

DIPLOMA IN PUBLIC SERVICE INTERPRETING – JUNE 2011

WRITTEN MARKERS' REPORTS

LANGUAGE: ARABIC

PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW, SCOTTISH LAW AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

The examination results demonstrated a range of achievement on the part of the students. Some candidates performed very well and exhibited a high level of competence in both languages (Arabic and English), subject knowledge and well-developed skills in professional translation practice. Others did not do that well on this occasion. The key issue here is to improve performance prior to the next attempt, ensure that competence is up to the expected standard by learning from mistakes, and that sufficient preparation will be made.

Weaknesses included a lack of familiarity with the relevant terminology, and at times this resulted in awkward or incoherent expression. Grammar was certainly a challenge for most candidates. However, good grammar and knowledge of language conventions are of paramount importance, particularly in legal authoritative texts. It was disappointing to see that some candidates were unable to construct a simple sentence (such as observing the case marking of the predicate of the verb 'kaana', or the case marking of the sound masculine plural, i.e. when to use the 'uun' or 'iin' ending). Not being able to distinguish between these basic grammar rules suggests that further language training and preparation are necessary.

There were some examples of using colloquial expressions in legal/local authority documents, which reflected on the overall quality of the message and text! There were some recurrent spelling mistakes (as in choosing which 'taa' to use, or the dots of the 'yaa' were dropped, or should the hamza be written on an 'alif', 'waaw' or 'yaa'?). Gender agreement was a clear weakness in some of the scripts. Sometimes, the translation was too literal, thus reflecting on the word order and sentence structure. For example, some candidates persisted on starting a sentence with the Subject, whereas the unmarked, common word order of MSA is Verb – Subject.

Recommendations to Centres

Candidates need exposure to real language as used in legal contexts or in the local authority business. It is good practice to encourage candidates to attend court hearings or familiarise themselves with local authority publications and websites.

Time-management during the examination is essential, and candidates should be instructed not to spend too much time on re-writing if this means submitting an incomplete answer. It is better to complete the translation rather than submit incomplete work no matter how well-presented it might be.

Familiarity with specialist terminology should be emphasised as a means to avoid vagueness and distortions. As the English/Scottish and Arabic judicial systems are different and straightforward translation is sometimes not possible, candidates should be advised to look for the nearest equivalent or give an explanation that fits the context. Any explanation or term that does not make sense in context, should alert the candidate and is likely to have been wrongly translated.

Grammar seems to be a problem for most candidates, and it is important to recommend some practical grammar books to brush up knowledge before the exam. Mock examinations can enhance the candidates' experience, build their confidence and provide feedback on their performance. This can help manage their expectations and gauge whether or not they are ready for the real examination.

Recommendations to Candidates

Being a good interpreter/translator requires proficiency in two languages so that candidates can fully understand and appreciate the source text and then reproduce it accurately and effectively in the target language. Subject knowledge is equally important to facilitate the use of terminology and appropriate register. For interpreters/translators of English-Arabic and visa versa, the challenge is doubled. This is because of Arabic being a 'diglossic' language, and it is often the case that some native speakers of (regional/colloquial) Arabic assume that their knowledge of the informal spoken variety is sufficient. In fact, it isn't. Some candidates' use of language did not live up to the level expected from native speakers at degree level. It is important to be proficient in the grammar and repertoire of Modern Standard Arabic, its registers, natural style and collocations in order to produce effective texts that are fit for purpose.

Reading the text in its entirety before translating can clarify ambiguities and help locate the exact meaning of terms and expressions. Some candidates may need to read the text more than once to fully understand not just the general meaning of the text, but also the connotations and nuances. This can also help give clues about unfamiliar language. Candidates can make a much better impression by paying attention to detail, such as consistency, grammatical agreement, spelling and choice between linguistic options.

Preparation prior to the exam is key for success, and this is not just about reading a grammar book or making good use of dictionaries. It should include, for example, attending court hearings, studying original documents, listening to relevant radio or TV programmes and documentaries. Language competence is demonstrated by correct, coherent and grammatically acceptable language.

LANGUAGE: BENGALI
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

Most candidates were able to convey information from English into Bengali, with some inaccuracies, errors and omissions. With some exceptions legibility was a big handicap for candidates. Spelling mistakes abounded in a few cases. A couple of candidates failed to conform to the “tu, vous” convention which exists in Bengali. Not to follow that convention in speech or writing would be considered as a case of social illiteracy. Addition of word/s which were not in the source text can be misleading: the word 'suspicious' was added before 'deaths' in the sentence “...responsible for investigating deaths in particular situations.....”. Following rigidly to the original sentence structure results in inappropriate sentence structure in Bengali. Some candidates did just that.

Recommendations to Centres

If the candidates have never dealt with interpreting before, it would be a good idea to encourage them to go and sit in an open court hearing where their language is being used. This would give them an idea of a real life situation in court proceedings and how an interpreter performs.

One cannot overstate the importance of the knowledge of specialist terminology. It is indeed vital for the examination and can help avoid misunderstandings and distortions.

Recommendations to Candidates

It is important that candidates are competent in both Bengali and English. An interpreter is a facilitator of communication between two parties none of whom have any knowledge of the other's language. If one is not able to fully comprehend one language how is he/she going to convey the message to the other party?

Before starting the translation work, make sure that you have read the material thoroughly and understood it. Then read the translated text and see if it reads like an original writing in Bengali.

Remember that a particular word in English may have more than one meaning. So when consulting a dictionary, look at the various meanings and choose the one that is appropriate in the given context.

Regularly read newspapers and magazines in both English and Bengali, listen to the radio (BBC Radio 4, BBC World Service, etc.) and television news and documentaries.

As you will be interpreting for legal purposes, the way you interpret the subject can mean justice to some and injustice to others.

LANGUAGE: BENGALI
PATHWAY(S): HEALTH

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

Performance was varied. The reason for the variation in marks, it seems, depended on attention to detail - accurately translating specialist words in the text or omitting some altogether. Spelling has been an issue as in every year.

Although, one candidate's translation had only very few spelling mistakes. It is the everyday words that candidates spell inaccurately not the specialist words! Candidates should be taught to look up the difficult words in the dictionary correctly.

The weaker candidates are still providing a literal translation, adhering to the source language sentence structure, resulting in disjointed sentences and incoherent reading resulting in a 'Fail'.

There definitely has been an improvement in the use of cohesive devices resulting in coherent reading and better marks. I was pleasantly surprised by the improved standard of presentation and legibility. Handwriting, especially, if not legible, makes it quite difficult to decide on a mark for the task as it has to be on assumption.

Recommendations to Centres

- Prepare candidates for examinations and do not just improve their knowledge base. Examination skills are as important in achieving good grades
- Pay extra special attention to the spelling of simple words
- Punctuation is extremely important in conveying messages
- Use paragraphing as required, separating information
- Discourage transliteration until and unless absolutely necessary.

Recommendations to Candidates

- Take great care of spelling, punctuation and grammar
- Read the text once before starting translating because you will have a better idea of what the text is all about
- Good, neat presentation and legible writing goes a long way towards a better grade. If the examiner cannot read your writing, you make it more difficult for the marker to award the grade you deserve.

LANGUAGE: BULGARIAN
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW, LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

Generally, this year all translations were of a good standard; however one of the candidates had missed an important sentence in the translation in Unit 05, which was the main reason for failing the paper.

A recurring theme again this year is the tendency to play it safe and stick too closely to the original text, which can impact negatively on the readability of the translation in the target language. There were also instances where candidates had opted to add the term in English, or a more wordy description of the translated term in brackets.

Spelling, grammar and punctuation mistakes continue to exist, and although some are clearly due to exam pressure, others demonstrate a clear gap in knowledge in this area, especially concerning the use of commas and the correct form for a subject in a sentence.

Recommendations to Centres

Advise candidates that playing it safe and providing descriptive translations or alternatives in English do not gain marks. In real-life situations candidates may not have the luxury of time to be too verbose, and adding the text in English does not ensure clarity. It is therefore important that interpreters build an extensive vocabulary in the area of work in which they wish to specialise.

Encourage candidates to gain and maintain their knowledge of procedures and terminology by attending as many court hearings and/or public service events as possible – in the UK and in their native countries, in order to familiarise themselves with procedures and actual use of terminology. Recommend also extensive reading of documents in their chosen area of work. Good understanding of the concepts in their chosen languages will make translation and interpreting more accurate, fluent and put less pressure on them as interpreters.

Advise candidates that accuracy, grammar, punctuation and style are part of the same package and that it is important that these are used correctly. Although interpreters may not wish to be professional translators, they should still demonstrate knowledge of grammar and spelling in the languages they work in.

Ensure that all terminology is covered adequately during the training.

Recommendations to Candidates

Examinations can be stressful but so can interpreting assignments. Control of the situation is therefore vital. Develop coping techniques that will help ensure good quality of work whatever the circumstances.

Work at mastering the vocabulary used in the area you plan to work in and maintain that. Dictionaries are useful; however, on their own they are not enough. Work towards use of language that is accurate but also sounds natural. Pro-actively seek exposure to situations you are likely to come across as an interpreter as well as situations that improve general knowledge and understanding of the environment people live and work in.

Accuracy, grammar, punctuation and style are part of the same package – maintain these to a high standard.

Hand-writing must be legible and any corrections marked clearly. In an examination if something cannot be read, it will be marked down. In real-life situations it can lead to vital information being missed out or misunderstood.

LANGUAGE: CANTONESE AND MANDARIN (TRADITIONAL SCRIPT)
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

The overall performance this year was slightly weaker than last year. Strengths were that all candidates managed to complete the task and most candidates, at the same, were able to understand the gist of the original text. Major failures concerned the lack of translation skills. The majority of candidates were not able to produce a fluent translation. Most translated the original text in verbatim, without paying due attention to grammatical structure, cohesive devices and most importantly, syntactical construction. A few candidates struggled with terminologies and as a result impeded understanding which resulted in confusion to readers.

Recommendations to Centres

It would be helpful if candidates could learn and practise:

- syntactical construction in Chinese;
- choice of appropriate cohesive devices;
- grammar;
- spelling of certain common words;
- checking for accuracy, errors and omissions after completing the task.

Recommendations to Candidates

Please bear in mind that the translated text should be:

- comprehensible and acceptable as a document (either formal or informal, depending on the source text);
- free from inaccuracies;
- a translated text and not a piece of creative writing;
- checked for errors and omissions before submitting the task.

LANGUAGE: CANTONESE
PATHWAY(S): HEALTH AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

There is a big variation in the performance of this year's candidates, ranging from incomplete tasks to incomprehensible text to work of a good standard.

Common problems include the following:-

1. A number of scripts continue to display wrong characters. Despite the fact that dictionaries are allowed in the examination, this is a problem that shows up year after year. It is felt that candidates should really exercise more care in their writing. It is unacceptable at this professional level to have wrong characters.

2. The task in the Health Pathway involves a leaflet about Alzheimer's disease. This has been a widely discussed topic in care issues. The text is relatively easy with a restricted number of technical terms. However, some candidates still find some of the terms challenging. For instance, *psychiatric* is confused with "psychological"; *personality* with "personal"; and *numeracy* with "numbers". The task in the Local Government Pathway is about instructions on postal voting. Again, technical terms such as *polling station* and *returning officer* are problematic.
3. Alternative translations are provided. One example is *Alzheimer's disease*, which has been translated as "阿爾茨海默病 (Alzheimer's disease)" and "早老性癡呆 (presenile dementia)" in the same text. This can only cause confusion to the readers.
4. Perhaps the biggest problem lies in the linguistic skills of the candidates. Some candidates appear to have trouble decoding some constructions, including *The symptoms of the degenerative disease known as Alzheimer's disease vary* (taking it to mean "Alzheimer's disease is the name of the symptoms"); *unusual words substituted* (taking it to mean "unusual words are being substituted"); and *If you have any allegations of fraud* (taking it to mean "if you have been accused of fraud").
5. Another manifestation of weak linguistic skills is the inability to produce grammatical sentence structure in the target language.

However, presentation of the scripts is generally good this year. Most of the candidates have neat handwriting.

Recommendations to Centres

It is suggested that the centres should remind candidates to fill in all the required details on the script cover. The information about the centres has created a bit of confusion this year. Indeed, a single word "London" is not very helpful. Perhaps candidates can be reminded to include the centre name.

Always advise your candidates to leave some time at the end to check their work. This is good practice to help rid the translation of omissions and wrong characters.

When training your candidates, centres should encourage candidates to do more reading in relation to various topics. This is the only way to get familiar with the terminology, conventions and languages used in the profession.

Recommendations to Candidates

It is of paramount importance that a translator has competent linguistic skills. Candidates are encouraged to read more good quality writing to improve their linguistic skills. However, merely knowing the source language and the target language well is not enough. It is essential to stay abreast of the language change. An illustrative example is related to the term *Alzheimer's disease*. A safe option is to use its established name 阿爾茨海默病 which is a transliteration. However, some candidates have opted for 早老性癡呆 (presenile dementia). Putting aside the question of appropriacy, it should be noted that since November 2010 the use of 癡呆症 for "dementia" has been abandoned in Hong Kong (where Cantonese is the main language) socially and substituted with 腦退化症 (degenerative disease of the brain). While the new rendition has not been adopted as the "medical" term by the government authorities, the change should be noted and closely monitored by professional translators and the like.

It is understandable to feel nervous and make silly mistakes in examinations and that is why leaving time at the end to check your work is extremely important. Indeed, one candidate has left out a whole sentence.

LANGUAGE: CZECH
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

In general this was a very strong group and results will have compared favourably to last year. Most candidates were able to convey information from English into Czech well. Overall grammatical and syntactical constructions were good, as well as the use of conjunctions and punctuation. There were some missing commas in subordinate clauses but less than in the past. This shows that the overall standard of candidates has increased. There was good command of specialised terminology but some people did not translate the terms "post-mortem" and "inquest" fully as they are translated in a dictionary. Overall, translations were fluent and comprehensive. What is really important is to feel that the text is not a translation but an original piece of text. Therefore good stylistic ability is essential and that comes with

practice and confidence and that seems to be happening with the candidates.

Recommendations to Centres

Candidates should learn to compile lists of appropriate terminology and check how these terms are used in real texts and thus learn how to be more comfortable and natural using them. It is important to learn how to write semi-professional texts. It is important that the candidates' knowledge of Czech grammar and stylistics is of sufficiently high standard so that they can concentrate on developing their translating skills. Candidates should be reminded that logic is essential to producing a good translation and that anything which does not make sense, in that context, should attract their attention and is likely to have been wrongly translated. Candidates need stronger linguistic skills, more awareness of the language and vocabulary actually used by the practitioners of the legal profession, not to restrict themselves to only the knowledge obtained from glossaries and dictionaries. Use of monolingual dictionaries for cross-reference is also vital.

Recommendations to Candidates

It is important to read relevant texts both in English and in Czech and develop the ability to transfer not just the message but also the style without copying the English style but finding the appropriate style in Czech. In reality it means using the right conjunctions and complex syntax and passive sentences to indicate a semi-professional style. Errors in punctuation are often avoidable if candidates follow the basic rules about subordinate clauses. It is also important to provide legible texts without many crossings out – as always, the first impression often counts a lot! Also compile lists of necessary terms, especially titles and legal terminology, which would be difficult to select from a dictionary correctly. It is also important to practise writing on selected topics so that the examination situation is not stressful.

LANGUAGE: CZECH
PATHWAY(S): SCOTTISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

I cannot compare overall performance of candidates to last year but if it is compared to the performance of candidates doing the pathway of English Law then they are substantially weaker. Some candidates did not understand the English meaning and were even making up phrases or sentences. The text did not make sense then. Also the knowledge of basic legal terminology in its context was missing. Several people translated "custody" as guardianship when "stay in police custody was the context. The ability of candidates to write a piece of text that would read like an original piece was lower than in the English law group. Usage of complex sentences and the right word order were also not as good as the other group.

Recommendations to Centres

Centres should select people that have a good knowledge of Czech grammar and are capable of writing in Czech so that they can concentrate on developing their translating skills and extending their general and specialised vocabulary. Good knowledge of specialised vocabulary and legal terminology are of paramount importance because candidates cannot rely purely on dictionaries. It is difficult to develop these skills without deep background knowledge of relevant situations and topics so the candidates should be always reminded to read and read as much as they can. Candidates need stronger linguistic skills, more awareness of the language and vocabulary actually used both by the practitioners of the legal profession and by the general public. Candidates ought to read and listen to general English as much as they can.

Recommendations to Candidates

Candidates should make sure that they have read and understood the material and only then go ahead with the translation. Equally, it is essential for candidates to re-read what has been written in its entirety to see if it makes sense in the context of the situation being described. Candidates should study as many original documents pertaining to their chosen topic as possible, in order to build up a bank of idiomatic terminology. Reading newspapers on a daily basis is also important. Knowledge of Czech grammar, especially the punctuation rules, varied conjunctions and complex syntax and correct word order as well as the use of passive constructions are also essential.

LANGUAGE: CZECH
PATHWAY(S): HEALTH AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

HEALTH

There was a failure to produce an adequate rendering as the specialist terminology and use of grammar was not up to the required standard. The cohesive devices used were not adequate and as a result did not provide a coherent reading. Many terms which should be the basic knowledge of a candidate for this pathway were mistranslated and this resulted in a distorted message.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The candidates produced good, cohesive pieces of writing with some exceptions that did not adversely affect the overall coherence of the text. The candidates also managed to convey the content accurately with some minor inaccuracies. However, one did produce fatal errors that could have been avoided.

Recommendations to Centres

Candidates need to be aware that the written aspect of DPSI is more common than is perhaps believed, and they need to be able to produce a coherent piece of writing with an adequate command of specialist terminology. This is especially crucial in a Health context where a person's life may be at stake. Candidates should also be reminded that interpreting is an ever-evolving skill that requires constant improvement of linguistic skills and that includes the ability to write in the target language.

Recommendations to Candidates

Be aware that interpreting is an ever-evolving skill that requires constant improvement of linguistic skills and that includes the ability to write in the target language. It is crucial to be able to apply the rules of grammar and syntax as any shortcomings may result in your translation being incoherent. It is very useful to read articles in the chosen subject in both languages to become aware of any cultural differences and to keep expanding your vocabulary, which is constantly evolving. Fluency in two languages does not necessarily equal a good interpreter. It is an acquired skill which needs to be constantly worked on.

LANGUAGE: DARI
PATHWAY(S): LAW, HEALTH AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

The translation of specialist terminology from English into Dari remains a prevalent issue amongst the candidates this year. Throughout the English Law, Health and Local Government papers most candidates have been unsuccessful in providing the exact equivalents for terminology in Dari. There are appropriate equivalents in Dari for words such as 'coroner', 'post-mortem', 'proxy vote' and 'inquest.' With the exception of a few cases candidates have failed to translate these terms and items of lexis accurately and have often provided a description in Dari which is out of context and misleading. There are further issues with the theory of translation. Specifically most candidates have provided a word for word translation of the original text as opposed to a meaning for meaning translation. As a result these translations do not convey the meaning effectively and coherently. Maintaining English word order and structure and merely translating English lexis into Dari is not adequate at this level. In addition some candidates have transliterated English words such as 'post-mortem' and 'electoral administration' into Dari instead of translating them which again has resulted in erroneous rendering of the original message.

