

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007

EXAMINERS' REPORTS ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE FOR SMALL ENTRY LANGUAGES

	Page
ARABIC INTO ENGLISH	2
ENGLISH INTO ARABIC	7
CHINESE INTO ENGLISH	12
ENGLISH INTO CZECH	17
DUTCH INTO ENGLISH	22
ENGLISH INTO DUTCH	24
FRENCH INTO GERMAN	26
GREEK INTO ENGLISH	30
ENGLISH INTO JAPANESE	31
POLISH INTO ENGLISH	32
PORTUGUESE INTO ENGLISH	34
ENGLISH INTO ROMANIAN	39
RUSSIAN INTO ENGLISH	43
ENGLISH INTO RUSSIAN	51
SWEDISH INTO ENGLISH	53
ENGLISH INTO TURKISH	54
URDU INTO ENGLISH	55

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

ARABIC INTO ENGLISH

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

General Report on Candidate Performance

The general standard of performance in this option was not of the highest, with only one third of the candidates awarded as Pass. One candidate omitted to translate more than 25% of the source text, indicating a failure to understand the Arabic original adequately, while the principle feature of another failed translation was a marked absence of coherence in English, accentuated by inappropriate use of prepositions.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

The level of performance in this Aspect of the pass candidates was satisfactory but marred by a number of errors ("... she enjoys considerable influence over the conversation of ordinary women..." should instead be something like: she enjoys a remarkable ability to address ordinary women / "...governments and organizations" should be: governments and regimes).

One of the translations contained too many serious errors and omissions (e.g. "...to a great extent she employs the simpler speech of a woman..." should instead be something like: she enjoys a remarkable ability to address ordinary women / "...I should look to the fact that Algeria witness" should be: justice requires that Algeria witness / "the official forecast" should be: the adoption by the President).

There was also a number of serious errors ("After the savage terrorism I started the return back to lawfulness...", which should be something like: After the savage terrorism, the return to legitimacy began...).

The use of register was generally acceptable.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

This aspect of performance was delivered with a wide range of results, some candidates produced a generally cohesive and coherent texts, although attention needs to given to the use of prepositions in English, which sometimes seemed inappropriate. The translations of the failed candidates who completed the paper lacked coherence.

All candidates are required to pay greater attention to the use of tense / aspect, which can be indicated quite differently in the two languages.

One candidate demonstrated an inadequate grasp of English grammar and syntax: "Algeria receives much criticism through that era by reason that she dealt with the violence ..." [Algeria previously received much criticism for the way it dealt with the violence].

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

The use of punctuation by candidates left something to be desired, in some cases (particularly the use of semicolons). The handwriting of one candidate was barely legible. It would have been helpful had all scripts been typed with double-spacing.

Recommendations to candidates

It is recommended that all candidates:

- Undertake a careful study of English grammar, particularly tense and aspect;
- Study the use of connectors in English in an attempt to improve the cohesion of their written English;
- Read English texts carefully to observe the application of the above in practice.

Additionally, all candidates are advised to develop their reading skills in Arabic.

Unit 01: Pass Rate 33% (2007); 75% (2006)

UNIT 02A: TECHNOLOGY

General Report on Candidate Performance

Unfortunately, translations in this Unit did not meet professional standards. The main problem was that sentences did not read coherently in English and would require considerable effort to review and revise. Native-speaker competence in written English was not demonstrated. There were a number of errors of comprehension/accuracy, some of them serious, and a general lack of cohesion. This is unfortunate, as a good grasp of technical English vocabulary was shown.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

There were many errors of comprehension and accuracy, a number of which were serious ("SASREF is one of the combined companies of the world..." / [correct: *SASREF is a refinery owned jointly by two of the world's oil and refining giants*] / "...while being servants of exact experiments for more than 11,000 samples..." [...*undertaking accurate tests on more than 11,000 samples...*]).

Despite occasional lack of appropriateness, use of register was generally satisfactory.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

It was in terms of coherence and cohesion that the greatest weaknesses were found.

In addition to conveying an incorrect meaning, the following is an example of incorrect English grammar and usage:

"... and what SADAF does is supplying any of the companies of SABIC with..." [correct: *while supplying SADAF, one of the SABIC companies, with...*]

The repeated use of "And" at the start of sentences is inappropriate. It is more acceptable to use the connector "However..." to start a sentence than it is to use "Except that...". Generally speaking, sentences began inappropriately, thereby adding to the overall lack of cohesion.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

It would have been helpful for scripts to be typed with double-spacing.

Recommendations to candidates

It is recommended that candidates:

- Undertake a careful study of English grammar, particularly tense and aspect;
- Study the use of connectors in English in an attempt to improve the cohesion of written English;
- Read English texts carefully to observe the application of the above in practice.

Unit 02A: Pass Rate 0% (2007); no candidates sat in 2006

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

Unit 02B: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 67% (2006)

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

General Report on Candidate Performance

Largely satisfactory, if marred by some isolated errors of comprehension / accuracy (one quite serious), some inappropriate use of tense / aspect, and a general impression of having been rushed. It is assumed that most of these were slips that could be rectified. While requiring some revision these were, in general, promising translations.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Some errors of comprehension made for incorrect meaning in the target texts. Most of these were relatively minor but one was not: "He took the small child who was looking attentively at the newspaper..." [correct: *The small child began looking attentively at the newspaper...*].

The Arabic word "*harīm*", normally means simply *women*.
For the most part, there was appropriate use of register.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

In general, translations were coherent and cohesive, although greater attention needs to be paid to the proper use of prepositions in English. Additionally, greater attention needs to be paid to the use of tense / aspect, which can be indicated quite differently in the two languages ("As for the brothers, they've all died." [*The brothers had all died*]). Of course, acquiring facility in this respect takes considerable time and effort.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Handwriting was at times barely legible and frequently required some effort to work out. Punctuation could be improved.

Recommendations to candidates

A good grasp of appropriate vocabulary and register was shown. It is recommended that candidates continue to read extensively in Arabic in order to: (a) develop greater lexical understanding and (b) achieve a fuller understanding of how tense / aspect in Arabic are translated into English.

Unit 02C: Pass Rate 100% (2007); no candidates sat in 2006

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

General Report on Candidate Performance

Despite occasional errors of comprehension (limited to individual words or terms), inappropriate use of tense / aspect and of prepositions, translations were of a generally sound effort, displaying a good grasp of the moderately scientific English required and appropriate register. Handwriting posed some problems of legibility.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Despite some inappropriate lexical choices that gave an incorrect meaning to the text (e.g. "natural science" [correct: *metaphysics*]), translations were generally accurate and displayed a satisfactory understanding of the source text.

In general, translations displayed appropriate use of register, although there is room for improvement ("Some of them, such as..." might be better rendered as: *Some, such as...*).

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Translations were coherent and cohesive, although greater attention needs to be paid to the proper use of prepositions in English. Additionally, greater attention needs to be paid to the use of

tense / aspect (“They have made many correct observations” is incorrect in this context and should be: *They made many correct observations*).

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Handwriting was barely legible (sometimes actually illegible) and frequently required some effort to work out. Punctuation could be improved. The presentation could be greatly improved.

Recommendations to candidates

A promising effort and the candidates displayed a good grasp of the vocabulary appropriate to the subject matter. It is recommended that candidates continue to read extensively in Arabic in order to: (a) develop greater lexical understanding and (b) achieve a fuller understanding of how tense / aspect in Arabic are translated into English.

Unit 03D: Pass Rate 100% (2007); 100% (2006)

UNIT 03E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

Unit 03E: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 0% (2006)

UNIT 03F: LAW

General Report on Candidate Performance

This paper is a challenging one but the translations did not meet professional standards and would be rejected by a client. The main problem is that they do not read coherently in English and would require considerable effort to review and revise. They did not demonstrate native-speaker competence in written English. Despite displaying some grasp of legal English terminology, there were a number of errors of comprehension / accuracy, some of them serious, and an overall lack of cohesion. A much higher standard is required in the translation of legal texts than, unfortunately, was demonstrated.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators’ notes, if any)

There were many errors of comprehension and accuracy, a number of which were serious (“... in an attempt to contest the jurisdiction...” [correct: *in an attempt to highlight the issues*]; “... and especially through the campaign of high qualifications and general hype...” [correct: *especially holders of higher and postgraduate qualifications*]; “Constitutional allegations of nullity” [*Allegations of Unconstitutionality*]).

Despite occasional lack of appropriateness, use of register was satisfactory.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Translations were well organised in terms of paragraphs and subparagraphs. However, in addition to conveying an incorrect meaning, the following illustrates frequently incorrect English grammar and usage:

“... so the announcement of the agreement on the Draft Law from the perspective of its concept, heavy with exaggeration in slowing the support for the government...” [correct: *The declaration of support in principle for the Draft Law was combined with an exaggerated show of support for the government*] (I assume that “slowing” is a misspelling of “showing”). There are many examples of a similar kind.

The repeated use of “And” at the start of sentences is inappropriate. It is more acceptable to use the connector “However...” to start a sentence than it is to use “Except that...”. Generally speaking, sentences frequently began inappropriately, thereby adding to the overall lack of cohesion.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Translations displayed poor use of punctuation (e.g. the repetition of "...; and..."). It would have been helpful had scripts been typed with double-spacing.

Recommendations to candidates

It is recommended that candidates:

- Undertake a careful study of English grammar, particularly tense and aspect;
- Study the use of connectors in English in an attempt to improve the cohesion of written English;
- Read English texts carefully to observe, *inter alia*, the application of the above in practice.

Unit 03F: Pass Rate 0% (2007); 100% (2006)

-*-

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

ENGLISH INTO ARABIC

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

General Report on Candidate Performance

The absence of any Merits or Distinctions does not reflect on the difficulty of the text chosen for the examination. It is just a reminder of the high standards set by the Diploma in Translation. Candidates should be aware of the criteria for assessing their performance.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Most candidates showed an adequate grasp of the informational content and sometimes good command of the subject matter. This Aspect of Performance was the main obstacle faced by the candidates. The main difficulty in comprehension was idiomatic language used in the source language text. Some candidates did not understand, or misunderstood, words, phrases and sentences used idiomatically. Examples run from the downright amusing (such as understanding *skin deep* to mean "skinny dipping" or taking the idea of a "*blind*" testing too literally) to the regretful (such as misunderstanding the phrasal verb *put in*). Such idiomatic use of the language is what candidates should expect in a general translation, and should definitely expect to find in the General Translation paper of the Diploma examination. The importance of this cannot be overemphasised. The difficulty, however, is that expressions such as *self-fulfilling prophecy* are not what one should expect to be given in class on a vocabulary list. These items test candidates' level in, and knowledge of, the day to day, idiomatic language. And there are no shortcuts. It is the kind of language one would find in newspapers. A translator must, among other things, read the press as often as possible.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

The importance of grammar cannot be overemphasised either. Papers could, and do, fail because of grammar. A professional paper in Arabic must not have grammar mistakes – definitely not the basic ones. Reference is being made here to mistakes affecting the subject (al-fa'il), the object (al-maf'ul bihi) and the possessive / associative structure (al-idafa). Candidates must make sure they revise their scripts looking for such mistakes as they are easily avoidable. Some candidates could not differentiate between Nominative, Accusative or Genitive nouns. Thus they failed to use the correct case endings. Candidates who sit the DipTrans must be familiar with grammatical rules as well as showing linguistic abilities. A good number of translations read like texts originally written in Arabic. Only a few candidates produced unclear, stilted or incoherent texts.

Regarding cohesion and coherence in most papers, and in those that did not fare too well in particular, there was a general tendency to imitate the structures of the English original. This has to be avoided at all costs. Candidates should be aware that their translation should (as far as possible) read like an Arabic text. Sticking to the English structures shows fear and weakness on the candidates' part. In addition to reading awkwardly, this feature makes the reader suspect the accuracy of the translation.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

In general candidates did well regarding the transfer of names, figures and dates. The main problem here was the perennial problem of spelling. The most important, recurrent and common "families" of mistakes: the "hamza" and dots. The hamza is probably the most common mistake made by native speakers in Arabic. Mistakes here fall into two categories: either using them where they should not be used or dropping them altogether. However, it is not permissible for translators, writers, journalists, editors and the like to deal so lightly with spelling conventions. If candidates know that they have difficulties with the hamza rules they must prepare themselves before the exam. The second category is the use of dots, in particular, the use of dots to denote a "ta'a marbouta." Most of the candidates did not crown the Ta'a Marbouta with its defining feature: the

two dots. This is considered a spelling mistake. More importantly it is not acceptable professionally.

Unit 01: Pass Rate 35% (2007); 30% (2006)

UNIT 02A: TECHNOLOGY

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates should pay extra attention to the translation of terminology which is paramount in texts of this nature. Extra care and attention should be given in order to maintain the original message of the source text. Stylistic and grammatical rules should also be adhered to. Further attention needs to be given to the translation of specialised terms and the right use of sentence word order.

Unit 02A: Pass Rate 33% (2007); 20% (2006)

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

General Report on Candidate Performance

Candidates did not do well in this examination this year. Granted that the level of challenges it posed is more than the General and Law papers, it seems candidates had not prepared themselves for it.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

The major problem faced by the candidates, which most of them were not able to successfully overcome, was to understand the text. Candidates failed to understand the general language of the text (such as: *has successfully taken online the ...*) and did particularly badly on understanding specialised terminology. It seemed candidates were not prepared to take a specialised examination. Most of them failed to understand, and hence, convey the meaning of the most important words and phrases in the text. Any other problem could be negotiable, but this one led to the complete failure to convey the message in most cases. The following are some of the most salient examples of failing to note the particular usage of a term, or a phrase, within a business context:

- Most candidates translated an economic / business term such as *lead generation* as “the leading generation,” which in the target language text did not make sense at all;
- Most candidates did not recognise the sense of *finder's fee*;
- The word *lead* was in most cases mistranslated because of a lack of comprehension – it was translated in the sense of “leadership;”
- Only a minority of candidates were able to render in Arabic terms such as *consultancy-led approach* and *one-to-many capability*; in many cases, the lack of understanding of these terms was evident;
- The most basic, and thus gravest, mistake in translation was *in-house*. Some candidates translated it as “at home”, leading to the complete obfuscation of the meaning of the original.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Most candidates did not do well in terms of grammatical accuracy. Many basic mistakes were made that should have been avoided at all costs.

