

## Introduction

This article describes a detailed process for reviewing target texts. A **target text** is the final product of the interpreting process. The following techniques for evaluating target texts were developed to provide systematic feedback to students in the Interpreter Training Program at the Community College of Allegheny County (CCAC), in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Each of the ten variables has a corresponding five-point scale. This conveniently provides for a fifty-point score for any given target text, whether it is the result of a translation, consecutive interpretation, simultaneous interpretation, shadowing, or transliteration. The feedback forms were designed to work equally well with either English or ASL as the target language.<sup>1</sup> This work is related to another evaluation tool developed at CCAC: The Seven C's of Effective Source Texts. The seven variables of that evaluation tool overlap with the first seven variables presented here (but without comparisons to any target text).

The identification of all ten target-text variables has helped interpreting students to broaden their understanding of effective interpreting. The use of the resulting evaluation forms has provided an organized way of giving feedback: the forms help students understand the scores they receive and pinpoint areas for improvement.

## The Ten C's of Effective Target Texts

The interpreting process is a complex process. At the most basic level, interpreting can be divided into three major areas: A) the comprehension of a source text, B) an understanding of its meaning, and C) the creation of an equivalent target text. This last part, the creation of a target text, provides the raw data for analyzing our work. Effective interpreters must demonstrate extensive language abilities in the target texts that they create. These skills are identified here as the Ten C's of Effective Target Texts: 1) Channeled Appropriately, 2) Clearly Articulated, 3) Comfortably Paced, 4) Complete Grammatically (within the rules of the target language), 5) Conceptually Accurate and Appropriate in the choices of vocabulary, 6) Cohesively Organized, 7) Confidently Presented 8) Culturally Adjusted for idiomatic language use, 9) Composed with equivalent affect, and 10) Correct informationally. While these variables do not represent even half of the entire interpreting process, they do constitute the primary components of completed target texts which are the most definable and measurable part of the process. Identifying these elements of target text productions (whether Spoken English, Signed ASL, Written Spanish, Cued French, etc.) is the first step in providing a framework for evaluative diagnosis. These skills are described here only in general terms. Since there will always be circumstances which will further influence how an interpretation is delivered, common exceptions are identified with a NOTE.

---

### 1) CHanneled Appropriately

This area has not been extensively explained in most literature regarding the interpreting process. Therefore extra time will be taken to explain it here. To begin, it is useful to understand the difference between *Communication* and *Language*. Any animal may use symbols (such as sounds or body movements) to *communicate* information between members of a community, but the word *language* can only describe certain types of communication systems. **Communication** is one mind's perception of a message which another mind has expressed. **Language** is a specific kind of communication which meets all four of the following requirements: 1) The communication must be systematic: it must have rules which apply to the production and organization of the symbols (ie. grammatical rules). 2) The communication

<sup>1</sup>It is expected that this evaluation tool should work well with *any* target language.

system must allow for an infinite number of ways to encode messages. 3) The communication system must pass between at least two generations of active users. 4) The communication system must be flexible enough to accept change over time and between users. In sum, **language is the systematic use of symbols to express and perceive information between members of a community in which the system is rule-governed, has infinite production possibilities, is intergenerational, and changes over time.** Humans are the only species on Earth which have the ability to communicate via language.

There are three *channels* which shape languages. **Language Channels** are the three basic ways of expressing language: written, signed, and spoken. So English can be expressed in two channels (written English and spoken English) while American Sign Language is generally expressed in one channel (signed ASL) although there are many people (mostly linguists) who have learned written versions of ASL. In fact there have been several writing systems proposed for ASL but none are used by any large communities of deaf people at this time. Therefore the written channel will not be considered as a current option for ASL target texts.

These three language channels can be encoded through three **Expressive Modalities**: image, sound, and texture. While it is theoretically possible to communicate through taste or smell, we will exclude these other possibilities from our discussion of modalities related to language. Channels and Modes are related, but not as a one-to-one match. Generally a spoken language is encoded through sound, written and signed languages are encoded through images, while texture is a common language-encoding mechanism for Blind and Deafblind people. But spoken languages can be encoded visually via phonetic alphabets, shorthand, or manual cues. Written symbols can be spelled out verbally or transliterated into morse code tones. Texture is a common language-encoding mechanism for blind and deafblind people and can likewise encode signed, spoken, or written languages.

