



Institute of Translation and Interpreting

MITI APPLICANT HANDBOOK

Standard Assessment Guide for Translators

Aug 2021



1	<i>What is the ITI Assessment?</i>	3
2	<i>Translation Assessment Process</i>	4
3	<i>How the assessment is marked</i>	9
	APPENDICES	xii
	<i>Appendix 1: Example source text</i>	xiii
	<i>Appendix 2: Example commentary</i>	xv
	<i>Appendix 3: Translation text marking criteria and examples of errors</i>	xviii
	<i>Appendix 4: Commentary marking criteria</i>	xxv



1 What is the ITI Assessment?

The ITI assessment is a compulsory entry test for professional translators wishing to gain Qualified membership of ITI. This is the second stage of the application process and is offered to applicants who have already satisfied the referencing and qualification requirements.

In a few instances where ITI is unable to provide a standard translation assessment due to a lack of Qualified assessor members in a particular language pair, an alternative assessment route may be offered or Associate membership (AITI). Applicants will be notified during the application process if this applies.

For the translation assessment, applicants are required to demonstrate their translation ability by translating a text to a professional standard of accuracy in their working language pair. Applicants should view the assessment as a professional commission from a client and produce a translation to a standard that would be accepted by the client. Texts used for assessment purposes will be of a level of difficulty that allow applicants the opportunity to demonstrate that they are able to translate to a high professional standard. The translation that is produced must be of a professional quality, technically correct and accurately convey the meaning of the source text. ITI is assessing the standard of the applicant's ability as a professional translator within their relevant language combination and not their knowledge of all their working areas of specialism.

1.1 Text subjects

ITI offers assessment texts in a number of broad subject areas. These texts are not highly specialised but it is recommended an applicant selects a subject area that they are familiar with working in. Applicants can choose several subject areas in order of preference for their assessment. ITI is **not** able to accommodate requests from applicants for specific texts.

- Arts, Literature and Media
- Business and Finance
- Engineering
- Environment
- History
- Law
- International Affairs, NGOs, Politics and Society
- Leisure and Tourism
- Medical and Pharmaceutical

Once an applicant has passed the assessment, they can list up to 20 areas of specialism on their ITI Directory profile irrespective of the subject area of their assessment text. All applicants sign the ITI Code of Professional Conduct as part of the application process, confirming that they will not take on any professional work for clients that they are not sufficiently competent to carry out so should select their Directory specialisms carefully.

It is expected that applicants that meet the required standard of a MITI should be able to translate the majority of general subject texts.



2 Translation Assessment Process

The assessment takes the form of a text to be translated at home or work over a four-day period (usually Friday to Monday or Tuesday to Friday), using the dictionaries, reference materials, own TM Software and any other equipment that the translator would normally use. Applicants are required to translate the assessment text of approximately 1,000 words in one of the subject areas offered and prepare a commentary on the text of between 500 – 1,000 words. The assessment text to be translated will be sent to the applicant by 10:00 (GMT) on the first day of the assessment. The applicant must return the completed assessment work by 16:30 (GMT) on the final day of the assessment period. The applicant must return the following documentation to ITI:

- Completed translation
- Completed commentary
- Declaration – confirming the work is their own

N.B. Assessment documentation returned after the 16:30 (GMT) deadline will receive an automatic fail result.

When the applicant receives their text to be translated, they can reject it if they do not feel that they will be able to complete the translation of the text to the required professional standard. The applicant must notify the Membership team they wish to reject the text no later than 13:00 (GMT) on the first day of the assessment. The applicant will then be sent a second text from one of their ordered preferences (where one is available) as an alternative. The applicant may not request a text back again once it has been rejected. No additional time is allowed where a text has been rejected and a new text supplied. Where a further text is not available the applicant's assessment will be postponed whilst further texts are obtained.

2.1 *The translation*

The assessment text (source text) is marked to indicate the 1,000-word section for translation with 'Translation starts here' and 'Translation ends here'. If these marks are not present, then the whole text should be translated.

The completed translation must be of a professional quality that would be acceptable to a client with little revision, technically correct and accurately convey the meaning of the source text. This would include having researched the subject and a thorough review and proofread before submission.

Captions, diagrams etc., do not need to be translated, unless otherwise indicated.

An example source text is included in Appendix 1

2.2 *The commentary*

The applicant is required to prepare a commentary of between 500 and 1,000 words on the linguistic, cultural and other issues presented by the text. The commentary, similar to translator's notes, allows the applicant to identify any issues within the translation and outline the strategy for dealing with them. Most texts will quite naturally raise a number of translation issues.



The commentary should be written in the **target language** of the assessment. The commentary helps the assessors to understand the approach the applicant has taken. The applicant needs to receive a pass mark in both the translation and the commentary to pass the assessment overall.

