2012; Timarová 2015a) call *interpreter readiness*, alternatively referred to by others (Walker & Shaw 2011) as *interpreter preparedness*. In her doctoral thesis, Wallace (2012) discusses at least two important facts as regards using aptitude tests in IS: firstly, it is twofold: these tests are eliminatory in nature and administered to interpreters in order to decide who should be admitted into interpreter EDUCATION programs and who should not; or they can be used for credentialing or CERTIFICATION purposes. Finally, curiously enough, unlike SIGHT INTERPRETING/TRANSLATION and such precursors to SI as SHADOWING or PARAPHRASING, consecutive mode of interpreting is rarely mentioned in current practices for aptitude testing in interpreter training programs, despite this mode (i.e. consecutive mode), along with sight interpreting/translation, being practiced regularly, e.g. by community interpreters (Roberts 2000).

Mention must be made of the fact that what is common to all interpreter aptitude tests in IS literature is the range of competencies candidates are expected to have, subjectivity in assessment criteria, and the high failure rate (Campbell & Hale 2003). What is more, standardized translation tests are still far from being truly standardized and interpreter aptitude testing is associated with subjectivity due to unavailability of objective tests for the most part (Moser-Mercer 1994; Skaaden 1999). As for interpreter aptitude testing and its PREDICTIVE VALIDITY, one should note that there is a need for empirical research (Macnamara 2008), in the absence of which it is suggested that how objective an interpreter aptitude test can be, depends on showing tendency towards acting on best practices for the purpose of optimizing VALIDITY and RELIABILITY (Setton & Dawrant 2016b) as two aspects of testing theory essential to assessment of performance or QUALITY in TIS (Angelelli 2013a, 2018).

Despite the fact that aptitude alone cannot predict how an interpreter trainee will progress through a program of study and into the profession, knowing what qualities may predict successful performance in interpreting may, in turn, lead to the development of more effective screening tools and objective measurement tools for assessing occupational suitability for

interpreting (Bontempo 2012; Fengxia 2015; Kalina 2000; Macnamara 2008). Keiser (1978) suggests that essential components of interpreter aptitude testing include (but are not limited to) 1) knowledge (perfect mastery of the active language(s)); fully adequate understanding of the passive language(s); solid general background (formal training or equivalent professional experience); and 2) personal qualities and attributes (e.g. the capacity to adapt immediately to subject matter, speakers, audience, and conference situations; and the ability to concentrate). Aptitude testing can be done, e.g. through administering recall tests as one of the key components of interpreter training assessment/testing (Donovan 2003; Gerver et al. 1989; Hiltunen & Vik 2015) as it has been suggested that such tests may create more insights into the online cognitive processes of interpreting (Yu-hsien 2015). Interestingly, Chabasse (2015a) suggests a battery of tests to be used in interpreter aptitude testing: different variations of cloze (in which candidates have to reconstruct the missing words by activating their language proficiency, capturing the inner structure of the text, going through the strategy of ANTICIPATION and coming to a conclusion; see also Andres et al. 2015; Chabasse 2015b); paraphrasing (in which candidates listen to an approximately five-minute long text in their native language and simultaneously paraphrase it in the same language; see also Kader & Seubert 2015; Russo & Pippa 2002); SynCloze (in which candidates have to listen to a text read to them in their native/foreign language at a speed of about 100 wpm with a word missing in every second sentence and they have to complete the missing parts using as many synonyms as possible; see also Pöchhacker 2014); cue-based impromptu speech (in which candidates have to produce a reasonably coherent text by integrating different concrete and abstract terms written on cards and given to them in rapid succession); cognitive shadowing (in which applicants have to answer a series of quick oral questions with yes or no and repeat the same question while they listen to the next question); and personalized cloze (in which candidates listen to a stranger's biography, and then, they have to repeat the text in the same language while replacing the biographical information with their own, i.e. this test is a combination of shadowing and paraphrasing; see also Andres et al. 2015; Chabasse 2015b). Chabasse (2015a:54) concludes that in selection of suitable aptitude tests in interpreting, one decisive factor is pragmatic feasibility, i.e. the challenge of scoring some tests, including anticipation, paraphrasing, etc., which may result in striking a balance between optimal reliability and validity on one hand, and feasibility on the other (see Setton & Dawrant 2016b:137). Another important factor is candidates' fluency in their working languages (see also Mead 2000; Pradas Macías 2015), which is what Skaaden (2013)

discusses under bilingual proficiency both as the standard component in most aptitude tests for interpreter training and as a prerequisite for interpreters' successful performance.