Expressive Modalities are not limited to language use: music uses sound, paintings use images, and some paintings of Elvis even use texture. It is quite possible, even common, to use an encoding modality without using language. For example, an infant's babbling, random gestures, and occasional contact with a caregiver would be examples of using all three Expressive Modalities (images, sounds, and textures) but not expressing any language at all through any of them. The child may certainly communicate, but the requirements which define language (such as being rule-governed and shared by a community) have not been met.

In order to communicate, however, we must "express and perceive information between members of a community." This means that whatever has been expressed must be perceived for the communication to take place. **Perceptive Modalities** are the means by which a message is perceived such as hearing, seeing or touching. Specifically we will identify these as **visual perception** (seeing images), **auditory perception** (hearing sounds), and **tactile perception** (feeling textures).

As we've seen above, the three channels of written language, signed language, and spoken language can be expressed through image, sound, or texture. Within the channel of writing we might first think of printing versus cursive writing. It is also possible to express written languages through dots and dashes for Morse Code (or raised dots on a flat surface for Braille). Printing, writing, Morse Code and Braille are not languages – they are all Language Encoding Systems. **Language Encoding Systems** are finite and closed sets of symbols which express the basic structural components of a language. If those symbols (letters of the alphabet, dots and dashes) are embossed so that they can be detected by touch alone, they still encode the written channel but the expressive modality is texture and the perceptive modality is tactile. The chart below provides some examples of the interaction of language channel, and expressive / perceptive modality.

## Language Encoding Systems

Language Channels	Expressive / Perceptive Modalities		
	<i>Image / Visual</i>	<i>Sound / Auditory</i>	<i>Texture / Tactile</i>
<i>Written Languages</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written Symbols</li> <li>• Typed Symbols</li> <li>• Fingerspelling</li> <li>• Morse Code Symbols</li> <li>• Semaphore</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Morse Code Tones</li> <li>• Spelling Aloud</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Braille</li> <li>• Raised Letters</li> <li>• Palm Printing</li> <li>• Tactile Fingerspelling</li> <li>• Tactile Morse Code</li> </ul>
<i>Signed Languages</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signed Symbols</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tactile Signing</li> </ul>
<i>Spoken Languages</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phonetic Alphabets</li> <li>• Shorthand</li> <li>• Manual Cues</li> <li>• Mouth Movements*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speech Sounds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tadoma</li> <li>• Tactile Shorthand</li> <li>• Tactile Manual Cues</li> </ul>

\* Mouth Movements are only a *partial* visual remnant of spoken languages.

Notice that one space in the middle of the grid has no examples. Signed languages are not expressed through sound nor are they perceived through auditory perception. While it is possible to make sounds while producing a signed language, these sounds do not effectively represent the basic structural components of signed languages. It is possible to use a spoken language to describe how to produce elements of a signed language. It is even possible to rearrange the order of words in a spoken language to match the word order of a signed language. But neither of these examples can be considered an *encoding system* for signed languages. While it is theoretically conceivable to generate a spoken language encoding system for signed languages, such a system seems inherently useless.

When we are interpreting, we must remember to keep the target-language production in the appropriate channel and mode. This means that auditory noise (whether made vocally, such as whispering, or through sounds made by body movements or hand contact) may be distracting to those consumers who depend upon hearing sounds to perceive language. Visual noise (such as swaying from side to side or wearing jewelry which moves or reflects light) may be distracting to those consumers who depend upon seeing images to perceive language. Olfactory noise (such as strong perfume) may be distracting to those consumers who depend upon feeling textures to perceive language. Every consumer of interpreting services has specific needs for effective communication. It is the interpreter's responsibility to ensure that target texts are appropriately channeled and expressed with an appropriate modality, with a minimum of noise, for each consumer.