Recommendations to Centres

The knowledge of specialist terminology is crucial for candidates who wish to take part in English Law, Health and Local Government examinations. Inaccurate translation of key terminology often leads to distortion of the entire text. Taking into consideration the socio-linguistic differences between English and Dari explaining certain terms off the cuff or coining an entirely new lexis for existing terms causes misunderstanding. My contention is that centres need to provide guidance, possibly on suitable materials for candidates and develop a vocabulary list consisting of accurate translations

of specialist terminology. Candidates should be advised to make a decision about their choice of word and avoid providing alternative translations for a word inside brackets or even worse transcribing the English word instead of translating it. Introduction to theory of translation is also essential in preparing the candidates for IOLET exams; as often a word for word translation leads to ambiguity and misunderstanding.

Recommendations to Candidates

There is no doubt that accurate, effective and efficient translation from English to Dari and Dari to English requires an in-depth command of both languages. However candidates need to bear in mind that speaking a language as a native does not give you the ability to translate to or from it. In order to be able to create an accurate translation you need to have a very good command of both the target and the original languages as well as a good command of theory and practice of translation. You also have to have very good background knowledge of your subject matter.

Regular contact (via media and press) with both languages can help develop your general linguist capability and improve your knowledge of vocabulary and grammar in both languages. Remember idiomatic translation of texts and providing a meaning for meaning rendering of texts are essential parts of examinations at this level. Develop a vocabulary list containing idiomatic terminology and their equivalents in Dari in your subject matter and review and expand this list regularly.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH (UNIT 04)

OPTION(S): ENGLISH LAW, SCOTTISH LAW, HEALTH AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

GENERAL COMMENTS

The standard was higher than in previous years, with fewer weak candidates. This was so across all pathways and languages. Performance was somewhat weaker in the Health pathway than in Law and Local Government.

LAW PATHWAY

The text was a letter to a firm of lawyers from a man involved in a divorce, enquiring about the availability of legal aid. Most candidates tackled this task well. Although exact legal terminology was not always used, acceptable paraphrases were usually found. Given that the text was a simulation of one written by a member of the public, who would not necessarily know and use exact legal terms and niceties, use of paraphrases was acceptable, provided that these expressed the right meaning and were not too lengthy. Consideration was also given to the fact that the other-language texts inevitably differed in the extent to which equivalent terms could be used, as their legal systems differ from that of the UK.

Legal terminology was often paraphrased, and the paraphrases chosen were of varying acceptability, e.g.:

“Marriage breakdown” was rendered as “definite breakage of marriage”, “breach of marriage”, “invalidity of marriage”, “matrimony cancellation”, “renunciation of marriage”, “to finish this painful marriage”. “Impending dissolution of my marital union”, “upcoming termination of marriage”, “anticipated dissolution of marriage” were characteristic of a high-flown style which sounds pompous in English but perhaps less so in Polish. On the other hand, “outstanding marriage dissolution” (Spanish *pendiente*) sounded like a paradoxical situation. Some Urdu candidates used an Urdu term “Nikah” and wrote “termination of Nikah” which was puzzling for the reader. It was inappropriate to retain this term, which is meaningless to a UK lawyer.

“Legal aid” was often not specifically stated, and various paraphrases were used. In most O/L texts, the concept was expressed as something like “free legal help”. Most candidates expressed this literally, using a term like “help”, “assistance”, “support”, “get benefit to cover solicitor’s cost” or “advice”. Only the best candidates, with knowledge of the British legal system, used the exact term “legal aid” (ideally, not preceded by the adjective “free” since the latter is tautological, as legal aid is by definition free). Many Polish candidates called it “legal advice” which was not accurate; the term in the Polish text, “*pomoc*”, could be translated as “help, aid, assistance”, so “advice” was too specific.

Other terms offered included “jurisdictional assistance” (from the French text’s “*aide juridictionnelle*”). Candidates should beware of choosing words just because they resemble the source language (“false friends”).

“Family law” was translated as “family rights” by some Polish candidates, influenced by the Polish “*prawa rodzinne*” presumably as “*prawo*” can mean either “law” or “right”. For a similar reason, a Spanish candidate wrote “a family right

matter“for “*un asunto de derecho de familia*”.

The idea of “contesting the divorce“ was conveyed in a more roundabout way in some texts. Thus, the Polish text expressed the idea of “contests” in a negative way: “*nie zamierza ona uznać powództwa*” (= she does not intend to recognise the action”. As “*uznać*” has many other possible translations, some of these were chosen by candidates, e.g. “she does not mean to admit my litigation”; “does not acknowledge the claim”; “does not intend to admit the petition”; “she intends to reject my action”; “will not acknowledge the complaint”; “she will not acknowledge the action”; “she does not accept the suit” (“suit” in this sense is an old-fashioned term). One translation offered: “She is not going to confess to an action” was the result of finding in the dictionary that “*uznać*” can on occasion mean “confess” though this would be meaningless in this context.

Some Slovak candidates produced the rather incongruous phrase: “challenge the proposal for divorce” (Slovak *napadnúť návrh na rozvod*).

“Seek custody” was paraphrased in various ways: “wants the children joined with her “; “keep the children (= to obtain custody); “guard of the children”.

One candidate perhaps misread the Polish “*ubiegać się o*” (= contend for, compete for/about) as “*ubiegać*” which means “run away, escape” and so produced the opposite meaning “does not want to accept the custody of the children”.

“Maintenance for my wife” was rendered as “upkeep of the wife” which carries unwanted connotations, as “upkeep” usually refers to a piece of equipment, like a car. Polish: *środki finansowe na utrzymanie żony* was translated as “financial liabilities of my wife”; “means to sustain my wife”; “financial resources for my wife’s maintenance”. These were rather too grandiloquent, reflecting the previously mentioned tendency.

“Subsidy for my wife” was a misuse of the dictionary by a Slovak candidate (Slovak “podpora”). Another Slovak error was to mistake the direction of the likely payment: “financial support from wife” (*podpory manželky*); here, the genitive case of the noun “wife” being mistakenly interpreted as meaning the one who gives rather than the one who receives.

A Panjabi candidate offered: “The financial well-being of my wife”, while “The economic benefit of my wife” was from a Somali candidate. “Income support for my wife” was quite wrong, as this refers to the benefits system. “Pension for my wife” (from a Brazilian candidate: a false friend for Portuguese “*pensão*”) was quite misleading. “Widow’s pension for wife” from another, would confuse the reader even more.

Other false friend errors from Portuguese included: “If the divorce is not adjudicated” and “I need to require legal aid” (Portuguese: *requerer* = *seek, apply for*). Another Portuguese false friend, used also by French and Romanian candidates, was “tribunal” for “court”.

The term “attorney” was sometimes used for barrister or solicitor, or as a general term for lawyer. This term has little currency in England, and is best avoided, though it is commonly used in the USA and to some extent in Scotland.

“Negotiating settlements” proved a difficult concept to express. Attempts included: “solve problems in talking”, “solve anything verbally”.

“Agent for litigation” was a rather opaque and ponderous term for “legal representative”. “Legal plenipotentiary” was even more ponderous, having been chosen presumably because the candidate had uncritically looked up in the dictionary the Polish term used in the text: “*pełnomocnik*”, which does have “plenipotentiary” among its possible translations. “Attorney ad litem” was too technical a term, and would not be used by the writer in question.

Another example of the perils of unthinking dictionary use was the translation of Polish “*przedmiot*” = “object, item”, as “subject” (which it *can* also mean sometimes), thus rendering the phrase “I don’t possess any other valuable items” as “I do not have any other valuable subjects”.

The concept of the wife contesting the divorce was often misunderstood or mistranslated, e.g.: “My wife intends to fight **for** the divorce (from a Gujarati candidate) which conveys the opposite meaning. “Protest against the marriage end” and “To apply against this divorce” were two other versions.

“My wife is thinking of fighting me for a divorce” was written by a Panjabi candidate. Here, the correct version was “is contesting the divorce” but the version given implies the opposite. “My wife is planning on going against the divorce, and says she will look after the children” was factually correct, but insufficiently legal-sounding.

“Custody of the children” was variously rendered as: “child protection” (a misleading term); “fostering” (something completely different); “children’s safeguard”; “guardianship”; “parental authority”; “her parental rights”; “caring for children” (too vague); “sole residency order” (too specific).

“Issues” (in the now current sense of “problems”) was rendered as “controversies” (a Spanish false friend: *controversias*). Other Spanish direct translations included: “My marriage, which is prickled with problems” (from: *erizado de dificultades*: *erizado* is related to the word for hedge-hog!).

“I beg you” (Spanish “*le ruego*”) sounds desperately plaintive in English, as, unlike “*ruego*”, “beg” is not usually used performatively. Similarly “I volunteer to pay” (*Me ofresco a pagar*) is unusual as a performative verb in English.

“State benefits” was rendered as “benefits from the country” or “from the government” or “government earnings”.

An example of word-for word translation from a French candidate was: “information regarding financial order (= *des informations d’ordre financier*). French candidates should also beware of rendering “*en effect*” or “*effectivement*” as “effectively”. A closer equivalent is “actually” or “the fact is..”. Possibly the worst French “*faux ami*” was the following: “In case they have to appear in court” was rendered as “in cas of comparison in tribunal” (= *au cas de comparution au tribunal*).

A Czech false friend was “Concretely” used for “specifically” (Czech: *konkrétně*).

“Hearing” was often rendered as “trial”. This is inappropriate for a divorce court, as no one is being “tried” as such. Some French candidates called “hearings”: “auditions” or “debates” (from *les débats*).

“Make a small contribution” was rendered as “participation” influenced by the French false friend = *payer une petite participation*.

“I live alone” was rendered as “I am a single parent”.

Some candidates rendered “interpreter” as “translator”. Given the title of the examination that they are taking, the distinction between the two really ought to be familiar to all candidates. Although in many languages the distinction is not made (e.g. Polish *tłumacz*, Russian *переводчик*), the context of a court appearance should have made the need for “interpreter” clear.

“A public hearing (i.e. open to the public) became “a show trial” for one Romanian candidate.

SPELLING

Words often misspelt included: separately, accommodation, lawyer, legal, receive, writing. The last of these “writting” – is the least forgivable.

“Sporting wife” was momentarily puzzling to the reader: one would not normally expect the wife to behave in a sporting way in this situation. However, “supporting” was intended.

Spanish candidates should remember that many words with a single consonant in Spanish have a double consonant in English. However, one Spanish candidate was so conscious of this pitfall that s/he produced a hypercorrection: “refferring”.

Among the most unfortunate misspellings was “I am devoicing my wife”. This sounds like a surgical rather than a legal procedure, possibly one contemplated by a desperate husband in a darker moment.

GRAMMAR

A weakness noted among some speakers of Indian languages was a tendency to run the sentences together, without full stops separating them. In other cases, question marks were omitted, causing lack of coherence, especially where the word order did not make it clear that a question was indicated.

A wide variety of languages of southern and south-west Asia, such as Pashto, carried over their L-1 way of linking a main clause to an indirect question (post-predicative subordination), using “that”, e.g. “I want to know that if.”; “I want to know that will I..”; “I want information that whether...” etc.

Article usage was one of the main areas of weakness. In many cases this involved simply omitting the definite article. This often does not affect the meaning, but produces an irritating impression on the reader. However, in some cases article omission is more serious, as it can affect the meaning, as in “My wife wants to have children” (rather than “My wife wants to have the children”, i.e. custody).

There was a tendency, especially among candidates in Slavonic and Baltic languages (particularly Polish, Russian, Czech, Slovak and Lithuanian), to overuse the indefinite article, writing, for example: “a help”, “a family law” or with uncountables: “an information”, “an advice”.

Some candidates used “the wife” for “my wife”. In English colloquial usage this does occur, but gives a connotation of chauvinistic condescension or jocularly, mainly used between males. This error was mainly from speakers of languages which lack articles, especially Slavonic languages which usually omit “my” in the context of “my wife”.

Russians tended to write: “I am living separately *with* the wife”, which was confusing. On the face of it, it was not clear why this mistake had arisen, as the Russian text had: “*живу отдельно от жены*” which exactly parallels the English phrase (= separately from). However, they may have been thinking of the frequently occurring Russian use of “*Мы с женой*” (“my wife and I”: literally “we with wife”) so this may be classified as an indirect interference error. A more obvious misuse of word-for-word translation from Russian was: “claiming for condemning of our children custody” (*требовать, чтобы ей присудили попечение над детьми*) where “*присудили*” could possibly mean “condemned” but not in this context.

Some candidates inserted articles where they should not be, e.g. “behind the closed doors”, “If I have to go to the court”.

Some speakers of Romance languages, e.g. Portuguese and French, inserted final –s on the end of adjectives, making them agree with their nouns, e.g. “officials notifications”; “Are the hearings privates or publics?”. This is a very basic error.

There was a tendency to use incorrect verb forms in longer direct questions, with a mixture of auxiliaries: “Are these proceedings at court will be public”.

The passive was often not used. Instead the active was used: “If my application does not approve..”.

Indirect questions were avoided by many candidates, who used the direct question forms instead: “I would like to enquire is it necessary.....”.

The only frequent tense errors concerned the incorrect use of a future tense in an “If”- clause: “If I will have to appear in court”.

Russian candidates produced a double negative construction: “not ... neither ... nor..” and were especially prone to errors with redundant indefinite articles: “a consent”, “a legal aid”.

Some Russians mistranslated the modal form “*должен ли я..?*” as “Should I ...” whereas in fact it means (in this context): “Do I have to (pay my wife’s legal costs)?”

One or two Urdu candidates overused the present continuous tense: “I am not even having any welfare benefit”, while some Russians made the opposite error – using the present simple where the present continuous should be used: “I divorce my wife”.

“Pay for” was used where “pay” was required in “pay my wife’s legal costs”.

GENRE CONVENTIONS

Care should be taken to avoid carrying over into English the letter conventions of the source language. These include punctuation. Several languages use an exclamation mark after the letter salutation, and some candidates wrote “Dear Sir or Madam!”. A linguistically-naïve British reader, unaware that the writer is simply complying with the habits of the other language, might interpret this “!” as a token of impatience, petulance or even sarcasm on the part of the writer.

The spelling “Madame” should be avoided, as in English it refers only to a brothel-keeper.

Other salutations that should not be used include “Respected gentlemen” “Respectable Sir” etc.

“Mr Manager” should not be used, even if followed by “Dear Sir” lower down the page.

Similarly, at the other end of the letter, such formulaic expressions as “With respect” or “Yours respectfully” (e.g. Bulgarian “*С уважение*”) should not be carried over. Urdu candidates tended to write “Applicant”, which is also inappropriate.

Russians should be aware of differences in the use of commas: “Will you, please, advise me...” reflects the conventional Russian use of commas before and after “please”; however, in English, their use in this context sounds rather too insistent, even impatient and long-suffering.

It is also safest to stick to the standard “Yours sincerely” and avoid colloquialisms such as “Kind regards”. Although the

use of email has resulted in a blurring of distinctions of formality in this regard, when reproducing a letter it is best to be conservative. It is also necessary to distinguish between “I attach ...” which is only for email, and “I enclose” which is still appropriate for a letter.

The pound sign should be placed before the number, i.e. £20 not 20£.

HEALTH PATHWAY

The text was a letter from overseas from a doctor who had treated a patient who has now returned to the UK, detailing what treatment she had received after an accident. Most candidates managed to convey the facts correctly, though the success at translating the medical terms varied considerably.

“Underweight” was mistranslated as “overweight”.

“Load-bearing exercise” defeated most candidates. Translations offered included: “exercises with a load of limbs”; “activity burdening limbs”; “activities with limbs ballast”. In the last example, the candidate had looked up the Polish “*obciążanie*” which literally means “action of making heavy, loading” and found “ballast” among the possible English translations, but had not bothered to do the necessary reverse look-up (always advisable before using an unfamiliar word) and therefore not found that “ballast” only refers to making a ship or similar vehicle heavier. A French candidate offered: “exercise which does not strain on her bones” which was a misreading of “*exercice avec contrainte osseuse*”.

“Bone density scan” was translated as “BMI” (which is Body Mass Index).

An example of a hurried look-up was: “She was cheered up about the exercise like walking and dancing” (Spanish .. *se le animo a que hiciera ejercicios de recargo tales como caminar y bailar*). The same candidate had a tendency to translate word for word: “*Aún bajo mi cargo*” (still under my care) was rendered as “yet down to my duty”, and “she moaned about a pain” for “*Se quejó de un dolor*”.

Osteoporosis was paraphrased as “weaker bones”.

“Passive smoking” was rendered as “the danger of smoking for others”; or “instant smoking”; “leads a sedentary lifestyle” as “sits most of the time”; “bone density scan” as “checkup to find the solidness of bones”; “steriled treatment” was a mistake for “steroid treatment”.

“I suspected that she might have osteoporosis” was rendered as “I was feared that she could have poor bones”.

A puzzling error of word order was “an operation requiring fracture was confirmed” which suggested that the surgeon was planning to break the bone, rather than mend the fracture! The intended version was, of course, “a fracture requiring an operation”.

GRAMMAR

One area of error was tenses. The present perfect was sometimes used where the past simple was needed. e.g. “I’ve done a full medical assessment” instead of “I did...”. This implies that the event is recent, and is closely linked to the present situation, which is not the case in the text. The same applies to “she has been feeling a pain in her right hip”.

Use of the correct sequence of tenses in reported speech was a problem for some candidates, as the incorrect use can cause ambiguity or can mislead the reader about the sequence of events. For example: “The patient reported that she had suffered from colitis” means that the patient said, at the time of interview: “I have suffered/or suffered in the past from colitis” (but am not at present suffering from it). English makes this clear by changing the tense to the past perfect. Slavonic languages operate a different system: the same tense is used in indirect speech, in the reported clause, as in a direct speech clause. Thus, the Polish text had: “*pacjentka podała, że chorowała* ... etc. Here, the reported verb is in the past tense. In this form the verb could also be translated by the unwary as “was suffering” or “suffered” which would suggest that she was still suffering from colitis at the time of the interview. However, if that had been the case, the reported verb would have been in the present tense, so there was no ambiguity. Some candidates did not spot this, and wrote “... the patient reported that she suffered from colitis”. A similar error led to “I suspected Mrs Kloda can have fragility of bones” (Polish: *może mieć*) instead of “might have”.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PATHWAY

The text was a letter from a community centre to the relevant department of a local council, outlining their plans to organise a street party for the local community.

The text was generally translated adequately. The most difficult parts were some complex terms such as “promote social cohesion”. This was rendered as “social integrity”, “cohesion within people”, “social inclusion”, “keeping together

community”, “propagate social relations”.

“Neighbourhood watch” was not known by most candidates, who came up with various phrases such as “neighbourhood guard”, “neighbourly fire brigade”, “neighbourhood patrol”, “promote the vigilance in the neighbourhood”.

“It is convenient to ask for” was a false friend from Spanish “*es conveniente solicitar* = it is advisable, as was “collocation of closed road signs” (“placing”).

“Dispose of rubbish” was rendered as “to remove harmful elements”.

“Noise pollution” was rendered as “phonic pollution”.

“To reduce the fear of crime” became “to reduce the thieves’ fear” which implies a different meaning.

The relatively new, and highly PC phrase “risk assessment” unsurprisingly caused some difficulties. Versions offered included: “The possibilities involving risk”; “Do we have to estimate about potential losses?”; “Must we do a risk assessment?” (French: *devons-nous...*) Here, “must we” conveys an unwanted implication of “please tell me we don’t have to..” i.e. it seeks the answer “No”, which is not necessarily the case with “*devons-nous*”. Here, “Do we have to..?” the more neutral, unmarked form, would be better.