An example commentary is included in Appendix 2

2.3 *The declaration*

The applicant is required to sign a declaration that the translation and commentary submitted is their own work. The applicant may use translation memory that they have accumulated themselves, but **not** one which has been contributed to by anyone else (or been merged with any other translation memories at any point).

The applicant is allowed to contact colleagues for advice on the translation of individual terms or phrases but not whole sentences or issues contained in the text as a whole. If an applicant contacts a colleague, they must not mention that the query relates to an assessment and the applicant must make clear in their declaration that they have consulted a colleague and which elements of the translation were discussed. The applicant must also detail any other reference material used during the completion of the translation, such as glossaries, online sources or websites.

2.4 *Formatting documents*

Your translation and commentary documents should be formatted as follows:

- Double-space your translation and commentary and add line numbers to assist the marking. You should use these line numbers in your commentary to refer to different parts of the translation.
- Add page numbers at the bottom of each page.
- Title your translation and commentary document with your applicant number in the top right-hand corner of each page (preferably in the header) as follows: 'Assessment translation – 15XXXXXXX' or 'Assessment commentary 15XXXXXXX'.
- Remove your name from the properties of the document (under author) to ensure anonymity. DO NOT include your name anywhere on your translation or commentary.
- Return your translation and commentary in a pdf format

Your translation/commentary should be returned by email to admin@iti.org.uk. If possible return your documents approximately 30 minutes before the deadline and then the ITI team will be able to check your submission is complete and possibly recommend any formatting changes which need to be made. Please do not leave it to the last minute to return your documents.

Documents received after the deadline will not be accepted and will automatically mean that you fail your assessment.



2.5 Anonymity

Each applicant is provided with a unique applicant number to protect their identity. The identity of assessors is also fully protected. Only the ITI Membership Team is aware of the identity of the applicant and the assessors.

2.6 Assessor selection

ITI assessors uphold and maintain high standards for ITI and the industry by ensuring that translators who produce good translations do become members of ITI and translators who do not yet meet the MITI standard are not granted Qualified membership status until they have reached the required standard.

All ITI assessors are existing members (MITI or FITI) qualified in the language combination of your assessment and typically specialise in the subject area being assessed. All ITI Assessors must have completed the ITI assessor training.

2.7 The marking process

The translation and commentary are marked simultaneously by two assessors. As a peer-led assessment, the assessors will be existing qualified members of ITI (MITIs or FITIs) in the chosen language combination and experienced in the subject of the applicant's assessment. The assessors' role is to review the translation and commentary thoroughly, including checking and researching terminology and to mark according to the set marking criteria and conventions.

2.8 Applicant results

ITI aims to provide all applicants with their result within 12 weeks of the assessment being completed. However, as assessors are also freelance translators themselves, occasional delays may occur especially during holiday periods.

All applicants receive the following result information:

- Individual score and grade per section
- Total score (pass mark 63 out of 95 with a possible extra 15 bonus points available for excellent renderings)
- Final grade awarded
- Pass or Fail awarded
- Advised of any Single Grave Error

N.B. A single grave error in either the translation or commentary can result in a fail result being awarded regardless of the final score.

If a pass is obtained the applicant will then be offered full Qualified membership and subject to payment of the relevant membership fee*, will then become an MITI.

2.9 Applicants who fail the assessment

Unfortunately, not all applicants will meet the required standard, and some may fail the assessment. All applicants who fail are offered the opportunity to take the assessment again and will need to pay the assessment fee again to do so. The assessors recommend a minimum of six months before an assessment can be repeated and may recommend a longer period if they feel additional professional development is required before the applicant will be ready to take the assessment again. Wherever possible a different pair of assessors will be used for subsequent assessments. The applicant should



note that the assessment fee* is subject to change and therefore could change between the first and any subsequent attempts.

Assessment fees are not refundable if an applicant fails their assessment.

Common reasons that applicants fail the assessment:

- The assessment is not returned by the submission deadline
- Formatting instructions are not followed
- Proof reading is not thorough enough to correct obvious mistakes
- Issues in the translation are not identified in the commentary and strategies for dealing with them explained.
- Commentary is not written in the target language

For unsuccessful applicants a detailed feedback report, showing a selection of errors and the corrections from any sections where an unsatisfactory or unacceptable grade was given, can be provided upon payment of the relevant report fee*. This may also include any recommendations and general comments to assist the applicant going forward.

2.10 *Appealing the assessment result*

Having received the information in the detailed feedback report, if an applicant is not satisfied with the assessment result, then they have the right to appeal within 28 days of receipt of the detailed feedback report.