*Diagnosis questions: Do I make any auditory or visual noise while creating ASL target texts? Do I make any non-linguistic sounds or visual distractions while creating English target texts? Am I using the appropriate channel (written, signed, or spoken) for my target consumer? Am I consistently using the appropriate mode (image, sound, or texture) for my target consumer? What can I do to improve my consistency in how I encode my own work? [suggestions - have a colleague watch your work to look for*

*visual noise and listen for auditory noise / videotape your work and note all the channels and expressive modes you use].*

## **2) CLEARLY ARTICULATED**

Target-language elements must be clearly articulated, at least to the same extent that the *source* message elements were clearly articulated. This means that a mumbled source text should generally be interpreted as an equivalently mumbled/misarticulated target text. Likewise a cleanly articulated source text should have an equally clear interpretation. NOTE: adjustments might be made for consumers who are not physically capable of generating perfect articulation (eg. an arthritic signer or an aphasic speaker).

Articulation of signed symbols which encode signed languages involves the primary four parameters of handshapes, palm orientations, movements, and signing locations. Facial expression used for grammar and for affect also play a role in signed-symbol articulation as do head nods, eye gaze and body posture. Articulation of speech sounds which encode spoken languages involves tongue position, lip position, vocal cord movement, and the shape of the oral cavity. Volume and pitch also play a role in the articulation of the speech sounds.

*Diagnosis questions: How clearly did I produce my target text? Did my level of clarity match the clarity of the original presenter? What can I do to improve my articulation clarity in my own work? [suggestions - warm up prior to the interpreting assignment (both voice and hands) / practice signing at a slow pace with every parameter (handshape, palm orientation, location, and movement) of sign production perfected / practice speech sounds with emphatic clarity].*

## **3) COMFORTABLY PACED**

Target-language production must be delivered with comparable fluency to the source text. This generally results in a target text which is not “choppy” (disfluent) or “oversmooth” (slurred) and which presents information at the same rate as the source text (not taking too much or too little time). While *clear articulation* focuses on the words, *comfortable pacing* focuses on the transitions between the words. If the target text production is slowed down in order to clearly articulate each sign then it may appear that the target text is being simplified, or that the words are no longer connected into coherent phrases and sentences. If the target text is presented at a pace beyond the ability of the interpreter to clearly articulate signs then the consumer must attempt to “repair” the target text in order to understand it.

Several common factors influencing the pacing of a target text such as **Working Vocabulary**, **Predictability of the Source Text**, and **Processing Time**. If the interpreter requires significant time to recall the conceptually appropriate vocabulary then the time taken to search will usually result in disfluent target texts. If the interpreter is unable to predict upcoming elements of the source text, then the interpreter will also be likely to produce disfluent target texts. Interpreters who are more comfortable attending to the overall meaning rather than the individual words will be better able to use greater amounts of processing time<sup>2</sup> which has been shown to improve overall performance on target texts (Cokely, 1986)

*Diagnosis questions: How fluent was my target text? Did my fluency in the interpretation match the fluency of the original presenter? What can I do to improve my fluency in my own work? [suggestions - watch your own interpreting on video tape and identify patterns of disfluency or slurring / become more*

<sup>2</sup>Previous research has referred to processing time as *lag time*. Such a label implies laziness. The author encourages the use of the phrase *processing time* which much more appropriately reflects the active work of interpreting.

*knowledgeable about the source text topic / preconference with the presenter].*

#### **4) COMPLETE CLAUSES & SENTENCES**

Target-language production must be grammatically complete, to the extent that the source message was grammatically complete. This means that poorly constructed sentences in the source text should have comparably poor constructions in the target text. Likewise, well constructed sentences which follow the grammatical rules of the source language should have target-language equivalents true to the grammar of the target language. NOTE: there are both culturally acceptable and unacceptable ways to be either structurally complete or incomplete (eg, casual conversation will often work very well with incomplete sentences and may even seem awkward if each sentence is grammatically perfect).

This issue is potentially variable, based upon the desires of the target consumer. Many Deaf consumers are bilingual in both of the languages being interpreted and some of these Deaf people may desire literal interpretations<sup>3</sup> which transfer meaning from the words of one language to the words of another while maintaining the grammar of the Source Text.