One needs to point out, however, that questions about aptitude testing for interpreting at the time of admission are not resolved yet (Pöschhacker 2010b; Shlesinger & Pöschhacker 2011). This said, it should be added that aptitude tests are not perfect (Johnson 2016; Wu 2010b): reasonable doubts exist over whether admission (or entry-level) tests deserve to be called aptitude tests in IS (see Dodds 1990; Gerver et al. 1989; Sawyer 2004; Timarová 2015a; Timarová & Ungood-Thomas 2008) due to the former's subjective nature and lack of the predictive power (see Campbell & Hale 2003:212). Reasonably enough, interpreter aptitude tests have been criticized over issues of reliability and validity, and accordingly, there are calls for valid and reliable aptitude tests for admission to interpreter training programs (Arjona-Tseng 1994; Kalina 2000).

Aptitude testing in TS

It is worth noting that aptitude testing for written translation is rarely discussed in the literature (see Campbell & Hale 2003), and therefore, can be said to have been neglected and a largely under-researched topic, at least from a theoretically focused perspective, in this respect. For example, a keyword search on the word 'aptitude' in the Translation Studies Bibliography (TSB) (Gambier & Van Doorslaer 2012) returns at least 76 entries of publications on this topic, with only 1 entry (Vos 1976) on aptitude in written translation, and with the rest on aptitude in interpreting. The important question is "are there aptitude tests for written translation as well?" According to Daniel Gile (personal communication, October 14, 2017), the answer for this lack of discussion of aptitude testing for written translation in the literature probably lies in the perception that conference interpreting requires certain cognitive and linguistic skills to be learned in a short time; otherwise, the whole investment in training may be said to have gone to waste. In written translation, however, since obviously time pressure is not as critical, there is perhaps enough room for revisions and improvement later; therefore, this may explain the existence of aptitude tests for conference interpreting, which let through only those considered capable of taking the training and achieving sufficient performance within the duration of the training (course/program), and rarity (if not non-existence) of aptitude tests for written translation. Along the same lines, David Sawyer (personal communication, October 11, 2017) acknowledges that virtually he is not aware of aptitude tests for written translation that can be

comparable to those for conference interpreting; he reminds us that many institutions (University of Maryland, ESIT, etc.) do have entrance examinations (typically including writing and summarizing tasks) for their degree programs varying greatly in content and scope, but the predictive validity and reliability of these tests, as it happens, have not been researched systematically (Shaw 2018; Stone 2017). He, in line with Angelelli (2018), calls for more research and highlights the need to test assumptions of validity in this area in translation and interpreting, particularly on issues of TEST CONSTRUCT (with regard to the critical issue of test constructs in interpreting, see also Huertas-Barros et al. 2019b; Setton & Dawrant 2016b:110).

However, there may be more to this issue than meets the eye: according to Christina Schäffner (personal communication, October 5, 2017), aptitude testing for written translation has been done over the years, at least in practice, for deciding on admission to a training program (e.g. at German Universities such as Leipzig University or University of Mainz). One very good case example regarding aptitude tests for written translation and for conference interpreting is Leipzig University: Beate Herting (personal communication, October 11, 2017), while discussing in detail the aptitude tests that currently exist for written translation and interpreting for all study programs (BA Translation, MA Conference Interpreting and MA Translatology/Translation) at Leipzig University, points out that such tests at BA Level include a wide range of skills, from comprehensive tests of firstly German, and then, other working language (i.e. English, French, Spanish or Russian) command, including grammar, syntax, register etc., tests of linguistic creativity and a good general knowledge, to writing tasks on given topics, to gap-filling tests, to assignments dealing with grammar, phonetics, vocabulary, situational and cultural knowledge, and finally, to an assignment of short translations English-German; no assignment of writing proper translation is included in the aptitude test as this is something to be covered during the program itself. She adds that a typical MA aptitude test for written translation at Leipzig University includes a translation from one of the above-mentioned languages into German (because German is the A language for everyone in the program) for a two-fold purpose: testing the applicant's ability to understand the source text; and testing the applicant's ability to write good German. This written test is compulsory for the MA in conference interpreting, the success in which is followed by an oral test focused on linguistic and personal qualities, knowledge of the world, memory, etc. However, Beate Herting laments the fact that these tests do not have a sound theoretical framework; they are far too intuitive and not scientific enough to actually have predictive validity. She adds that these