The appeal fee is applicable when the appeal is raised. If the appeal is upheld, then the fees for the detailed feedback report and the appeal fee will be refunded.

The appeal itself will consist of a full re-mark of the assessment. Assessors who were involved in the original marking process will not be involved in the appeal. The ITI Membership Team and ITI Membership Committee are also not involved in the appeal process. The appeal is carried out by the ITI Appeals Panel with the assistance of ITI's Operations Manager.

Applicants wanting to raise an appeal need to email ITI's Operations Manager (Operationsmanager@iti.org.uk) to advise that they wish to do so, who will then instruct the Chair of the Appeals Panel to proceed with the appeal accordingly. The Chair of the Appeals Panel will then identify suitable assessors to carry out the re-marking of the assessment.

**All ITI fees are subject to change. For the latest fees please refer to <https://www.iti.org.uk/membership/fees.html> where all current fees can be found.*

Appeal assessors will be:

- Qualified member (MITI or FITI) in the language combination and subject area being assessed
- Not one of the original Assessors or Moderators
- ITI Assessor trained

Following completion of the re-mark the applicant will be advised of a **Pass** or **Fail** result only. No further information will be made available to the applicant. The decision of the appeals panel is final.



Where the applicant's appeal is upheld, the appeal fee and the detailed feedback report fee will be refunded to the applicant and they will then be offered Qualified membership with the Institute for the relevant language combination.

Where the appeal produces a negative outcome for the applicant, they will not be offered Qualified membership for the relevant language combination but will be able to attempt the assessment again in the future in a time scale recommended by the assessors.

Based on the outcome of the appeal, the original assessors will, where appropriate, receive feedback and may be required to re-take the assessment training to ensure consistency of assessor marking is maintained at all times and the risk of any future potential errors minimised.

2.11 Copyright

ITI has copyright permission to use the various assessment texts for assessment purposes only. Therefore, applicants are asked to destroy all copies of the source text once they have completed their assessment and they should not share this text or the translation with any other individuals in order to protect the copyright. This is important both for copyright reasons and to protect the applicant. As soon as a translation of a text becomes available in any other language, it can no longer be used and will be removed from the ITI text library.

ITI retains copies of all documents used throughout the assessment process.



3 How the assessment is marked

3.1 Marking the translation text

Assessments are marked by two assessors simultaneously to ensure that there is no undue influence placed on either assessor to follow another's marking. The assessors' role is to review the translation thoroughly, including checking and researching terminology and to mark according to the set marking criteria and conventions. Although the same error may appear a number of times throughout the translation piece, the assessor will only count this as one type of error, although they may list the number of occasions in which this same error was noted by the assessor.

Once the assessor has reviewed all of the documents and checked them thoroughly, the assessor awards the marks per criteria area within the appropriate section of the marking form and obtains a total score for the translation.

3.2 Marking criteria for the translation text

The assessors will be marking according to the criteria in the table below:

SECTION		Max. number of points deducted or added for each section
A	Accurate transfer of content	-30
B	Appropriate terminology, register and collocation	-15
C	Grammar, syntax and rewording	-15
D	Spelling, punctuation, layout and presentation	-15
E	Omissions and additions	-10
F	Miscellaneous: consistency, tense usage and tautology	-10
G	Excellent renderings	+15
	Single grave error/s	Automatic fail

The applicant starts with a weighting score of 95.

Section A: 1 error = 2 point **deduction**. The maximum number of error points that can be deducted in this section is 30 (15 errors).

Sections B – F: 1 error = 1 point **deduction**. The maximum number of error points that can be deducted is shown in the table above.

In section G: 1 or 2 points can be **added** per excellent rendering. The maximum number that can be added is 15.

Total points in sections A – F are deducted from the weighted score of 95 and then any excellent rendering points will be added.

Pass mark: 63 or above.

Full criteria for marking the translation and common errors are shown in Appendix 3

Assessors do not mark the applicant on style as this can be a matter of preference. If the assessor believes that there is a genuine error with the style of the translation and it is not in keeping with the author's intended readership for example, they would consider whether the errors fall under a different error category such as register or re-wording.



Assessors are provided with a set of marking conventions and the criteria which they use to mark the translation. All ITI Assessors undertake the ITI assessor training to ensure that consistency is maintained at all times.

3.3 *Marking the commentary*

The commentary should be written in the **target language** of the assessment. The commentary is designed to give the applicant the opportunity to justify their choices in producing a professional piece of translation and assist the assessors in understanding the approach the applicant has taken. The commentary is marked according to the criteria below and needs to achieve a minimum of 4 marks. A fail in any of the sections below will result in a failed commentary and a fail in the overall assessment.