Cohesiveness and coherence particularly suffered. This was an indication of a general feeling of helplessness towards the source language text in general, and was also an indicator of a failure to solve a number of translation problems related to the structure of the English text. Candidates in general found it difficult to deal with structures such as *Online betting exchange Betfair manages its own network in-house and uses third-party affiliate network operator Commission Junction (CJ) to deal with a wider group of affiliates*. The difficulties in grammar and structure, though, cannot be compared to the problem of lack of comprehension.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Candidates also made many avoidable spelling mistakes. Candidates should know that “hamza” rules are considered to be spelling mistakes. They should prepare themselves for this.

Recommendations to candidates

The most important advice to give to candidates wishing to take the Business option in the Diploma in Translation examination is to acquaint themselves fully with both the specialised terminology and style of business articles. This cannot be done only through studying vocabulary lists or the ability to use a specialised dictionary. It is important to read business papers, magazines and periodicals, or at least the business section in the broadsheets. The main problem candidates faced this year was the recognition of terms in their semi-specialised context. A business translator should be conversant with the language and culture of business. This cannot be acquired just by using a terminology list.

Unit 02B: Pass Rate 33% (2007); 0% (2006)

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators’ notes, if any)

Most candidates showed an adequate grasp of the informational content and sometimes a good command of the subject matter. The source text was understood and was mostly conveyed with a correct choice of register and terminology.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Grammar was one of the weakest points for most of the candidates. Some failed to use the correct case endings. A good number of translations read like texts originally written in Arabic. Only a few candidates produced unclear or stilted or incoherent texts.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Candidates transferred figures and names in a variety of ways. For example, some wrote down figures in ordinary numbers while others spelt them out in letters. Foreign names can hardly be written in Arabic in one way as there are no criteria/rules for writing them. Different forms are therefore expected and usually accepted.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates who sit the Diploma in Translation examination must be familiar with grammatical rules, as well as show linguistic abilities.

Unit 02C: Pass Rate 50% (2007); 22% (2006)

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators’ notes, if any)

In general, candidates showed adequate understanding of the subject matter. Those who did not were let down by decoding the source text; in one case, the term *Flavonoids* (Polyphenolic compounds) was left in English throughout. The expression *Dry weight* was inaccurately translated as “Dried weight”. *Atherosclerosis* was mistakenly translated as “Osteopsathyrosis”, which is a totally different condition.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

The rule of comparatives and superlatives should be observed.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

The word *Vitamin* was misspelled. The use of conjunctive tools in Arabic (the use of the “Wa” – “And”) is recommended so as to maintain the cohesion of the translated text.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates should pay extra attention to the translation of terminology which is paramount in texts of this nature. Extra care and attention should be given in order to maintain the original message of the source text. Stylistic and grammatical rules should also be adhered to. Further attention needs to be given to the translation of specialised terms and the right use of sentence word order. The right use of pronouns should also be observed.

Unit 03D: Pass Rate 50% (2007); 0% (2006)

UNIT 03E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

General Report on Candidate Performance

Most candidates showed an adequate grasp of the informational content and sometimes good command of the subject matter. Some of those who failed could have passed if they had allowed themselves extra time to finish the translation. Their failure was due to serious omissions and/or occasional clumsy renderings.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Quite a large percentage of candidates understood the source text but conveyed it with an incorrect choice of register and terminology. This was one of the causes of failure.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Grammar was one of the weakest points for most of the candidates. They could not differentiate between Nominative, Accusative or Genitive nouns. Thus they failed to use the correct case endings. Candidates must be familiar with grammatical rules as well as show linguistic abilities. A good number of translations read like texts originally written in Arabic. Only a few candidates produced unclear or stilted or incoherent texts.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Candidates transferred figures and names in a variety of ways. For example, some wrote down figures in ordinary numbers while others spelt them out. Foreign names can hardly be written in Arabic in one way as there are no criteria/rules for writing them. Different forms are therefore expected and usually accepted.

Recommendations to candidates

Always remember this word: Professional. To acquire the Diploma in Translation means candidates can become professional translators, not amateurs.

Unit 03E: Pass Rate 33% (2007); 33% (2006)

UNIT 03F: LAW

General Report on Candidate Performance

Candidates did very well overall this year. It seems most of the candidates had prepared themselves well for the exam. Most of the papers were of a professional calibre.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Candidates did particularly well in this Aspect. In general, it seems they did not encounter comprehension problems. Nor did the specialised vocabulary challenge them too much.

Candidates should prepare themselves for this examination by studying, among other things, lists of basic vocabulary and terminology, including lists of Courts and types of legal remedies. One candidate seemed to have a problem in translating *count*, as in *convicted on an indictment*

containing eight counts... This was probably the central word of the whole piece. But it shows the type of vocabulary that candidates must have if they are interested in becoming legal translators, or passing this examination.

Some candidates did particularly well in using an appropriate legal register in Arabic. It showed their familiarity and comfort with the topic.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

In general, candidates did well in terms of grammatical accuracy. Most of the papers displayed good cohesion and coherence. They read like good Arabic papers. This is not to say that the usual mistakes of “idafa” and the subject were not there – but less than in other options. It certainly reflects on the candidates and also the tight cohesiveness of the source text.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Candidates did well regarding transfer of names, figures and dates. The main problem here was, as in the other options, with spelling. Candidates should be aware of the rules of the “hamza” and be sure to include all the necessary dots, particularly the Ta’a Marbouta. Candidates for the Diploma in Translation should not reproduce common native speaker spelling mistakes. This is most important in the case of legal translators. Such spelling mistakes are taken very seriously by clients and examiners.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates for this examination should be aware of its level. They should prepare themselves by reading more in English, especially newspapers and specialised journals or reports. They should also prepare themselves by reviewing the main rules of Arabic grammar and do as many exercises as they can. Rules for the “hamza,” the “idafa,” “kana” and “inna” should be known very well and practised even more. There are many good, short books on the subject. Candidates should spare no effort in learning specialised terminology. There are lists and books for this purpose. Candidates should be aware that mistakes in legal terminology are weighted heavily in specialised or semi-specialised translations.

Unit 03F: Pass Rate 83% (2007); 22% (2006)

-*-

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

CHINESE INTO ENGLISH

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

General Report on Candidate Performance

The General Paper on this occasion was of average difficulty, with the first half being generally straightforward, but with the second half containing some more difficult areas.

As usual, most of the candidates had little difficulty in understanding the meaning of the Chinese characters in the source text, but were unable to provide an English translation to a standard acceptable at this level and this is invariably the cause of failure.

The scripts were much better than in previous years, but there is still a problem in that most candidates are obviously not native speakers of English. Native speaker competence is a pre-requisite for success in this examination.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Most of the text was well understood, except that some candidates did not understand 入伍. Although most candidates were able to translate 论述, the solution was not always appropriate in the context (a variety of solutions were used, including "discourse", "discussion", etc., whereas *narrative* was probably the ideal one).

A number of candidates had problems with the various kinds of *records* – in English it is necessary to vary the terms used – *records, registration, patient history*, etc.

The discursal emphasis on the last sentence was not always correct.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Making the right choices in English is invariably what lets the candidates down in this combination and this Unit was no exception. Some examples are:

- "put in much efforts to thoughtfully compile a glamorous history"
- "such that we can emerge victorious in tugs of war driven by societal forces"
- "to clear the pre-requisites smoothly"
- "within a network of societal system and human relationship"
- "be careful not to leak out one's private matters"
- "Writing autobiography is a sweating work for many people"
- "having growing up to an adult life that filled with striking events and shining rewards"
- "the compilation of histories is the construction of memories and the shaping of acceptance".

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Punctuation, word order and spelling often posed a difficulty for the candidates. Examples of bad spelling were: "abeit" and "continusely".

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates are advised not to attempt this paper unless they are confident that their English is of a professional standard acceptable to a paying client. Candidates need to brush up on the minutiae of English grammar.

Unit 01: Pass Rate 50% (2007); 29% (2006)

UNIT 02A: TECHNOLOGY

General Report on Candidate Performance

This was an interesting passage for translation, concerned with the possible dangers inherent in using microwave ovens, mobile telephones and radio telephones. The technical vocabulary was not highly demanding and almost all candidates were able to understand the meaning of the Chinese.

As is normally the case with this combination, the difficulty for the candidates was in providing an English translation to a professionally acceptable standard. Paradoxically, it is often the case that the more technical options are done better than the more general papers by the candidates. This is probably because they work using English in highly specialised areas of technology in their daily lives.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

The vocabulary of the source text was not highly technical and comprehension presented no difficulties for the candidates.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

A very common error demonstrated by many candidates was the use of "cataract" in the singular when the plural was intended, as in "shown to cause cataract" and "believed to cause cataract". These are typical examples of 'Chinglish'. Other errors in grammar or poor use of English were:

- "During the early days of pragmatism in the United States"
- "that are breeding the danger of cataract"
- "It is the type of high rate thermal cycle string"
- "caused the housewives suffered cataract"
- "In the early stage of pragmatization in the US"
- "Do not get into physical contact with the antenna when conducting conversations".

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Vocabulary choices in English were often inappropriate:

- "noisier" rather than *higher amplitude* when referring to wavelengths.
- "retrofit" where *installation* was meant.
- "this indicate that it is not a safe installation"
- "cateract"
- "2,450 billion-Hz" where *2,450 MHz* (or *Megahertz*) are standard.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates are advised not to attempt this examination unless they are confident that their English is of a professional standard.

Unit 02A: Pass Rate 43% (2007); 50% (2006)

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

General Report on Candidate Performance

This was a fairly undemanding source text, with much repetition of standard financial terminology. The meaning of part of the text was misunderstood, but the main cause of failure was the inappropriate use of English demonstrated.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Haiyou Construction's share distribution was one share issued for every ten held, rather than one for one. Candidates had this as ten issued, then later went on to say (correctly) that the company was more interested in stable long-term growth rather than "implementing high share give-out to shareholders". Common sense indicates that you can't have it both ways. Overall, understanding of the source text was otherwise good.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

The following are several typical examples of 'Chinglish':

- "If taking into account increase of tax rate from 15 percent to 33 percent, HAIYOU CONSTRUCTION actual business performance improved more than 150 percent"
- "In fact, this was the third time the company had implemented such a system consecutively, although not in a large way this time"
- "The share price of the company had increased more than one fold"
- "thus affected the company's profit by more than 15 million RMB and wiping out two third of the profits".

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Financial information concerning exchange rates, etc. was generally transferred correctly. There were some typical errors in using an inappropriate tense:

- "Since the company listed 3 years ago, net profits had increased from 130 million"
- "earnings per share is RMB 0.32, net profit with comparative period increased by more than 30 percent."

Recommendations to candidates

Knowledge of the subject matter and its associated vocabulary is important, but the key factor in this examination is the ability to write clear, grammatical English to a professional standard in order to satisfy a paying client.

Unit 02B: Pass Rate 0% (2007); 50% (2006)

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

General Report on Candidate Performance

Candidates fared less well in this paper. This is not surprising, as most of the candidates appear to be non-native speakers of English, and although they make very good attempts at purple prose, they are rarely successful.

拿铁 Most candidates transliterated this, when they could have guessed at *latte*.

再小心的安慰 A number of candidates missed the conditional effect of this sentence *However attentively I comforted her* was misunderstood as "comforted again...".

喝一口咖啡 This whole section was misinterpreted by some candidates who did not work out the zero anaphors. Thus, they wrote as if it were the narrator who sipped his coffee elegantly and turned at an angle of 45 degrees, rather than the girl.

四十五度角 This sounds very clumsy in English if translated literally. It is much better to say *she half-turned towards...* or even just *she turned towards...* There were some extremely awkward renderings of the 45°.

刚走的朋友 Most candidates wrote about “my boyfriend who has just left/gone” when the whole point of the story is *my boyfriend who has just left me*.

包峰 This was a mystery to most candidates – a package, a pack of ‘Feng’ cigarettes, or a packet of bees.

Most candidates were not comfortable with the Taiwan allusions and colloquialisms, although some of them made very good guesses. On the whole the language used was too formal and very stilted. This kind of text needed a lot of restructuring to make it sound good in English.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators’ notes, if any)

Most of the errors were minor inflectional ones, such as a plural verb form with a singular subject, wrong tenses, wrong choice of definite, indefinite or zero article, etc.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

The technical aspects were generally good. There are problems with the placing of commas – candidates tend to adhere to the Chinese punctuation of the source text, which makes the English rather strange.

Unit 02C: Pass Rate 56% (2007); 25% (2006)

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators’ notes, if any).

The source text was straightforward and all candidates performed well.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

It is usually this Aspect that is the downfall of candidates attempting this combination. On this occasion there were some instances where a better choice of English might have been made, but none were sufficient to cause failure.

One candidate insisted on calling the subject plane “The Pluto” rather than *Pluto*.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Candidates had little difficulty in transferring data. For one candidate *Triton*, a moon of Neptune, became “Krypton”.

Unit 03D: Pass Rate 100% (2007); 100% (2006)

UNIT 03E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators’ notes, if any)

Some candidates were not at ease with the titles of the history and the personalities narrated. One of the key skills in translation is to know how to transmit the source culture efficiently, especially if there are recognised historical precedents. The actual story was usually quite well done.

没有大脑的科学全面地分析。。。

This was not well rendered; candidates missed the emphasis. Candidates could and should have restructured this.

阅读 some candidates read this literally as “read”, which does not sit well in the context, unless it is placed in inverted commas.

。。。不能得出正确的结论 this also needed some restructuring to make it reader-friendly.