“We expect the music” was influenced by the French “*Nous prévoyons de la musique*” whereas the verb in this context means “we plan (to have) some music”.

“Noise pollution” was rendered as “nuisances resounding” (French: *nuisances sonores*).

“In order not to exceed noise limits” was rendered as “so that we do not exceed the level of uproar/tumult”.

There were the usual article omissions, one of which was potentially confusing: “few of the stalls will be selling food” (= a few).

GRAMMAR

Word order in indirect questions was sometimes reversed, as in a direct question: “I’m not sure how many people can we expect”, which suggests that the writer is enquiring about the reader’s opinion, rather than merely expressing doubt.

The reader would be puzzled by the following reference to a subterranean dwelling: “The disabled driver living under number 26” (Polish: “*pod numerem 26*”, where “*pod*” does mean literally “under”).

Recommendations to Centres

Make sure that candidates write both the name and number of the centre correctly on the script cover and also on each sheet of the script. In cases where a college has more than one venue for the examination, the name of the main institution should be written. Candidate numbers should also be checked for accuracy as sometimes a 6 digit number is written as 5 digits or a different number is written on the script cover from that on each sheet.

If candidates opt to type their answers, double spacing should be used.

Recommendations to Candidates

Be aware of the typical mistakes of your own language group, e.g. article usage among Slavonic and Baltic languages, and “false friends” among speakers of Romance languages. When a dictionary search gives what appears to be an equivalent, if it is unfamiliar to you, check its context of use by performing a reverse look-up.

LANGUAGE: FARSI
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

I did not mark the papers last year, therefore, I cannot compare performance with that of the candidates who took the examination last year. Overall, the performance of the English Law examination candidates was not impressive. This year Unit 05 was not particularly difficult; this is more noticeable when we compare it with Scottish Law.

Generally speaking, there were three different groups of candidates this year and there may be in other years as well; one group were those who have a good command of English but poor Farsi (group 1), those who have a good command of Farsi but poor English (group 2) and those who have an equally good command of both languages (group 3).

Candidates in group 1 understand the text and obtain good marks for "Accuracy & Appropriacy" but fare less well in the other two areas ("Cohesion, Coherence & Genre Conventions" and "Effectiveness of Communication"). Candidates in group 2 do well in "Cohesion, Coherence & Genre Conventions and Effectiveness of Communication" but they are poor in Accuracy & Appropriacy". Those who are in group 3 are the ones who can be good interpreters.

The candidates in group 1 had mostly encountered problems in the translation of terms such as "Coroners", "post-mortems" and "inquests", terms for which there is either no exact equivalent in Farsi or for which there are different terms. Therefore, most of them must have looked the terms up in a dictionary and chosen one of the senses of the particular term, but because their Farsi was not very good, they were unable to choose the appropriate rendering.

The only paragraph that was slightly challenging for candidates was the last paragraph (An inquest is a legal inquiry into the medical cause and circumstances of a death. It is held in public - sometimes with a jury - by a coroner, in cases where the death was: violent or unnatural; took place in prison or police custody; or when the cause of death is uncertain"). Most candidates either transliterated "with a jury" or wrote both the translation and the transliteration.

Recommendations to Centres

I have two recommendations to centres:

- 1- They should make sure all candidates make it clear which copy is the rough copy and which one is the neat/final copy.
- 2- They make sure the details of the front page forms are all completed correctly.

Recommendations to Candidates

I recommend that the candidates in group 1 work on their Farsi more than their English and that those in group 2 work on their English more than their Farsi. There is a good website with both Farsi and English texts which the candidates in both groups can benefit from. It is: www.gooya.com

LANGUAGE: FARSI
PATHWAY(S): LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

This year's results have been unusually outstanding, including Distinction, Merit and Passes, one of which would have been a high Merit or a Distinction had it not been for the candidate's oversight and missing two short sentences from the translation.

The few mistakes that do appear in the papers are again mostly in sentence structure which prove to be rather clumsy expressions because they tend to follow the same structure as the English text. This is a very common mistake and very easily made, especially in the heat of the examination. The main and the subordinate clauses do not always follow the same pattern in Farsi as they do in English, and candidates ought to pay particular attention to this point for, as I have said, it is a mistake that is very easily made and may look normal in the first instance.

Recommendations to Centres

Please see 'recommendations to candidates'.

Recommendations to Candidates

There is now a heap of material on the internet that provides the translation of various articles on different subjects. Candidates should spend time studying these articles for the purpose of comparison.

Candidates should also be wary of word for word translation in particular and afford themselves some time to review their rendition and rectify instances of unsound or weak expressions.

LANGUAGE: FRENCH
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

ENGLISH LAW

Generally, the performance was not as good as last year, with many candidates mistranslating key legal vocabulary. The text was about inquests and contained some vocabulary which did not always have a direct equivalent in French. The words “inquest” and “coroners” were used several times throughout the translation and when they were incorrectly translated from the start, the errors were repeated throughout. These are the main words many candidates have transferred incorrectly.

A couple of candidates did not have sufficient language skills to attempt the exam, displaying poor syntax and poor understanding of the source text. For example, one candidate translated “coroner” as “cardiologist” and misinterpreted the rest of the text in a medical context, producing a very fanciful translation.

A few renderings were nonsensical. Candidates were particularly defeated by the second sentence of the first paragraph “An inquest is a legal inquiry into the causes and circumstances of a death”. Several candidates translated both “inquest” and “inquiry” by the same word “enquête” given renderings such as “Une enquête est une enquête légale sur les causes et les circonstances de la mort” (an investigation is a legal investigation into the causes and circumstances of a death); the same applies to the first sentence of the last paragraph which was nearly identical.

A number of candidates did not know how to deal with items which do not have a direct equivalent in the target language.

French syntax was a major challenge for some candidates who copied the English sentence structure. A couple of candidates did not master the accentuation and either ignored it or put accents where they should not be any. There were sometimes some serious grammatical errors which should not be seen at that level of examination, but only for a minority of candidates. There were some spelling mistakes, including some changing the meaning of the words, but overall fewer than last year. Occasionally, the number of technical errors were too numerous for the translation to be considered as acceptable in a professional context, although the message had been conveyed.

A few candidates used some vocabulary which was inappropriate for the target audience (i.e. family of the deceased). For example, the words “cadavre” (corpse) for “body” and “dissection” (dissection) for “post-mortem” were a little insensitive in the context.

Some candidates offered a choice of translations, suggesting two solutions, sometimes several times in the translation, which was obviously unacceptable (the translator must choose the appropriate vocabulary, not the reader). Sometimes, the register used was a little too informal. There were also some omissions and some additions on a few occasions. Some titles were left out. One candidate did not translate the titles and did not mark the paragraphs out either, which made the reading very difficult.

SCOTTISH LAW

Generally, the text, which was about fatal accident inquiries, had been understood. However, there again, some candidates had problems with the transfer of some terms which could be considered as typical of Scottish law and were inadequately paraphrased or incorrectly translated, such as “sheriff”, “Cabinet Secretary for Justice” and “Lord Advocate”.

Also, some candidates did not transfer the figure “14,000” correctly and kept it as such in French, although a comma is the equivalent of a decimal “.” in English.

Recommendations to Centres

Candidates should be made aware of the level of examination and centres should make sure the candidates’ linguistic skills are good enough. Candidates should be good in two languages and have very strong linguistic skills before starting a DPSI course.

Candidates should be encouraged to learn legal vocabulary and read some articles relating to the subject in order to get to know how things should be worded. It is not enough for the candidates to know what the equivalent word or expression in the other language is. They must also know what reality it covers, because there are major differences between the English and the French legal systems and one must make sure that the full meaning is carried over.

Candidates should learn translation techniques, including how to transfer vocabulary which has no direct equivalent in the target language. For example, it can be done by keeping the English word in inverted commas with a brief explanation in brackets or by paraphrasing briefly.

Also, candidates at this level would be expected to know how to transfer figures and how to lay out their translation and mark paragraphs out.

Recommendations to Candidates

Candidates should bear in mind that this is a professional examination at degree level and ensure that they have strong linguistic skills in both English and French prior to registering on a DPSI course. Also, it is imperative to be able to write correctly in the target language in order to be able to produce a translation reading like an original piece of writing.

It is essential for candidates to learn specialist vocabulary, also bearing in mind that there is not always a direct equivalent for organisations, courts, job titles, court or police procedures, etc. They need to read legal documents in both languages to get an idea of the type of vocabulary and wording used.

When translating, it is vital to use logic: anything which does not make sense is very likely to have been misunderstood. Words must be chosen carefully to make sure they convey the message of the original text and that they are appropriate for the target audience.

The use of good dictionaries is essential (monolingual and bilingual, as well as specialised legal dictionaries).

Candidates must manage their time well during the examination and need to save a moment to read the finished translation in order to ascertain that it would be understood by the target audience, to make sure it reads as if it had been written directly in the target language and to be able to correct spelling mistakes.

Candidates also need to master some translation techniques, to learn what one can and cannot do in a translation (for example, it is unacceptable to give a choice of translations), how to deal with items which do not have a direct equivalent, etc. There are a number of books available (for example, "La traduction raisonnée" by Jean Delisle).

At the end of the day, the translation done in the examination has to be professionally acceptable, i.e. the message of the original must be conveyed and the number of technical errors must be minimal (ideally there should not be any).

LANGUAGE: FRENCH
PATHWAY(S): HEALTH

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

The candidates who chose this pathway seemed better prepared than those candidates who chose the Local Government pathway – perhaps because there is an awareness that health is a specialised field, with specific terminology and phraseology, whilst local government may mistakenly be assumed to be a rather more 'pedestrian' area requiring no specialised lexis. The quality of the candidates' language skills was also better, even though there were still inadequacies. At least here basic skills such as verb forms and tenses were on the whole mastered. For both options candidates were not careful enough with potential faux-amis, and the importance of checking equivalents in both bilingual and monolingual sources must be stressed.

Recommendations to Centres

When teaching translation skills for this exercise, the importance of accuracy when looking for lexical equivalents must be emphasised, and students need to be taught how to recognise potential problems, and how to check for a suitable equivalent, using both bilingual and monolingual sources. For this exercise, approximation is always dangerous, and overchecking is always better than underchecking.

Recommendations to Candidates

Focusing on producing an accurate rendering of the source text is key to success. This is achieved through lexical choices, but also through clear unambiguous phrasing (as seen from the point of view of the reader who does not speak English). Care also needs to be taken when checking the translation – with a view to avoiding omissions (it is only too easy to miss part of a sentence), as well as checking for spelling and grammatical errors (agreements and so on).

LANGUAGE: FRENCH
PATHWAY(S): LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

Performance for this Unit was very uneven, due partly to candidates' difficulties with lexical issues and a tendency to use straightforward literal equivalents, even though those words are not used in the same way in the two languages. For instance, 'vote postal' is a legitimate equivalent for 'postal vote'. However, it is incoherent to talk of 'compléter un vote postal'. The word 'bulletin' needed to be inserted, and the verb used should have been 'remplir', ie 'remplir un bulletin de vote postal'. This highlights the importance of using appropriate resources when translating, involving as a minimum a good bilingual dictionary, and also a good monolingual French dictionary.

The other issue – and this is a fundamental one – is the candidates' mastery of the rules of French grammar and syntax. Unfortunately, some candidates sit this exam when they do not know how to phrase a question in French, they have no idea how to use the imperative, they cannot handle verb forms correctly, or cannot use the various pronouns and prepositions in a coherent manner. These are basic requirements, and for those candidates who have not mastered those fundamental skills which are essential to conveying meaning, the result is bound to be a Fail.

Recommendations to Centres

Finding appropriate lexical equivalents and phrasing is a skill which needs to be learned, and candidates need to be taught how to use resources effectively. In particular, candidates need to be taught not to rely exclusively on a bilingual dictionary, and how to use monolingual sources. Candidates need to be taught when to check items, and how.

Grammar teaching is the other area that needs to be covered, with a view to ensuring that candidates have mastered the essential basics, as listed above.

Recommendations to Candidates

For those candidates whose written French skills are not adequate, it is essential to realise that class teaching is helpful, but not sufficient. Sustained work is needed to master things such as verbal forms and structures, or the correct use of pronouns. There are excellent resources available for self-study – such as for instance the various grammar books published by McGraw-Hill.

LANGUAGE: GERMAN
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

A very similar picture to last year – a very clear split between good candidates and unsuitable candidates.

Some candidates produced translations that were of a very high standard. They were obviously very well prepared for the exam and had excellent knowledge of specialist terminology. Others were unable to convey the information from English into German. They made grammatical mistakes and spelling mistakes that should not be made at Degree level and committed fatal errors. Sometimes the grammar, including natural word order, was so jumbled that sentences and paragraphs did not make sense. In general, candidates' use of language did not live up to the level expected from German learners at Degree level. The candidates did not have the necessary knowledge of specialist terminology in their subject and thus produced a text that was not comprehensible to a German native speaker.

Recommendations to Centres

The majority of candidates need stronger linguistic skills, more awareness of the language and vocabulary actually used by the practitioners of the legal profession, not to restrict themselves to only the knowledge obtained from glossaries and dictionaries. Use of monolingual dictionaries for cross-reference is also vital.

The knowledge of specialist terminology should not be overlooked, as it is vital in the DPSI and can be a key to avoid misunderstandings/distortions.

Candidates should be reminded to go over their finished text, as there were a lot of unnecessary mistakes and omissions

that could have been avoided by careful proof-reading.

Recommendations to Candidates

My recommendation to candidates is to improve their linguistic skills as well as their understanding of their chosen option. You cannot translate a text into German if you have not understood it in English; such a translation will not be comprehensible for a German native speaker.

It is also essential for candidates to re-read what has been written in its entirety, to see if it makes sense in the context of the situation being described.

Candidates, please continue to read as well as listen to general news and documentaries on the radio as well as on TV and internet to improve your general linguistic level and understanding of German culture.

LANGUAGE: GUJARATI
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

I am pleased to observe that the quality of entries has improved a great deal and do justice to the level expected at DPSI. The presentation, style and level of linguistic ability needed for the test is all present there. The candidates were able to convey the information into Gujarati, although there were minor inaccuracies and some errors arising out of misplaced diacritics. It should be remembered that in Gujarati every noun has a gender and so the verb/gender agreement should agree. Weaknesses that have been observed in the past, and are unfortunately still occurring, refer to inappropriate translations of certain terms like 'coroner', 'post-mortem examination'. Candidates are advised to familiarise themselves with the suitable Gujarati translations in use in Gujarat. It is quite possible to collect such translations by regularly reading on-line Gujarati papers and following court-cases which are reported at length in Gujarati newspapers.

Recommendations to Centres

It is suggested that centres should encourage their candidates to use the online Gujarati dictionary available at www.gujaratilexicon.com and also use other bilingual dictionaries. It is a good idea to encourage candidates to sit at an open court hearing so that they could put themselves in the place of the actual court interpreter.

It is very pleasing to note that the paperwork submitted by the centres is clean, well-organised and with full details provided. Time management is of utmost importance and centres should encourage their candidates to allocate appropriate time to finish their final copy and still have enough time to go over the finished work.

Candidates must pay more attention to linguistic skills. Particularly in Gujarati where accents make a lot of difference in meanings- e.g. ગમ- ગામ, કમ-કામ.

Recommendations to Candidates

When one is under time constraint, it is tempting to use the first meaning offered in the dictionary. One should judge whether the meaning offered is relevant to the demands of the whole text. e.g. the English word "body" is shown as:

Pronunciation: બોડી Grammar: ના.

Meaning : પ્રાણીનું શરીર, દેહ, ધડ; મુખ્ય ભાગ; માણસ; માણસો, વસ્તુઓ, ઇ.નો સમુદાય-જૂથ-મંડળ; દ્રવ્ય કે પદાર્થનો એકમ, વસ્તુ; નક્કરતા, મહત્ત્વનું લક્ષણ અથવા સ્વાદ; સાર, તત્ત્વ; ઇન્દ્રિયગોચર વસ્તુ

BUT: our text refers to a dead body for which the most appropriate translation in Gujarati is:

શબ

૧. વ્યુત્પત્તિ: [શ.] વ્યાકરણ: સ્ત્રી.

અર્થ: . રાત્રિ.

૩.પ્ર. :

શબે રાહત = સુખની રાત્રિ.

૨. વ્યુત્પત્તિ: [સં. શબ] વ્યાકરણ: ન.

અર્થ: . જીવરહિત કલેવર; મડદું; મડું; મૃતકાયા; મૃતદેહ.

વ્યાકરણ: ન૦

અર્થ:

મડું, મડદું, મુરદું, લાસ

વ્યાકરણ: ન૦ વ્યુત્પત્તિ: [સં.]

અર્થ:

મડદું

Type: n.

Meaning: dead body, corpse.

In short, to be a good interpreter you should be good in two languages - English and Gujarati. Background knowledge in both languages is of vital importance and absolutely necessary for interpreting. Attention to detail and an ability to look up the dictionary and decide upon the most relevant meaning will save you a lot of time and your interpretation will be more meaningful. On-line Gujarati radio stations are available; on-line Gujarati newspapers are available and some TV documentaries are often available to watch.

LANGUAGE: HINDI

PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

An average performance with no noteworthy candidates. There is a persistent problem of a lack of full understanding of Hindi resulting in candidates choosing terms from the dictionary rather in the hope that they will be the right ones. The general standard of English seems sufficient for the demand of the task. It is the lack of Hindi that lets candidates down. Do centres check the language competence in both languages before putting candidates through?

Recommendations to Centres

Please assess candidates' competence in both English and Hindi. A very large number of people originating from North, West, East and middle India will claim that they can understand Hindi perfectly. This is true but their competence and exposure to the variety of registers and usage of Hindi will be limited and therefore their productive Hindi will be far inferior to their 'understanding' of the language. To a non native Hindi speaker the difference may not be clear; however, the lack of sufficient command of Hindi vocabulary and grammar is easily exposed when a candidate comes across words which are not in his/her Hindi for day to day communication.

Recommendations to Candidates

Be honest and realistic about your competence in Hindi. Just because you can talk to Hindi speakers effectively on a day to day basis may not indicate that your Hindi is good enough for the tasks set in the DPSI examination. A very large number of people of Indian background have good functional knowledge of Hindi. (Much of it acquired by watching Hollywood films!!). This will definitely not stand in good stead when taking DPSI examinations!

LANGUAGE: HUNGARIAN
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

As in previous years, candidates did not have problems grasping the subject and basic concepts of the task. The process of death and dying and their legal aspects are similar to a large extent in both countries and the subject of coroner's inquest and post-mortem was not alien for the Hungarian reader at all.

There were some good attempts as well as weaker ones. This year more candidates failed than were successful in producing a good translation.

Similarly to previous examination sessions, what proved difficult for most candidates was the production of a good Hungarian text. With almost no exception, the original still has an overly strong influence on syntax, word order and sentence structure in general. A few years ago I sought to give a brief and easy-to-understand description on why it is important that the text is not only translated but also restructured according to the logic of Hungarian. In the words of Katalin É Kiss '*A closer scrutiny, however, makes it clear that the order of major sentence constituents is just as strictly constrained in Hungarian as it is, for example, in English or French – merely the functions associated with the different structural positions are logical functions instead of the grammatical functions subject, object etc.*' (*Hungarian Syntax*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.) This slightly different yet strict structure has to be observed to give the reader a well-flowing text that is easy to use.