It is also common for interpreters to unintentionally skew the grammar of their target texts. **Skewing** occurs when the grammatical category of a word in the source language is maintained incorrectly in the target language. An example of skewing between English and ASL would be maintaining a nominalized English verb in the ASL syntax. Nominalized verbs are words which have a basic meaning of action (verbs) but have been adapted to be used as labels (nouns). For example, the English word *swim* in its primary sense is an action, but it can be used as an object noun in the sentence “How was your swim today?” The skewing can be avoided if the source text is understood to be asking about an activity such as “You swam today. Did you enjoy yourself?”

The greatest difficulty in self analysis of appropriate ASL grammatical word use is that there currently are no dictionaries of ASL which identify the correct ASL usage of the signs. If grammatical categories (such as *noun*, *verb*, *adjective*, or *adverb*) are provided at all then they identify the use of the English word, rather than the appropriate use of the ASL sign. This leaves the working interpreter in the position of *field linguist*, discovering for herself what the appropriate grammatical categories are for each sign.

*Diagnosis questions: How complete were the sentences in my target text? Did I consistently use ASL verbs as verbs and ASL nouns as nouns? Was the grammar in my interpretation as correct as the grammar of the source text? What can I do to improve my ability to produce correct grammatical structures in my own work? [suggestions - watch videotapes of native deaf people and note how the signs are used... which signs are used as verbs but never as nouns? which can be used as both? / videotape yourself and then identify all the nouns, verbs, and descriptors as well as how sentences and ideas were grouped together in time and signing space and how different ideas were separated or contrasted].*

#### **5) CONCEPTUALLY ACCURATE VOCABULARY**

The first three areas we have reviewed so far (channel, clear articulation, and comfortable pacing) focus on the physical production of the target text (otherwise known as *phonetics* and *phonology*). The fourth area (complete clauses & sentences) focuses on *morphology* and *syntax* (also known as grammar). The

---

<sup>3</sup>Literal Interpreting into ASL which maintains the syntax of English source texts has long been misidentified in the United States as *Transliterating*. At the time of this writing, the label of *transliteration* is still used to identify the process of literal interpreting for one of the certifications (CT) offered by the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf.

next level, **Conceptual Accuracy**, is a higher level of evaluation which looks at the choices of vocabulary items which correctly express the meaning of the source text vocabulary (otherwise known as *semantics*).

Target-language vocabulary must reflect the meaning of the source text; but this is only rarely accomplished with a word-for-word match between the languages. Some vocabulary items, such as pronouns and numbers, do have one-to-one matches between some languages. More likely is that a single word in one language represents a set of meanings which requires several words in the other language. It is also possible that a single word in the source language, such as the English word *run*, has multiple conceptual meanings, each having a different word in the target language. It is even possible that there simply is no cultural-equivalent meaning in the target language. An example of a culturally specific information is the identification of sign-names in ASL. English users do not have a cultural equivalent to sign-names and often omission can provide the best cultural equivalent (Ex. MY FRIEND B-O-B, B-SIGN-NAME, TEACH A-S-L. "My friend Bob teaches ASL").

Correct choice of vocabulary will depend not only on the topics being discussed but also the relative status of the speakers, the setting of the communication, and the language channels and modalities being used. These four factors constitute what linguists call Register Variation. In short, **Register Variation**<sup>4</sup> is the modification of language-use based on *who* is communicating, *what* they are discussing, *where* it is taking place, and *how* they are expressing and perceiving the communication (who, what, where, and how).