张开的手意 candidates obviously found it difficult to visualise the gestures described here, and this came out in the writing.

跷起二郎腿 this was almost unanimously translated as “cross-legged” which gives entirely the wrong message; it should be *sitting with legs crossed* or to avoid any ambiguity, *ankles crossed*.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Most of the errors were minor inflectional ones, such as a plural verb form with a singular subject, wrong tenses, wrong choice of definite, indefinite or zero article, etc.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Some candidates were not at ease with the titles of the history and the personalities narrated. The technical aspects were generally good. There are problems with the placing of commas: candidates tend to adhere to the Chinese punctuation of the source text, which makes the English rather strange.

Unit 03E: Pass Rate 63% (2007); 25% (2006)

UNIT 03F: LAW

General Report on Candidate Performance

This option is normally very straightforward with little technical vocabulary and the nature of the subject matter often tends to make the source text rather repetitive.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

The candidates struggled with the standard English terms for the titles, categories of people, legal institutions, examinations and working practices concerned.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

There were no problems under this Aspect.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were no problems under this Aspect.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates are expected to demonstrate a standard of English translation which is professionally acceptable to a paying client and they should not attempt the examination if they are not fully confident that they are of this standard.

Unit 03F: Pass Rate 0% (2007); 100% (2006)

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

ENGLISH INTO CZECH

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

General Report on Candidate Performance

The level of candidates' performance was very good. Most candidates understood English very well and their standard of Czech was also high. There were no spelling or basic grammatical mistakes, the texts read very well and contained nice turns of phrases. The style of the article was light and it was conveyed like that. What proved difficult was to translate *self-fulfilling prophecy*.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

In general comprehension was good, but there were some mistakes caused by inattentive reading and by not paying attention to grammatical structures.

Translating *superior natural ability* as "nadřazená přírodní schopnost" highlighted the danger of the ambiguity of certain terms and the importance of paying attention to context. Another awkward structure was "se navrhuje názor".

There were also mistakes when candidates translated an English phrase literally when there would have been a different verb in Czech – i.e. *finding a partner* – the verb in Czech is "looking for a partner" – *hledání partnera* not "nalezení partnera".

Other examples include: *In the study* translated as "Při studiu" (during their studies); *associate professor* as "companion and professor"; *European Society for Population Economics* as "Evropské společenství" (European Union); *Affect* as "postihují" rather than *ovlivňují*; *self-fulfilling prophecy* as "cestou naplnění očekávané věštby vlastními silami" or "sebe naplňující proroctví" rather than *přání je otcem myšlenky*; *blind testing* translated as "zaslepené" (prejudiced); *long arm of the law* translated literally instead of as *rameno spravedlnosti*; natural as "přírodní" (of nature) instead of *vrozený* (inborn).

Good translations included: *reignite* as "rozproudí"; *unidentified* as "nejmenované", or "blíže neurčené"; *significant and economically meaningful effect on the performance of students* as "ekonomicky přínosný dopad na výkonnost studentů" or as "ekonomicky smysluplný dopad". "as portrétní fotografie" was excellent for *close-up facial photograph*.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

The usual problem occurred with not recognising the need for a reflexive adjective ("jejich" for "svému"). Possessive adjectives in general seemed to be a problem with the failed candidates (gender - "její" confused with "jejich") and so was the agreement of the past participle with the subject in singular and plural ("objevily slova", "studie ukázali"). Inconsistence in gender often affected cohesion ("známky...studentů...zvýhodnění").

Wrong cases or prepositions: není jenom o tom, ale také o lepší přirozené schopnosti – should be: o lepších přirozených schopnostech; přitažlivé děti dostávají – přitažlivým dětem se dostává; "proti" instead of "k"

Clumsy constructions: *a close up facial photograph of each student*: "fotografie obličej z blízkého záběru každého studenta"; "fotografie obličej zblízka každého studenta"; "jedním z důvodů, proč tomu tak je, je ten".

Present perfect tense translated as past tense: "léta debatovali" instead of *už léta debatují*.

Wrong aspect in verbal noun: "Přednášení" instead of *přednesení*.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Some candidates were let down by mistakes under this Aspect of Performance. There were a number of missing commas such as "ti kteří", "tam kde", "důvodů proč" and commas at wrong places, such as in "méně, než"; "tříd, v případě".

Spelling mistakes such as "zda-li", "z hezkým", "studije", "výší lidé", occurred. Some candidates did not leave the names of universities intact: *University of Verona, University of Florida, University of North Carolina, University of Oslo*.

Unit 01: Pass Rate 67% (2007); 77% (2006)

UNIT 02A: TECHNOLOGY

General Report on Candidate Performance

This was a well chosen text with the right balance of linguistic and technical challenges. Most candidates performed at a high level. Some candidates failed because of problems under Aspect 3. There was a worryingly high number of wrongly placed commas and sentences with incoherent word order.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Some candidates had a problem with the term *viable*, often confusing it with "available". Most candidates did not realise there was also a Czech word for *alfalfa*. The term *foodborne* inspired some awkward paraphrasing, such as "potravinno-rodných".

Preservation was translated wrongly as "zpracování" in two cases.

In one case, *commonplace* was translated as "nudnými".

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Some scripts showed a lack of cohesion often caused by word order ("průmysl vyvíjí"), wrong endings ("vyrábí" instead of *vyrábějí* or "spory přežili") or an awkward structure ("alternativy konzervování potravin využívající tepla" – it is not clear which method uses the heat – the traditional one or the alternative?)

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There was a high number of wrongly placed commas: "odstranil, nebo snížil"; "informace jakými jsou"; "dozvíme se take jak"; "tlaku, potraviny", etc.

Unit 02A: Pass Rate 75% (2007); 50% (2006)

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

General Report on Candidate Performance

The information must be conveyed correctly. Hence a small mistake can lead to a substantial misunderstanding of the information. Candidates showed a thorough knowledge of the subject matter and managed to convey the meaning well. There are several translations of the main technical term *affiliate* and candidates used a different acceptable term. Business translation is probably the area that is going to need most translators in the future, so this is a very good example of how to approach the business topics.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Mistakes included: *major* as "hlavní" (main); *one-to-many capability* as "jedna z mnoha schopností"; *associated* as "společný" instead of *spojený*.

Example of good translation: *one-to-many-capability* as "dojít od jednoho klienta k mnoha".

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Mistakes included the use of wrong possessive pronouns: "Jejich" instead of *svou*; "jeho" instead of *své*. Examples of wrong case included "prostředníka, spravující" instead of *spravujícího Stránek*; "poskutující" instead of *poskytujících*.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were no problems under this Aspect.

Recommendation to candidates

Candidates are advised to try to understand the possible current business topics by following business trends.

They are also advised to concentrate on understanding the complex Czech syntax.

Unit 02B: Pass Rate 100% (2007); no candidates sat in 2006

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

General Report on Candidate Performance

Some very good pieces of writing were produced, which carried the same air of nostalgia as the original piece and on the other hand, some texts had a wide vocabulary but just piled the words together without looking at the text as a whole. The meaning or register chosen were often out of keeping with the original. The introductory sentence was already a minefield of potential meanings, since *poignant* and *wistful* are difficult words to translate. The English text was challenging if one was to retain the original character

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Poignant was translated as "dojímavý" (moving); *There is a poignancy to the diminutive side of Bath...* was translated as "Město Bath má vedle své dojímavé stránky také stránku nepatrnou..." which means "The town of Bath has – apart from its moving side – also a diminutive side"; *half Bath* was translated as "městu Bath" (town Bath); *large range* was translated as "mohutná řada" (a mighty row); *terrace houses* as "terasovité domy" (houses in the shape of agricultural terraces); *burrows* was translated as "doupata" (the end of fox hole); *havens* as "přístavy" (ports); *civil servants* as "civilní úředníci" (civilian i.e. non-military clerks); *Pump Room Trio* as "dechové komorní trio" (brass chamber trio); *bellpush names* as "na městech" (towns); *engraved* as "krasopisně vytištěné" (beautifully printed).

Examples of good translations include: *are very revealing*: prozrazují mnohé; *did not much care about*: "si hlavu příliš nelámala"; *stuck their additions haphazardly*: "se svými troškami do mlýna náhodně nalepenými"; *offers one such spectacle*: "nabízí právě takový zážitek"; *look decorous*: "vypadají malebně"; *enthraling muddle*: "kouzelný zmatek"; *look richly velvet*: "budí zdání bohatého sametu"; *they appear to consist of a couple of discarded blankets*: "jako by to byly jen dvě stare deky"; *Every city has its share of the purposeless*: "Každé město má v sobě trochu bezúčelnosti".

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

There are no specific examples of wrong cohesion and there were no grammatical mistakes as such.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were no errors on technical points.

Recommendation to candidates

Candidates are advised to read English short stories which usually have a very good style. Journalistic pieces, which often contain humorous or wistful observations, should also be considered. This will prepare them for the kind of style that will be quite likely to appear in the Literature Unit. They should try to find similar styles in Czech literature so that they can absorb the register, interesting turns of phrases and appropriate syntax. They should also practise translating – often one knows what the sentence means, has a feel for the register, but finds it hard to convey it so that it comes across as a natural piece.

Unit 02C: Pass Rate 50% (2007); 83% (2006)

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

General Report on Candidate Performance

There was a generally good level of understanding of the text, spoilt at times by technical aspects. Certain terms caused problems within the context. The information must be conveyed correctly because a small mistake can lead to a substantial misunderstanding of the information. Most candidates were of a reasonable or very good level.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

The term *brew* was often mistranslated. Also *polyphenols*, *endothelium* and surprisingly, even *antioxidant* were not always correctly transferred. The words *evidence* and *diet* were not always accurately translated. A Czech equivalent should be given preference. There was some confusion between the terms UK and Great Britain.

Mistakes included: Several candidates translated *many* as "mnohé" instead of *několik* – a serious mistake in a scientific paper; *exhibit actions* translated as "podporují" instead of *mají...účinky*; *emerging* as "nastupující" or "vyplývající na povrch" instead of *následné*; *Diet* as "dieta" instead of *strava* or later *potrava*; *Ground* as "surový" (raw) or "přízemní" (near the ground) instead of *mletý* or *drcený*; *Brew* as "vařit" (to boil) instead of *louhovat*; *a second carried out* translated as "jedna vteřina" instead of *druhá*; *One human trial* as "jeden pokus na člověku" (trial on one person); *Total* as "celkových" instead of *všech*; *stroke* as "srdeční záchvat" (heart attack) – a very serious mistake; *Consumption* as "strávení" (digestion); *Brewing conditions* as "podmínek, v jakých žijí..." (living conditions); *Gives a figure* as "dává informaci"; *Compound* as "směs" instead of *sloučenina*.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Examples of wrong preposition:

"zájem v" instead of *zájem o* – follows English.

Following the English word order as in: "Snížení krevních lipidů bylo prokázáno ve studiích se zvířaty" instead of starting with *Ve studiích se zvířaty bylo prokázáno...*

Present perfect tense translated as the past tense: *has been known* translated as "bylo známo" instead of *Je známo*.

Passive structures were overused: "může být zachráněno". The wrong case in "se zabývají jejich možných zdravotních výhod". The comparative "více komplexní" should be replaced by *komplexnější*.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were some misspelled words: "flavoidů", "množnému", "vasculárních", etc.

Wrong technical data: "125 mg / 235 mg na šálek".

Names of institutions translated wrongly: *Tea Trade Technical Committee* as "Čajová, Obchodní a Technická komise" instead of *Technický výbor Obchodu s čajem*.

Unit 03D: Pass Rate 50% (2007); 60% (2006)

UNIT 03E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

General Report on Candidate Performance

Aspects 2 and 3 were found to be where candidates failed. A serious lack of knowledge of grammar and spelling and insensitivity to Czech sentence structure was shown. Sentences beginning with prepositions and overuse of the passive voice go against the spirit of the language.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

"výsledku gramotnosti" (*educational outcome*); "na povinné úrovni" (*post-compulsory level*).

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

The following sentence has 3 errors in Aspect 2 and one error in Aspect 1: "S čímž souvisela následující práce bližšího poznáním mobility v Británii, jejíž změna během let a role vzdělávání ve vytváří možnosti".

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Commas and spelling: "to jak se"; "v Americe ale také"; "let z kterých"; "ranném".

Unit 03E: Pass Rate 0% (2007); 33% (2006)

UNIT 03F: LAW

General Report on Candidate Performance

The text offered good challenges in legal vocabulary. The term *Lord Justice* was omitted by one of the candidates. One candidate mistranslated the word *consecutive*. Also, two candidates failed to recognise the need for a reflexive adjective *svých*.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

navazovat should be "následovat" in the sense of *consecutive*.

se proti rozsudku jednoho soudce (against sentence *by leave* of the single judge).

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Cases: "v souvislosti bodu", "letem".

Reflexive adjective: "jeho" (instead of *svých*)

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Comma: "...nálezu, měl odvolatel...".

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates are advised to revise grammar and double check their work. Careful reading and attention to non-specialised and semi-specialised terminology is strongly recommended; attention to the singular or plural forms, which can significantly distort the meaning, is also very important.

Candidates should read English newspapers, magazines, short stories, journals, etc. in order to know the written style of the different texts and fully understand them, noticing grammatical structures that could lead to a different meaning. This will prepare candidates for the kind of style that could appear in the examination. They should also find similar types of style in Czech so that they can absorb the register, interesting turns of phrase and appropriate syntax. Practise translating – often one knows what the sentence means, has a feel for the register but finds it hard to convey it so that it comes across as a natural piece.

Candidates are advised to revise syntax and pay attention to context.

Unit 03F: Pass Rate 100% (2007); 100% (2006)

-*-

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

DUTCH INTO ENGLISH

ALL UNITS

General Report on Candidate Performance

There were no outstandingly good candidates. Some of them produced work that would have been completely unacceptable to a client. The standard of English in some cases was very poor and was often a word-for-word literal rendering of the Dutch. There were also lapses of register, with unacceptably colloquial sentences.