- Grammar and Syntax
- Spelling and Punctuation
- Commentary produced according to the instructions given
- Appropriate strategies adopted to identify and address issues in the text

Full criteria for marking the commentary are shown in Appendix 4

3.4 *The Single Grave Error*

An assessment can fail due to a single grave error in either the translation or commentary. This may be a major omission which the applicant has not given a satisfactory reason for in their commentary, or it may be a serious mistranslation which would mislead the reader. These would be especially important if the mistranslation/s could have serious consequences such as in a legal or medical situation. However, errors can be serious in some circumstances but not in others and so the gravity of the error will depend upon the context, the subject area and the intended use of the finished translation.

Examples of a single grave error in the translation:

- omitting an entire sentence or heading
- omitting an entire paragraph
- the omission of significant words e.g. a negative or a qualifier;
- opposites (depending on the context) e.g. left instead of right or a positive instead of a negative
- quantities and values (depending on context) e.g. 5 thousand instead of 5 million
- 50 milligrams instead of 5 milligrams, incorrect dates, metres instead of kilometres
- incorrect prepositions e.g. received from instead of received by
- Mistranslation that significantly changes the meaning of the text

Examples of a single grave error in the commentary:

- Commentary is not written in the target language
- Commentary does not reflect the same standard of work as the translation
- Commentary is not returned by the deadline

3.5 *Moderation*

Where two assessors have disagreed on the scores which has caused a significant difference in the final grade and score to be awarded (making the difference between a pass and a fail), a third assessor may be required to moderate the assessment.



3.6 *Final score*

The applicant must achieve a score of 63 or above in order to pass the assessment.

3.7 *Pass/Fail Translations standards*

We would expect an assessment which scores highly to read as though it was originally written in the target language, with few minor errors and needing little revision.

Average marks would be seen on a translation which flows well and is accurate. It may contain some minor errors or the odd medium error which does not distort the meaning. It may also contain some areas which require minor re-wording to aid the flow.

The minimum requirement of marks for a pass would demonstrate a translation which is competent, but which might require a small amount of revision. It may contain one or two minor mistranslations or omissions/additions. There may be a few issues with terminology or register but no grave errors.

A score below the required standard would be awarded a fail for the assessment. This translation which may be good in some places but contain either a single grave error or an accumulation of minor, medium and major errors which mean that the translation would require significant revision before being suitable for a client or in cases of very low scores, the translation may contain fundamental flaws; for example, serious errors in transfer of content or terminology leading to major or frequent mis-translations. A translation would definitely fall into this category if you needed access to the source text in order to understand the overall meaning of the text or if the translation would not be professionally usable even with substantial revision.



APPENDICES





Appendix 1: Example source text

Source of assessment text for translation

The following assessment text was sourced from the British and Irish Legal Information Institute (BAILLI) website and has been reproduced for the purposes of this assessment only. Neither the author of the text nor the website owners are responsible for the content of this assessment text. The text has been edited to only include an extract of a suitable length for the purposes of this translation assessment. The full original document is available at:

[http://www.bailii.org/ew/other/EWLC/2002/276\(7\).htm](http://www.bailii.org/ew/other/EWLC/2002/276(7).htm)

What kinds of conduct should suffice?

...

TRANSLATION STARTS HERE

Secrecy

- 7.18 In Part IV we identified various kinds of conduct which can amount to fraud at common law (with the result that persons who *agree* to engage in such conduct are guilty of conspiracy to defraud), but which are not an offence if engaged in by one person alone, and which would therefore cease to be criminal (even if engaged in by more than one person in concert) if conspiracy to defraud were abolished without replacement. Some of the examples we identified involve misrepresentation, but the authorities on conspiracy to defraud recognise that misrepresentation is not an essential element of fraud. This was established in *Scott v Metropolitan Police Commissioner*, where the appellant bribed cinema staff to let him borrow films and make pirate copies, and the House of Lords upheld his conviction of conspiracy to defraud. He made no representation to the owners of the copyright and distribution rights – they knew nothing about him – but he nevertheless intended to *defraud* them.
- 7.19 We note that in some jurisdictions it has been thought sufficient to create a general fraud offence requiring misrepresentation (or deception). The Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong, for instance, recommended such an offence in 1996. We also note, however, that the Hong Kong legislature, in enacting that recommendation, decided that the new offence should supplement conspiracy to defraud rather than replacing it. Apparently it was thought unsatisfactory that the *only* fraud offence should be one confined to deception.
- 7.20 We think that our definition of fraud should not be confined to misrepresentation – even if it is designed (as we believe it should be) to reflect the ordinary meaning of fraud rather than its wider legal meaning. As Stephen's definition recognises, misrepresentation is no more essential to the former than to the latter. If an employee embezzles her employer's money, both lawyers and non-lawyers would agree that her conduct can properly be described as fraud even if she makes no misrepresentation (for example, by falsifying the accounts).
- 7.21 Fraudulent conduct which does not involve misrepresentation obviously cannot be brought within the reach of the criminal law either by extending the individual deception offences while still requiring proof of deception (as we proposed in Consultation Paper No155) or by replacing them with a general "fraud" offence requiring such proof (an option that we there considered and rejected). If, however, we are to stop short of criminalising *any* conduct which causes