Accomplishing this – and avoiding any major mistakes – rewards the candidate with a Merit or even Distinction in most cases.

A particular issue this year was that the traditionally most heavily used dictionary gives *post-mortem* a translation that suggests the survey of the body immediately at the scene or location of death (*halottszemle*). For the actual invasive post-mortem examination, autopsy (*boncolás*) is reserved in Hungarian.

This issue highlights how important it is not to be satisfied with using the first meaning of a word given in a bilingual dictionary but to reflect on the context as well.

Recommendations to Centres

The two main concerns regarding candidate performance is the classic duo: producing a well structured, good sounding Hungarian text and appropriate knowledge of specialist terminology.

Candidates could use the practice of re-reading their translations - or indeed each other's translations - and try to employ an impartial viewpoint by pretending to be a speaker of the Other Language who reads the text for the first time.

Candidates should be strongly encouraged to read Hungarian language specialist texts while preparing for the examination; this habit will also be a necessary part of their ongoing activity as interpreters.

It seems that every year there are some candidates who do not pass because they give alternative translations; please remind them time and again that this is penalised.

Recommendations to Candidates

Read specialist publications in your native tongue corresponding to your option while preparing. This will enable you to work yourself into, so to speak, the Hungarian legal vocabulary and you will be able to produce a better text. The internet offers a huge pool of knowledge. Research the new developments of your chosen option. Try to stick to government websites and established newspapers in order to get the best results.

The larger part of the translations fell short of a good standard Hungarian this year. It is imperative that the client does not have to struggle through a text in his or her native tongue because the sentence structure, cohesive devices, punctuation and syntax are "not translated" into Hungarian. Try to re-read your texts with the eyes of a native speaker and try to imagine that this is the first time you encounter - and try to understand - the translation. Timing will always be an important issue in an examination so make sure that you always allow time for a final check.

Use dictionaries creatively and be mindful not to take the first meaning for a word or a phrase; sometimes you have to dig deeper to find the appropriate translation. It is of course a good idea to use specialist bilingual dictionaries but an English dictionary is useful for cross-referencing as well.

LANGUAGE: ITALIAN
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

ENGLISH LAW

Candidates' overall performance was better than last year. Particular strengths were the translation of specialised terms such as coroner and post-mortem, and the fact that most translations were effective and very usable and the problems that they contained did not mar comprehension.

Perhaps the main weakness was the fact that some candidates did not seem to put themselves in the readers' shoes. The best example to support this statement is "Coroner". Some candidates decided not to leave Coroner at all in their translations and to just put a translation of this term. This was not considered a very good choice because the translations will be used by an Italian-speaking person living in England who needs to be aware that the title of the person dealing with post-mortems is actually Coroner. Therefore, leaving Coroner in the title, for instance, would provide this clue. Moreover, the translation is not really needed as there was an explanation of what a Coroner does in the first paragraph of the translation.

Another weakness was the tendency to transliterate and, in some cases, to follow the English structure. For instance, "This is a medical examination of the body..." was translated by some candidates with "Questo/a è un esame medico...". This is a typical English sentence starting with "this" which in Italian is best rendered either by linking it with the previous sentence (...ordine l'esecuzione di un'autopsia, un esame medico per scoprire...) or by starting the sentence with the actual subject, in this case post-mortem. Perhaps the first solution is more fluid. A few candidates wrote "prigione" to translate "prison" when in fact "carcere" is more commonly used and more appropriate in this context.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

It is not possible to compare with last year's candidates because there were no candidates for this pathway last year (nor in 2009).

The candidate group was very small and performance was poor. The main problem was the number of translation errors and the fact that one sentence did not stand as it was "Compilatelo e speditelo all'ufficio di competenza locale...Registro Elettorale". The preposition "del" should have been there but in one candidate's script whatever was meant to be there had been crossed out. The most serious translation error was the translation of "return" in "you can return your completed postal vote". The candidate wrote "spedire" (to send) which is confusing. Moreover, the use of "riferire" to translate "referred" sounds like a transliteration ("...allegations of fraud, ... should be referred to the police."). Segnalare or denunciare would have been more appropriate. "Tagliando elettorale" is not the right translation for "ballot paper". It should have been "scheda elettorale". Writing "voto" in "spedire il voto" is not quite correct in Italian. It should have been "scheda elettorale" as "il voto" is the action taken to express one's choice rather than the actual paper where that choice is noted down.

In terms of cohesion and coherence, in one title (Se ho fatto domanda di votare per posta... – If I have applied for a postal vote, can I still vote at the polling station?) one candidate used the 1st singular person but then switched to the 2nd plural person in the reply. It would have been more logical to have kept the same subject throughout.

One candidate used "colui" in "colui che vota per posta" which excludes women voters and sounds heavy in Italian.

These problems impacted the effectiveness of the translation as a means to communicate a specific message.

Recommendations to Centres

Keep insisting on the importance of a) avoiding transliterations, including following the English structure in Italian, and b) trying to see the translation from the user's point of view and his/her context. Perhaps, the best way to avoid transliterations is to assign enough time at the end to read the translation as if it had been written in Italian. Difficult but necessary and avoids quite a few problems.

Recommendations to Candidates

It is very important to leave enough time at the end to read the translation to make sure that it sounds as if it has been written in Italian. This helps with avoiding transliteration and it also helps finding the right register for the translation. For instance, in this case, “decesso” was more appropriate than “morte” and “prigione” more appropriate than “carcere”. It is also worth remembering that in Italian the tendency is to use the impersonal in official or semi-official documents such as this one as opposed to the second person singular or plural (tu or voi).

LANGUAGE: JAPANESE
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW AND HEALTH

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

LAW

In 2006, one of the candidates used too many pronouns such as ‘you’, ‘we’ and ‘I’ which is very awkward to read. There were also spelling mistakes. This year the candidate group was very small. The mistakes mentioned above were not made.

Information was conveyed accurately with only a few minor errors such as “cases” (one candidate translated this as “police investigation” though the word in this context has wider meanings including “police investigation”). There was good use of vocabulary and sound use of grammatical/syntactical constructions as well as providing text which facilitates generally a good coherent reading. Thus the translated text is very easy and natural to read and enables the reader to act entirely appropriately on the basis of the translation.

One candidate did not follow the original text to start a new paragraph on one occasion (paragraph 3).

HEALTH

In 2009, one of the most serious yet avoidable mistakes were spelling mistakes, i.e. the use of Kanji, but this year there was only one mistake in paragraph 2 (通のとおり instead of 次の通り). This year one of the most serious yet avoidable mistakes was the mixture of two different styles. When you start using the polite style, then all of the writing should be in the polite style and when you start using the plain style you should keep to this style; one should not mix these two styles. In one candidate’s translation, the first half starts in the polite style and then the latter half is mainly in the plain style with an occasional mixture with the polite style which should be avoided.

There were three omissions in one candidate’s translation. All three of them are small omissions such as “many people think”, “about money” and “apparent” which are probably not that serious but without them the translation is not accurate. Coupled with an inadequate command of vocabulary this makes the translation unable to convey the accurate meaning to the readers, especially the bullet points. One example is “initiative”. Here it is not used as “creativity” which the candidate decides to use.

Recommendations to Centres

Encourage candidates to read the source text a few times before starting to write. Thus candidates could avoid any misunderstanding/omissions. Encourage candidates to spare 5 minutes for reading his/her own translation as a third person to find any mistakes at the end.

Spelling mistakes and lack of unity of styles should be avoided and can be avoided very easily. Encourage candidates to take special care with them.

Encourage candidates to follow the original text for paragraphing.

Recommendations to Candidates

Lack of unity of style and spelling mistakes are easily avoidable and should be avoided. Please pay extra attention to them.

Do not start to translate immediately. Reading the text a few times before writing could avoid any misunderstanding.

Also try to re-read your translation and think if native speakers would write in that way or not, or if it reads naturally.

Do not choose any word from the dictionary. A word could have several different meanings and you should choose the most suitable meaning among them. You should always think if it makes sense.

Do follow the original paragraphing.

LANGUAGE: KOREAN
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW AND SCOTTISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

This year was the first time that an English and Scottish Law examination was set for the Korean language. There was a significant gap in performance between each of the candidates. Strengths and weaknesses varied between individual candidates to a greater or lesser degree. One candidate was unable to translate basic terms such as “violent” and “certify” in the English Law pathway while on the other hand another candidate provided a text with perfect presentation and legibility.

The most common weakness was inappropriate language (the use of a colloquial style more in keeping with an informal text than with a legal document) and Korean grammar structures such as the passive and active forms of sentences used inaccurately. Transitive and intransitive verbs became mixed and broke up the structure of many sentences. These all happened because candidates would translate small sections or individual words directly from English into Korean before turning the whole text into something concise.

The majority of candidates did not have a good enough knowledge of specialist vocabulary such as “Post-mortems”, “Inquests”, but also there were unnecessary lapses of concentration where unnecessary words were added in Korean or phrases left out entirely.

Recommendations to Centres

If your candidates have had no experience with legal interpreting before please concentrate on scenarios and role plays covering various circumstances. This is an essential ingredient to increasing candidates’ legal terminology as well as getting them used to the style of register appropriate to such texts.

In role plays the interpreter is made familiar with how the stages of case processing relate to what interpreters will actually experience when they go to work. The role play should briefly provide an overview of related settings to which the interpreter may be called, such as jails, probation department and detention centres. Preparing interpreters for what to expect in jail and detention centre interviews, which are a particularly important part of an interpreter's work, should be emphasised.

During such role plays, the instructors should prepare interpreters for the phenomena of crowded high-volume courtrooms, practices followed in some courts that require interpreting legal or procedural advisements to groups of people, unpredictable court schedules, hallway conferences and interviews, etc.

Also, provide Korean composition and grammar lessons to those who are lacking grammar skills.

Recommendations to Candidates

If you wish to improve your interpreting skills, there are several ways you can practise. Consider the following:

- Work on expanding your vocabulary in English as well as Korean.
- Practice memory-building techniques to improve your ability to retain information.
- Try sight translating written documents or magazine articles.
- Practise doing consecutive and simultaneous interpreting of radio or television programmes.

To improve your knowledge of court-related legal terminology there is an excellent Korean and English Dictionary and other resources available to interpreters in publications and on organizational websites, visit: “Current Laws of the Republic of Korea”, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/36499905/Korean-Legal-Terms-and-Vocabulary-Part-1-of-2>

If you are not familiar with courtroom proceedings, you might want to visit a courtroom and observe a trial in session.

Another possibility is to watch actual televised courtroom trials or programs that dramatise courtroom situations, and practise interpreting the content.

Visit Korean websites in order to compare Korean written law and English law expressions.

LANGUAGE: KURDISH (SORANI)
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

The overall performance of the candidates in Unit 05 was satisfactory. The translated texts were generally coherent and effectively communicated. However, the main problems were as follows:

- Candidates seemed to lack the knowledge of some specialist terminology, such as: ‘coroners’, ‘post-mortems’, ‘custody’, ‘inquiry’, ‘certify’ and ‘inquests’.
- Candidates lacked accuracy - there were inaccurate, inappropriate and wrong translations. There were also some omissions and additions, such as: ‘coroner’ as ‘investigation’; ‘arrange’ as ‘make up’; ‘causes’ as ‘how’; ‘if’ as ‘when’; ‘in most cases’ as ‘most of the time’; ‘certify’ as ‘decide’; ‘in some cases’ as ‘sometimes’; ‘ordered’ as ‘gave’; ‘strong’ as ‘special’; ‘uncertain’ as ‘unknown’; ‘the death was violent or unnatural’ as ‘violence or something unnatural became the cause of death’; ‘prescribed’; ‘right’; ‘religious’; ‘custody’; ‘cause’; ‘was’; ‘lawyer’; ‘court’; ‘some’; ‘unclear’; ‘in these cases’.
- There were some transliterations and Arabic like words that affected the originality of the translated text, such as: ‘mortems’ was transliterated as ‘morten’; ‘coroners’; ‘jury’; ‘legal’; ‘objection’; ‘unnatural’; ‘sometimes’.
- There were lots of spelling mistakes that made the translated text difficult to follow, such as the Kurdish translation for: ‘unknown’; ‘about’; ‘circumstances’; ‘some’; ‘held’; ‘violence’; ‘coroner’; ‘understand’; ‘or’; ‘sometimes’; ‘prison’; ‘doctor’.
- Unlike previous years, there were just a couple of literal translations, like: ‘once’ and ‘most cases’.
- There were a number of grammatical/structural mistakes, which affected the originality and accuracy of the text, such as: usage of singular subject ‘he can’ instead of ‘they can’. Usage of the plural form instead of singular: ‘cases’. Usage of the present tense instead of the past: ‘is unknown’; ‘is uncertain’. Verb last, not first: ‘cause of death to certify’. Omission of indefinite articles, as in ‘a lawyer’; ‘a legal inquiry’; ‘a medical examination’. Omission of the verb “to be” in ‘coroner is a lawyer’. Usage of passive voice instead of active: ‘a death will be reported’; ‘they are uncertain of the cause of death’ for ‘the cause of death is uncertain’. Usage of wrong preposition in ‘responsible for’.
- A couple of candidates had illegible handwriting which made the text difficult to follow.

Recommendations to Centres

- Encourage candidates to prepare well for the examination.
- Encourage candidates to be familiar with the specialist terminology.
- Encourage candidates to be as accurate as possible and to avoid guessing when rendering the text.

Recommendations to Candidates

- Become familiar with the examination and its format.
- Sit the examination when fully prepared.
- Carefully read the text before translating.
- The translated work needs to be as accurate as possible, i.e. without any addition or omission, making sure that literal translation is avoided.
- Familiarise yourself with specialist terminology and expressions in both languages (source and target).
- Be familiar with grammatical/structural points in both source and target languages, such as: parts of speech, tense, singularity/plurality, passivity, etc...
- Avoid using Arabic-like words; use pure Kurdish (Sorani) words as much as possible.
- Improve spelling by looking up the word in the dictionary.
- Avoid transliterations as much as possible.
- Try to make your handwriting as legible as possible.

LANGUAGE: LATVIAN
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

With the exception of a couple of presentations, the translations provided by candidates suffered a few common weaknesses, most serious among them were: keywords and key phrases were rendered incorrect as regards to register, hence, incomprehensible and unacceptable; due to minor or major accuracy errors throughout the renditions candidates could not facilitate an accurate rendition of the original English text and, hence, provided an incoherent reading; corrections in the translated texts led to poor presentation and legibility.

Most candidates displayed quite sound grammatical constructions, including use of tenses and word order. Nevertheless, all of them mixed singular and plural forms of nouns when translating headings, but that was regarded of minor importance and not fatal in the particular context. There were some cases of mistranslating words expressing modality, like 'can', 'is able to', 'should', 'need to'. Overall candidates used good syntactical constructions, though displayed several cases of missing commas at the beginning and end of subordinate clauses. Half of the group of candidates had faultless spelling. There was one addition, a couple of distortions, and a number of omissions noticed.

Recommendations to Centres

All the folders were clean and organised. Details on the folders were complete. When marking no notice was paid to the rough copies of the candidates' translations. There was no need to leave candidates' copies of Unit 05 in the folder.

It is not acceptable to provide two alternative translations for a word or phrase, as was the case with one of the presentations, where one translation was used and another one followed in brackets. It is necessary for the candidate to make up his/her mind and choose the most suitable translation of the original word in the relevant context, and write just one version.

The knowledge of specialist terminology should not be overlooked, as it is essential in the DPSI and can be a key to avoid misunderstandings. In cases where there are straightforward translations of words or word combinations from English into Latvian, the Latvian translation needs to be used alone in the text and not followed or preceded by the original in brackets. An entirely Latvian text could facilitate a more coherent reading, and provide a more authentic sounding message.

Candidates should be reminded that logic is essential to produce a good translation and that anything that does not make sense, in that context, should attract their attention and is likely to have been wrongly translated. When doing a final version of the translation candidates should make sure that it sounds Latvian and can be easily understood by a Latvian audience.

Candidates need to have more awareness of the language and vocabulary actually used by the practitioners of the legal profession, as well as have a better knowledge of the technical side of punctuation, particularly, of the use of a semicolon, a dash or a comma in the source and target languages.

Recommendations to Candidates

To be a good interpreter you should be good in two languages. You should also have a good background knowledge of your subject in both languages. Studying as many original documents as possible pertaining to the chosen topic of Law could be of great help in building up a bank of specialist terminology.

It is essential for candidates to study the text carefully paying attention to details on key issues, and then to re-read what has been translated in its entirety, to see if it makes sense in the situation being described, and if it sounds authentic.

Not of least importance is to ensure your presentation of the text is legible and not full of corrections for your submission of the rendition.

LANGUAGE: LITHUANIAN
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW, SCOTTISH LAW AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

ENGLISH LAW/SCOTTISH LAW

The majority of candidates were able to produce good, comprehensive and fluent translations. The percentage achieving a Merit or Distinction grade seemed to be higher than last year although a direct comparison could not be made because only the results of 2nd marking were to hand and the sample could not be regarded as representative.

The English Law subject was the Coroner's Court's work. The main weakness of most of the candidates was the exact terminology. Words such as "inquest", "jury" and even "coroner" seemed to create some difficulties. These seemed to be caused by the use of non-specialist dictionaries. A general dictionary usually presents several different meanings of a word and the candidates often tended to select the not quite appropriate one. In most cases all the answers would have been available in a dictionary of legal terms with the proviso that the user chose one covering the U.K. judicial system. In fact in two cases candidates had obviously used an American Law Dictionary and obtained some wrong answers.

It was quite surprising, at this level, to find that some candidates still made many grammatical, spelling and punctuation mistakes and there were even some very clumsily worded sentences. However, others demonstrated an excellent command of English.

The candidate group for Scottish Law was very small and performance was competent.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Again a small candidate group which achieved a good result.

Recommendations to Centres

All centres deserve commendation for the very well organised and run presentation of the scripts.

Obviously it is very important for candidates to know the specialist terminology and to have a good vocabulary. In this respect a good dictionary is a great help to the interpreter. With very many dictionaries on offer it is not always easy to choose a good one. A poor one can cause difficulties. No doubt students can and do receive good advice from their tutors but an evaluation and firm recommendations of good books could be worthwhile.

It is particularly important for foreign students, when choosing an English dictionary, to make sure that it is a UK one and not American. There have been some instances of candidates quoting incorrect answers from an English-Lithuanian dictionary of legal terms published with the help of the American Bar Association. (Two mistakes of this kind have been noted in this DPSI examination).

When translating written documents do not do it too literally and make sure that the translation of a difficult sentence fits into the text as a whole

Recommendations to Candidates

One must always remember the importance of being well-read in one's chosen subject and read as many relevant documents, texts and books as possible. Attentive perusal of the press and knowledge of the organisation of the courts and the workings of public institutions will always be useful.

LANGUAGE: MANDARIN
OPTION(S): ENGLISH LAW AND SCOTTISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

There are more candidates taking Mandarin English/Scottish Law this year than in 2010.

Strengths:

Most candidates can handle the sentence structures effectively and grammatical accuracy has improved greatly this year in comparison with last year. All the candidates completed the task within the required time limit. The majority presented the translated texts in a good format and legibly. The overall performance is improved this year.