The handwriting of some of the candidates was untidy and their crossings-out did not help legibility.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

The title of the General Translation paper presented a problem in that the concept of *alphas* and *betas* is not generally known in the English-speaking world, and only the better candidates made any attempt to explain it. One candidate did not seem to realise that *canon* is an accepted term in English and so unnecessarily translated it as "standard", thus leaving the reader even more baffled by the title "The standard of the alphas". This same candidate did not appear to be aware of the word *contraceptive* and translated *voorbehoedmiddel* as "means of restriction".

The Dutch text was a spoken presentation on a television programme, but not all of the candidates managed to turn it into an acceptable piece of spoken English. An example is where a candidate wrote "I would like to suggest two windows myself, if you don't mind". The "if you don't mind" is over-colloquial, and a suggestion may be : *May I introduce two windows myself?*

The Business paper was accurately translated – although unfortunately one sentence was omitted, but this did not prevent the overall message from getting across. There was one minor error, with the term "buy-up" being used instead of *buy-out*.

The Literature paper contained numerous minor translation errors and one glaring mistake, where the narrator of the story "moved closer" to a glass of wine, instead of *pouring* it.

In Social Science, an error occurred translating *lied* as "anthem" rather than *song*, so that a *volkslied* became a "national anthem" instead of a *folk song*, although it is true that *volkslied* can also mean *national anthem*. There was too close an adherence to the Dutch, but also in relation to register. There were some difficulties from the start with the mistranslation of the title, as well as the translation of *liedblaadjes* (*song sheets*) as "love songs".

The Law paper was well presented and in the correct register, although the terminology used was not always strictly accurate. For example, *Titel* in the Dutch Civil Code should be translated as *Chapter* and not "Title".

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

The candidates tended to adhere to the arrangement of the Dutch text, which was reasonable, as far as the paragraphing was concerned, but there is a tendency among Dutch authors to write rather short, staccato sentences and to omit verbs, which is less acceptable in English, and this was shown up by the versions of the candidates who adhered too closely to the Dutch original. This applied particularly to the translations of the third paragraph, where the Dutch is particularly idiomatic and needs to be rewritten to make for acceptable English.

The standard of English in the Business paper was good and the candidates combined some of the single sentence Dutch paragraphs to give a more cohesive effect.

The standard of English in the Literature paper was poor, mainly as a result of candidates adhering too closely to the Dutch original, and the second paragraph, in particular, would have benefited from a complete rewrite.

The Law paper scored well in this respect and candidates were right to adhere to the layout of the original text.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

The handwriting of some of the candidates was a little difficult to read and was further marred by a lot of crossings-out. There were no spelling errors, but one of the papers would have been improved by the insertion of a few commas.

The Business paper scored well on this Aspect, in that it was legible, contained no spelling errors and was properly punctuated.

There were points where the insertion of commas would have improved comprehensibility.

Recommendations to candidates

It is recommended that candidates read through their papers carefully before submitting them, particularly in order to check whether they read like a piece of native English prose and to avoid omissions. It would also help if they rewrote passages containing several crossings-out.

All Units: Pass Rate 54% (2007); 61% (2006)

-*-

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

ENGLISH INTO DUTCH

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

General Report on Candidate Performance

Some translations were really up to professional standard and some contained unnecessary and unprofessional inaccuracies. The paragraphing of the source text should be adhered to at all times.

There were several unnecessary omissions. Tenses after repeated reported speech should be kept consistent.

Well known universities keep their names in translations (*Harvard, Cambridge, Cambridge University, the Sorbonne, or Sorbonne University*). General ones: *the University of* – likewise in translation there is no need for italics or quotation marks.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Points worth noting are: *Hoofddocent* = senior lecturer; *Buitengewoon hoogleraar* = associate professor; *Vooroordeel* = prejudice; *Oordeel* = judgement; *Superior* = just *better* was intended; Use of *superior* in Dutch = superlative meaning, i.e. *the best*; *Population economics* = demografische economie; *Echtgenoot* = male spouse; *Echtgenote* = female spouse.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Has raged for years: present perfect + *for* is rendered by present tense + *al* in Dutch

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were no problems under this Aspect of Performance.

Unit 01: Pass Rate 100% (2007); 82% (2006)

UNIT 02A: TECHNOLOGY

Unit 02A: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 100% (2006)

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

No candidates chose this option for the 2007 or 2006 examinations

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Terraces signify the typical rows of English houses, not buildings; *Builder* – the company, not the person himself, absolutely requires the word *row* in Dutch, either in diminutive or not; *Late 1780s* – the only option in Dutch: *the late 80s of the 18th century*; *Sham* means *fake*. *Pensioners* are not people on social security, just people enjoying their pension, whether state or private.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

There were no problems under this Aspect of Performance.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

The spelling in Dutch of *Mahrabyas* is *mahrabya's*; the word *Privé-thuishaventjes* should be hyphenated.

Unit 02C: Pass Rate 67% (2007); 57% (2006)

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

Unit 03D: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 40% (2006)

UNIT 03E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

General Report on Candidate Performance

Some candidates made a number of omissions for which there clearly was no need. Some texts read nicely but were not exact translations of the source language. In Dutch, long words consisting of two or more related nouns do occur, such as: *intergeneratiemobiliteit*.

A specific Flemish choice of words is only acceptable if for a specific Flemish readership, otherwise such choices are best avoided.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

There were some unjustified omissions.

Flemish

Kansgelijkheid → gelijke kansen

De waarborging → het waarborgen

Beleiden (policies) → beleid (collective notion in Dutch)

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Work has been carried out – the impersonal passive sentences require *er* in Dutch

Their success – links success to people previously mentioned – translating it as “the success” makes it general.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Please note: *Noord-Amerika* and *Groot-Brittannië*.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates are advised to pay attention to the source text and try to avoid unnecessary omissions and stick to the true content.

They need to establish who the target readership is (Flemish, Dutch) and be consistent.

Unit 03E: Pass Rate 100% (2007); 50% (2006)

UNIT 03F: LAW

No candidates chose this option for the 2007 or 2006 examinations

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

FRENCH INTO GERMAN

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

General Report on Candidate Performance

In the last paragraph the number of slips increases visibly. So it is not surprising that the majority of candidates failed. They had very good ideas for the translation of idiomatic expressions, e.g. *ce n'est qu'un leurre* by "so ist dies nichts als Augenwischerei". Yet they also had problems with some sentences and especially with the re-writing in the target language. A candidate created a new word in German, "Hegemonismus", which does not exist.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

The majority of candidates had serious problems rephrasing the sentences in German. Some sentences were just incomprehensible without the original.

The first sentence, *Pour régulariser les enfants sans papiers* does not mean "um die Kinder ohne Papiere zu regulieren" or "zur Regelung der in Frankreich eingeschulten Kinder", but *um die Situation der Kinder zu legalisieren/ in Ordnung zu bringen*. The bilingual dictionary (*Pons, Klett*) indicates this solution. Some other sentences are also so obviously out of order that the candidates should have realised this. Accuracy and register also left a lot to be desired. Candidates did not always correctly decode a quite normal French expression: *N'être pour rien dans un problème* means *to have nothing to do with* and was translated as "Die Sprache ist also nicht unwichtig", the opposite of what was meant. Other misinterpretations include "Geschmeichelt schließt Frankreich die Augen über [vor instead!] dem von Bouteflika nicht zugegebenen Ziel: die Verbesserung des Bildes eines glanzlosen Regimes durch den 'schmutzigen Krieg'". The image of the regime damaged by the "dirty war" should be improved and the "dirty war" will not improve the picture of an inglorious regime: "... die Verbesserung des Bildes eines Regimes, das durch den 'schmutzigen Krieg' getrübt war". A simple subordinate relative clause would have been the solution.

Translator's Notes would have been useful in the first paragraph (line 8) to explain to the German reader what the *rupture* of Mr Sarkozy means.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Serious grammatical errors were made which impeded comprehension of the translation. In one script, the grammatical mistakes did not interfere with the cohesion and coherence, but it is rather obvious that they were due to lack of time.

In one case, the relative pronoun did not agree with the gender of the noun it was related to. "Der Runderlass, das [instead of *der*] vom Innenminister and die Präfekten verschickt wurde ...". In the last sentence a "s" changes a "da" (causal conjunction) into a "das" (relative pronoun gender agreement). Also the following personal pronoun relates to the wrong word ("Hegemonie"), it should be *er* relating to the "Runderlass". Therefore the sentence should read: *Der gerade verschickte Runderlass gestattet den Widerstand diese Hegemonie nicht, da er diesen Zustand der Unsicherheit (Verunsicherung) verstärkt* instead of "Der gerade verschickte Runderlass gestattet den Widerstand gegen diesen Hegemonialanspruch nicht, das sie diesen Status der Unsicherheit verstärkt".

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were almost no spelling mistakes. There were some slips of punctuation.

Recommendations to candidates

The effort to deliberate carefully for a couple of minutes about the correct idiomatic expression when encoding is recommended. The re-reading of the target text without looking at the source text is also recommended. Misinterpretations, incongruent genders and numbers catch one's eye. In these cases, one should go back to the source text. If a sentence is incomprehensible, a look at

the source text is also advisable. Most translation problems are resolvable by thinking, not by translating. If necessary, the grammatical structure of the source sentence has to be thoroughly analysed in all parts.

Unit 01: Pass Rate 33% (2007); 60% (2006)

UNIT: 02A TECHNOLOGY

General Report on Candidate Performance

Challenges of the text were dealt with rather well and a relatively good command of the subject matter was displayed. The transfer of information was sometimes impeded by the choice of words. The inaccuracies were minor, but there were a lot of errors concerning German spelling reform and the revision of the use of the ß.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

The translations were comprehensible though the terminology was not always correct.

In the first sentence the "Heimkinosaal" seems a curious solution as it is actually a contradiction in itself and not in the large *Duden*. The meaning is that it is possible to change a normal room of the apartment into a hall where films are shown. The "Heimkino" is an expression mostly used ironically for the television, but the expression found on the Internet was used positively. Then, *image de plusieurs mètres de large* is not "lang" but *breit*. The complete form of the technical term would have been preferred, as a layman may not know what is meant: *Polarisationsfilter* instead of "Polfilter". The voltage is *fed* in English and *appliquée* in French. In German it is *angelegt* and not "verabreicht". A certain voltage is "verabreicht" to the patient only when the neurologist feeds the voltage for taking the nerve conduction velocity.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Sentence structure was sound, though with some awkwardness. Sometimes there was too much adherence to the sentence structure of the source text but this did not impede comprehension. And as it was not a literary subject, the text needed to be clear but not over elegant. The sentence: "Da der Abstand sehr gering ist, kippt, sobald eine elektrische Ladung der einen oder anderen verabreicht wird, der Spiegel durch elektrostatische Ladung auf seine Seite um" would have been better rendered as *Da der Abstand sehr gering ist, kippt der Spiegel durch die elektrostatische Anziehungskraft nach dieser oder jener Seite, sobald eine Spannung an die eine oder andere angelegt wird.*

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There seemed to be problems with the ß.

Recommendations to candidates

If a candidate chooses the Technology text, s/he should be aware of the difficulties that s/he may encounter. For the Technology option, a solid knowledge of the terminology and some idea of the devices used are recommended. Also, a good specialised dictionary is always a good tool. The rules of the German spelling reform should be known.

Unit 02A: Pass Rate 100% (2007); 0% (2006)

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

General Report on Candidate Performance

All candidates seemed to have difficulties coping with the challenge this text presented. Although the candidates seem to have understood the subject matter, they committed major and minor inaccuracies, which distorted or impaired the message at several points. There was some unidiomatic use of language which rendered the translations clumsy.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

The translations were often incomprehensible due to the unidiomatic choice of words and poor presentation.

In the first paragraph, first sentence, all candidates translated word-for-word and *comprendre* by “verstehen” instead of *kennen*, even though a businessman has to *know* the strengths and weaknesses of his rivals to be able to fight, not *understand* them. The third sentence presented another difficulty, *Désormais, il existe de nombreuses études quantitatives et qualitatives permettant d'isoler les huit facteurs de succès du hard discount et en même temps de comprendre pourquoi et où son succès fut moindre*. The word *isoler* was a problem even though the bilingual dictionaries indicate *isoliert, einzeln betrachten* (Pons, Larousse). “Unterscheiden” and “eine Abgrenzung ermöglichen” are not comprehensible solutions. *Mittlerweile existieren (zu diesem Thema) quantitative und qualitative Untersuchungen, die es gestatten, die acht Erfolgsfaktoren der Harddiscounter isoliert zu betrachten/herauszuarbeiten und zu verstehen, weshalb und wo ihr Erfolg geringer geworden ist/abgenommen hat*: this sentence is neither extremely difficult nor are the expressions unusual. In the second paragraph it is mainly the sentence: *Cette situation qui fait la richesse des hypermarchés fait la détresse des ménages de chômeurs, ou des ménages surendettés ou des retraités ou de tout un chacun* which caused problems. The following translation is an option: *Dieser Sachverhalt, der die Verbrauchermärkte prosperieren lässt, ist der große Kummer von Arbeitslosen, in überschuldeten Haushalten, von Rentnern und eigentlich von jedermann*. In the third paragraph, the first and the second sentence gave way to some mistranslations and in the fourth paragraph the only challenge of the text caused very serious mistakes. *Pour contrebalancer l'attractivité intrinsèque des grandes marques, leur « privilège de demande » pour reprendre l'expression d'O. Gérardon de Véra, ils ont accentué la part de marché de la marque-enseigne par « pression de l'offre » : mises en avant, part de linéaire, et surtout écart de prix*. The problem was *linéaire*, which means *shelf space* (Petit Robert). The following is suggested: *Um die den Markenprodukten eigene Anziehungskraft zu konterkarieren, deren so genannten ‚Nachfrage-Vorteil‘, um den Begriff von O. Gérardon de Véra aufzugreifen, haben die Einzelhandelsriesen durch ‚Angebotsdruck‘ den Marktanteil ihrer Eigenmarken erhöht: sie haben sie im Vordergrund platziert, ihnen in den Regalen mehr Platz eingeräumt und vor allem den Preisabstand vergrößert*. The last paragraph fared no better.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Reorganisation in the target language led to problems. Sentences were often incomprehensible due to too much adherence to the sentence structure of the source text. Coherence and cohesion were rarely good.