loss and is deemed by the fact-finders to be dishonest (an option which we considered and rejected both in Consultation Paper No 155 and in Part IV above), we must identify the circumstances in which conduct not involving misrepresentation nevertheless amounts to fraud. Viscount Dilhorne's definition, "to deprive a person dishonestly of something ... to which he ... might ... be entitled", seems too wide: it would allow dishonesty to do all the work. So would Lord Diplock's dictum that "Dishonesty of any kind is enough". In our view Stephen was closer to the truth when he said that fraud requires deceit (or an intention to deceive) *or in some cases mere secrecy*. We have concluded that there are two further kinds of "secret" conduct, not involving misrepresentation, which can properly be described as fraud and should be sufficient for the new fraud offence. They are (a) non-disclosure, and (b) secret abuse of a position of trust.

Non-disclosure

- 7.22 Secrecy can be regarded as a kind of deception by omission. One person may deceive another by taking positive steps to create a false impression in the other's mind, or may simply refrain from taking any steps to dispel such an impression. It is arguable (though by no means clear) that simple non-disclosure can constitute deception under the present law, at any rate where there is a legal duty to disclose.
- 7.23 In Consultation Paper No 155 we provisionally concluded that mere non-disclosure should not be sufficient for an offence of deception, regardless of whether there is a legal duty to disclose. The majority of respondents who responded on this issue agreed. A substantial minority, however, argued that, from the victim's point of view, a failure to reveal material facts can be just as devastating as, and tantamount to, deception by conduct. Some went further and argued that criminal liability for non-disclosure ought not to depend on the existence of a duty of disclosure in civil law, which might well be difficult to identify.
- 7.24 The view we expressed in Consultation Paper No 155 related to the definition of *deception*, for the purpose of offences requiring deception. As we have explained, however, we now believe that a fraud offence ought not to be confined to cases of deception, but should include other kinds of conduct which non-lawyers would regard as fraud. The question is therefore whether the ordinary concept of fraud is wide enough to embrace at least some cases of dishonest non-disclosure. In our view it clearly is – whether or not there is a legal duty to disclose. For example, an antique dealer calls on vulnerable people and buys their heirlooms at unrealistically low prices, making no misrepresentation as to the value of the items but exploiting the victims' trust. There may be no *legal* duty to disclose the truth, but there is clearly a *moral* duty to do so. If the dealer's failure to do so is regarded by the fact-finders as dishonest, we see no reason why he should not be guilty of fraud.
- 7.25 We have considered the possibility of defining deception (or misrepresentation) in such a way as to make it clear that the breach of a moral duty to disclose will suffice. We have concluded, however, that this would not be helpful. In the first place it would perpetuate the artificiality of the present law, under which a defendant who fails to disclose material facts can be convicted (if at all) only on the basis of a positive misrepresentation supposedly implicit in his or her silence. In reality, the antique dealer's dishonesty lies not in any implied representation but in the dealer's failure to provide crucial information which the other party trusts the dealer to provide. We think the legislation should expressly reflect this, by providing for a separate kind of fraudulent conduct which does not masquerade as a form of misrepresentation but is a genuine alternative to it.

TRANSLATION ENDS HERE

APPLICANT 17XXXXXXX



Appendix 2: Example commentary

1
2 The text for translation is an excerpt from an article in the German business journal *manager magazin*.
3 The article is factual and informative, and written in an accessible, journalistic style for readers who would
4 be expected to have some awareness of the issues discussed but might not necessarily be experts in the
5 subjects covered. I have attempted to produce a similar style of document in translation.

6
7 In the absence of a more specific brief, I have assumed that the translation is to be used as an equivalent
8 journal article published in British English. I have therefore used British rather than US terminology when
9 referring to the US supermarkets mentioned in the article (e.g. shopping trolley, rather than shopping cart,
10 line 19, and petrol station rather than fuel center, line 17). In this context, I also considered omitting the
11 “British” reference to Tesco (line 69) given that the name will be more than familiar to a UK readership but
12 ultimately felt it was worth including to clarify that Tesco is not a US chain.

13
14 I noticed several spelling errors and discovered one factual error in the source text. The reference to
15 Billigländern should be “Billigläden” (line 15), the supermarket chain is called Supervalu not Supervalue
16 (line 39) and the discount stores referred to in line 71 have the name Trader Joe’s above the door, not
17 Trader Joe.