Weakness:

1) Vocabulary:

The most common errors are caused by misunderstanding some of the vocabulary. Therefore the information conveyed in Mandarin is not accurate. For example:

- 1.1) Confusion in the translation between “post-mortems” and “inquests”;
- 1.2) Other common mistakes are the translation of “legal inquiry”, “medical examination of the body”; “in public”; “in cases where”

2) Sentence structure:

The sentences containing “if necessary” and “if” are translated in the same order as they are in English sentences.

3) Lack of necessary additions:

“the death is violent and unnatural” is translated exactly the same as it is in English.

4) Mistakes in character writing:

This year has more cases of character writing errors. Some of the serious ones lead to misunderstanding for the reader.

Recommendations to Centres

Help candidates to edit the source language to a professional standard for the target language reader.

Recommendations to Candidates

Practise handwriting and dealing with/analysing synonyms.

Reference books which you may find useful are:

- Bassnett, S (1996) “Translation Studies”. London: Routledge.
Newmark, P.P. (1988) “A textbook for Translation”. Programme Press.
Samuelsson-Brown, G (1995) “A Practical Guide for Translators”.

LANGUAGE: PANJABI

PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW, SCOTTISH LAW AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

Candidates made the same mistakes as in previous years and I am sorry to say that the standard has not improved much. The spelling and incorrect use of Panjabi vowel Symbols is the main problem. Poor sentence rendering, punctuation and such spelling mistakes should not be present in the work of DPSI candidates. Some candidates could have interpreted the text very well but have poor written skills.

English Law – most of the candidates struggled to translate ‘coroners’, ‘post mortem’, ‘inquests’, ‘legal inquiry’, ‘prescribed set of circumstances’, ‘unnatural’, ‘certify’, ‘religion’ and the list goes on and on. Some candidates missed ‘DEATH’ altogether and the use of ‘body’ in a different context meant it was a normal medical examination of somebody. Common errors were missing vowel symbols and using English words.

Scottish Law – the candidate group for this pathway was very small. There were also common mistakes which caused one candidate dearly. The candidate could have provided an excellent translation if extra care was taken while writing. ‘Cases of death’ was omitted (‘Inquiry must be held for accidents at work’). ‘Death’ omitted (‘FAI is not to blame anyone for civil or criminal case’).

Other mistranslations include:

‘Serious public concern’ translated as ‘in the eyes of the public’.

'Procurators Fiscal' translated as 'legal right officer's office' (not very clear what this means).
'Conclusion' translated as 'warnings'.

Local Government – most of the candidates failed to encode the source text. Incorrect translations were presented for 'postal vote', 'proxy vote' translated as 'power of attorney' as in Wills and 'secret vote', 'ballot paper', 'specific time period', 'application', 'apply', 'offence', 'allegations of fraud', 'referred'. One candidate could not provide the translation of 'signature': 'print of your name'. There were many omissions and also some additions. Other errors were that the candidates used English words and simply wrote them in Panjabi even though there are perfect words or explanations available. This could have been the reason for not knowing the specialist terminology.

Recommendations to Centres

Firstly, centres should have guidelines on how to choose candidates. This year's candidates are not up to the standard expected for DPSI examinations. They may be fluent in speaking both languages but their standard of written Panjabi is not what it ought to be for this level of examination. They need better linguistic skills, vocabulary and terminology. They also should have language assessments to test the candidates' level to assess what help is required and in which areas. Tutors should pay extra attention to the needs of the candidates. More practical work should be given in order to achieve the required standard. Specialist dictionaries for Law and Health could be useful. Centres should provide more material for translation in both languages. Some candidates might be very good in English (reading and writing) however their own language is not of the same level. This year's candidates' performance was very poor: poor grammar, spelling, sentence rendering and muddled up translations. Therefore much more work is needed by centres and tutors. It should be the quality of the candidates not the quantity. To test candidates' progress and to give them a taster of the real thing, centres could hold a few mock examinations before the real examinations. Candidates would then have a better idea what to expect.

Recommendations to Candidates

Again, recommendations to candidates: always take time to read the original text and understand the message; this year's message was distorted in translation because of incorrect encoding of the original text. Some candidates write the Panjabi text as it is written in English: always remember to rearrange the words to make a proper sentence and not to translate in the same form as the original text as sometimes it does not make any sense. Grammar is another area where a lot attention is needed. Formation of the Panjabi alphabet letters is also very tricky as if you miss a line it could be a different letter. Vowel symbols are often incorrectly used; this is another area where a lot of care is needed as incorrect use of these symbols can change the pronunciation and the meaning of the words. It is good practice to use dictionaries but be careful to use the correct word for the context. Try to read newspapers and magazines in your own language as they are a really valuable source for new and old terminology and vocabulary. Listening to daily news on TV and radio is also very helpful.

Always study the original text with great care and remember to keep some time to read what you have written and correct any mistakes you have noticed.

LANGUAGE: PASHTO PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

ENGLISH LAW

Overall performance of the candidates was mixed. Some translations were clear and stuck closely to the original text. Except for minor omissions, there were no major or fatal mistakes in these texts. However, the Pashto texts of some of the other candidates were not very good. Some occasionally followed the Urdu style and their translations were marred by spelling mistakes. In Pashto for the alphabets: E, I and Y sounds there are five different alphabets but not all candidates followed the new style and used the old style. At least two candidates would have performed better, if they had worked more carefully on their text.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Pashto text of at least one candidate was riddled with numerous spelling mistakes, broken sentences and distortions but the rest of the candidates did well. The translation was clear and easy to understand. Again, the text of the weaker candidates was not very good. They need to concentrate on improving the Pashto text and avoid spelling mistakes.

Recommendations to Centres

Please see recommendations to candidates.

Recommendations to Candidates

Common mistakes:

Common mistakes by the candidates were in Pashto scripts, particularly when it come to the Pashto alphabets (English equivalent of i, a, e, y or ee). In order to improve their script and avoid mistakes it is suggested that candidates should regularly read Pashto online newspapers and magazines. International broadcasters like BBC, VOA publish their reports online regularly. Addresses of some media outlets are:

bbcpashto.com

Voa/pashto.com

taand.com

The Afghanistan Justice/Law Department also has many materials available on its website which is very helpful for candidates who need to understand the legal terminology in Pashto.

LANGUAGE: POLISH

PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

ENGLISH LAW

The examination text this year was about coroners and was a relatively easy text with simple sentences that do not really reflect the complicated nature of legal texts that a legal interpreter has to deal with in their daily professional practice. Unsurprisingly, the number of acceptable translations was proportionately higher than in previous years.

The most common mistakes related to how the words *coroner* and *inquest* were translated into Polish as these words or the institutions they represent do not exist in Poland. Most candidates simply used the word *koroner* – but some had problems with the correct declension. In one case a very good footnote was prepared by a candidate explaining the concept to a non-English reader. This was awarded with additional points. *Inquest* is not just an investigation, but a very specific kind of investigation and a full translation/explanation should have been provided. Sometimes when there is no direct equivalent, a paraphrase is the only possible option. Those candidates who provided the word in English as well were awarded additional points.

Many candidates struggled with the word *deaths* in plural. The Polish word: *śmierć* can only be used in singular as an abstract word, therefore another word *zgon* should have been used when discussing deaths. Another difficult word was *violent* which was often mistranslated as *brutal* or *sudden*. The word *arrange* was often translated literally as *aranżować*, which was not the best solution here.

Quite a few candidates made a mistake while translating the word *jury* – for some jury meant just one juror, for others it meant a judge or judges, for others the coroner was part of a jury. All such mistakes were considered fatal errors.

It is held in public also proved a difficult phrase to translate and some candidates rendered it as if the case was held on a forum (i.e. on an open public square) and as if the case was not actually held in public. The word *held* was sometimes translated literally as *trzymany* (as in held in a hand).

Concerned about the cause of death was also a challenging expression, some candidates provided overinterpretation such as *suspicious about the cause of death*.

The most common spelling mistake was in the word *obiekcje* (misspelt as *objekcje* – *interference from English*).

Some candidates still are unable to translate a sentence with 'you' correctly into Polish. Addressing a Polish reader 'you' may be considered impolite and disrespectful and it is not an appropriate style to use in formal leaflets. The best choice is to use an impersonal verb such as *można*, *trzeba*, *należy*. Using 'you' in Polish has another disadvantage – namely

the form used is invariably masculine, which may alienate 50% of the readership. Every year the same comment is made but it seems that candidates never practise how to translate the English 'you' into formal Polish.

There were several translations that were highly professional and used highly specialised language – e.g. words such as *orzec, jawny, określony przepisami*. These were the exceptions however. Most candidates used everyday non-specialised language. English might sound very simple but in Polish in such a specialised context appropriate terminology should be used.

SCOTTISH LAW

The Scottish Law paper was completely different from the English Law paper. On average, Scottish candidates did much worse than candidates in English Law. The level of Polish was much lower.

There were problems with terms specific to the Scottish legal system such as *sheriff, Procurator Fiscal* or *Lord Advocate*. Candidates have the tendency to translate everything into Polish, even the words that do not have their direct or functional equivalents in Polish. In such situations a paraphrase or an explanation what the word really means would have been much more helpful. Candidates should not be afraid of using the English terms such as *Lord Advocate*. This is a very good translation technique.

Surprisingly there were a lot of errors in the last sentence when translating the phrase *Cabinet Secretary for Justice*. Many candidates could not understand that this refers to a function in a Scottish government and secretary stands for minister and not for a personal assistant.

Like in the English Law text, there was a word *concern* which was often mistranslated – *public concern* was rendered as *niepokój/niepokoje społeczne*, which when backtranslated into English means *civil unrest*. This was considered a fatal error. Sometimes *public concern* was translated as *public interest* which is not fully accurate, either.

A particularly difficult word was *discretionary* - often translated as *arbitralny* = *arbitrary*, which has a slightly different meaning. On several occasions it was translated as *confidential*, which was considered a mistranslation.

Similarly to my comment about the English Law paper – the text was translated using a non-specialised language. Mostly it was accepted but candidates should really work on their legal vocabulary.

Recommendations to Centres

Practise more, highlight differences between English and Polish legal language. Pay attention to register, practise writing texts in formal and informal registers. Encourage your students to read Polish legal texts. Translating a legal text is a daunting task and needs proper preparation. Just because someone speaks Polish does not mean that they can write in a good register and style. Do not encourage candidates to sit the examination unless you have prepared them thoroughly.

Recommendations to Candidates

Written language is a different sort of a language; if you have not written in Polish for a long time, you should practise. Ask your centre to set more written tasks for you – you should translate at least 500 words of a legal text a week. Make sure that somebody checks your work and explains the mistakes.

LANGUAGE: POLISH
PATHWAY(S): HEALTH

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

General performance of candidates this year was on the weak side. The source text posed some difficulties in terms of terminology and structure. In numerous cases candidates did not make their translation sufficiently clear, using terms that were either not specific enough, or applying inappropriate structures that made the meaning vague. It is very noticeable that most candidates use linguistic calques to some degree, either using equivalents of English words in Polish, without making sure that this particular context justifies it, or copying English sentence structures, which immediately makes the translation stilted. It is rather disappointing to see that students aspiring to work as professional interpreters cannot come up with translations that would sound natural in the target language. One such example is overuse of passive voice structures; when the source text says: "psychiatric assessment may be necessary", almost all candidates translated it as "ocena psychiatryczna może być wymagana/konieczna"; it would sound much better to say

“badanie” instead of “ocena”, but more notably, reversing the syntax and using an impersonal form would improve the style, e.g. “może zająć potrzeba/konieczność przeprowadzenia...”. Most candidates showed some intercultural awareness by avoiding a direct form of address (“you”) and used either “Państwo” or “Pan/Pani” (but some of them forgot to adjust verb endings to both gender forms), or used impersonal forms instead.

The source text included a number of terms that, although not particularly technical, proved tricky to translate. One such example is “judgement”, which most candidates translated as “ocena” or “osąd”. In themselves they are not wrong translations, but they are too general and to be communicative one would need to add “of the situation”, but hardly anyone thought it appropriate. Other examples of producing vague translations by using calques from the source text are: “objekty” – as a translation of “objects” (it should be translated as “przedmioty”/“rzeczy”, as “objekty” may either apply to building/facilities or large items, such as a monument), translating “scan” as “skan” (not normally used in a medical sense in Polish), translating “someone is developing an illness” as “ktoś rozwija chorobę”. Some candidates failed to use reflexive forms correctly translating “forgetfulness” as “zapominanie się”. Other terms that admittedly are difficult to translate into Polish but undoubtedly can be rendered in a stylistically and contextually correct way were: “misplacing”, “confused”, “enjoy” and “lifelong”.

In terms of coherence, most candidates managed to use appropriate linking words and structures to show the meaning in a logical way, however, some candidates just copied English structures and in the case of “the following is a list of...”, the style of the calque was unacceptable. A number of candidates disregarded the importance of commas, or used other punctuation marks incorrectly. Moreover, in comparison with last year, spelling errors were on the increase (these included not using diacritic marks, or ignoring rules of which parts of speech particle “no” should be spelled as one word, and in which cases it is kept separate from the word it follows (e.g. “nie wiedząc” – adverbial participle: “no” is spelled separately). Such mistakes in the Polish language are considered grammatical errors, rather than just spelling mistakes, which makes them more serious.

Recommendations to Centres

Course tutors should encourage students to make sure that terms they use in their translations match the context and are clear enough. It is no good taking any dictionary translation if it sounds unnatural, vague or incorrect. Another area that students need to do more work on is style, affected to a large degree not only by word choice, but also syntactic structures. It would be worth reminding students that very often changing the order of phrases in a sentence, using impersonal structures instead of passive voice (notoriously overused in translations into Polish), or breaking sentences up into shorter, more comprehensible sentences may greatly improve readability of a translation.

Prospective interpreters should be reminded that any translation they work on should be proofread before it is returned, as they themselves should be able to spot most shortcomings.

As occasionally there may appear terms that do not have a direct equivalent, students should practise paraphrasing; however, it is advisable to keep paraphrases concise and only use them when necessary.

Recommendations to Candidates

Candidates need to constantly remind themselves that translation does not involve copying structures or even words. All languages vary and what sounds perfectly natural in a source text, may require a different structure or phrasing in the target language. Where in the English language, for instance, the passive voice is used, a translation may benefit from using a different structure, such as impersonal phrase or active voice.

Candidates need to continue working on punctuation, in particular the use of commas. In Polish most commas are obligatory and omitting them signals certain carelessness, which should not feature in professional translations.

It is worth practising the use of a wide variety of linking words, structures, fixed phrases and stylistic variants, as a large linguistic stock will allow a translator to make conscious and thoughtful choices in the process of translating.

LANGUAGE: POLISH
PATHWAY(S): LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

The key lexical items of the text, such as ‘a postal vote’, ‘a proxy vote’, ‘to vote’, ‘a vote’, caused a variety of recurring problems. ‘A postal vote’ was translated in a variety of correct (‘głosowanie drogą pocztową’, ‘głosowanie korespondencyjne’, ‘głosowanie przez pocztę’) and less appropriate ways (‘głos pocztowy’, ‘głos listowny’, ‘głos oddany

pocztownie', głos korespondencyjny', 'głosować pocztownie'). 'Proxy vote' ('przez pełnomocnika') was often rendered with terms pertaining to 'agency': 'przez / z pomocą pośrednika', 'za pośrednictwem', 'głosowanie zastępcze' to name a few. 'To vote' ('głosować') was quite frequently rendered by the expressions 'zagłosować' or 'oddać głos', although in contrast to the source text, where 'to vote' is used in a general, neutral sense, the first one implies one completed act of voting and the second a specific, concrete occasion of voting, such as going to a polling station and putting the ballot card in the ball box. The term 'głos' was often used to render 'a vote' ('głosowanie'). 'Ballot paper' ('karta do wyborów', 'karta wyborcza', 'karta do głosowania') and 'polling station'. ('local wyborczy', 'punkt wyborczy') were generally translated correctly, although incorrect terms, such as 'karta głosowa', 'druk do głosowania' and 'papier do głosowania' were used for the former and a relatively weak one, such as 'punkt głosowania' for the latter.

It was interesting to see general vocabulary items which caused frequent problems and errors. 'To download' was the one item of the text which was very frequently rendered informally as 'ściągnąć'; relatively few candidates offered formally more appropriate equivalents, such as 'pobrać', 'wziąć' or 'skopiować'. Terms related to 'applying', such as 'to apply' and 'an application form' caused the candidates some difficulty. In addition to correct expressions for 'to apply' ('złożyć wniosek' or "złożyć podanie"), there were also less fortunate expressions, such as the anglicised 'aplikować', 'złożyć aplikacje' or 'wypełnić aplikacje o formularz' and a derivative of 'złożyć wniosek', namely 'wnioskować'. 'Application form' ('formularz') was sometimes rendered as 'forma'. 'To apply for a vote' was often expanded as 'to apply for the possibility of a vote' or 'for the right to vote', although the source text used this item in the neutral sense of simple registration for a method of voting, without any implications of 'right' or 'possibility, both of which are presupposed be part of the 'voting process'. The expressions 'for a specific time period' and 'for a permanent postal vote' also gave some problems, usually with the repetition of 'czas' ('na określony okres czasu', 'na nieokreślony czas'); often a somewhat informal expression 'na stałe' was used for 'permanent'. Quite a few candidates had difficulty in rendering the emphasis in 'just one election' - many put the emphatic 'just' in the wrong place 'na tylko jedne wybory' instead of 'na jedne tylko wybory'. A relatively common mistake was the use of the word 'jednorazowe', used here by some in the expression 'na jednorazowe wybory' to convey 'one election', the formulation which suggest an election which takes place only once, rather than 'voting during only one election; the expression 'once' - 'jednorazowo' - would have been more appropriate here.

A few other general items, unexpectedly, were relatively difficult to translate correctly. 'Date of birth' was often translated as 'birthday date' ('data urodzin'), 'measures' ('środki') were translated as 'sposoby' ('means'), kroki ('steps'), 'zasady' ('principles'), 'methods' ('metody) or kryteria' (criteria). Some candidates some difficulty with the co-ordination of 'give my date of birth and signature' ('podać datę urodzenia i złożyć podpis') which was sometimes clumsily rendered as 'podać date urodzenia i podpis' or 'podać date urodzenia i podpisać się'. 'Separated' was often translated literally as 'oddzielony', where a better expression 'odłączony' ('detached') could have been used. Moreover, many candidates failed to change the present tense verb in the expression 'signature and the date of birth are separated from the ballot paper before being checked' into the future tense. They rendered it as 'są oddzielone od karty do głosowania przed sprawdzeniem' instead of 'zostaną odłączone', creating an incongruous (in Polish) time expression with present tense used to refer to a future action. 'Secrecy' ('tajność') was almost persistently mistranslated as 'a secret' ('tajemnica); other versions were 'dyskrecja' ('fact', 'discretion) and 'poufność' ('confidence'). The usual way ('w tradycyjny sposób) in the sentence 'you cannot vote in person at the polling station in the usual way' also caused some candidates difficulty.

The legal terms were generally handled by correct equivalents: 'offence' as 'wykroczenie' 'przestępstwo', 'allegation' as 'domniemanie', 'zarzut' or 'podejrzenie'; fraud as 'oszustwo, although there were a few cases of translation as 'falszerstwo' ('forgery').

Some structures caused difficulty: weaker candidates followed the word order of the expressions such as 'you can download a postal vote application form', 'for what period does my postal vote last' and 'it is an offence to complete a postal vote' – all resulting in clumsy structures in Polish (e.g. 'Może Pan/Pani ściągnąć z serwera formularz do głosowania korespondencyjnego', 'Przez jaki okres czasu jest mój głos oddany drogą pocztową ważny', 'Jest to przestępstwem aby oddać głos drogą pocztową').