*Diagnosis questions: How accurately did the words in my target text reflect the ideas of the source text? Did I attempt to find a sign-for-word match or did I produce an idea-for-idea match? What can I do to improve my vocabulary in both of my languages? [suggestions - read articles of interest in professional journals, view videotapes of various lectures presented in ASL, ask questions of native language users, keep a dictionary handy to look up new words immediately upon contact].*

## 6) COHESIVE ORGANIZATION

Target-language production must be organized and cohesive, to the same extent that the source message was organized and cohesive. This means that a confusing and unorganized source text should be interpreted as an equivalently confusing and unorganized target text. Likewise a highly structured and organized source text should have an equally organized interpretation. NOTE: it is entirely common that a message will make no sense to the interpreter and yet the interpretation will make perfect sense to the target consumer. This happens when the target consumer is familiar with the source consumer's intentions but the interpreter is not yet familiar with all of the consumers and/or their intentions.<sup>5</sup> Familiarity with the consumers, the topic, and the background knowledge that the consumers have in communicating with each other are all important factors in determining whether a message makes sense.

Cohesive organization includes the ability for a consumer to be able to make predictions and to understand which elements are main points and which are supporting details. The knowledge and correct

<sup>4</sup>Register Variation has often been simplified into five distinct labels: *intimate*, *casual*, *consultative*, *formal*, and *frozen*. These labels were originally proposed by Martin Joos (1961). Joos called these labels "The Five Clocks" but never referred to them as Register Variation. Research by Gregory and Carroll (1978) defined register as being composed of three elements: the *field* (a combination of topic and setting), the *mode* (language channel and modality), and the *tenor* (relation of speakers).

<sup>5</sup>I once successfully interpreted an "In-joke" which the deaf consumer understood along with his hearing peers. I still don't know why it was funny, but everyone else thought it was hilarious.

use of discourse markers can play a significant role in understanding source texts correctly and in the cohesive organization of target texts. Discourse markers are words or phrases which organize conversational interaction, such as *well, oh, and you-know* in English (Schiffrin, 1987), or *OK, NOW, and ANYWAY* in ASL (Roy, 1989) Discourse markers allow participants in conversations to take turns and they also allow audiences to make connections between ideas presented in lectures.

*Diagnosis questions: How organized was my target text? Did my level of organization match the organization of the original presenter? What can I do to improve how I organize my own work? [suggestions - watch videotapes of native deaf people and note how ideas are separated or grouped together. How do signing space, eye gaze and body posture organize ASL messages? / videotape yourself and then identify your use of pronouns, space, eye gaze, and body postures to organize the message (or where the message could have been more clear by using these strategies)].*

## 7) CONFIDENT PRESENTATION

The confidence exuded during the presentation of the target text will have a significant impact upon the audience's trust that it is accurate. An otherwise accurate interpretation can include multiple self-corrections, hesitations, questioning facial expressions or vocal inflections and therefore cause the target audience to question the skills of the person performing the target text. Likewise an inaccurate interpretation can be deceptively delivered with such unwavering certainty that the target audience never realizes that the interpretation is vastly different from the source text. NOTE: it is entirely common during simultaneous interpreting that portions of the message will be misunderstood and require correction. If the interpreter allows herself enough processing time, however, the number of errors needing correction will significantly diminish (Cokely, 1986).

*Diagnosis questions: How many corrections were required in my target text? Did I reveal any uncertainty in my understanding of the source text, even when I knew what was meant? What can I do to increase my ability to predict the source text and therefore reduce misunderstandings and errors? [suggestions - prepare for specific assignments by becoming familiar with the topics of discussion, how technical terms are signed/ spelled/pronounced, observe similar communication situations prior to interpreting them, only accept assignments that fall within your general knowledge].*

## 8) CULTURAL ADJUSTMENT

Target-language production must accommodate the cultural knowledge of the audience, to the extent that the source message is **not** culturally adjusted. This means that a source text which makes no accommodations for the target consumers (probably when the source consumer is unaware of a cultural difference) should be interpreted with appropriate adjustments. In contrast, a presentation which is intended to explore cultural differences may depend on the omission of cultural adjustments in order to demonstrate a point or generate questions from the target consumers.