18
19 Slightly more importantly, the staff at Trader Joe’s appear to wear Hawaiian shirts (line 76), as confirmed
20 on the company’s own website, not any kind of Hawaiian skirt as stated in the German (Hawaii-
21 Röckchen). (See <http://www.traderjoes.com/about/general-faq.asp#Hawaiian>)

22
23 If I were returning this job to a real client, I would mention all of these points, as it would make sense to
24 improve the German version, which is still available online.

25



26 In terms of research for this job, the very topical nature of the issues covered meant it was relatively easy
27 to access relevant Internet articles¹ from the business and general-interest press, including recent articles
28 in the British press on the rise of discount retailers. These provided useful terminology, although generally
29 the text is not particularly technical in keeping with its general-interest character.

30

31 I was also able to use web searches to confirm the quotes made by Dailey (line 36) and to confirm
32 the title of Lafley's book (line 64).

33

34 I have not, however, been able to confirm the original English version of the Ruler Foods slogan referred
35 to right at the beginning of the article (line 10). Again, if I were returning this job to a client, I would advise
36 that my translation was not confirmed. I have therefore avoided the use of quotation marks.

37

38 There were two instances where I added some additional information in my translation. At line 19, the
39 section on customers needing to pay 25 cents to rent a trolley might not make a lot of sense to British
40 readers as it is not immediately clear how this will save the stores money. I have added the explanation
41 that, traditionally, US stores pay someone to clear up the trolleys in the car park and customers are not
42 normally required to wheel them back to a trolley bay themselves.

43

¹ Examples of relevant texts:

<http://business.time.com/2013/08/07/meet-the-low-key-low-cost-grocery-chain-being-called-wal-marts-worst-nightmare/>
<http://business.time.com/2013/04/18/tale-of-two-supermarkets-why-fresh-easy-flopped-and-fairway-flies-high/>

<http://www.wcpo.com/money/local-business-news/kroger-kr-inching-forward-with-ruler-foods-a-deep-discount-chain-expanding-in-illinois>

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-05-17/mcdonald-s-seen-overhauling-u-s-menu-from-145-choices.html>

<http://www.bizjournals.com/cincinnati/news/2013/06/05/kroger-expanding-its-ruler-foods-concept.html?page=all>

<http://hbr.org/books/playing-to-win>

<http://www.theguardian.com/business/2014/sep/29/how-aldi-price-plan-shook-up-tesco-morrisons-asda-sainsburys>



44 I have also added a brief explanation of the term “trading up” (line 113) as it has a very specific meaning
45 here in the context of consumer goods.

46

47 The structure of the source text in the section following the McDonald’s heading (line 50) is slightly
48 disjointed, jumping quickly from one company’s experience to another, and from the supermarket sector
49 to other types of company, also with the added confusion of a P&G manager called McDonald. I have
50 tried to make the translation as clear as possible here.

51

52 The German is also slightly ambiguous when referring to Lafley’s previous career (line 63) and, without any
53 background knowledge, the reader might assume he was CEO at P&G for 33 years. Again, I have tried to
54 make this as clear as possible. (Lafley joined P&G when he graduated in 1977 but was only CEO from 2000
55 until his retirement in 2009).



Appendix 3: Translation text marking criteria and examples of errors

Your assessment translation will be marked under a set of criteria as follows:

A	Accurate transfer of content
Errors	Each error incurs 2 points. Max 15 errors (30 points)
0-1	Excellent: Excellent understanding of the subject matter and consistently accurate transfer of meaning
2-3	Good: Good understanding of the subject matter; a few minor errors in transfer of information and occasional lack of clarity in meaning
4-5	Acceptable: Adequate understanding of the subject matter with some errors or omissions in the transfer of information which do not result in substantial distortion of meaning
6-8	Unsatisfactory: Inadequate understanding of the subject matter with a number of minor or medium errors or omissions in the transfer of information
9+	Unacceptable: Fundamental lapses in understanding with several minor, medium and major inaccuracies leading to incorrect transfer of information and major distortions

Accurate transfer of content: This can be a serious error if it significantly distorts the meaning of the original text and can result in a single grave error.