One example will suffice. The third paragraph begins with *Le besoin de regagner du pouvoir d'achat à tous prix a été exacerbé par le sentiment que le passage à l'euro fut l'occasion de réajustements de tous les prix à la hausse menés par la grande distribution. Il est vrai que tout un pays changeant de monnaie d'un jour à l'autre, les repères de ce qui était cher ou non ont été bousculés* was translated as “Der Bedarf, die Kaufkraft um jeden Preis wieder zurückzugewinnen, ist durch das Gefühl, das die Einführung des Euro zu einer Anhebung aller Preise durch den Handel geführt hat, stärker geworden. Es stimmt, dass ein ganzes Land, das seine Währung (Anhaltspunkt für das, was teuer war und was nicht) von einem Tag auf den anderen umgestellt hat, ins Wanken gebracht wurde”.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Punctuation, spelling, etc. were faultless.

Recommendations to candidates

If candidates choose the Business option they should know the terminology and have a “feeling” for the formulations. They should read the economic section of newspapers and the Internet.

Unit 02B: Pass Rate 0% (2007); 50% (2006)

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

No candidates chose this option for the 2007 or 2006 examinations

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

No candidates chose this option for the 2007 or 2006 examinations

UNIT 03E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

General Report on Candidate Performance

Some of the candidates' performances were professionally acceptable, only marred by one serious and some slight mistakes.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Overall, the translations showed a good command of the subject matter, although sometimes there was a lack of clarity or there were inaccurate choices of expressions.

There was only one really difficult passage in the text, line 15 of the original, *les familles légitimes et les familles naturelles*, revealing candidates' unsatisfactory knowledge of French and German legal terminology. This passage should be translated as: *Sie hebt jeglichen Unterschied zwischen verheirateten Paaren und nichtehelichen Lebensgemeinschaften auf*. In the old days, the *enfants naturels* were the illegitimate children of unmarried women. A law is *eingbracht* (introduced) in the parliament but it *bewirkt* (achieves) a reform, and it is always the *Ausübung der elterlichen Sorge* (exercise of parental custody) and not the "Ausführung". The *titulaire du bail* is the *Hauptmieter*, but the candidates found other, equivalent verbal solutions.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Candidates had no real problems with grammar and organisation of their work. The general tendency to leave out the article was no mistake but a regrettable loss to the language.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Aspect 3 was dealt with successfully.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates need to check their translation, read the original texts and be familiar with the relevant terminology of the option they choose.

Unit 03E: Pass Rate 67% (2007); 0% (2006)

UNIT 03F: LAW

Unit 03F: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 50% (2006)

-*-

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

GREEK INTO ENGLISH

ALL UNITS

General Report on Candidate Performance

. In general the fail grades were due to poor English or, less often, to serious misunderstanding of the Greek. Although some understanding of the source text was evident, the awkward use of the English made it difficult and at times impossible to make use of the target text. Some candidates focused too much on the source text and this resulted in unusual language, while others focused too much on the target text and missed out on accuracy.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Unusual collocations (“juvenile sector”; “touristic industry”; “and tourist current”; “cultural inheritance”) make the target text difficult to read. Similarly, word-for-word renderings showed poor command of English: “the chase of tourist heads number”.

The tone was at times too ‘chatty’ for publication in a similar paper (“it was just that – problems”). The use of contractions (“don’t”) was inappropriate for publication purposes.

In a number of cases, the English showed a misunderstanding of the Greek, at word or phrase level; elsewhere, the relationship between clauses caused problems. An example of the former: “the retreat of logic” was actually *a return to the logic [of the last century]*, and the attribution of a rise in petrol prices to only one cause rather than the two causes clearly given in the Greek text.

There were inconsistencies in the use of register, target language and terminology: *ανήλικος* was translated as “underage”, “youngsters” and “youths” instead of *minors*. Word-for-word rendering makes the target language inaccurate, ambiguous and unusual: “after the fact”; “to solve the reasons of a tragedy”; “they are now alleging”; “according to the radio station”, etc.

This use of language affects accuracy: “a theft of a mobile phone” instead of *the theft of a mobile phone* brings unnecessary ambiguity to the target text.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Some candidates seemed, from the nature of the target text submitted, to be of Greek mother tongue, showing a good understanding of the Greek, but a severe inability to write coherently or accurately in English (“without under no circumstances lacking in performance”; “the crisis ... mean that”).

Candidates seemed not to have had the time to carefully proofread their translations.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

One or two candidates had spelling problems. It seems probable that word processed texts could be spell-checked, which would put some candidates at an advantage over others.

The errors in this section consisted of transferring Greek punctuation unaltered into English. Conscious use of punctuation was not evident: dashes and semi-colons were used unnecessarily. Greek speech marks (« ») are not needed around words used figuratively or metaphorically. The three dots (αποσιωπητικά / aposiopetika) (...) should likewise not have been used in English.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates are advised to pay attention to idiomatic English.

Much more experience of writing English and getting collocations right is needed. In a few cases, the Greek clearly proved difficult, but without an accurate understanding of the concepts and the meanings of keywords, a successful translation is unlikely.

Further study of source and target languages, as well as careful proofreading, time-management, and research are recommended.

All Units: Pass Rate 36% (2007); 67% (2006)

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

ENGLISH INTO JAPANESE

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

A concise and scrupulous translation is crucial in order to reach a professional standard.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Candidates could have chosen more appropriate vocabulary in place of "good-looking", "attractive", "unattractive", "blind", "Physical appearance", "unidentified", "rated", "beauty grade", "concluded", "do not discount", "make a beeline for", "found" and "activate".

Candidates should convey the accurate meaning of the source text and the subject matter more clearly.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Candidates adhered too closely to the sentence structures of the source text and the resulting translation was stilted.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were considerable technical faults.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates are advised to read through the translation carefully upon completion, focusing on whether the style and nuance are appropriate for the target audience.

Unit 01: Pass Rate 50% (2007); 0% (2006)

UNIT 02A: TECHNOLOGY

No candidates chose this option for the 2007 or 2006 examinations

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

Unit 02B: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 100% (2006)

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

No candidates chose this option for the 2007 or 2006 examinations

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

No candidates chose this option for the 2007 or 2006 examinations

UNIT 3E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

No candidates chose this option for the 2007 or 2006 examinations

UNIT 03F: LAW

Unit 03F: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 100% (2006)

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

POLISH INTO ENGLISH

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

General Report on Candidate Performance

Aspects to look out for:

- Polonisms and literal translation should be avoided – e.g. *pierwsza nadarzająca się okazja* is *first opportunity*, and not “the first possible arising situation”
- Precision – the key word the text was about (*understatement*) is given as *insinuation* - changing the message and making a huge chunk of the translation incoherent
- Overinterpretation, which might appeal to the candidate but is not always present in the text – e.g. in Translator’s Notes: “I chose ‘English’ since the Welsh, Scottish and Irish tend to be more direct with the humour”. This Translator’s Note provides the reader with the translator’s (not author’s) view on the sense of humour of the Welsh, Scottish and Irish, while it could draw attention to the inconsistent use of the word *Anglik* by the author – after all, the text described a British ambassador to the United Kingdom (who could well be Scottish, Welsh or Northern Irish).

Unit 01: Pass Rate 50% (2007); 38% (2006)

UNIT 02A: TECHNOLOGY

Unit 02A: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 0% (2006)

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

Unit 02B: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 75% (2006)

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

General Report on Candidate Performance

There was a lack of comprehension of the source text which resulted in awkward, inaccurate translations.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators’ notes, if any).

One candidate did not understand the text fully and the message was not conveyed accurately. [*Jedruś was nicknamed “The Tram”*], the candidate wrote: “This Tram as we used to call it...” It was clear from the text that the boys were playing with counters and yet one candidate translated the source word literally as “fleas”; another candidate had a somewhat better understanding but was not quite correct and used “tiddlywinks”.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

In some places the translations showed a lack of cohesion as the text was somewhat awkward and stilted and did not flow easily.

E.g. “They would lay a large blanket on the table...”, whereas the table was large and a blanket was laid on it.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Basic spelling mistakes - candidates were unable to copy the names used in the text. One candidate decided to change the names from one diminutive to another diminutive and then proceeded to write a Translator’s Note explaining the diminutives.

E.g. in the original the author uses the names *Jedruś* and *Piotruś*, which are diminutive forms of *Jedrek* and *Piotrek*, which in turn are diminutive forms of the children’s “official” names, *Andrzej* and *Piotr*.

“He also new how to read a map”.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates are advised to carefully read the original text – even a couple of times to understand it fully before launching into the translation. Candidates should make sure they have sufficient time left to just read through the translation again and make any necessary final alterations.

Unit 02C: Pass Rate 50% (2007); 0% (2006)

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

Unit 03D: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 0% (2006)

UNIT 03E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

There was some inappropriate use of the definite and indefinite article, “...we are in the seventh place in Europe”. In places, it was evident that candidates had misunderstood the source text. The choice of language in some places was not appropriate and this resulted in a stilted, clumsy translation.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

In places, the text was wrongly punctuated and broken up, therefore again resulting in a translation that did not flow. Also, some wrong tenses and idioms were used. One candidate used “small shops” and “boutiques”; however no distinction was made by the candidate.

The translations were awkward in places, where in the source text the emphasis was elsewhere to that provided by the candidate giving the translation a different slant. E.g. “The food supermarket stopped playing the central part in the third generation centres”.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Candidates need to copy out the names of towns correctly, including accents e.g. “Poznan”.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates should make sure they have sufficient time left to just read through the translation again and make any necessary final alterations.

Unit 03E: Pass Rate 100% (2007); 0% (2006)

UNIT 03F: LAW

General Report on Candidate Performance

Some excellent specialist vocabulary was shown, as well as good English and professional presentation.

Just one general remark on Translator's Notes:

“The name of the Act may require confirmation and replacement by an officially recognised version. Possible source of such information: www.proz.com/search”

It was good that the candidate saw a problem with the name of the Act, but proz.com may not be the right source. While it is undeniably a great source of help from other translators, official names of pieces of legislation should be consulted elsewhere. The Act in question regulates industrial property rights (not laws – candidates are advised to be careful how they translate the word *prawo*), an international concept. It is recommended that candidates double-check the information they receive from proz.com with truly official sources.

Unit 03F: Pass Rate 100% (2007); 50% (2006)

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

PORTUGUESE INTO ENGLISH

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

General Report on Candidate Performance

The source text, a European Portuguese magazine column discussing the lack of punctuality amongst the Portuguese people, should have presented no major problems, being written in a fairly neutral register, with largely accessible vocabulary.

Although the text did not seem to be too taxing, candidates made quite a few errors in the vocabulary they chose, and basic errors in punctuation and grammar, than they ought to have done at this stage. Candidates seemed to have a misunderstanding of relatively common expressions and certain awkwardness in transferring the register and/or the content into readable English.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

As far as accuracy was concerned, not many candidates were able to translate correctly *Mania de...*, which had nothing to do with manias, crazes, obsessions or being hooked on something, but is simply an irritating habit.

Brandos costumes was translated as "weak" and "lax" rather than *tolerant* in this context. The expression *por tudo e por nada* was translated literally instead of as "at the slightest thing".

Even if the expression *paga o justo pelo pecador* was not known to the candidates, from the literal meaning they should have been able to deduce the sense of the expression and some actually translated it as the opposite of what was meant. *Social order* was translated as "the organisational effort put into a social function"; *both ... and* as the opposite "either ... or" and *a passing phase of asserting themselves* as "a right of passage" by one candidate.

Some candidates misinterpreted *Muito embora* (meaning *Although / While on the one hand*).

It would have been good to see an idiomatic rendering of the subheading *sempre os mesmos* (*the usual suspects*, for example).

Some candidates struggled with the word *professora*; *lecturer* would have been appropriate, in the context of the source text.

There were some pleasing idiomatic renderings (e.g. "drop the children off at school"; "night owl").

Translator's Notes, when used, were mainly explanations to the marker rather than to the reader and thus not necessary.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

There were still grammatical errors which are not acceptable at this level: lack of agreement between noun and pronoun ("the adolescent ... they", "a night owl ... they"), incorrect prepositions used with verbs ("distinctive to") and adverbs used as adjectives to qualify nouns instead of to qualify verbs ("frequent lateness" instead of *is frequently*).

Some candidates were over-literal in many cases, at the expense of comprehensibility.

The rendering of "for your fellow men" for *pelo próximo* seems too colloquial, despite the journalistic register (*one's fellow men* or simply *for others* would be more appropriate).

One candidate misinterpreted the term *como* and produced a grammatically incorrect sentence as a result.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Where punctuation was concerned, there are still candidates writing non-sentences, some who use a comma instead of a full-stop and some who use the semi-colon incorrectly, all of which are basic errors not expected at this level.

Spelling mistakes included "critise"; "methological"; "cronically".

Recommendations to candidates

Careful reading of the source text cannot be stressed enough - candidates need to pay special attention to detail so that they are not conveying in the target text the opposite of what was in the source text or something quite different.

Great care should be taken with regard to register and spelling and candidates should be more rigorous in seeking to transfer meaning and style into the target language.

Candidates need to work on their written English expression. They need to think about synonyms and not translate too literally if the quality of the English is likely to suffer as a result. At this level, candidates should not be submitting work that contains sentence failures.

Candidates should avoid using Translator's Notes where they are not absolutely necessary.