tests, the efficiency of which have been proved by a comparatively low drop-out rates and by the fact that 90 percent of the graduates are in employment one year after graduation (an important fact also echoed by Donovan 2003 concerning entrance exams for interpretation), are based on experience of the staff members who are trained translators themselves and know what is required of a good translator and what to be tested at all.

Material selection in interpreting entrance exams

Now, one must draw attention to the importance of appropriate source material selection for evaluative purposes in entrance exam testing for interpretation (see Donovan 2003) as an essential component of educators'/trainers'/assessors' assessment COMPETENCE: Donovan (ibid) argues that inappropriate source material can cause extreme difficulty in EVALUATION of competencies and abilities, a procedure notoriously difficult per se. Moreover, as far as using written tests and written translation tests in assessing interpreters' skills is concerned, Skaaden (2013) and Skaaden & Wadensjö (2014:21), in line with different authors (Keiser 1978; Moser-Mercer 1994; Seleskovitch 1999), convincingly argue that such tests fall short of testing the essential skills for interpreting (e.g. pronunciation skills, or performance under the time pressure), since speech comprehension and production is different from written text comprehension and production, and therefore, requires a different, but still reliable and valid testing regime. Skaaden & Wadensjö (2014) add two more important reasons for this: existence of differences between written language standards and those of spoken language; and the important fact that one should not expect all languages and all varieties of largely diffused languages to have unified standardized written forms. But one should also consider that some other authors in IS (Setton & Dawrant 2016b:109) recommend using a combination of written tests (consisting of language, basic verbal skills and general knowledge tests, and tests on performance tasks) and oral exams in ADMISSION TESTING for candidates, despite current reasonable doubts over the reliability of admission testing or over if it deserves to be called aptitude testing (Timarová 2015a).

Challenges to aptitude testing in IS

In IS, aptitude testing presents two enormous challenges: the complex nature of aptitude (i.e. what aptitude for interpreting really is and identifying its key elements, e.g. particular disposition constructs/dispositional traits, see e.g. Wallace 2012, 2019); and the difficulties of implementing a test (on

the elementary underlying abilities) under the legal and organizational constraints of a given educational context (Pöchhacker 2014; Timarová & Ungoed-Thomas 2009). Pöchhacker (2014) goes ahead to identify two broad approaches to aptitude testing in IS: a test, or a battery of tests administered at a given point in time; and an extended curricular component, course, or program in which, students' performance will be taken to reflect their aptitude. Now, the important issue is that entry-level testing (i.e. diagnostic testing for selection purposes) must show predictive validity; one good way to achieve this is through conducting systematic research in order to provide a reliable basis for such tests, and therefore, for predicting a candidate's chances of successfully completing a (translation or interpreting) program (Beate Herting, personal communication, October 18, 2017). As for aptitude testing to be captured in its full sense, interestingly, Sawyer (2004) and Beate Herting (personal communication, October 18, 2017) argue for the necessity of providing evidence of predictive validity (as in Moser-Mercer 1984's model applied to interpreter aptitude testing), considered to be the most important feature of aptitude tests (Skaaden 1999; Timarová & Ungoed-Thomas 2009), regarding entry-level diagnostic testing, e.g. through such scientific methods as setting up a score correlation with GPA, intermediate, and/or final exams, etc. in order to find out more about a possible link. Zannirato (2013) adds one good suggestion for the purpose of increasing predictive validity of such tests: to let selection criteria and ideal profile be informed at the local level and not on universal factors. What is more, Russo & Pippa (2002) and Russo & Pippa (2004) recommend paraphrasing as a promising diagnostic tool in interpreter aptitude testing. Other important factors to be considered in aptitude testing in IS include (but are not limited to) the candidates' sensitivity to cultural undertones as a prerequisite for appropriate performance (Arjona-Tseng 1984), a critical issue also echoed by Valero-Garcés & Tan (2017) but regarding dialogue interpreter education; a very good general and specialized knowledge; interest in many subjects; an ability to familiarize oneself with new information quickly; tools skills; self-organization; etc. (Beate Herting, personal communication, October 18, 2017). This very desire to develop oneself and acquire new skills and specialized knowledge has been called *learning orientation* (see Bell & Kozlowski 2002) and is thought to be potentially linked with interpreting aptitude (see Bontempo 2012).