Examples of errors:

- opposites (depending on the context) e.g. 'left eye' instead of 'right eye', a positive instead of a negative, 'up' instead of 'down'
- quantities and values (depending on context) e.g. '5 thousand' instead of '5 million', '50 milligrams' instead of '5 milligrams', dates, 'metres' instead of 'kilometres'
- incorrect prepositions e.g. 'received from' instead of 'received by'



B	Appropriate terminology, register and collocation
Errors	Each error incurs 2 points. Max 15 errors (30 points)
0-1	Excellent: Excellent use of terminology; register consistently appropriate to target reader and intended use; excellent collocations
2-3	Good: Generally appropriate terminology with the occasional lapse; register appropriate to target reader; generally appropriate collocations
4-5	Acceptable: Generally good use of terminology and register with only a few minor errors; some inappropriate collocations
6-8	Unsatisfactory: A considerable number of minor or medium severity errors in terminology and register that impairs the overall acceptability of the translation in many instances; wrong collocations
9+	Unacceptable: A large number of fundamental errors in terminology and register causing substantial impairment or distortion of meaning; substantially wrong collocations

Terminology: choice of terms which are current and commonly used in the subject field of the text

Examples of errors:

- Use of outdated terminology
- Use of incorrect terminology
- Use of terms which are not appropriate for the target readers (British versus US - English)

Use of inappropriate terminology can be a serious error if it significantly distorts the meaning of the original.

Register: use of language which is appropriate to the target reader and the intended use of the target text

The appropriate register will vary greatly between, for example, a legal text and an article in a tabloid newspaper. It will also vary between a magazine article in a social weekly and one in a professional journal. A patient leaflet will be written in a different register to a doctor's reference book, even if they are describing the same things.

Example of an error:

- Use of terms that are inappropriate for the context (e.g. translating the German term *Magersucht* as 'the slimmer's disease' rather than as 'anorexia nervosa' in a medical context).

Collocation: words that naturally go together in the target language

Examples or errors:

- 'fast food' not 'quick food'
- 'lion's roar' not 'lion's shout'



C	Grammar, syntax and rewording
Errors	Each error incurs 2 points. Max 15 errors (30 points)
0-1	Excellent: Translation is excellent from a grammatical/syntactical point of view; a number of instances of excellent rewording/rephrasing, coherent organisation
2-3	Good: Good accurate grammar and syntax; a few instances of good rewording/rephrasing
4-5	Acceptable: A few instances of errors in grammar and syntax; occasionally awkward sentence organisation but acceptability of translation is not substantially impaired
6-8	Unsatisfactory: Several minor or medium mistakes in grammar and syntax; several examples of awkward sentence structure affecting text coherence, retention of source language structure
9+	Unacceptable: Several minor, medium or major mistakes in grammar and syntax; inappropriate sentence structure leading to miscomprehension, slavish adherence to source language structures

Grammar: ensuring that sentences follow the rules of the target language

Examples or errors:

- Putting a singular verb with a plural subject e.g. 'We is'
- Incorrect prepositions e.g. 'in the TV' instead of 'on the TV'

Syntax: word order

Example of an error:

- Incorrect word order e.g. 'She down the road drove'

Rewording: changing the word order of the original so that it is grammatically correct and flows well in the target language

This can be particularly important where very long sentences need to be turned into several shorter sentences to aid understanding or readability. Sometimes several shorter sentences could be combined to aid flow.



D	Spelling, punctuation, layout and presentation
Errors	Each error incurs 2 points. Max 15 errors (30 points)
0-1	Excellent: Excellent spelling and punctuation; layout and presentation professional
2-3	Good: Correct punctuation, spelling and formatting, with an occasional minor error
4-5	Acceptable: A few minor lapses in punctuation, spelling and formatting, not impairing the overall quality of the translation
6-8	Unsatisfactory: A number of minor or medium errors in punctuation, spelling and formatting which collectively impair the overall quality of the translation
9+	Unacceptable: A large number of minor, medium or severe errors in punctuation, spelling and formatting which substantially impair the overall quality of the translation

Spelling: including typing errors

Examples of errors:

- 'to' vs. 'too' vs. 'two'
- 'there' vs. 'their' vs. 'they're'
- typing errors e.g. 'the only the only', 'cheif executive'

Punctuation: used to organise sentences and clarify meaning

Examples of errors:

- 'the assessor's' vs. 'the assessors'
- Too many or too few commas, which impairs the flow of the sentence
- Missing brackets or quotation marks
- Missing capital letters

Layout and presentation

Applicants are expected to present their translation in a way which is easy to follow and read. Usually applicants will match their translation to the layout of the original. If the original is in columns then the translation may run as one column of continuous text instead.

Footnotes should be clear and easy to find. Tables and images which do not need to be translated can be referenced or omitted.