Cultural Adjustment also means that the target consumer should not have to work to complete the interpretation. In other words, the target text should appear as though it were not an interpretation, but rather a source text created through the idiomatic, natural use of the target language.<sup>6</sup>

A common example of cultural adjustment would be voicing the phrase DEAF INSTITUTE as "residential school for the deaf" because American hearing people associate the English word "institute"

---

<sup>6</sup>The decision to produce an idiomatic versus a literal target text will again depend upon the target consumer's preferences. Thus a literal interpretation may still include a significant amount of cultural adjustment, but is likely to have fewer cultural adjustments than an idiomatic interpretation.

with negative images of isolation while the deaf perspective is most often one of warmth and communication. NOTE: cultural adjustment requires that the interpreter be aware of both the source consumers' culture(s) and the target consumers' culture(s). This requires personal awareness of the cultures involved as well as pre-conferencing with all primary consumers. It may be impossible to consistently make appropriate cultural adjustments when there is significant variety of cultures among the target consumers or when some consumers desire literal interpretation while others prefer idiomatic interpretation.

*Diagnosis questions: How much adjustment was included in my target text? Would a deaf consumer who did not know English understand my target text correctly? Am I producing English which sounds grammatical, normal, and appropriate to the hearing consumers. What can I do to improve how I adjust my own work to account for cultural differences? [suggestions - watch videotapes of native deaf people and note how ideas are presented differently than English would present those ideas. / attend public deaf events (sports events at residential schools, deaf theatre performances, deaf awareness days) and identify how deaf people interact in ways different than hearing people / ask your deaf friends to identify things that hearing people do differently than deaf people].*

### **9) COMPOSED WITH EQUIVALENT AFFECT**

Target-language production should generally be delivered with inflection and emotional quality equivalent to that of the source text. Information which is emphasized in the source text should be equivalently emphasized in the target text. This also means that a "nervous" presentation in the source language should have a comparably "nervous" equivalent in the target language. Likewise a confident presentation should have an equally confident interpretation. NOTE: an extremely emotional message in which the target consumer has access to the emotional qualities of the source consumer (tears, facial expression, etc) are probably best left without attempting to imitate these elements, otherwise the interpreter may appear to mock the source consumer.

*Diagnosis questions: How did I feel while creating my target text? Did my inflection in producing the interpretation match the inflection of the original presenter? Did I emphasize the same points as the presenter? What can I do to improve my ability to match another person's presentation style in my own work? [suggestions - view videotapes of your own work and compare to videotapes of deaf and hearing people presenting similar information while looking for how information is emphasized or how emotional quality is reflected in English and ASL / work to improve your confidence in speaking and signing in front of an audience].*

### **10) CORRECT INFORMATION**

The target text must contain the same information as the source text. This means that *all* audience members should have the same understanding of the presenter's message, regardless of whether they perceived it directly or through an interpretation. A source text which includes extensive amounts of implicit information (outside of cultural knowledge) should be interpreted as an equally implicit target text. For example, instructions in the use of new computer software may omit details commonly known to the people who already know how to use the existing programs. If these details were then provided in the interpretation it may appear as an insulting assessment that the target consumer is not competent in operating the existing software.

Likewise, a source text which includes every detail (leaving no information implicit) should be interpreted as an equally detailed target text. The interpreter must remain aware, however, of the appropriate



use of implicit or explicit information for each language and culture. English, in general, is *less likely* to provide explicit information while ASL is *more likely* to provide explicit details; but implicit cultural knowledge also plays a role in how much detail is provided. Outside of adjustments necessary for culturally appropriate use of the target language, the target text should not include information beyond what appeared in the source text nor should any source text information be omitted.

NOTE: this is an area which may at first seem quite straightforward but becomes complex when the consumers do not share a common culture. Cultural adjustments such as implicit information being made explicit (or vice versa) may seem to be significant omissions or additions to a less experienced observer. In addition there are many situations (such as legal proceedings) where the source message is designed for people who have significant language fluency and world experience (such as attorneys and judges), but the target consumer may not possess adequate language fluency, world experience, or both (such as some defendants or witnesses). It is appropriate to make explicit the implicit aspects of the source texts (or vice versa) to accommodate the cultural differences of the source and target consumers.