Designing aptitude tests in IS

As far as designing aptitude tests (in interpreting) is concerned, Pöchhacker (2014) mentions grading, and validity with regard to the aptitude or skill

component to be measured (see also Valero-Garcés & Socarrás-Estrada 2012). Yet there is ample room for improvement in general, and consistent researching and validating aptitude tests in particular, as far as aptitude testing in IS is concerned. One neglected area, by way of example only, is the inclusion of soft skills such as MOTIVATION which, while being still an under-researched area in aptitude and aptitude testing in IS (Bontempo 2012; Bontempo & Napier 2011; Russo 2014; Timarová & Salaets 2011; Yan et al. 2018), has been found to be an important, if complementary, contributing factor of interpreting aptitude (Bontempo 2012; Bontempo & Napier 2011; Shaw 2011; Timarová & Salaets 2011). In addition, some authors (Shaw 2018) highlight the importance of the balance between soft and hard skills in predicting interpreting skill acquisition. Apart from that, developing aptitude tests for community interpreting (D'Hayer 2013; Valero-Garcés & Socarrás-Estrada 2012) and signed language interpreting needs scholarly attention (Shaw 2018; Stone 2017).

Admission testing in TIS

Admission testing, seldom discussed in translator education (Kim 2013), is considered part and parcel of interpreter education (mainly in conference interpreter education and training contexts) to maximize the recruitment and retention of suitable candidates (Bontempo 2012; Timarová 2015a) by eliminating those whose bilingual proficiency is not strong enough to enable them to enter training programs and follow the activities. As mentioned earlier in this entry, reasonable doubts exist over the reliability of such tests, or over whether they deserve to be called aptitude tests (Timarová 2015a). It is also worth noting that some liaison interpreting courses must do without admission testing for the purpose of meeting training needs in a variety of languages or to fill classes where minimum language-specific numbers are required (see Ozolins 2017).

ASSESSMENT

Definitions & classifications

The term assessment, from Latin *assidere* meaning ‘to sit next to/with’, can, in pedagogical settings, be broadly defined as the systematic multi-step process of developing and documenting a clear picture of individual and institutional effectiveness through the use of a wide variety of methods and judgment and assessment instruments/tools in order to maximize the QUALITY of learners’ academic achievement. The first step for any

assessment/testing program is to articulate goals (Walvoord & Anderson 2010) or to plan assessment, i.e. what to assess, when to assess, and how to assess.