Unit 01: Pass Rate 50% (2007); 78% (2006)

UNIT 02A: TECHNOLOGY

General Report on Candidate Performance

The source text, in Brazilian Portuguese and on the petrochemical industry, was specialised, but not over-technical. However, most candidates seemed to be out of their depth, as reflected in their somewhat garbled translations.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Some terminology, e.g. *cetano* (*cetane*) was misunderstood by virtually all the candidates, even though the English cognate is very similar to the Portuguese, and the term can be found in a general monolingual dictionary. In one case, even a fairly basic term, *matéria-prima* (*raw material*), was misunderstood, and this was perhaps symptomatic of the overall lack of accuracy.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Generally speaking, misunderstanding of the text as a whole led to poor performance under this Aspect, as if the candidates had just given up, and were translating all too literally. This was a notable fault.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

In one case, spelling was consistently very bad, leading one to feel that the candidate was not a native speaker of English.

There was one case of incorrect transfer of a numerical figure, though it did not drastically distort the meaning of the text.

Otherwise, Aspect 3 was satisfactory.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates should think twice before embarking on any technical translation, or else make sure they are reasonably familiar with the terminology and the subject matter of the particular specialised field.

Unit 02A: Pass Rate 25% (2007); 20% (2006)

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

General Report on Candidate Performance

Candidates showed that they were at ease with the subject matter, including the terminology, and they were able to transfer the register and adjust the structure of the source text.

They showed quality of rendering of the source text into English (and thus a good grasp of the required register, an improvement on last year's cohort). Candidates experienced no major difficulties in terms of the technical aspects of the translation exercise, and generally speaking, their comprehension of the source text was very good.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

Even though some of the terminology was specialised, and the sentence structure was sometimes complex, candidates were highly accurate. The register was transferred appropriately. There were instances of inelegant expression in their work, which would somewhat hinder the target audience's comprehension of the passage. For example, the rendering by one candidate of *a empresa não seria paralisada* as "the company would not be suspended" (*Varig's planes would not be grounded or the company would not be brought to a standstill* might have been more accurate). *outra tentativa da Varig* was rendered by one candidate as "another of Varig's ideas" – *another initiative by Varig* would have been more appropriate.

Most candidates struggled with the term *instrumento de recuperação*: *means of financial recovery* would be an appropriate rendering.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Some translations read well, and were both cohesive and coherent. There were some major sentence failures, which had a considerable impact on the overall grade. These include the sentence "Although, it still has not had a positive response from creditors or company employees", "For years the company is facing difficulties that..." and "Varig continued to be compelled to meeting current expenses". The candidates who failed committed at least one major grammatical error.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

The candidates experienced no major difficulties, although all were unsure as to how to render R\$ (*Brazilian reals*, with an Anglicised plural, being the most appropriate rendering).

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates should check through their work carefully to ensure that the English rendering does not contain any grammatical mistakes. At this level candidates should not be submitting work that contains sentence failures. Generally speaking, comprehension of the source text was very good. Candidates who did not pass this paper were therefore let down ultimately by their choice of register and expressions in English.

Unit 02B: Pass Rate 67% (2007); 50% (2006)

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

Unit 02C: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 0% (2006)

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

General Report on Candidate Performance

Candidates performed poorly, not so much because of the semi-specialised nature of the source text, but through basic errors in translation; however, none of the candidates appeared to be at ease with the subject matter of the text.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

Some basic errors in comprehension here (e.g. *naquilo*: "in what", rather than *wherein*; [*Muotri*] *deve publicar*: *is due to publish*, not "has to/must publish". These seriously distort the meaning of the original.

In general, the candidates seemed to be out of their depth with the subject matter, which was not obscurely technical.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

The translations did not read well and were often over-literal, reflecting the fact that the candidates were not at ease with the source text.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

One text was almost illegible with unexplained underlining. Otherwise, there were no major problems here.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates should be wary of tackling translations in this particular area without being entirely sure of being familiar with the subject matter and the terminology.

Much more care should be taken with Aspect 2 in terms of making the target text readable. Presentation and legality are also important.

Unit 03D: Pass Rate 0% (2007); 25% (2006)

UNIT 03E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

General Report on Candidate Performance

Some candidates showed they were at ease with the subject matter, however others revealed a lack of familiarity with the required register for this semi-specialised option.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

In one case, there was uncertainty about some of the specialised terminology, but a Translator's Note stated that checks would be made with an expert in this field.

Otherwise, the translations were accurate, and Translator's Notes were appropriate.

The term *fronteira* seemed difficult to some candidates as used in the source text, but knowledge of the register should have enabled them to make at worst an informed guess (an appropriate rendering may have been to leave the term in Portuguese and describe it in brackets as border Portuguese). Terms such as *aleatório*, *marcadores* and *vocalização* were practically dismissed by one candidate in a footnote as being too technical, when they are not.

It is an acceptable and accurate term in this context to use the term *Departments* in English for *Departamentos*.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

There were some instances of grammatical inaccuracies and sentence failures (the use of the simple past instead of the perfect tense, for example). At this level candidates should not be submitting work that contains sentence failures.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Punctuation and spelling was an issue for some candidates (*parametres*, for example)

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates need to become more familiar with the required register. They need to check their work more carefully for spelling and grammar errors, and they could do more to ensure legibility and the accuracy of transfer of information. At this level candidates should not be submitting work that contains sentence failures. Candidates are advised to develop expertise in this area, and improve knowledge of terminology, in order to be able to specialise satisfactorily in this field.

Unit 03E: Pass Rate 60% (2007); 56% (2006)

UNIT 03F: LAW

General Report on Candidate Performance

Not all candidates understood what the text was about, organised their translations well, presented them legibly and showed good command of written English except for one or two basic

grammatical errors (which should not be made at this level). Specialist vocabulary was, however, not always properly translated.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

The candidates generally used the correct register. The main problem with this Aspect of Performance was the lack of knowledge of the specialist vocabulary: *Relação*; *Supremo Tribunal de Justiça*; *Conselho Superior da Magistratura*; *Segredo de Justiça* and *MP (Ministério Público)*.

Attention to detail is vital if accuracy is not to be compromised as exemplified by a candidate having translated *às* as "as" in *Às infracções...* and changed the meaning of the sentence completely.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Candidates produced work which was coherent and cohesive, in general. However, one still made a noun/pronoun agreement error ("the cases ... it is").

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were no problems with spelling.

Recommendations to candidates

Attention to detail cannot be stressed enough, as the incorrect translation of a conjunction can lead to misunderstanding. Knowledge of specialist vocabulary is essential in order to translate properly.

Unit 03F: Pass Rate 50% (2007); 0% (2006)

-*-

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

ENGLISH INTO ROMANIAN

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

General Report on Candidate Performance

The performance by most candidates was poor, with much of the source text mistranslated either because of lack of attention to context, or because of poor language comprehension. Whilst candidates were well equipped to deal with grammar and technical points in their mother tongue, their inadequate knowledge of English posed a serious problem.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

There were major comprehension problems with much of the text mistranslated, e.g. *testing is 'blind'* was translated as "the examination is mistaken"; *got lighter sentences* was translated as "have more imposing attitudes"; *The European Society for Population Economics* was translated as "The European Society for Popular Economic Sciences".

Most candidates showed no understanding of idioms, e.g. *self-fulfilling prophecy* was translated as "the myth of self-fulfilment" or "satisfying prophecy"; *escape the long arm of the law* was translated as "in borderline cases".

Simple words, key to the text, were translated without due regard to context, e.g. *good-looking* was translated as "nice", "attractive", "presentable" and "pretty". The impression in some cases was that candidates had been selecting words at random from a dictionary.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

The translations were well organised, with no grammatical mistakes. No major problems.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

The translations were correct from the technical point of view. No spelling mistakes, correct punctuation. No major problems.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates are strongly advised to pay attention to possible minor mistakes, which could make a translation clumsy in parts. More work is required to improve English proficiency.

Unit 01: Pass Rate 33% (2007); 100% (2006)

UNIT 02A: TECHNOLOGY

General Report on Candidate Performance

Translations read well in the target language

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

Candidates produced a good piece of work which read well in the target language. There were a couple of omissions, including a whole sentence, and a serious mistranslation, *ground beef patties* translated as "ground beef filled pies".

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

There were no major problems under this Aspect.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were no major problems under this Aspect.

Unit 02A: Pass Rate 100% (2007); 0% (2006)

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

General Report on Candidate Performance

Performance was uneven. Sometimes, a lack of understanding of the source text and a lack of familiarity with the terminology in the target language was shown, whilst others produced a good piece of work containing few very serious errors.

In one case, the translation was incomplete, with quite a few omissions, including the final paragraph.

Although candidates make no major mistakes when it comes to grammar and spelling, vocabulary poses problems in the source language and sometimes in the target language.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

In the case of one of the candidates, lack of familiarity with the terminology in the target language lead to a lot of unnecessary paraphrasing, making the translation difficult to read. For example *online* (a word fully integrated into the Romanian language) was translated as "by computerised connection", and *marketing* is translated as "the promotion and sale of products and services". There were numerous mistranslations, e.g. *A Shared Resource* translated as "The Share Stratagem"; *the marketing practice of lead generation* translated as "the marketing practice which has led generations"; *industry circles* translated as "industrial circles" etc. The Translator's Note is unnecessary – it offers readers an explanation of the word *Internet*. The text also includes an explanation for *Amazon*.

Another candidate produced a good piece of work but which contained a few very serious mistranslations, e.g. *the marketing practice of lead generation* was translated as "the marketing practice of the generation of leaders"; *1 bn* was translated as "1 million", and *should get a cut of the sales* was translated as "might get a price reduction".

One candidate left the translation unfinished and with many inaccuracies. The line *Most clients haven't built up a relationship...* was missing. Some words were mistranslated: *brands* was translated as "large company"; *sales force* as "selling power"; *lead* as "order".

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Whilst there were no major problems, unnecessary paraphrasing at times produced awkward sentences.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Some diacritic signs were missing (in "dicționarul", in "divorț" and in "rețele"). "sugerat" was misspelt.

Recommendations to candidates

More work is required to improve vocabulary in both source and target languages. Candidates should read business texts in both English and Romanian to familiarise themselves with the terminology and improve their translation skills.

Unit 02B: Pass Rate 0% (2007); 0% (2006)

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

General Report on Candidate Performance

The quality level of the examinations varied from excellent to poor.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

Most candidates had understood the meaning of the original text and managed to reproduce it in Romanian. One candidate had too many missing words and sentences as well as mistranslations. *Terrace houses* was translated as "houses with terraces", *widows* as "windows", thus making the sentence completely meaningless; the same happened in the case of *childless*, which was translated as "childish".

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

The level varied, from a text reading almost like the original to a stilted and incoherent translation.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Punctuation was correct in all the texts.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates should consider whether their abilities are up to the required standard. They should also be careful not to make careless mistakes.

Unit 02C: Pass Rate 67% (2007); 100% (2006)

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

Unit 03D: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 100% (2006)

UNIT 03E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

General Report on Candidate Performance

Candidate performance varied widely. Poor performance was due to lack of understanding of the source text and paying insufficient attention to context. Some candidates were well equipped to deal with grammar and technical points in their mother tongue.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

Lack of understanding of the source text and insufficient attention paid to context lead to a number of mistranslations, which significantly altered the meaning of the text. A few examples: *captures* was translated as "incorporates"; *the extent to which individuals can make it by virtue of their own talents* as "the levels individuals can achieve in terms of their own talents"; *compares across* as "behaves in"; *fell markedly* as "distinguished itself"; *make a genuine difference to educational outcomes* as "contributes a lot to educational costs"; *mobility culture* as "cultural mobility"; *post-compulsory level* as "less compulsory activities", etc. One candidate translated *Britain* throughout the text as "England". One candidate produced a good translation, which read as if written in Romanian. There were just a couple of minor mistakes.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Sentence structure was generally good.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were some minor spelling mistakes.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates for this option should be encouraged to read public documents and reports on statistics to acquire the style used in this type of writing. More work is required to improve English proficiency.

Unit 03E: Pass Rate 67% (2007); 50% (2006)

UNIT 03F: LAW

General Report on Candidate Performance

Good overall notwithstanding some serious mistranslations and instances of poor grammar.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

Translations were let down by a few mistranslations, e.g. *he now appeals* was translated as "the defendant is entitled to appeal"; *a woman with whom the appellant had had a relationship* as "the defendant's partner"; *a sawn-off double barrel shotgun* as "a shotgun with two barrels which were shortened through to make it easier to handle and increase its range".

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

The text contains some instances of poor grammar, e.g. "persoana în cauză este interzisă de lege"; "motivată pe faptul ..."; "acuzatul era interzis de lege", etc.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

No major problems.

Recommendations to candidates

More work is required to improve English proficiency.

Unit 03F: Pass Rate 0% (2007); 100% (2006)

-*-

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

RUSSIAN INTO ENGLISH

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

General Report on Candidate Performance

The passage, taken from *Russian Newsweek*, was not, on the whole, unduly difficult but it did, however, contain a number of potential pitfalls requiring candidates to be very much on their guard. Regrettably, some candidates taking this option were not able to display the prerequisite command of Russian or the ability to produce the consistently high-quality English required for this examination. The result was error levels of such degree and frequency that the calibre of their translations was significantly impaired.

Many of the errors seemed to arise from carelessness.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

There were various serious mistranslations as a result of failure to comprehend the original Russian. The phrase [женщины] в сложном положении (women in difficult circumstances) was mistakenly translated as "women who are expecting" by one candidate who confused it with в интересном положении. In one instance the phrase: Петру определили "кураторшу" mistakenly became "they appointed Pyotr as supervisor". Here the use of the dative case [Петру] signifies that the "кураторшу" was appointed to [look after] Pyotr. This error in particular demonstrates how vitally important it is that candidates fully understand the intricacies of the Russian case system.

The most frequent cause of error was candidates' inability to transfer the meaning of the Russian into an appropriate English idiom. All candidates, to a greater or lesser degree, were unable to distance themselves sufficiently from the syntactical patterning of the Russian which resulted in clumsy phrasing and, at times, distortion: "...it is unlawful to conduct commerce..." (нельзя [...] заниматься деятельностью, приносящей доход); "By the account of the beggars themselves..." (По ощущениям самих попрошайек).