Examples of errors:

- Unclear headings or sub-headings
- Not maintaining paragraph structure



E	Omissions and additions
Errors	Each error incurs 2 points. Max 15 errors (30 points)
0-1	Excellent: No omissions of crucial information or additions of superfluous or unnecessary words or information
2-3	Good: One or two instances of minor omissions of crucial information or superfluous or unnecessary additions but not affecting the overall quality of the translation
4-5	Acceptable: A few omissions of crucial information or superfluous or unnecessary additions of minor importance
6-8	Unsatisfactory: A number of minor or medium severity omissions of crucial information or superfluous or unnecessary additions
9+	Unacceptable: A significant number of minor, medium or serious omissions of crucial information or superfluous or unnecessary additions which impair overall quality

Omissions: missing out crucial words or information

Intentional omissions on the part of the applicant should be indicated with a footnote or explained in the commentary. Minor omissions (which may not be accompanied by an explanation) are acceptable where they aid the flow of the text but do not distort the meaning. An omission can be a serious error if it significantly distorts the meaning of the original.

Examples of errors:

- omitting an entire sentence or heading
- omitting an entire paragraph
- omission of a negative e.g. 'not'
- omission of a qualifier e.g. 'suddenly', 'yet'

Additions: adding in extra words or information which does not appear in the source text

Additions are acceptable where they clarify the meaning of the source text to the target text reader or aid the flow of the text (but do not distort the meaning). Additions will be marked as an error where they are unnecessary or serve no purpose. An addition can be a serious error if it significantly distorts the meaning of the original.



F	Miscellaneous: e.g. consistency, tense usage and tautology
Errors	Each error incurs 2 points. Max 15 errors (30 points)
0-1	Excellent: No miscellaneous errors occurring in the translation
2-3	Good: One or two lapses in miscellaneous errors
4-5	Acceptable: A number of minor miscellaneous errors not affecting the overall quality of the translation
6-8	Unsatisfactory: A number of minor or medium severity miscellaneous errors which impair the overall quality of the translation
9+	Unacceptable: A significant number of minor, medium and major inaccuracies which substantially impair the overall quality of the translation

Consistency: ensuring the use of the same spellings, terminology choices, etc.

Examples of errors:

- Mixing the use of US and British spellings e.g. 'realise' and 'realize'
- Mixing the use of the 12 and 24-hour clock e.g. 2pm and 14.00

Tense usage: language indicating when and in what order things happened

Examples of errors:

- 'He is eating' vs. 'He was eating'
- 'Levels have increased' vs. 'Levels had increased'

This can be a serious error if it significantly distorts the meaning of the original.

Tautology: saying the same thing twice using different words

Example of an error:

'This policy attempts to try to...'



G	Excellent renderings
	Excellent renderings can be awarded either 1 or 2 points to a maximum of 15 points. These are added to the total.

Excellent renderings allow the assessor flexibility to award further marks for areas where the applicant has excelled in overcoming a particular translation issue but has not resorted to using the most straightforward renderings that the applicant would be expected to translate correctly without any difficulty, as standard.

Examples:

- **Rewording:** where the candidate has found a neat and effective solution to a difficult syntactical problem in the source text
- **Idiomatic expressions:** where the candidate has used an idiomatic expression that reads nicely in the target language, e.g. “working around the clock”, or works well as a collocation, e.g. “freezing cold temperatures”.
- **Unpicking complexity:** where the candidate has correctly decoded a complex expression, phrase or sentence in the source text and found an elegant solution that transfers the idea correctly and reads well in the target language.



Appendix 4: Commentary marking criteria

1. Grammar & Syntax

Marks	
2	Good: Good accurate grammar and syntax with very few or no errors. Commentary reflects the same standard as the translation.
1	Acceptable: A few instances of errors in grammar and syntax or sentence organization.
0 - Fail	Unsatisfactory: Several significant or major mistakes in grammar, syntax or examples of awkward sentence structure. Commentary does not reflect the same standard of work as the translation.

2. Spelling & Punctuation

Marks	
2	Good: Accurate spelling and punctuation with very few or no errors. Commentary reflects the same standard as the translation.
1	Acceptable: A few instances of errors in spelling and punctuation.
0 - Fail	Unsatisfactory: Several significant or major mistakes in spelling and punctuation. Commentary does not reflect the same standard of work as the translation.

3. Commentary produced according to the instructions given

Marks	
2	Good: Commentary is within the given word count, written in the target language and follows the formatting instructions.
1	Acceptable: Commentary is slightly over/under the word count.
0 - Fail	Unsatisfactory: Commentary is significantly under or over the word count, is not written in the target language or doesn't follow the formatting instructions.

4. Appropriate strategies adopted to identify and address issues in the text.

Marks	
2	Good: Issues identified in the text are highlighted and strategies to deal with them explained in a structured way.
1	Acceptable: Issues are identified, but strategies to deal with them are poorly explained or justified.
0 - Fail	Unsatisfactory: Key issues are not identified or no explanations/strategies are given to deal with issues.