Although the expressions 'postal vote' and 'proxy vote' were frequently repeated throughout the text, within some sentences and in the adjacent sentences, few candidates edited the text to improve its style and cohesion. The only exception being the long-winded final sentence; a number of candidates made some, appropriate changes to this section. Only proficient candidates avoided repetitions of 'postal vote' and 'proxy' vote 'in the text by using a range of synonyms.

Coherence was generally affected by the rendering of some of lexical expressions, for example the use of 'zagłosować' ('to vote once') for the general sense of 'to vote'.

The text was a formal informative genre, written in a direct style, with pronouns 'I' and 'you'. Candidates had to make a decision how to transfer the text into the register appropriate for its genre in Polish: whether to use 2nd person singular ('ty') (direct and informal in Polish), 2nd person plural ('Państwo' or 'Pan/'Pani') (formal and distant) or whether to use impersonal constructions (also formal and distant). Quite a number of candidates used the first option; some interlaced it with a few impersonal constructions; some selected a neutral impersonal style.

The lexical formality of the text caused little problems, with the exception of the word 'to download', mostly translated by informal 'ściągnąć' and 'permanent' ('permanent postal vote') translated usually by 'na stałe' (rather than 'na czas nieokreślony').

Stylistically, some candidates showed reliance on English syntax. This took the form of the use of the passive voice, where the active voice or an impersonal form would be more natural (e.g. 'if you have any allegations of fraud, they should be referred to the police', 'all postal and proxy voters are required'), the use of possessive pronouns in the context where they are usually absent in Polish (e.g. 'your electoral registration office', 'my postal vote', 'my date of birth', 'their date of birth and signature', 'your local council' etc.) and following the word order of the source text, as in the sentences discussed above.

Presentation and legibility were generally satisfactory. Some scripts, however, contained substantial editions, with material crossed out, inserted and corrected and one contained substantial changes to the paragraph structure of the original.

Recommendations to Centres

Most texts adhered to presentation instructions, but there was also some work which was single-spaced, written on paper without margins (leaving little space for marking) and on both sides of the sheet. Draft work was included and clearly marked. Despite the opportunity to draft their translation, some candidates submitted work with substantial editions. Presentation is part of the assessment (criterion 3) and untidy or illegible work will have an impact on the mark awarded. Some work showed signs of being rushed towards the end - drafting, editing of the draft and final copying need to be well-timed and candidates need to time their task. Most assignments, but not all, contained a copy of the source text.

Recommendations to Candidates

Candidates need to have a sound familiarity with various subject areas relevant to their pathway. This will include not only familiarity with the relevant terminology, such as that pertaining to 'voting' but also appreciation of the subject area. In this particular case, they would need to have insights into voting, some organisation of the voting system, organisations and the officials involved (e.g. Returning Officer), procedures (e.g. 'postal voting', 'voting by proxy', 'single', 'permanent'), and distinction between various relevant concepts such as 'registering for a postal vote or a proxy vote' versus 'the right to vote', 'electoral rights' etc. Appreciation of similarities and differences between the systems in the two countries is essential to being able to deal with the content of the text in an informed manner.

Apart from the familiarity with the subject areas and relevant terminology, candidates also need to have a clear appreciation of the genre and function of the text they are trying to reproduce (informative, persuasive, instructions) and its stylistic features, such as register (formality), directness (reader involvement) and how these are achieved by specific syntactic and semantic features (e.g. the use of the passive voice, the use of the imperative, declarative or interrogative mood, impersonal constructions, the use of pronouns etc.). They need to be able to reproduce the discourse aspects of the source text as these are present in the text for specific stylistic and communicative reasons.

In addition to genre and stylistic awareness, the candidates need to have an appreciation of syntactic and stylistic features of both the target and source languages (for example the use of possessive pronouns English or the frequency of passive constructions). They need to be able to judge which structures and forms are the inherent features of the source and target languages, which are transferable and whether they will be syntactically and stylistic appropriate in the in the target text.

It is advisable to practise writing translations within a specified time period to learn how to pace oneself during the task in order to finish each section of the text to the same standard.

LANGUAGE: PORTUGUESE (BRAZILIAN)
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

The overall performance was considerably higher than in previous years, but I am suspicious that this buckle in the trend is due, primarily, to this year's paper being considerably easier compared to previous years. There isn't a marked improvement in candidates' performance because the papers did not really go far enough to test their skills and knowledge. Even simple sentences are causing major difficulties to the majority of candidates. Specific terminology in the subject matter is a major concern as only 2 or 3 candidates got the correct translation for *post-mortem* and *coroner*.

It is expected that at this level, candidates would be familiar and comfortable in translating such materials, but that is not the case. Grammar, punctuation, correct use of accents, etc. are still a major concern, and this is reflected in the poor quality of the vast majority of translations.

Recommendations to Centres

Stress the importance of knowledge and full command of one's own language. Regular assessment of candidates' abilities and knowledge is recommended. Recommendation of adequately challenging material and role plays. Explore realistic scenarios with candidates to place them outside their comfort zone. Most candidates sitting this examination are clearly not yet ready and lack the basic skills and knowledge to succeed. Visits to courts to sit through hearings may be as productive as sitting in a classroom and will give candidates a real sense of urgency to master their chosen subject matter. There is no substitute to real life practice and exposure, for this is what they will have to deal with if they are successful and manage to get established in the profession.

Recommendations to Candidates

Start by brushing up on your language and grammar knowledge, followed by regular practice, private study, role plays, reading, visits to courts to watch proceedings. Prepare yourselves by going back to basics and building from the ground up. This is a difficult examination and only those with sound grammatical, linguistic and specialised knowledge are likely to succeed. Go back to grammar books, relearn the rules, learn the new Portuguese Orthographic Rules, read the specialised press, go to court and sit through hearings to pick up terminology, etc. Demand more from your interpreting/translation course providers and get more for your money. This examination must not be approached lightly and will require firm commitment for at least 6 months if you are to be successful. Also, at the end of the day, interpreting courses can only teach you so much, and the rest is down to each individual candidate and to how much they want to get out of, firstly, the course and, secondly, the examination. You will not become an accomplished interpreter from one day to another. It takes years, and even those very experienced interpreters have to constantly work hard to stay in the profession and to be recognised by their clients and peers alike.

LANGUAGE: PORTUGUESE (BRAZILIAN)
PATHWAY(S): LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

This text was a questionnaire explaining to citizens how to vote by mail. The main weakness shown was on the use of the correct vocabulary to the "neologisms" in Portuguese. There is no equivalent term in the dictionaries for "postal vote" in Portuguese, as there is no such possibility nowadays in our electoral system. So candidates would have to adapt the translation using a structure of explaining the idea, rather than choosing a precise word. My suggestion is "voto pelo correio", instead of "voto postal".

Another difficulty was in the translation of the period of time of the postal vote. Candidates found difficulty in differentiating between the concepts of "período de vida" and "período de validade". The first term is suitable for living beings (life) and the second term is suitable for things that have a definite time to finish, such as a driving licence, for example. This particularity of the language is a very subtle idea to acquire for a translator.

Recommendations to Centres

Candidates should be reminded that cohesion and coherence are essential to producing a good translation. For example, there is a tendency in English which is the use of gerund in general, and not only in the present continuous or past continuous. In Portuguese, the gerund does not work very well and it denotes a poor knowledge of syntax. Instead we use the "oração adjetiva", which initiates with the word "que".

Candidates need stronger linguistic skills, more awareness of vocabulary actually used by professionals. Use of monolingual dictionaries (I would recommend "Michaelis") for cross-reference is important, as well as giving them texts from newspapers for listening and comprehension skills. There are special sections in online newspapers, such as "Folha de S.Paulo" -- www.folha.uol.com.br -- and "Jornal do Brasil" -- www.jb.com.br.

It is essential for candidates to re-read what has been written in its entirety to see if it makes sense in the context of the situation being described. Encourage your students to do the whole process.

Recommendations to Candidates

In general, candidates are nervous when it comes to tests and examinations. I would ask candidates to make sure first that they have read and understood the material and then go ahead with the translation.

The use of linkers to build a good sentence is essential for an accurate communication. In order to achieve the knowledge of the use of those “syntagmas”, candidates should prepare for the examination by studying grammar structures applied to texts. It is very hard to learn grammar without a context. It is always the text that will provide the right context and the right appropriacy of the language structures and vocabulary. Reading and writing are essential to be successful.

Candidates should pay attention to the genre of the text and the correct vocabulary and “tone” which that genre asks. If they are from the area of “local government” it is important to use a tone of formality, rather than informal language. Keep in mind that the documents are official.

LANGUAGE: PORTUGUESE (EUROPEAN)
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

This text was about “Coroners, post-mortems and inquests”. The title on its own proved to be difficult to translate for all candidates. There was no discernment in regards to the word “coroner” (in one translation “coroner” was translated in six different ways). None of the candidates was able to look at the text and use the information provided as an aid.

There were problems with spelling and accentuation, and this can sometimes change the meaning of a word (for example “deaths” was translated as *óbidos* instead of *óbitos*. The first is the name of a well-known Portuguese town.

Compared to previous years, the standard has decreased substantially.

Recommendations to Centres

Candidates do need input from language tutors. Their weaknesses are far from being solved on their own without the guidance of language experts as some candidates do not seem to be aware of the standard of writing that is expected from a native speaker.

It should be emphasised by centres that Translating and Interpreting are very different; they require the use of different techniques but it is also paramount that centres explain these techniques to their students.

Many translations lack cohesion and coherence. Candidates should be reminded that these aspects offer logic to the reader; therefore the work they produced has to follow these rules.

I strongly recommend an individual approach as much as possible from the part of the language tutor.

The DPSI is an interpreting qualification but candidates need to be made aware that without a Pass in the written units the full qualification is not obtained.

Recommendations to Candidates

Do not start a translation without having had the chance to read the text twice and underline unknown jargon that needs checking. (If you use the dictionary do not go for the easiest option, the answer may be in the text and use common sense). It will save you time in the long run. Likewise, re-read your text after you have finished your translation and **MAKE SURE YOU UNDERSTAND IT**. Look for imperfections such as spelling mistakes, accentuation, etc.

Identify your weaknesses and work hard towards improving them. You need strong linguistic skills to be able to translate a text that will be of use to the reader.

You need to be fluent in both languages, source and target language, to perform well at a professional level.

LANGUAGE: PORTUGUESE (EUROPEAN)
PATHWAY(S): LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

This text contained information regarding postal voting for the local elections and detailed the ways in which a post vote could have been obtained. The main weakness shown was a lack of knowledge of specialist vocabulary with excessive paraphrasing as for instance the use of the verb “aplicar” to translate *to apply* instead of *requerer* or even *pedir para votar*. Another serious error was shown in the literal translation of *secrecy* instead of the correct Portuguese expression in this context, *sigilo*. The translation of *Returning Officer* was also paraphrased as “Funcionário da Organização Eleitoral” instead of *funcionário encarregado dos serviços de escrutínio*.

There were mistakes in spelling, particularly in accentuation, such as *período*, *preenchê-la*, *polícia*. Some verbs did not have agreement between the subject and the number, for instance, *os eleitores têm de dar a sua data de nascimento* and not “os eleitores tem que dar....”

Recommendations to Centres

The knowledge of specialist terminology should not be overlooked as it is vital in the DPSI and can be a key to avoiding misunderstandings and distortions. This is particularly important in Local Government where the Portuguese and English systems can be quite different and sometimes there is not a straightforward translation. When in doubt it is better to give a brief explanation, to make sure that you are aware of cultural differences, rather than try to work out which organisation in the other language and country would correspond to the British one.

Candidates need stronger linguistic skills, more awareness of the language and vocabulary actually used by those organisations and not restrict themselves to only the knowledge obtained from glossaries and dictionaries. Use of monolingual dictionaries for cross-reference is also essential.

Candidates should also pay more attention to the rules of accentuation: accents are a feature of the written word and many accents serve to differentiate homonyms and verbal forms. The omission of such accents is penalised.

Recommendations to Candidates

In general candidates are nervous when it comes to tests and examinations. It is essential though, that candidates make sure first that they have read and understood the material and then start the translation. This practice will prevent unnecessary mistakes and incoherence. Also read the finished text and if something does not make sense to you it also will not make sense to the examiner. So better not to write than to write nonsense and make use of your common sense. Remember that being a native speaker does not make you a good interpreter. You need to be good in two languages. You also need to have good background knowledge of your subject in both languages.

It is essential that candidates continue to read as well as listen to general news and documentaries on the radio as well as on TV. Remember that interpreting for Local Government can mean a lot to some people. Another key point is to provide good handwritten translations, which create a good impression and demonstrate professionalism.

LANGUAGE: ROMANIAN
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

A large number of candidates took the English Law pathway examination, some very strong, but a number not quite up to a professional standard. The challenge this year was the translation of ‘coroner’. Various dictionaries give various translations, most of them as ‘medic legist’, ‘anchetator’, ‘coroner’. However, apart from the above mentioned translations, many candidates came with other translations, some very good paraphrases: ‘procuror medic legist’, ‘experți medico-legali’, others less good: ‘legist’ (too colloquial in this context), ‘ofițeri legiști’, ‘judecători speciali’.

The sentence: ‘An inquest is a legal inquiry into the causes and circumstances of death’ was missing in a surprisingly large number of papers. Another problem seem to be the translation of ‘in a prescribed set of circumstances’, with many wrong translations of this phrase (including ‘investigating death in particular situations’, ‘investigating a particular death’, etc.). Some candidates had problems with ‘in police custody’, which was translated as ‘on bail’ or ‘under arrest’.

One candidate translated 'objections' as 'objectives' which sounds almost similar, but the sense is completely different.

A recurring grammatical mistake was 'v-a', which should have been 'va' as part of the future tense and 'să de-a' which should have been 'să dea' (subjunctive).

Recommendations to Centres

As last year, not all the centre names and numbers were on some of the examination covers.

On the positive side, centres have ensured that all the examination papers were correctly presented, with all the pages numbered and clearly marked.

Recommendations to Candidates

Presentation and legibility are very important. Make sure that you present your translation in clear, legible handwriting and check all the diacritic signs.

There should also be a clear demarcation of paragraphs and paragraph titles should be clearly written and underlined.

LANGUAGE: RUSSIAN

PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW, SCOTTISH LAW, HEALTH AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

This year's performance in English Law and Local Government appears to be better, perhaps because the texts for these options were more straightforward and presented fewer challenges. There were fewer problems with word order and sentence structure, though candidates still follow the original too closely, which often results in clumsiness in the target language.

Most of the mistakes lay in the use of vocabulary, both ordinary and specialised. There was the usual problem with 'false friends' as well as the inability to distinguish between synonyms and choose one that is appropriate to the context. The English *legal*, for instance, can be translated into Russian as *легальный*, *законный*, *правовой* and *юридический*. None of them are completely interchangeable and it was important, therefore, to find the right one for the expression *legal inquiry*. Amongst other adjectives that presented similar problems was *violent in a violent death*, translated by some as *жестокая* (*cruel*). While death is always cruel, it is not necessarily violent.

There were problems with verbs. *Arrange for in The coroner is a doctor or a lawyer... who can arrange for a post-mortem examination of the body* was translated by many as *arrange* (*договориться, устроить*). Neither were appropriate for the context as neither are formal enough. *Распорядиться* would have been more appropriate. Some translations even implied that the coroner carries out the post-mortem himself. Does a lawyer have the necessary medical skills to do this? Translating too literally is another problem. Sometimes this results in clumsiness, but it can also lead to distortions if there is more than one instance of this in one context. *You do not have the right* is a good example. Most candidates translated it as *у вас нет права*, even though the common expression in Russian is *вы не имеете права*.

Specialist vocabulary was another area where there were many errors. In the Scottish Law pathway the *Lord Advocate* was translated either too literally, or completely wrongly as *the House of Lords*. In cases like these one ought to think what the person occupying an equivalent position would be called in Russia rather than translate literally in the hope that because the legal systems are different one might somehow get away with this.

Wrong use of prefixes, suffixes and prepositions can also lead to mistakes. For instance, *to object to a post-mortem* requires a preposition in Russian, e.g. *возражать против вскрытия*, and simply using the Dative case for the object (*возражать вскрытию*) is not correct, as this would mean 'to contradict' and can only be applied to human beings.

In Local Government the verb *download* (*сгрузить, скачать*) was translated by some as *upload* (*загрузить*), and the recipient of the communication would not have been sure of what to do.

In Health there were similar problems. The word *personality* was translated as *личность* when in this context it was clear that what was meant was *характер*. We don't say: *У него с годами изменилась личность*, but *изменился характер*. *Judgement* was translated as *суждение* which means *opinion*, while the word in the text implied the ability to make good judgements.

Recommendations to Centres

Encourage the candidates to read widely and to use monolingual dictionaries.

Recommendations to Candidates

Remember that word order can change the meaning or shift the emphasis. Don't be afraid of moving away from the structure of the text. The translation, as much as possible, should sound as if it had been written in the target language. The differences between the legal systems in Britain and Russia, and the way in which local governments operate are immense. Your translation serves to enable the recipient to take appropriate action, so clarity is paramount.

LANGUAGE: SERBIAN**PATHWAY(S): LOCAL GOVERNMENT****Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group**

This year the text was translated using the appropriate register and in a formality appropriate to the Serbian language formal style. Although a few simple mistakes were made, this did not affect the meaning of the text, which would provide clear instructions to the readers and would allow them to act appropriately.

The omission of a sentence, which did not distort the meaning of the instructions and generally would not mislead the reader acting on the information provided, can be seen as an example when an omission would be acceptable.

Candidates who have been living in a bilingual environment have to be careful not to fall into a trap of creating "new" words in Serbian, designed and formed by using an English expression, but adapting it to Serbian grammatical rules.

Dictionaries do provide translated words, but the choice of the best fitting word from these synonyms is up to you and you have to choose one that best fits into the sentence, not use as a rule the first one given.

Recommendations to Centres

It would be wise to point out to the candidates that omissions are not only related to particular words, but could happen under examination stress, as in the oversight of a whole sentence. This does emphasise the importance of final checks before submitting the work.

Recommendations to Candidates

This year the examination clearly demonstrated the need to check the text translated thoroughly before submitting it, to avoid omissions made by pure oversight. This is particularly important under the stress of the examination, when overlooking a word or a whole sentence is quite possible and potentially could lead to failing the examination, even for good candidates.

LANGUAGE: SLOVAK**PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW****Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group**

This year there were some very good examples of translation, but also examples of translations that do not reach the professional standard required for this qualification.

The text was relatively challenging this year as the system of inquests into deaths in Slovakia is quite different to that in the UK. A number of terms, such as coroner, do not actually exist in the Slovak language, but transliterated terms are accepted as equivalent (a number of candidates used this, although a few did not use the correct grammatical terms – 'koronery' or 'koronér' exemplifying some of the problems). Another issue with specialist vocabulary was the 'post-mortem' examination. Some candidates used incorrect 'obhliadka' or 'prehliadka' and also transliterated 'autopsia', where the correct and accepted term is 'pitva'. In addition to specialist issues, there were issues of decoding the original message - e.g. the rendering of the final sentence regarding the Inquest, where the candidate renders it completely

differently to the original message by stating that 'it is kept in public, sometimes with the jury of the coroner' or 'it is accessible to public, sometimes with a jury (with coroner)' rather than 'held in public by a coroner, sometimes with a jury'; the rendering of the sentence regarding reporting deaths to coroner by stating that 'prescribed circumstances of death will be reported to the coroner, e.g. whether the cause of death is unknown...' which changes the intended message.