Accommodation for language fluency and world experience also falls within the realm of cultural adjustment. In some situations, however, a consumer's fluency and/or experience are insufficient to allow an equivalent message to be understood (such as pre-school aged deaf children without fluency in *any* language who receive "interpreting" services in public schools). Under these circumstances all consumers should know that interpreting is not possible and that an alternative means of communication is necessary (perhaps an attempt at paraphrase, summary, or a provision of some form of parallel presentation would be made instead, by mutual agreement of the interpreters and all consumers). One must be careful, however, not to judge a person's language fluency solely on their language production. Consumers with cerebral palsy, severe arthritis, aphasia, multiple sclerosis, or other physical disabilities may not be physically able to *express* a language at the same level that they can *perceive* it.

In some instances an interpreter may provide an interpretation which scores well in areas one through nine, yet remains unfaithful to the meanings and intentions of the source text. In this case, the result is a *Deceptive Interpretation*, which pretends to be accurate, confident, and equivalent in all perceivable ways other than the information and/or intent. In order to prevent deceptive interpreting from receiving overall high scores, the evaluation tool presented below establishes a maximum possible score based on Correct Information. Each item in this evaluation tool generates a score between one and five. The maximum overall score is determined by multiplying the Correct Information score by ten.

*Diagnosis questions: How correct was my target text? Did my message have the same meanings as the source message? Would my target consumers and other audience members share the same opinion about the source consumer? What can I do to improve my ability to produce equivalent meaning in my own work? [suggestions - watch videotapes of yourself doing actual work. Write down notes from your target text first, then write notes based only on the source text. Are there any differences in the information contained in the notes (you may need someone who did not attend the presentation so that the notes truly reflect the information presented and not your memory of the information). Where the notes do not overlap, what information was missed? What information was added? Was anything emphasized in one version and not emphasized in the other? What led to these differences?].*

## Conclusion

Our work to improve our skills never really ends. As long as languages continue to change we will always have more to learn, even about our native language(s). As long as we work with people who communicate with ever-changing languages, we will always need to analyze how they communicate and

make adjustments in how we create our target texts. The Ten C's of effective target texts allow an organized approach to evaluating our work. If we regularly review our own work and observe the work of our colleagues we will always be getting better – first by knowing both our weaknesses and strengths, and second by developing ways to improve our skills for the future.

## The Evaluation Tool

The following pages represent the evaluation tool in its current form. It is offered here as a public tool for professionals and students who seek organized feedback and evaluation of their target texts. For each of the ten variables there is space allotted to provide comments. This evaluation tool is best used when written comments are provided for all ten variables. At a minimum, each variable which scores less than a five should have an explanation for the score and at least one specific example for every point less the maximum possible score. Feedback should be specific enough to identify the particular occurrence of the problem and to define the problem in a way that leads to its solution. Example: *ARTICULATION* “*Fingerspelling contained errors in transitions between handshapes... try slowing down so that each letter can be clearly presented.*”

- INSERT EVALUATION TOOL HERE -

## Bibliography

- Cerney, B. 1996. Language acquisition, language teaching, and the interpreter as a model for language input. *RID 1995 National Convention Proceedings*. Silver Spring, MD: RID Publications.
- Cokely, Dennis. 1986. The effects of lag time in interpreter errors. *Sign Language Studies*, 53: 341-376.
- Gregory, M. & S. Carroll. 1978. *Language and Situation: Language Varieties and Their Social Contexts*. Boston, MA: Routledge & Keegan Paul.
- Halliday, M. & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Hervey, Sándor. 1992. Registering registers. *Lingua*, 86: 189-206.
- Joos, M. 1961. *The Five Clocks*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Joos, M. 1968. The isolation of styles. In *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. J. Fishman, Ed. New York, NY: Mouton Publishers.
- Roy, C. 1989. Features of discourse in an American Sign Language Lecture. In *The Sociolinguistics of the Deaf Community*. C. Lucas, ed. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Schiffrin, D. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaw, R. 1987. Determining register in sign-to-English interpreting. *Sign Language Studies*, 57: 295-322.
- Zimmer, J. 1989. Toward a description of register variation in American Sign Language. In *The Sociolinguistics of the Deaf Community*. C. Lucas, ed. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Zimmer, J. 1990. From ASL to English in two versions: An analysis of differences in register. *Word* 41:1, 19-34.