There was also a significant amount of inauthentic English from one candidate who was clearly not a native speaker: "they knew each other by face" (знали друг друга в лицо); "And this is by far not the upper limit" (И это далеко не предел).

Some candidates' work had frequent omissions of words or phrases which bespoke a lack of due care whilst carrying out the examination task.

since ... anyway ('blago' in Russian) was mistaken for "thanks to" ('blagodarya' in Russian); *underpass* was misunderstood; *dormitory districts* was mistranslated and made little sense in the context. In both cases it was the cumulative effect of a number of errors, clumsy phrasing and distortions which led to failure.

The Ukrainian word for a Muscovite – *moskal* – was translated adequately, but only one candidate knew its Ukrainian origin and linked it within the translation to the subject of the first part of the passage, who was Ukrainian, and of course, that was the real reason for the word appearing in the Russian text. Other words which gave some candidates problems were *stolichnaya elektrichka*, the best version for which was "suburban" or "commuter train". Also *za bugor*, which literally means *beyond the hill*, but it is used colloquially to mean *abroad*.

The word *kasting* (of English derivation) was understood by most candidates, but some struggled to find a suitable translation ("casting" was not really appropriate.) The best attempt was "audition".

Words linked to the particular subject matter of begging provided some difficulty:

platiť otstupnye – *paying kickbacks, paying protection, paying commission, paying someone a cut, paying indemnity or paying smart money* were all possible.

kuratorsha (khozyaika) – *female supervisor (boss woman)*.

spal'nye raiony – *areas for sleeping*.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Surprisingly, all candidates at some point or other produced ungrammatical English. Examples: “He therefore works by a shift schedule unpredictable schedule”; “ladies young infants”; “...areas for sleeping are tightly packed – in all over than half the subways in the city are being used”. This suggests that candidates did not allow due time to review their work on completion of the task. Some candidates scored highly in this Aspect, demonstrating that their standard of English was very good.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Some candidates did not know that *Ukraine* must have a definite article in *Ukraine*. A couple of candidates also misspelt *Ukrainian* by missing the first ‘i’ out – “Ukranian”.

The use of hyphens in English was problematic for many candidates, who omitted them when they were necessary. *Twenty-six-year-old* and *sixty-year-old* may seem to be an over-use of hyphens, but that is the accepted punctuation in these phrases.

Two candidates incorrectly transliterated *Kishinev* as “Kishenev”, and interestingly, two candidates gave it as “Chisinau”, which is the Romanian version, and indeed, Kishinev is now in Romania, so this was not penalised, although this is an English translation of a piece of Russian, of course. *Pyotr* was transliterated as “Piotr”, which is not the accepted form of transliteration. Perhaps, it might have been safer to translate as *Peter*.

As usual, an acronym caused a problem for some – *GUVD* is *Glavnoye Uprav Vnutrennikh Dyel* and is the equivalent of something like the Home Office, or may be given as a branch of the MVD – the Ministry of the Interior or Internal Affairs.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates must ensure that they possess the required fluency levels in both Russian and English before attempting this examination.

In preparation for the examination, candidates should work, as often as possible, through previous examination papers and selected texts from the Russian press and journals in order to develop their ability to translate Russian appropriately and quickly. In doing so, they should pay particular attention to the typical problems which arise when translating between Russian and English and reflect on how these might be resolved. An important aspect of this is cultural terminology, which can be extremely problematic. As well as the required language ability, candidates should possess a very sound knowledge of contemporary Russia, together with knowledge of Russian culture. Knowledge of Russian history – at least of the twentieth century – would also be a valuable asset. Candidates should also constantly hone their writing skills in English.

Candidates should take note of the sources from which examination texts are drawn and make a point of reading such publications regularly in order to become *au fait* with the sort of language they typically employ.

Familiarity with the grammatical and idiomatic resources of the Russian language is absolutely vital and candidates are advised to work on these areas constantly.

In the examination itself, candidates should read and make sure they understand the text before they begin their translation. When they have completed their translation task, candidates should check through their work very carefully.

Translator's Notes were used inappropriately by some candidates. They should ensure that they know the difference between Translator's Notes and annotations and do not use the one for the other. Neologisms and colloquialisms are always a problem, unless students regularly read the Russian press and appropriate journals, and/or have up-to-date reference works at their disposal.

The Internet can also help to prepare for the examination.

Unit 01: Pass Rate 55% (2007); 33% (2006)

UNIT 02A: TECHNOLOGY

General Report on Candidate Performance

The original Russian was very well understood and was, for the most part, appropriately transferred to the target language.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

There were one or two instances where a smoother choice of wording was desirable: "In order that the signal [does] not degrade they use amplifiers..." might, in the context, have flowed better as: *So that the signal [does] not degrade amplifiers are used...*

Phrasing could occasionally have been a little more concise: "the transmission ability of modern fibre optic cables" (*the capacity of...* would have been a better choice here).

In this option it was the colloquial turns of phrase and links, rather than vocabulary, which made some candidates fail. *They brought fame to the laboratory* was translated as "They brought the world famous lab with them", for instance. This is a bad distortion which alone does not warrant a pass.

There were some serious errors of accuracy or register including: *vsyemirniy izvyestnost* means *worldwide fame* not "notoriety", which means *well-known* but in a bad sense. *vpolnye obychnaya* means *completely* or *totally ordinary*, not "full of ordinary". *mezhkontinental'nye* means *intercontinental*, i.e. *between continents*, not "transcontinental", which means *across continents*.

britansko-russkii is not normally translated as "British-Russian" but as *Anglo-Russian*.

vzhgli and *vzhiganie*, although used in a very technical way, were translated adequately by "burning out" and "cauterisation".

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

There were one or two very minor problems in this Aspect. At one or two points phrasing was a little inauthentic: "...at intervals of a few tens of kilometres from each other". One minor verb omission: "In order that the signal not degrade..."

Some candidates wrote very well and made virtually no errors under this Aspect.

However, "almost not" for *pochti ne* is not good English, and should be *scarcely*.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were no major problems under this Aspect.

Ian Bennion, as the scientist in charge of the facility at Aston University, was unknown to some candidates, and, surprisingly, they made mistakes in transliteration, e.g. "Ian Bannion" and "Ian Bunnyon", but these were not seriously penalised.

Turitsyn was mistakenly given as "Turitsjn"; *most advanced to date* was incorrectly hyphenated as "to-date".

Recommendations to candidates

As well as reading Russian material candidates should also, in preparing for the examination, read widely in English in order to develop their ability to write with a high degree of fluency and style.

Unit 02A: Pass Rate 60% (2007); 33% (2006)

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

General Report on Candidate Performance

The majority of candidates taking this option displayed a very clear lack of competence in Russian, required for this examination. Comprehension levels were for the most part exceedingly poor and resulted in a collective level of error which was vast. One candidate would have achieved a pass with distinction but for two errors – where the source text had not been read with due care – which were serious enough to incur a mandatory failure.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

Errors in this Aspect include outright mistranslation, poor rendition and clumsy phrasing and are so numerous that only a small representative sample may be given here. In terms of outright mistranslation the following are typical: ...количества инвесторов [...] выросло почти втрое... was wrongly given as "the number of investors [...] almost doubled" (they actually almost *tripled*); кровные was the victim of various mistranslations ranging from "inheritance" to "blood, sweat and tears". The most acceptable translation would be "hard earned cash". One particularly revealing

mistranslation was that of ...за быстрами денгами, которые сулит растущий фондовый рынок, which was given as "...for quick money promising a growing market". Here the candidate fails to identify the correct verbal subject which is фондовый рынок and not быстрами денгами.

The following is a typical example of the many poor renderings: [бодрая повышательная динамика] настораживает экспертов – "...causing experts to take note". A better solution here would have been: ...*puts experts on their guard*. The work of some candidates included a puzzling degree of clumsiness in such phrases as: "For investors who are not very sure of themselves, not wishing for excessive risk"; "[people] compare the growth to the yields of savings accounts, to the detriment of the latter"; "1% of the population able to work". This type of error occurs typically where candidates transfer but do not translate the syntactical structures of the source language.

One candidate omitted to translate the entire last paragraph of the text which duly attracted a fail. Acronyms caused some trouble, and there were some problems with *PIFy*, although there was a fairly obvious clue in the English introduction to the passage for translation, which identified them as *investment trusts*. *PTC* is the *Russian Trading System* and is then *RTS*.

MMVB = Moskovskaya Mezhsobankovskaya Valyutnaya Birzha – the *Moscow Interbank Currency Exchange*, or *MICEX*. The use of the preposition *k* in an expression of time, *k seredine nynyeshnogo mesyatsa*, was wrongly translated by all candidates. It means *fly the middle of this month* not "towards", as in an expression of place or direction. The particle *bylo* was mostly not translated satisfactorily in *propisavshiyesya bylo za pridelami Rossii*. In such cases, *bylo* suggests that the result which might naturally have been expected from a completed perfective action was frustrated. The action may actually have begun or simply been projected (*had begun to, was about to*) when it was interrupted by another action.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

A common and puzzling failing amongst the majority of candidates was the prevalence of ungrammatical English which fatally jeopardised any professional potential their translations may have had. The following constitute two of the more salient examples: (1) "Why do people, seeing these results including the sizeable growth in profit, compare it with the profit of bank deposits, not in favour of the latter. Why?" (2) "...demonstrating the market's optimistic increasing dynamics of the last few months without essential serious connections put experts on their guard".

Some candidates usually score highly in this Aspect. Some candidates showed carelessness in the use of tenses.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

A number of financial institutions were named using only their initials. Most people coped with this satisfactorily.

Recommendations to candidates

Those who are considering taking this examination should heed very strongly the advice given in the Diploma in Translation Handbook regarding the prerequisite language skills. The examination will be within the capabilities only of those who have a very high degree of fluency in Russian, together with a native ability in English. Moreover, it will be very much to the advantage of potential candidates if they have a significant level of experience in the field of professional translation.

In preparation for the examination, candidates are required to do two things. Firstly, they need to read extensively – articles in the Russian press on issues relating to contemporary Russia as well as more specialised publications directly related to their chosen semi-specialist options. They should also ensure that they become familiar with the whole range of semi-specialist terminology in each field. Secondly, they will need regular practice in translating this sort of material, preferably in association with someone who is able give suitable feedback. Having specialised up-to-date reference books is also very important.

Unit 02B: Pass Rate 44% (2007); 100% (2006)

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

There were some non-serious mistranslations: e.g. "...in the middle of the square with the public garden" instead of ...*on the square with the (small) public garden in the middle*; "But they aren't half making a fuss about it here" instead of *Then they'll kick up a fuss!* There was one minor omission: Шофёр пьяный.

The set passage consisted mostly of conversation, which contained a significant number of colloquialisms and elliptical phrases, which made for some problems in accurate translation. One phrase, *pustit' matyushkom*, is unlikely to feature in any easily available reference book, and would involve realising that *matyushkom* is a diminutive form of *mat*, which means swearing or abuse.

Colloquial speech, as here, also contains a number of particles for emphasis:

-*to* as a suffix is often the equivalent of the English *then* as in *Go on then*; *nu* = *now then*; *yezveli* is a colloquial form of *yesli*.

chto-li = *don't you think so* or often doesn't require translation.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

The conversational nature of the passage impacts on the ability of any candidate to write coherently, since much of the passage is isolated comment.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were no problems in this Aspect.

Recommendations to candidates

The Literature option embraces a much wider range of vocabulary and phraseology. Whilst literary texts may be fully comprehended, it is often more difficult to express that comprehension with the best English equivalents.

This may be compared with options such as Technology etc. where one either knows the exact equivalent or not. Candidates should bear this in mind when selecting the Literature option.

The principal technical requirement is to ensure that the correct punctuation, speech marks largely, is used. Russian punctuation differs very greatly in this respect, since it rarely uses speech marks, as may be seen from the passage set.

Unit 02C: Pass Rate 33% (2007); 57% (2006)

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis translators' notes, if any)

There were some challenging terminology in the text, but they were mostly dealt with well. *knopochki* could have been translated as *little knobs*, but in the modern technological context was well given as "buttons", since they were being pressed. *milyard* is frequent in technical passages, and although "milliard" exists as an English word, it should never be used. It means a thousand million, for which Americans have always said *billion*, and the English have now taken on that word, although originally for them *billion* meant a million times a million.

One or two excellent renderings were present in the candidates' versions:

smena vlasti in a country was given as "regime change".

gosudarstvo-izgoy was given as "rogue state".

spolokhi is a colloquial word for the northern lights, which had been mentioned earlier in the passage (*polyarnye ciyaniya*), so it was good when *raznotsvetnye spolokhi* was translated as "multicoloured bursts in the sky", rather than be repetitive.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

This Aspect was very good indeed with well-written and sometimes inspired efforts from both candidates.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, date illegibility, etc

VVS is the abbreviation for *voyenno-vozdushniye sily* and means *air force*.

Hyphens can be problematic, appearing in Russian and not in English, as, for example, *rogue state* in English, but in Russian *gosudarstvo-izb goy*.

In general, incidentally, it should be remembered that words like *air force* do not have a hyphen as a noun, but as an adjective they are hyphenated, as in *air-force uniform*.

Capitals are another problem where usage differs between English and Russian all the time. In this passage, the word *arctic* occurs in the phrase *arctic night*, but were it to appear in a proper name, it would then be capitalised, as in *Arctic Circle*.

One candidate did have problems with capitals, or their absence. *megahertz* is not capitalised, but its symbol (or abbreviation) uses both, *MHz*. Similarly, *watt* is not capitalised, but its symbol is *W*.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates should always have a good background in their chosen option, so that they know the correct vocabulary in English; it is also essential that they prepare well by reading the appropriate journals or press in Russian.