Grammatically there were issues with incorrect endings of adjectives/nouns: 'verejný, verejný' in relation to 'vyšetovanie', 'je jediná osoba' instead of 'je jedinou osobou', diacritics: 'situáciach' instead of 'situáciách', 'príčinach' instead of 'príčinách' and punctuation. A couple of candidates were of Czech background (judging by the work produced) as there were strong influences of Czech grammar (incorrect for a Slovak translation): 'pak' (doesn't exist in Slovak) instead of 'potom', 'nariadené' instead of 'nariadenej', 'policajné' instead of 'policajnej', 'nahlási' instead of 'nahlási', 'týkajúcich' instead of 'týkajúcich'.

Recommendations to Centres

My recommendations relate to the above points:

- More attention to be paid to specialist vocabulary and correct grammar (where required)
- Encourage candidates to read more documentation in Slovak and familiarise themselves with equivalent terminology
- Where the candidate is not a native speaker of the language, more written and spoken practice should be encouraged (reading authentic Slovak texts, as above, may be useful).

Recommendations to Candidates

Concentrate on specialist vocabulary and getting to know the equivalent expressions in Slovak, especially where judicial; these are quite different to the Slovak structures. Be careful when producing the final product, double check the grammar and punctuation and try to read the resulting translations as a native Slovak reader would do (rather than sticking too rigidly to the English original).

LANGUAGE: SLOVAK
PATHWAY(S): SCOTTISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

This year there were some good and some less professional examples of translation. The text was a little challenging to some of the candidates in terms of specialist terminology, for example 'Cabinet Secretary for Justice' simply transliterated or translated as the 'Cabinet of the ministry of justice and of the Lord Advocate' or 'government of the secretary for justice' none of which is correct. One candidate translated 'FAI' throughout as 'information about fatal injuries', referring to the 'recording of this info', rather than 'holding FAI' and the decision about it being 'created' by Lord Advocate. Some candidates also had problems with decoding the original message correctly, especially the rendering of 'FAI recommendations are made...' was not aligned with the original by using 'recommendations about FAI...'. There were also numerous examples of inappropriate lexis: 'spoločenský' instead of 'občianskoprávny', 'diskrétné' for 'discretionary' (incorrect in this context), 'prehľad' (overview) instead of 'previerka' (review), 'unexplainable' instead of 'unexplained'. Grammar still remains an issue for some of the candidates with incorrect forms of nouns used (e.g. 'Procurators Fiscal' (plural) often rendered in singular), declination endings, (e.g. 'príčina' instead of 'príčinu'), use of diacritics ('okolnosťami' instead of 'okolnosťami').

Recommendations to Centres

My recommendations relate to the above points:

- More attention to be paid to specialist vocabulary and correct grammar (where required)
- Encourage candidates to read more documentation in Slovak and familiarise themselves with equivalent terminology (e.g. government structures both in Scotland and Slovakia, judicial terms, etc.)

Recommendations to Candidates

Concentrate on specialist vocabulary and getting to know the equivalent expressions in Slovak, especially where judicial and government-structure terms are quite different to the Slovak structures. Be careful when producing the final product, double check the grammar and punctuation and try to read the resulting translations as a native Slovak reader would do (rather than sticking too rigidly to the English original).

LANGUAGE: SLOVAK
PATHWAY(S): LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

This year the candidate group was very small. An acceptable rendering of the original text was produced, although at times adhering too rigidly to the original. Examples of issues include using 'to what period will my postal vote relate to' rather than 'for what period does my postal vote last' (change of meaning in Slovak rendering). 'Information' has a plural version in Slovak and should have been used ('informácií'). Endings of adjectives/nouns should be appropriate to the sentence 'je trestným činom' rather than 'je trestný čin'. 'Váš' is written with a capital usually in letters directed to a particular person, not generic leaflets. 'ovplyvňovanie ako iní' is particularly stilted in Slovak.

Recommendations to Centres

My recommendations relate to the above points:

- Encourage candidates to read more documentation in Slovak and familiarise themselves with equivalent terminology
- More attention to be paid to Slovak grammar (declination rules and general grammar).

Recommendations to Candidates

Concentrate on specialist vocabulary and getting to know the equivalent expressions in Slovak. Be careful when producing the final product, double check the grammar and punctuation and try to read the resulting translations as a native Slovak reader would do (rather than sticking too rigidly to the English original).

LANGUAGE: SOMALI
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

The overall performance of candidates shows a significant improvement from last year in terms of presentation and legibility. This relates to the fact that legal terms included in the examination text such as "coroner, post-mortem and inquests" were explained. With that in mind a number of candidates failed to translate such terminology accurately. Moreover, some translations showed a number of mistakes in basic grammar usage like upper case and lower case letters which literate native speakers are not expected to make, let alone professional interpreters. Specifically, some translations indicated a number of misunderstandings regarding the meaning of: investigation, test, examination, medicine and medical. I also found a few omissions and additions but, in general, candidates produced very good renderings and well organised use of sentence structure and overall coherence.

Recommendations to Centres

In general, centres provided a stress free atmosphere to candidates which is conducive to good examination performance. This is clear from candidates' presentation and work produced. I further recommend centres to provide a friendly and welcoming atmosphere, as candidates endure anxiety and stress when it comes examinations.

Recommendations to Candidates

As always, candidates experience nervousness and pressure when it comes to writing examinations, but candidates need to show professional confidence, calm and concentration to translate the text in hand fully and accurately to their best ability. Furthermore, candidates need to have a strong basic linguistic background of the target language; simple grammatical mistakes and misuse of terminology from professional interpreters are unacceptable. Therefore, candidates need to improve their knowledge of legal terminology and should always remember to double check what has been written in its entirety and make sure, before handing it over, that it makes real sense in the overall context of the scenario being described. To this end, candidates should bear in mind the ethical responsibility involved, especially in a scenario where the interest of the clients, who need to understand the legal terms and are concerned about the legal outcome of any legal proceedings, is at stake. Thus, competent, professional interpreters are the main facilitators of justice in real life situations and must equip themselves to convey the information completely and accurately and without lapses or jumble.

LANGUAGE: SPANISH
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

This year fewer candidates were awarded a Merit or Distinction. These candidates were able to overcome the main difficulty of this text, which was conveying in an appropriate and unambiguous manner the term 'Coroner', a legal institution particular to the English system and with no exact equivalent in Spanish speaking countries, whose functions were the main subject of the original text. The term is crucial in the context and the translation has to be transparent, therefore the best solution in this case was an explicative paraphrase or a footnote. However a Pass was also awarded to all those who managed to convey the distinctiveness of this institution without serious conceptual error. Attempts as '*pesquisidor*', '*funcionario forense*', '*personal forense*' were all accepted as well as, '*juez de instrucción*', chosen by a few candidates, even though it is not entirely accurate: A '*juez de instrucción*', an examining or committing Judge, has jurisdiction on penal matters, and can order an investigation and autopsy, as the Coroner does. However, the '*Juez de Instrucción*' can detain and indict persons against whom there are reasonable grounds for proceeding. The Coroner cannot do this, which in England is a matter for the prosecution services of DPP. Neither is he a Judge, and therefore cannot pass judgement or apportion blame. Although a '*Juez de instrucción*' has more powers than the Coroner, the term was accepted only on the grounds that, at least, the English Coroner shares some of its functions. Unfortunately we could not accept '*Juez de Primera Instancia*', mainly because this category of judge has jurisdiction over civil matters. Neither could we accept '*Medico forense*', a pathologist working for the Judiciary who is in charge of the necropsy and all medical procedures. The '*Médico Forense*' follows the Judge's instructions, and he himself examines and carries out any requested post-mortem. This translation is not accurate and does not convey the functions of the Coroner: The Coroner is an independent officer and not necessarily a medical doctor, or a pathologist.

Other legal terms considered central to this text were '*inquest*' and '*legal inquiry*'. The former was translated in the majority of scripts simply as '*investigación*' which is too unspecific, because it does not differentiate the Coroners' inquest from any other investigation: to produce an approximation of the original meaning, it is necessary to add a sense-component such as '*judicial*'. Regarding the translation of '*legal inquiry*', it cannot be translated using again '*investigación*': It does not help the reader's understanding to define '*una investigación*', (i.e. in the OT *an inquest*) as a '*una investigación legal*', (i.e. in the OT: *legal inquiry*), particularly when the legal Spanish language can provide terms as '*indagación*'.

Other concepts and terms rendered in a way that did not convey the original meaning were: '*anyone concerned*', mainly translated as '*Cualquier persona preocupada*' and also '*quienes estén interesados*': '*concerned*' in this context implies something more than a simple interest or worry, therefore the translation should aim to eliminate any such ambiguity. '*Object to a post mortem*' was translated by some candidates as '*denegar*', which means '*dismiss*' or '*refuse*', but it is better suited to a petition or a claim. The terms '*Religious objections*' go beyond the simple '*inquietudes religiosas*' i.e., '*religious preoccupations*' as found in some scripts. Some candidates tried to improve on '*certify*', and its straightforward equivalent '*certificar*', with unnecessary paraphrases such as '*decir con certeza*', '*afirmar con certeza*' and similar, all of them inaccurate.

There were also many grammatical and syntactical mistakes: Word-for-word or literal translation produced unnatural Spanish and the same occurred when the passive voice was unnecessarily used: '*Una muerte se le será informada al forense*' and '*una muerte será reportada*' are both unnatural translations. There were some examples of wrong agreement when using impersonal passive verbs such as '*se puede*'; several examples of improper use of the Subjunctive were noticeable such as '*si sea necesaria*' instead of '*si fuera necesaria*'; verbal phrases such as *deber + infinitive* and *deber + de + infinitive* used indiscriminately, when they have different meaning and should be clearly differentiated; incorrect translation of the modal '*should*' when indicating obligation.

Improper use of prepositions and omission of personal '*a*' was very frequent as well as improper use of the relative pronoun '*quienes*'. Errors in genre agreement: '*él es el único persona*', '*el autopsia*', '*el muerte*'.

Unnecessary accent in words such as *autopsía*, *investigaciones*, *situaciones*, and, last but not least because this error affects cohesion, the use of formal and informal forms of address in the same sentence and referring to the same person.

Recommendations to Centres

Centres should make sure the candidates entered have a command of the language and legal background knowledge in accordance with the level required for this examination. The translation exercise indirectly also tests the candidates' understanding of the English legal system and their ability to convey it to a non-English speaker in an intelligible and transparent manner. Centres should make sure that candidates develop the ability to notice which elements of the source text do not have an exact equivalent in Spanish. These concepts require attention and should be properly thought

out before deciding on a translation or an explanatory note. Candidates are allowed dictionaries and other resources, so these should be used effectively.

Recommendations to Candidates

The usual recommendations apply: terminology should be double-checked in a monolingual legal dictionary if the candidate's knowledge of the English or Spanish speaking country's legal systems are not sound. Also they should be aware of institutional and legal concepts that do not have an equivalent in the other country's legal system and decide on the best way to deal with this.

Candidates who favour any Latin American variant of Spanish over others certainly know there are at least as many variants of Spanish as Latin American countries. However, their legal systems are all based in Roman Law and the Napoleonic Code, so they share the same legal principles. If there are any non-obvious or uncommon lexical differences, they should specifically name the country whose legal system they are using as a reference.

LANGUAGE: SPANISH
PATHWAY(S): SCOTTISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

It was pleasing to find that this year there were a fair number of very competent candidates who conveyed the text with a good degree of accuracy and were awarded a Merit or Distinction. The document to be translated provided information on the purpose and scope of Fatal Accident Inquiries and made reference to the Procurator Fiscal Service that conducts them. Although most candidates performed well in general and in a number of cases used polished language in the appropriate style and register, the text involved some difficulties that challenged some of the candidates' ability and knowledge.

An example of this is the candidate who misunderstood the term '*inquiry*' translating it as '*solicitud*'. This triggered a sequence of fatal mistakes as he or she tried to make sense of such an erroneous translation, and those errors seriously distorted not only the Act's title, and its acronym, but all the information related to it.

'*Lord Advocate*' was in general well translated although there were one or two instances where this title was conveyed as just 'solicitor' or with the unnecessary and long paraphrase 'person in charge of the Judicial Service'. '*Procurator Fiscal*' did not present problems and was, in general, well translated.

More problematic was the translation of '*give rise to serious public concern*' where '*concern*' was translated simply as '*preocupación*', a term that does not transmit exactly the same meaning as the original text. In one script the phrase was conveyed as '*aumento en las preocupaciones seriamente públicas*' and in another it was rendered as '*que den lugar a una gran preocupación por la seguridad pública*' which is totally inaccurate and completely changes the reasons and objectives of the inquiry.

Lexical elements not belonging exclusively to legal vocabulary such as '*Carried out in the public interest*' and 'fact-finding exercise' were also misunderstood and translated the former as '*el bien estar (sic) del pueblo*' and the latter variously as '*recopilación de datos*', '*un hecho encontrado*', and also as '*un ejercicio en el cual uno encuentra lo que ha pasado*'.

There was a tendency to paraphrase unnecessarily, a translation method that should be avoided when there is a perfect equivalent of the English term used in the text. Paraphrasing should not be seen as a way to achieve formality, a case in point in this text being the translation of '*fatal accident*' as '*accidente con resultado de muerte*' which is unidiomatic and defective, instead of its simple Spanish equivalent '*accidente mortal*'.

There were also some grammar and syntax mistakes: Adherence to English syntax resulting in unidiomatic sentence constructions; wrong verb tense or verb mood; agreement of verb and subject; incorrect use of the plural with impersonal expressions such as *soler + infinitive* and the imperfect tense of "*hay*". Several errors in the use of the prepositions '*a*', '*de*' and '*en*' and the disjunctive conjunction '*ni*'. There were also some spelling mistakes and missed accents.

Recommendations to Centres

Centres should make sure the candidates entered have a command of the language and background knowledge in accordance with the level required by this examination. The Scottish legal system terminology can be problematic for a Spanish speaker. The legal concepts should be translated precisely and, although in certain circumstances it is necessary to resort to a paraphrase, where there is an equivalent term this should always be used.

Recommendations to Candidates

The acquisition of strong linguistic skills requires practise, good background knowledge and more effective use of dictionaries and other resources at the candidate's disposal during the examination. The use of monolingual dictionaries for cross-reference is also vital.

Grammar and syntax also need consolidation and revision. Incorrect use of articles and prepositions, connectives and verb mood and tense in subordinate clauses are a concern, even in the case of native speakers, who are prone to be influenced by the grammar and syntax of the source text. Finally, candidates should give themselves a few minutes to revise the text and check whether the text is intelligible in Spanish and would be clearly and unambiguously understood by the intended reader, otherwise the script may not be fit for its purpose.

LANGUAGE: SPANISH
PATHWAY(S): HEALTH

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

Although this year the candidate group was very small, the mistakes seem to be the same as previous years: staying too close to the English original, which makes it very difficult to produce a good Spanish text; lack of grammar knowledge (accents, article usage, spelling, concordance); some issues with the most medical specialised terms and literal translations.

Once again the English text seems to have been understood but there was a tendency to stay too close to it to produce a high quality Spanish translation. Sometimes whole sentences were translated word by word.

This year the text did not have any major complexity and there were only one or two specialised medical terms. Even so, one candidate literally translated one of them (*brain scan* as "rastreo del cerebro"), which is incorrect and shows a lack of medical knowledge, even the basic, patient-friendly terms.

Recommendations to Centres

The examination seemed to be well organised and everything was clearly marked.

Centres should encourage students to distance themselves from the English and focus on common mistake areas like, for example, in Spanish there is no need to repeat constantly the personal pronouns as in English ("si **usted** está preocupado de que **usted** o un pariente próximo esté desarrollando esta enfermedad, **usted** debe hablar con su médico"); or the use of articles, English tend to omit them but they are needed in Spanish.

Candidates have to be made aware of the importance of grammar; accents are important and using the right preposition is important. It is very easy to underestimate this aspect which is crucial to pass the examination.

Special attention should be paid to false friends and literal translation to avoid unnecessary *calques*, for instance, *develop* can be translated in many different ways apart from *desarrollar*; *severe* is not *severo*, but *grave*; *not only... but* is not *no solo... pero*, but *no solo... sino*.

Good book recommendations:

Manual de estilo de la lengua española, José Martínez de Sousa; *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas*, RAE; or the *Little Manual de redacción y estilo* by Manuel Alvar Ezquerro for general Spanish writing and grammar.

Specialised: *Diccionario crítico de dudas en medicina, inglés-español* by Fernando Navarro or *El lenguaje en la medicina. Usos y abusos* by Rodolfo Alpízar del Castillo.

Recommendations to Candidates

Once again, there was a good understanding of the SL, therefore it is essential to concentrate on the TL. Read more Spanish texts.

It is very, very important to leave enough time to check your text thoroughly and read it without the English.

If something does not “sound right”, check it again; re-read the English to make sure you understand the meaning. Once you know what it means, think about how to express that concept in clear Spanish. Try to explain it in your head to a friend or relative: which words do you use? Distance yourself from the English but stay close to the concept.

If something does not make sense, it is probably a mistake.

LANGUAGE: SPANISH
PATHWAY(S): LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

A smaller number of candidates this year chose this pathway, but the majority achieved excellent results. The document to be translated was a leaflet with information regarding postal voting and voting by proxy and the procedures involved, as set by the local authorities. One script could not be awarded a Pass because the candidate omitted such crucial information as the place where the postal application should be sent for approval and the fact that postal voting could be requested for just one election, both details that could be very significant for the person who requested the translated leaflet.

There were no major lexical problems, except for the translation of “registered to vote” as “*empadronarse*”, which could create a problem for Peninsular Spanish speakers. In Spain this term means to register as being a resident in a particular location, either for the Police or the Local Government or for the payment of local tax, but never in connection with the electoral register. People that are “*empadronados*” do not necessarily have the right to vote: only those who are registered in the *Censo Electoral* can do so. The translation is, however, accepted as this term is commonly used in other varieties of Spanish and it is assumed that the interpreter translating this document is aware to the linguistic needs of the potential reader.

Another term that could baffle some readers is the translation of *Returning Officer* as “*escrutador*” = scrutiniser. It is not commonly used in Latin American Spanish or even in Spain, where it is more common to use the term “*presidente de la junta electoral*” - the person who announces the winning candidates at the end of the count. However “*escrutador*” is the person who counts the votes, and for this reason has been accepted. Some candidates opted for a paraphrase: “*Officer who is in charge of overseeing the ballot*”, “*person in charge of the electoral district*”. One candidate translated it as “*funcionario*” or “*funcionario correspondiente*” – a very inadequate translation - and included the English term in between brackets in the text.

Other lexical problems: The translation of “*by proxy*”, a type of vote not available in Spanish speaking countries, was not always correct: “*voto delegado*” may or may not be understood by the reader. However, this was considered a minor lexical fault without major incidence in the grade awarded.

Grammar and syntax were, in general, adequate although the defective use of prepositions, verb sequences and moods were still frequent as well as unnecessary reflexive forms of certain verbs such as “*descargarse*” with a direct object. The use of “*estar*” instead of “*ser*” distorted the meaning of the sentence “*Your signature and date of birth are separated from your ballot paper...etc*”: the Spanish passive voice with *estar* announces an already existing result, while in the original text the passive construction announces a future action.