Objectives of assessment in TIS

Prior to any attempt to define assessment in TS and IS, it must be borne in mind that translation and interpreting assessment, underpinning all forms of translator and interpreter TRAINING, is different from language COMPETENCE assessment or language proficiency testing per se. Assessment in TIS may serve the purpose of judging the quality of translation or interpreting output; assessing the appropriateness of a process (localization or videoconferencing); assessing the potential of candidates or products; or decision-making about who should enter or exit a training program, or about who should be hired e.g. by a translation company (Angelelli 2018). It must be added that, like TS, in IS, any assessment of interpreters, in written and oral form, is initially used for selection purposes (Lee 2016b) as part of the traditional doctrine of the standard interpreter training MODEL (Setton & Dawrant 2016b:3), and must be preceded by the identification of various types of language proficiencies or subskills, which is essential in, and related to, any assessment or testing of language knowledge (i.e. DECLARATIVE KNOWLEDGE and PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE) (Skaaden & Wadensjö 2014) and must also, as Clifford (2001) points out, determine whether these interpreters have the competence to meet professional standards (a relevant case in point is Riccardi 2002a's typology of assessment criteria, i.e. macrocriteria and microcriteria for professional and student interpreters, respectively, for the purpose of illustrating the interdependent relationship between professional standards and educational assessment). However, one must note that that in no way does language proficiency testing assess interpreting/interpreter competence.

Assessment in TS

Now, one needs to define assessment in TS: the first step in translation assessment is to establish a model of quality and then to transform it into a set of metrics that measure each of the elements of that quality (Khanmohammad & Osanloo 2009). Veiga Díaz & García González (2016:281), while discussing the most common misconceptions in higher EDUCATION assessment, and proposing constructive alignment (i.e. learners embark on constructing their knowledge as assessed through

assessment tasks aligned to what is intended to be learned) as a solid framework in this respect (see also Marais 2013; Pakkala-Weckström 2019), summarize the three mostly-agreed-upon aspects of assessment: 1) the need to consider both the product and the process; 2) the need to adopt a complete assessment approach that relates the COURSE competencies or objectives, the teaching and learning activities performed by students and the assessment methods and tasks used; and 3) the need to incorporate reflective and FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT to maximize learning.

In TS, different classifications exist for major approaches to translation assessment: Colina (2011, 2013), citing Lauscher (2000), divides non-experiential methods into equivalence-based (e.g. based on Nida's formal and dynamic equivalence category) and non-equivalence (e.g. skopos theory) approaches, which have been subject to much criticism (see Colina 2013). Martínez Melis & Hurtado Albir (2001) identify three areas for assessment: assessment of published translations; assessment in professional practice; and assessment in translation teaching. In TS, work on the under-researched area of assessment (Kelly & Martin 2009; Kim 2013), can be categorized as ACCREDITATION and PEDAGOGY, depending on the purpose of assessment (Campbell & Hale 2003), with the former (accreditation), aiming "to certify whether the translator in question has reached a predetermined standard" (Chesterman 2016:135), and with the latter (pedagogy), serving as the main purpose of much of translation assessment in real life (see Chesterman 2016). With regard to the latter, the findings of recent research highlight the need to integrate assessment literacy, i.e. the capacity to develop a high degree of understanding and awareness of academic standards and assessment practices, and the need and criteria for adjustment, through discussion, transparency, and feedback, into translation course design both for staff and students. This is believed to contribute to CONTINUOUS/CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (CPD) (see Huertas-Barros & Vine 2019).

Translation quality assessment (TQA)

In TS, with translation assessment having multiple interpretations depending on the trends and theories translation scholars support in this area (e.g. the concept of norms and its major influence on lateral assessment, and characterizing any mode of translation assessment as normative, see Chesterman 2016:130-131, 138), and having different categories (pragmatic revision; translation quality assessment; quality control; didactic revision; and fresh look/QUALITY ASSURANCE) (Brunette 2000), the overall tendency is to pay attention to translation quality assessment (TQA) mainly