Unit 03D: Pass Rate 50% (2007); 67% (2006)

UNIT 03E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

General Report on Candidate Performance

The set piece for translation was a typical Social Science text and needed a clear understanding of the ideas being presented. On the whole, candidates' performance was variable. Linguistic abilities ranged from adequate to wholly unsatisfactory.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any)

Failures in this Aspect arose, principally, where candidates were unable to comprehend the original Russian which resulted in: serious mistranslation: e.g. "[Caucasians] ... frequently speak together in conflicted situations"; and poor renditions which tended to distort the message: e.g. образ спекулянта-кавказца given as "the image of a Caucasian merchant".

There was also some clumsiness: "...on the level of societal consciousness, robbery is accepted as..."; "It [Caucaso-phobia] takes its start in the lower rungs of society". This, as with candidates in other options, was the result of undue adherence to the syntactic structures of the source language.

Several phrases presented interesting problems to test the candidates' ability to express the full meaning of the original Russian e.g. *nemalo marginalov* – *quite a number of people living on the margins of society*; *pokaznaya orientirovannost' kavkaztsev na prestizhnoye potrebleniye* – *the ostentatious inclination of Caucasians towards prestigious consumer goods*; *Eti utverzhdyeniya dyelayutsya 'nye na pustom myesty'e'* – *These assertions are not 'made in a vacuum' or 'plucked out of thin air'*.

Nearly all candidates had problems with *rasistskiye ustanovki* – *racist attitudes/positions or standpoints*, most failed to note the *ich* in *natsionalisticheskiye izdaniya*, which meant that it had to mean *nationalistic publications* rather than just *nationalist*. The suffix *ist* in English and *ich* in Russian adds a pejorative connotation, which is needed to fit the theme of the article. There was also difficulty with *pod nikh podvyedena 'nauchnaya' baza* – *they are underpinned/supported by a 'scientific' base*.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

There were few grammatical errors, and most candidates produced cohesive and coherent translations, but of course, where Aspect 1 overlaps with this Aspect is that, if there is a lack of

complete comprehension, then it usually results in a lack of coherence. This was evident in translations that failed.

One candidate's use of English was clearly not that of a native speaker and was frequently impaired by inauthentic idiom or wholly ungrammatical structures resulting in phrases such as: "...residents of the Caucasus brought their own stereotype of social behaviour to the Russian plains that are not accepted in Russia" and "There is no reasoned logic, no idea contained in itself". Neither of these sentences conveys intelligible information to a native target readership and as such precludes any possibility of the translation being usable in a professional context.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

There were some technical errors – failure to reproduce quotation marks from the original. Errors with capital letters: *Carnegie Centre* requires a capital for both words. *kavkaztsev* = *Caucasians*. There is a clear difference between Russian and English in that countries/regions in Russian have capitals e.g. *Rossiia*, whilst the people/inhabitants are not capitalised e.g. *russkiye*. However, in English, the people/inhabitants are always capitalised. There are other anomalies concerning small and capital letters, and candidates need to study them closely.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates are strongly reminded that for the purposes of this examination, they are required to translate into their mother tongue or language of habitual use. The Diploma in Translation seeks to assess native competence only. Those who are considering taking the examination should, therefore, pay careful attention to information relating to prerequisite skills in the Diploma in Translation Handbook, which can be viewed on the Institute's website.

In preparing for the examination, candidates will need to read regularly in both languages in order to become *au fait* with typical language usage both on a general level and a more specialised level, bearing in mind the technical options at which they are aiming. They should ensure that they are fully acquainted with the specialist lexis appertaining to each technical field. It is useful to acquire and work through past examination papers – all the better if this can be done within the framework of a preparatory course where qualified feedback can be given.

All candidates, when preparing for this examination, need to take careful note of the differences between Russian and English use of capital letters and punctuation.

Candidates should remember to make time at the end of the examination to read through their work, and if it does not make sense, the chances are that there are some major errors.

Unit 03E: Pass Rate 71% (2007); 86% (2006)

UNIT 03F: LAW

Aspect 1: Comprehension accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis &

There was some problem with *FZ No. 122*, one being a confusion between the capital letter Z in Russian and the numeral 3, since they are identical, another in that it is an abbreviation for *Federal'nyi Zakon (Federal Law)*, and thirdly because it was felt by some that it should be left in the text as "FZ" and explained by a Translator's Note. This same law is quite specifically translated as *On the monetisation of benefits (O monetizatsii I'got)*. *yedinorosov* required an up-to-date knowledge of Russian politics, because it refers to the members of the *Yedinaya Rossiya (One Russia) Party*, who are right-wing and in the majority in the Government of the Russian Federation (please note the hyphen in "right-wing" because it is an adjectival use, and also the capital letters for the specific government).

the European Convention on Human Rights (not "of") was a problem for some.

ne uspevayut otslezhivat was mistranslated in some way by all of the candidates. *uspevat* is *to have time to* and *otslezhivat* is *to keep up with, to follow, or to keep an eye on*. So *do not have the time to keep up with*, or something expressing the same meaning, is needed.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

There were some very well-written versions of this piece. However, several candidates were unaware that, in English (as opposed to Russian), it is normal usage, when there is a list of nouns, adjectives or phrases, to insert *and* before the last one.

Examples of this were:

they complain of judicial red tape, unfair judicial process, and use of torture by the police.

to know the laws and international conventions, to go through all the judicial stages within the country, and to possess properly drafted documentation.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Comment has already been made on some technical points in Aspect 1, because they were comments regarding comprehension and accuracy. However, there were several other technical errors: misspellings: “injust” instead of *unjust* which of course, is a typical English pitfall, since the noun is *injustice*. Also “prosecuters” was written instead of *prosecutors*.

The use of hyphens, or not, as the case may be, can be difficult, e.g. “red-tape” and “highly-qualified” are wrong, but it is difficult to give any kind of rule to apply in every case.

Recommendations to candidates

Those who are seeking to produce accurate translations from Russian originals must prepare by reading current Russian newspapers and journals as frequently as possible.

Candidates are advised not to follow the sentence structure of the original too closely. Pay particular attention to links and small colloquialisms. Reading newspapers helps, as well as modern literature.

Unit 03F: Pass Rate 71% (2007); 67% (2006)

-*-

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

ENGLISH INTO RUSSIAN

ALL UNITS

General Report on Candidate Performance

Performance was mixed this year. Failures were mostly due to following the original too slavishly, sloppy use of vocabulary and poor use of links. Lack of familiarity with colloquialisms also seemed to be a problem for some candidates.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

In most Units comprehension did not seem to be the main problem. There were some words that were not fully understood such as *marked anonymously* but this constituted only a relatively small proportion of the overall text. A much more serious concern was the overall sloppiness in the use of language. *Unidentified* can be translated into Russian in at least two different ways, depending on the context. One would imply that the subject has not been identified, another that it has not been named. Candidates should make sure that the chosen terminology and wording is appropriate for the context – a fact many candidates chose to ignore – as this is crucial for the production of a good translation. Sometimes it was not so much the meaning, but the register that was wrong; this too altered the context, and if there is a series of words used inappropriately, the context stops making sense at all.

Candidates mistranslated not only technical terms (*DNA* or *non-technical preservations*), but also common English words such as *advances* or *beef patties*.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

Candidates taking the exam should have a sound command of grammar, syntax and linking devices. This, unfortunately, was not the case in most units. Candidates seemed unable, or unwilling, to break away from the sentence structure of the original. The target language text often sounded artificial as a result, with the emphasis shifted.

Linking devices were a particular problem, even ordinary conjunctions such as 'и' (and), 'а' (whereas /while) and 'но' (but). There was often confusion with regards to the use of gerunds and short forms of participles. Case endings were often incorrect, or inconsistent. The fact that there are no articles in Russian does not mean the corresponding meaning does not exist. In the General Translation Unit *a Norwegian study* was translated by some as "the Norwegian study" - the candidates simply dropped the indefinite article and thought that was sufficient. In Russian that was equivalent to using the definite article.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Basic spelling errors, even more than grammatical ones, are unacceptable at this level, yet there were many in all units.

Candidates were not sure about how to use punctuation marks properly, or the conventions regarding the use of capital letters in the target language. Transfer of various names, such as *London Metropolitan University*, for instance, was also inadequate.

A few candidates failed to notice that *6000* is not the same as *600*.

Recommendations to candidates

Candidates taking the DipTrans examination must have a good and sound knowledge of grammar. They should be aware of the terminology required in each unit; careful choice of words is strongly recommended.

Candidates are advised to check the monolingual dictionaries for meaning.

Candidates should construct their sentences carefully and should not be afraid of breaking away from the original – some candidates start the sentence with a target language sentence structure but end it with a Russian one.

Candidates are advised to read widely in preparation for the examination (newspapers, magazines, fiction, popular science, etc.) - not only for meaning, but for the use of language and style; it is important to pay attention to linking devices, word order and syntax.

-*-

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

SWEDISH INTO ENGLISH

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

General Report on Candidate Performance

Candidates showed very good understanding of the original Swedish and the ability to turn this into good English.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

A good and sound performance was evident, but candidates had the rather un-English *cause discussion*. One candidate mistranslated the verb *saknar*.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

A good performance from candidates again, but sometimes there was a tendency to use the positive inconsistently: *their* referring to a singular subject.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Again a good performance was forthcoming from the candidates; however, one candidate wrote "misogynism" instead of *misogyny*.

Unit 01: Pass Rate 100% (2007); 100% (2006)

UNIT 02A: TECHNOLOGY

Unit 02A: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 100% (2006)

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

Unit 02B: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 100% (2006)

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

Unit 02C: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 100% (2006)

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

Unit 03D: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 100% (2006)

UNIT 3E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

Unit 03E: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 100% (2006)

UNIT 03F: LAW

No candidates chose this option for the 2007 or 2006 examinations

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

ENGLISH INTO TURKISH

ALL UNITS

General Report on Candidate Performance

Candidates' performance showed a wide range of competences, the success rate being higher overall for the General Translation Unit. The assessment indicated that the candidates did not find the texts in the original language inaccessible. There were some comprehension problems, but these stemmed from the candidates' competence in the language and not from a particular problem with the source text. Completing the translation in the required time also seemed not to be a problem.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

On the whole, the appropriate register had been used for the different subject papers. There were some omissions, mostly sentences, which gave the impression that sometimes the candidates were not being very careful – e.g. when copying from a rough draft. A number of candidates used Translator's Notes. More care needs to be exercised in the use of these Notes.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organisation of work (cohesion and coherence)

In an agglutinative language like Turkish, candidates should be more careful, making sure that grammatical links necessary for a cohesive structure of the sentences are all in place. Care should be given, especially in complex sentences with relative clauses, to use particular verbs with the appropriate case endings they require; for example, *-(Y)E bakmak*, *-dEn almak*, or the genitive and possessive links.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spelling, punctuation, accents, transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

The need for legibility cannot be stressed enough. Candidates must make sure their handwriting is legible and the numerous changes they sometimes make on a given word must be clear. Some scripts looked like draft answer sheets.

Candidates using computers for writing in Turkish must make sure they put in all the diacritics after printing, if they cannot word process Turkish letters. Candidates are reminded that incorrect spelling may hinder comprehension.

Recommendations to the candidates

Candidates are urged to become more acquainted with specialised and semi-specialised English terminology. Candidates are advised to read all kinds of general and semi-specialised newspapers, journals, etc.

The difference in register and style across the units is worth noticing so that candidates can get acquainted with them.

All Units: Pass Rate 87% (2007); 57% (2006)

-*-

DIPLOMA IN TRANSLATION 2007
EXAMINER'S REPORT ON CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE

URDU INTO ENGLISH

UNIT 01: GENERAL TRANSLATION

General Report on Performance of the Candidates

The candidates performed well. The subject matter was well understood and the candidates read the text well and handled the complexities professionally. Some minor mistakes have been noticed in comprehension but overall the candidates were able to convey the message.

Some good use of terminology was used but attention should have been paid to current professional terminology as this is the core feature for this examination. Candidates must check their scripts before handing them in.

Aspect 1: Comprehension, accuracy and register (appropriateness of rendering and lexis & translators' notes, if any).

The candidates had clearly understood the subject matter but mistakes were still made in grammar and comprehension. Better usage of terminology is very important for getting a pass mark and to maintain a professional standard. There were some grammatical mistakes, words like "west's religions", "mastering", "measure of time", "improperly", "kind of user" and a few others were used which indicate that candidates must be more careful in word selection and professional strategies should be applied.

Acceptable Translator's Notes were given.

Aspect 2: Grammar, organization of work (cohesion and coherence)

Candidates produced well organised work, although some of them should concentrate more on sentence construction. Words like "In the whole world" can be replaced by better words of professional standards to render evidence of complete understanding and accuracy. The candidates provided evidence of good vocabulary and understanding as the translations do not seem to be a translated script but an original piece of writing. There were no omissions and, except for a few examples of awkward grammar, no serious mistakes were noticed.

A coherent piece of translation is required in this examination, so special attention should be given to this Aspect.

Aspect 3: Technical points (spellings, punctuation, accents transfer of names, figures, dates, legibility etc.)

Candidates displayed a good ability with regard to punctuation and spelling. The translations are correct in all major technical elements. Candidates should re-read the script to avoid spelling mistakes.

Recommendations to candidates

The three Aspects of Performance should be kept in mind while translating. Candidates should concentrate on sentence construction and present a high quality professional translation. The translated script should seem natural and read like a text originally written in the target language. The element of overall coherence is a key factor of a professional translation. Presentation is also very important and efforts should be made by the candidates to present their work as neatly as possible.

Unit 01: Pass Rate 100% (2007); 60% (2006)

UNIT 02A: TECHNOLOGY

Unit 02A: Pass Rate 100% (2007); 0% (2006)

UNIT 02B: BUSINESS

Unit 02B: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 0% (2006)

UNIT 02C: LITERATURE

Unit 02C: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 100% (2006)

UNIT 03D: SCIENCE

Unit 03D: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 100% (2006)

UNIT 3E: SOCIAL SCIENCE

Unit 03E: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 50% (2006)

UNIT 03F: LAW

Unit 03F: Pass Rate – no candidates sat in 2007; 50% (2006)