English interference was noticed in phrases such as “*¿Qué tan seguro es el voto postal?*”. This is a bad mixture of Spanish words and English syntax, and should be avoided at all costs. The correct interrogative is *¿Es seguro el voto postal?* or *¿En qué medida es seguro el voto postal?*. “*Si tiene alegatos de fraude*” is another example of such a mixture: this construction is unidiomatic.

Recommendations to Centres

As per English and Scottish Law.

Recommendations to Candidates

As per English and Scottish Law regarding the use of dictionaries and decisions about paraphrase and footnotes. However, the ability to decode from one cultural and institutional environment into another whilst maintaining lexical transparency is best achieved by intensive and extensive reading on the subject and practical exercises in translation.

LANGUAGE: TAMIL
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

The overall general performance was much better than the norm. Also, as in most years, the group number was small. It is strongly advised candidates get hold of more than one good quality English-Tamil-English dictionary as reliance on one single dictionary is not a good idea if one is working in translations, as contextual meanings are very important, especially in law. Another aspect which was noticed in this year's scripts was the weak syntax, and the genre convention of the original being reflected in the translation. While there are many dictionaries available in the bookshops, it is considered some are quite poor in their descriptive nature as well as suggestions for appropriate word equivalents.

Recommendations to Centres

It is strongly suggested that some serious attention be given to improving the English competence of candidates during their training. Equally, it is also important to recommend candidates to practise and improve their competence in the Other Language, which is Tamil in this case, by listening to suitable radio and television programmes, with some exceptions of television programmes where the spoken word is extremely badly diluted with badly pronounced English. Another clear area of concentration is for candidates to become familiar with idioms and usage of spoken English.

Centres must ensure that they offer the services of an Other Language competent person to assist candidates in their preparation.

Recommendations to Candidates

It is suggested that all prospective candidates spend a great deal of time reading, in both languages, appropriate texts in newspaper reports and magazines, which thankfully are available in plentiful supply at present in the UK. Please concentrate on the quality English newspapers such as The Times, The Independent, The Guardian etc. Equally important, it is advised that candidates practise listening to good radio programmes such as those broadcast on BBC Radio 4, and news reports from various Tamil radio and television broadcasts available in the UK. Please pay particular attention to the pronunciation of words in the respective languages. It is not wrong to have an accent but it is very important in the role that an interpreter performs, whether it is in a court of law or a Police interview or any other relevant task, to ensure that when his/her spoken word is listened to there is no ambiguity of what was said. In the recent June examination, there were a couple of instances of translations saying the very opposite of what was given to be translated. This is extremely critical, especially in law, as the successful candidate's work may be re-examined in important cases by a third party and possibly bring serious problems of liability with it; besides it could have a significant impact on the case and its perception. You are strongly advised to go to court cases, immigration and other tribunal hearings where an interpreter is used. Also there is no reason why you should not attend a hearing where there is no interpreter used as it will give a flavour of the type of words and issues you may encounter in such situations. Many of these hearings are open to the public. Finally, get more than one dictionary in English and at least two good quality Other Language-English dictionaries and, if necessary, specialist dictionaries as well.

LANGUAGE: TAMIL
PATHWAY(S): LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

The candidate group for the Local Government examination was very small. One candidate could have achieved a Merit but lost the opportunity by missing a sentence, providing the wrong translation of a phrase and a few spelling mistakes.

Such errors give the impression that even though a candidate may have the knowledge of the particular subject, the basic requirements of translation, like word to word checking of the source text and the translated version in the other language and reading the final document and checking spelling mistakes, are still to be understood.

Recommendations to Centres

No special recommendations are necessary and the system is fine and appropriate.

Recommendations to Candidates

Every word, sentence and piece of information is important in translation. Careful reading of the original text and understanding the meaning and translating the information accurately, without missing even a word or changing the meaning, is the essential skill. Reading the source text with care and checking the final translated document will help to ensure this.

Changing the meaning of one verb by carelessness, for example – “to post” and “to vote” might lead to misunderstanding of the whole text. Accuracy is the essential skill to develop.

Even with a perfect understanding and skilful use of terminology and language, spelling mistakes could lead to undermine the translated text. Spelling mistakes should be avoided. In Tamil, this skill could be achieved by understanding the basic structure and grammar of the language.

LANGUAGE: THAI
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

The candidate group was larger than last year's. One thing which is in common among the candidates is that they tend to do literal translations at some stage of their work when they are not able to understand the text well. This year, two of the candidates did not take into a consideration the function of the punctuation and therefore translated the following; **'...in cases where the death was: violent or unnatural; took place in prison or police custody; or when the death is uncertain** as *'post mortems will take place in prison or police custody' or 'to find out where the death took place in the prison or the police custody'*.

Recommendations to Centres

Please see 'recommendations to candidates'.

Recommendations to Candidates

Translate the work from an understanding of the text and do not just translate words. Although using a dictionary in the examination is helpful, one should not totally count on it. The word gives us the meaning but we have to interpret that word in the context of the whole text so that we can convey the true meaning of the passage. Understanding the function of punctuation will help us to understand the links with the text and therefore produce a correct translation. Thai does not use articles, therefore 'a death' should not be translated as 'one death' or 'death once' these give out the wrong meaning and will be very confusing to a reader.

Candidates must take into consideration the function of the punctuation and thereby avoid errors such as translating the following: **'... in cases where the death was: violent or unnatural; took place in prison or police custody; or when the death is uncertain'** as *'post mortems will take place in prison or police custody' or 'to find out where the death took place in the prison or the police custody'*.

LANGUAGE: TURKISH
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

This year the pass rate is again very low. Many candidates experienced difficulty with the translation of the term "Coroner". I actually believe that some of the candidates did not know who a "Coroner" was because one candidate translated it as a "Prosecutor" and another translated it as "the person who conducts the post-mortem". Another area of concern I have is the candidates' distinct lack of ability to form proper Turkish sentences. A number of candidates appeared *"to think in English and write in Turkish"* with all the attendant syntactical and grammatical errors that entailed. At least two papers, for example, had syntactical errors in every single sentence. Finally, certain candidates performed very badly in spelling and punctuation. One particular candidate committed over 30 spelling mistakes.

Recommendations to Centres

Many candidates are taking the DPSI examination without being properly prepared. There are a significant number of candidates who use "colloquial" expressions as if they are speaking to their friends and family. They fail to produce a translation which is in keeping with the register of the source text. The other problem is the preoccupation some candidates have with writing in neat. During the copying process, candidates lose valuable time and make silly mistakes. One candidate, for example, had omitted a whole sentence, which had, in fact, been translated in the rough copy.

Recommendations to Candidates

The Diploma in Public Service Interpreting (Law pathway) is a serious and difficult examination and serious candidates should spend the entire year preparing for it if they wish to stand any chance of passing it. Many candidates appear to be taking the examination because they speak two languages. On account of some of the candidates' inability to form proper Turkish sentences and use the correct register, many candidates appear to be underestimating this examination. Finally, candidates should be aware that they do not get extra marks for neat handwriting, but they will certainly lose valuable points if they do not check their translation in full before they hand in their papers.

LANGUAGE: TURKISH
PATHWAY(S): LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

This was a text entitled "How do I get a postal vote?". It was divided into 4 sections headed by questions that were clarified by the following text. Candidates should have been well prepared for such a format. This is a very typical almost "bullet point" leaflet translation. There are quite a lot of examples to work and practice on.

There was no consistence in candidate performance. The overall grades ranged from Fail to Merit. Whilst one candidate conveyed all information accurately with only a few minor errors, another candidate could not convey the content adequately. The particular common weakness was the spelling/grammatical mistake which was the attached spelling of the "stand alone -da-". It has to be written separately. This is not the same as the case suffix "da" and at this level one expects not to spot such basic linguistic errors in a translation. Generally usage of specialised terminology was acceptable.

In one text, a complete headline was omitted and choice of vocabulary was not adequate.

Recommendations to Centres

Centres should make sure that candidates know that some **common spelling mistakes** in Turkish are not acceptable at this level:

- 1- In Turkish there are two versions of the letter "i". One is dotted and the other one is not dotted. UK residents tend to forget or add cedillas to this letter. This counts as a mistake and cannot be accepted at this level.
- 2- C, S, G, I, O, U are letters which also have versions with cedillas. They are SEPARATE letters in the alphabet and should be spelled accordingly.

There is no shortage of online and offline material to practise and “fine tune” candidates’ skills. Centres should point out, that candidates should be proactive in making sure that their grammatical and spelling skills in their own target language is up to the required standard if a native speaker support tutor is not available. It seems that candidates this year had not been trained by an expert aware of grammatical nuances.

One candidate’s text was full of colloquial syntax structures. This resulted in a text that did not provide a coherent reading. The purpose of the written translations should be stressed by centres. Centres have the duty of training the candidates for real life situations. This translation would have not been acceptable by any client as the instructions would not have been clear/sufficient for a target language speaker. Because of the **order of the Turkish sentence** structure (Subject, Object, Verb) Turkish DPSI candidates should be trained very thoroughly by a Turkish tutor to acquire good translation methods.

Recommendations to Candidates

Candidates should prepare a very well researched glossary. Original documents should be studied.

Candidates should be at all times tuned in to paying attention to details. Even a tiny mistake might trigger dangerous misunderstandings. The importance of grammatical knowledge and perfect spelling should not be underestimated. Usage of punctuation marks was not accurate. Candidates should be aware of the fact that this is a vital part of translation and can distort/change the meaning easily or hinder the fluency unnecessarily.

LANGUAGE: UKRAINIAN
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

All candidates were able to convey information adequately, taking into account the peculiarities of the English legal system which may be unknown to Ukrainian speakers. The specific English terms were appropriately transliterated from English (rather than translated using analogous terms from Ukrainian law). In some cases they were relevantly complemented with one-word translation or explanation in Ukrainian. This ensured the efficiency of the translated text. Presentation and legibility, as well as overall use of syntactical and grammatical constructions, were at a good level.

Weaknesses of the candidates were mostly due to inattention to details of the original text and interference of other languages. Firstly, the lack of attention to legal terms resulted in ‘approximate translation’ which may be sometimes suitable for oral interpreting because one can correct it further on; however, the general rule is to translate terms accurately. Because this was a written task and candidates had access to dictionaries and enough time, I would have expected them to be more attentive to the key vocabulary of the pathway. Secondly, candidates sometimes found it hard to move away from the wording of the original English text, which resulted in awkward collocations in Ukrainian. Another problem is the interference of the Russian language in the Ukrainian translation, which was another source of awkward word combinations. Also, more attention is to be paid to punctuation and spelling as it can make it more difficult for the recipient to understand the translation.

Recommendations to Centres

The centres have done excellent work in preparing candidates to the required standard. Also, all the folders were well-organised and complete. The candidates seem to have had enough time for rough copies. However, it might be expedient to emphasise that candidates have to keep track of the time that they spend on rough copies. Whereas work on the rough copies allows candidates to correct some mistakes and devise a proper sentence structure for translation, it seems that the initial translation on the rough copy is made in a hurry, without attention to detail and exact terms, then most time is spent on editing this translated version without reference to the original, and then it is transferred to the clean copy in a hurry. This creates room for the mistakes mentioned above: inattention to the source text leads to inaccurate translation of terms (‘make’ instead of ‘arrange’, ‘confirm’ instead of ‘certify’) and grammatical construction (changing tenses, modifying singular into plural etc.). Little time is left for the clean copy, which results in spelling mistakes, missing prepositions and English/Russian structures in the Ukrainian text, as well as missing or extra punctuation marks.

This situation can be avoided by re-arranging the time evenly for attentive reading of the source text, rough translation and its transfer to the clean copy. Especially important is the final editing/proofreading phase which should be done first with the source text and then without it, in order to check the final translation for cohesion and non-contradiction of terms.

As for the interference of the Russian language in the Ukrainian text, this is a common problem for many Ukrainians who are mostly bilingual. If this is the case with the Ukrainian candidates at the centre, this issue can be avoided if the DPSI Ukrainian preparation course includes some practice on frequently confused Russian-Ukrainian collocations and expressions. A Russian-Ukrainian dictionary of set expressions (Російсько-український словник сталих виразів) like this one (<http://www.rozum.org.ua/index.php?a=index&d=17>) may be helpful for developing exercises.

Recommendations to Candidates

Candidates will find it useful to read more Ukrainian legal and business materials so that they can acquire a command of the appropriate vocabulary in their language. At the same time, they have to focus on gaining in-depth knowledge of English law. Some mistakes in this year's translations could have been avoided if candidates knew exactly the function of the official whose work was described.

Another recommendation is to read the final translation at least once without reference to the source text. This can help to spot mistakes done in a hurry, particularly those in spelling (in some cases reading the text to oneself may be of use for this purpose) and cohesion. Also, try to allocate more time for this final stage of proofreading the clean copy, because this is the last chance to correct mistakes and make your work represent your professional competence in the best possible way.

LANGUAGE: URDU

PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW, SCOTTISH LAW AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

Law

The subject for translation was 'Coroners, post-mortems and inquests' which is a common subject. Even so, a lot of candidates were unable to translate or paraphrase the terminology. Some handling of involved sentences was faulty. Some candidates lacked grammatical skills, others had poor spelling resulting in a disappointing outcome. Bad presentation and poor legibility was another problem area for some.

Local Government

The subject was postal votes and related issues, which was relatively simple and straightforward. Hence, all candidates passed comfortably. Some candidates misunderstood the allegation of fraud as if they were against the person who is entitled to the postal vote and consequently earned low marks. Writing was generally good with proper spelling, accentuation, good grammar and correct sentence formation. The candidates appear to be above average.

Recommendations to Centres

Many candidates provided more than one alternative translation; in many cases both were correct but candidates should make up their mind and write only one. Some candidates could not handle the language because of a poor command of Urdu. Correct language depends upon a good knowledge of grammar. Candidates must pay attention to spelling and have good knowledge of specialised terminology.

Impress upon candidates how important it is to read the whole passage before attempting to translate and to work carefully to avoid omissions. Correct writing is important and they must cross all the 'T's and dot all the 'i's, as they say, and avoid losing marks. They need to continuously improve their linguistic skills and there are plenty of means in this day of information technology.

Recommendations to Candidates

Candidates can improve their language skills by devoting sufficient time and effort to reading Urdu literature and watching Urdu television programmes to improve their understanding of Urdu. They must try to learn the rules of grammar and avoid pitfalls. A good store of vocabulary is essential and so is the ability to choose the correct word from the dictionary. Candidates must read the whole text before starting to translate.

Candidates must be good in both languages and also know their chosen field in depth. They must improve their linguistic ability. Some candidates translated 'If you have any allegations of fraud' as 'If you are accused of fraud' and lost marks. They must also make it a habit to re-read their work in its totality to correct errors as well as to complete any missing parts.

LANGUAGE: URDU
OPTION(S): HEALTH

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

This year the overall performance, compared to the last year, was much improved. Most of the candidates were competent and produced good, grammatically correct, flowing translations. The candidates also paid attention to providing neat handwriting.

However, there is still a tendency for some candidates to not pay enough attention to the grammar rules and there were quite a few spelling mistakes. There were also some cases of incorrect sentence construction and punctuation problems.

Recommendations to Centres

It was good to notice that the centres made sure that, in general, only the candidates who had a suitable knowledge and command of both languages were entered for this examination.

It would be helpful if centres could ensure that the programme of study included emphasis on the importance of correct spelling and grammar techniques.

Some candidates are still offering more than one translation for a phrase or word. Please tell the candidates that they cannot provide two alternative translations of the same word. They must choose only one.

Recommendations to Candidates

Candidates should remember that a fatal error can mean failure in the examination. If you get a critical word or term wrong, then no matter how excellent the rest of the translation is, the result will be a Fail.

You should remember that a translation needs to convey accurate information, in a natural flowing style, using correct grammar and good punctuation. Also remember that the word order is different in Urdu, so before writing a sentence down, try to say it aloud in your head, and you should always leave enough time for proof reading. It is advisable to read the text the first time straight through to get a feel for the text.

A few candidates are still paying little attention to the grammar rules, for example using the past simple tense where the present perfect tense might be more appropriate e.g. the sentence 'The nurse has given a dose of medicine' has a different connotation to 'The nurse gave a dose of medicine'. In the former sentence, the action might or might not be completed yet. However, in the second example, the action has been completed and it is at an end.

Finally, remember a stress on the wrong letter can change the meaning of the word. There is a tendency among candidates to ignore all the stress patterns; however, the correct use of stress marks can increase your marks and it does matter when a difference of just one mark might make the difference between a Fail and a Pass.

LANGUAGE: VIETNAMESE
PATHWAY(S): ENGLISH LAW

Overall Performance of Candidates (compared to last year, where possible) and any Particular Strengths and Weaknesses of the Candidate Group

There is no Distinction candidate this time but one candidate showed a high standard in translation skills: most of the information from the original was accurately presented in the translation. The candidate had good use of vocabulary, specialist terminology grammar and displayed good spelling.

Some translations were well written in a good style and displayed a good command of language although there were occasional choices of inappropriate vocabulary and terminology. For example: 'investigating deaths' was translated as 'deaths prosecution'.

Also, there were examples of Vietnamese which was below the average standard. Examples of spelling mistakes that should not be made by a literate native speaker are:

	Spelling mistakes	should be
Example:	“da”	ra
	Phat day	‘phat giay’
	Chuoc	‘truoc’
	say ra	xay ra
	Chong	‘trong’
	Dam	‘giam’

Sometimes candidates used an unnecessary word (for example: 'ma') and added texts that do not appear in the original text (for example: 'Khong vua long').

In general, each candidate made different types of mistakes: omissions, additions and distortions, grammatical mistakes (wrong tense used), and did not notice single or plurals (for example: Coroners/post-mortems/ inquests).

There was one omission: 'by a coroner' and one distortion.

Cohesion, Coherence & Genre Conventions

It is easy to see how the parts of the text relate to each other. Some candidates provided a text which conformed to the conventions of the relevant genre, adequately facilitating a coherent reading. Occasionally, candidates repeated texts which was unnecessary and provided texts which did not exactly match with the original.

Effectiveness of Communication

In some instances, the reader would be able to act appropriately on the basis of the text. Some candidates have beautiful handwriting and clear presentation. For example: one candidate underlined the topic headings and there was a clear separation between paragraphs which created a clear presentation. It is easy to see how the text parts relate to each other. However, it still remains that some candidates confused the reader with a long stream of text and did not pay enough attention to tenses, choosing vocabulary that was not suitable for written language.

In summary, performance was mixed, ranging from good translation work to translations which showed a lack of knowledge in term of specialist terminology, spelling mistakes, distortions, omissions and additions.

Recommendations to Centres

When marking the translations, I noticed that each candidate's script had more than one page. I recommend that when candidates complete the examination, the invigilator should staple each candidate's examination paper together in order to avoid the possibility of mixing up candidates' scripts.

Recommendations to Candidates

Candidates should listen carefully to the instruction of the invigilator before starting work on the examination. Candidates have only one hour to complete the examination, thus timing structure is very important to avoid incomplete work: first write down key words, plan the structure logically and always leave 15-20 minutes at the end to transfer written notes into your final version and to check spelling, grammar etc.

Candidates should improve their library of vocabulary and specialist terminology continuously by reading newspapers, journals and follow news on the television and radio.