used in employing translators, concluding a contract with freelancers, and/or gaining admittance to professional associations or guilds (Brunette 2000). While emphasizing the three key notions of *quality* (aiming at, according to Al-Qinai 2000, the reception of target text), *ERROR ANALYSIS* (as an essential approach to TQA in the comparative analysis and typically used in both the translation industry and CERTIFICATION testing, and focused on product assessment and criticized for such a limited focus, see O'Brien 2012), and *human or automatic product* (see Moorkens et al. 2018a), TQA is conceptually based on the fundamental notion of equivalence (Dybiec-Gajer 2013; House 2015, 2018; Khosravani & Bastian 2017) and is essential for the purpose of improving the quality of a translated text (Khosravani & Bastian 2017). TQA, to which the empirically-based distinction between overt and covert translation is essential (House 2009, 2013), is associated with such important tools as translation CORPORA as an assessment instrument/tool (Bowker 2001; Buendía-Castro & López Rodríguez 2013; House 2015; Laviosa 2010; Rabadán et al. 2009). TQA is addressed through self-evaluation grids (Pakkala-Weckström 2019) or analytical grids reflecting specific criteria (see Eyckmans & Anckaert 2017; Martínez Melis & Hurtado Albir 2001; Morin et al. 2017; Thelen 2019), such as RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, objectivity and practicality (see Doherty 2017; McAlester 2000), or based on implications teaching norms to trainees have for assessment of translation quality, e.g. teaching trainees to think consciously about the usefulness of appropriate strategies, etc. (see Chesterman 1993/2017, 1996, 2016; Heydarian 2016).

Various approaches to and/or models of TQA have been proposed by TS scholars (e.g. Amman 1990; Al-Qinai 2000; House 1977/1981; Larose 1998; Reiss 1968, 1971, 1973; Van den Broeck 1985, 1986), depending on whether they are quantitative, non-quantitative, or of a different category, e.g. linguistically oriented approaches, the argumentation-centered model proposed by Williams (2004), or quite recently, a computerized model of dynamic assessment of translation quality within a pedagogical context by Akrami et al. (2018). Also, House (2009, 2013, 2015, 2018), who proposed her functional-pragmatic model of TQA in the late 1970s (see House 1977/1981), summarizes different approaches to TQA in terms of their area of focus: from psychosocial approaches to philosophical and sociocultural, sociopolitical ones. One should note that, in terms of what the EVALUATION should be, TQA can be summative (focused mainly on translation as a product); or formative (mainly focused on translation as a process) (Thelen 2008). In her doctoral thesis, Mitchell-Schuitevoerder (2014:248) draws a fine distinction between TQA in higher education and TQA in the industry: firstly, the former is focused on translator competence

assessment, while the focus of the latter is output quality; secondly, the former follows standards recommended by national or international quality assurance bodies, but the latter faces the challenge of unified standards (see also Castilho et al. 2018; Drugan 2013, 2014; Thelen 2019). Due to such an inherent difference of TQA in academia and in industry, while some TS authors (O'Brien 2012) advocate the move towards a more dynamic quality evaluation model for translation within the translation industry, others (Wu 2017b) have called for both to work in tandem on translator training.

It should be noted that there is a need for improving the methodological rigor of TQA (Doherty 2017) as a hot issue for translation training (Thelen 2008), and that concerns are expressed over the reliability of holistic assessment (as compared to error-based and analytical assessment) of quality in translation and translator assessment (often in the form of impression scoring) because its objectivity in assessment can be questioned unless it is clearly systemized and in conjunction with other methods (Vigier Moreno & Valero-Garcés 2017:13, 21; see also Doherty 2017; Van Egdom et al. 2019), e.g. clear scoring guides and rubrics, and corpora (Bowker 2000, 2001; Zanettin 1998).

Critical review of TQA models

In a critical review of the models above, Karoubi (2016a, 2017), having developed a process-oriented model of TQA (focused on the behavior of assessors during the assessment process), reaches five main conclusions: 1) the crucial role of assessors/human agents in translation assessment process is minimized or even largely ignored in many TQA models; 2) many TQA models are theoretically based on equivalence as a disputable concept, and TQA process, as formulated within these models, is extremely source text-oriented; 3) purpose of assessment is narrowly defined within the framework of many of TQA models; 4) there is a confusion over translation quality assessment and translation competence assessment in many TQA models; and 5) TQA process is handled based on fixed standards/criteria in most TQA models. Other authors (Mellinger 2018a) argue for the editing and revision component, as a subbranch of translation criticism under applied translation studies in Munday's (2016) expansion of Holmes (1972/1988) map of TS, to be included in TQA models.

TQA in TIS

TQA, as Clifford (2004) rightly argues, is able to offer a great deal of insight into the features that determine the quality of translation and interpretation,