trans-kom ISSN 1867-4844 http://www.trans-kom.eu
trans-kom ist eine wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für Translation und Fachkommunikation.

trans-kom 10 [1] (2017): 22-44
Seite 22

Alireza Akbari

Needed Skills and Strategies to Improve the Efficiency of Sight Translation in Classroom Context

Abstract

There has been relatively little research on sight translation. The present research is an attempt to inspect the fundamental findings of a pilot study including ten student and four professional interpreters' sight translations from English (L2) into Persian (L1). This research paper investigates the transcriptions of their sight translation performance on the basis of their reading speed and Lee's (2008) tripartite model: accuracy, delivery quality and the quality of target language expressions. With this idea, the results illustrated that student interpreters' group need to advance their sight translation skills as well as their reading performance to fully perceive the source text and differentiate the main ideas from the secondary ones. The analysis of data indicates that student interpreting performances mostly depend on literal and word-for-word translation in which they have difficulties to free themselves from the context and form of the source language. In other words, they seem to have problems with "deverbalization" (Seleskovitch 1975; Donovan-Cagigos 1990). By the same token, these findings have pedagogical implications for the teaching of sight translation in classroom context. Finally, this research paper discusses the strategies such as delaying response and lexical and syntactic compressions increasing and shortening the time of delivery and the quality of target language expression.

1 Introduction

The term sight translation (SiT) is defined as one of the basic modes of interpreting, more specifically a hybrid form (Timarová et al. 2014), namely the combination of written input and interpreting as oral output depending on the context (Setton/Motta 2007; Agrifoglio 2004) since it requires reading and production synchronization. Sight translation alludes to various sorts of activities depending on the circumstances where SiT is carried out. Sight translation can be applied in such occasions when an interpreter both sight translates and listens to the speech. According to Weber (1990), sight translation necessitates rapid analysis of a text, swift information transmutation from one language to another while avoiding transliteration or literal translation, and the techniques/approaches of public speaking (Lee 2012). Sight translation has been reckoned closer to interpretation rather than translation since cinterpreters are able to apply largely the same strategies that they use when they perform oral-to-oral interpreting" (Dragsted/Hansen 2007: 254).

Franz Pöchhacker argues that

> In sight translation, the interpreter's target text production is simultaneous not with the delivery of the source text, but with 'the interpreter's real time' (visual) reception of the written source text. If the interpreter is working 'at sight' without the constraints of real-time performance for a larger audience, sight interpreting will shade into the consecutive mode or even come to resemble 'oral translation', with considerable opportunity for 'reviewing' and correction. (Pöchhacker 2016: 20)

Viaggio (1995) has pointed out that sight translation has been observed as an educational exercise for increasing interpreter's cognition of syntactic and stylistic variations between the source and target languages. Also, sight translation is considered as a beneficial asset in expanding language transfer and oral skills through the process of paraphrasing, reformulating, and restructuring the source text (Ilg/Lambert 1996). In the same manner, Song (2010) contends that sight translation is a "traditional step" and "learn-to-anticipate" exercise between simultaneous and consecutive interpretation. Timarová et al. (2014) underline that sight translation is a useful exercise for working up speed and thus preparing students to undertake simultaneous interpreting in the booth. When allowing for prior reading, sight interpreting is believed to improve students' ability to navigate in a text applying a non-linear approach and to identify core information (Timarová et al. 2014).

The question is whether sight translation is regarded as a particular mode of translation or interpretation. As both visual and oral forms of 'information processing' are included; therefore, SiT is considered as a particular kind of written translation (written input) as well as an alternation of oral interpretation (oral output). According to Lambert,

> [s]ight interpretation – as opposed to sight translation – is one step closer to simultaneous interpretation in that the message is presented both aurally and visually. In this case, candidates are given five to ten minutes to prepare the written version of the message. Then, candidates are asked to deliver a sight interpretation of the text as it is being read to them through headphones. Candidates are urged to follow what the speaker is saying, given that the speaker may depart from the original text from time to time, and not to simply read from the passage as though it were a sight translation exercise. (Lambert 2004: 299)

Reading and production synchronization arise simultaneously in sight translation. As a consequence, the interpreter needs to process the translation of the source text in his/her mind, while reading the source text (Weber 1990). The important task of an interpreter is to scrutinize the source text ahead for more particular keywords, while outlining the expressions of the target language so that he/she can produce a reliable and smooth translation (Agrifoglio 2004). In doing so, the interpreter is advised to store some chunks of information in his/her short term memory until he/she "reads enough information from the source text to reformulate it in the target language" (Lee 2012: 695). Sight translation can be performed in two shapes: unstressfull and stressful sight translation (Lambert 2004). The former refers to the situation when the candidate has plenty of time (e.g. ten minutes) to 'read a 300-word passage', while the latter alludes to the situation where 'preparation time' is removed completely and the participant is asked to render right away without having an opportunity to scrutinize the source text (Song 2010). Complex and

long sentences demand greater processing efforts from the interpreter. The syntactic differences between the source and target languages create great obstacles for the interpreter to synchronize source language reading and target language production. The interpreter must avoid transliteration or word for word translation since the visual input might alleviate listening and memory efforts in sight translation; however, it might also make intrusion in the target language (Martin 1993). In line with Martin, Agrifoglio's observations indicate that the continual presence of the source language text seems a major challenge for the sight interpreter which conditions the ability to synchronize 'silent reading' and 'oral translating' as well as 'target language expression' (Nilsen/Monsrud 2015). To this effect, the flow and the speed of reading will affect the process of sight translation, as sight translator's reading speed will influence the accuracy and precision of the end-product.

In spite of its importance in both interpreting contexts and interpreting training, sight translation has always received less academic observation than both simultaneous and consecutive interpreting. In the deficiency of enough knowledge on what represents proficiency in sight translation, research on the performances of student interpreters' sight translation comparing to professional interpreters' may pave the way for filling the gap between theory and practice in SiT.

2 Research on Sight Translation

2.1 A Review

Sight translation and its role in interpreting has not enjoyed a thorough research among other modes of interpretation including simultaneous and consecutive. In an interesting study carried out by Viezzi (1989), the correlation between "morphosyntactic differences in the language pair and retention rates" was calculated. Viezzi made a comparison between simultaneous interpreting and sight translation on the basis of 'information retention'. He then concluded that retention is higher after simultaneous interpreting in comparison with sight translation since it included more and deeper incoming information processing (Viezzi 1989). By the same token, his argument was significant since he indicated that the interpreters recalled more after sight translation "from such morpho-syntactically closer language as Spanish and Italian (85 %) than after ST (SiT) from German into Italian, i.e. a language pair with less morphosyntactic similarity (64 %)" (Viezzi 1989). Seemingly, he came to the conclusion that the interpreters could maintain more incoming information in the sight translation activities if it included less variation due to 'morphosyntactic similarities' between the language pair.

In another study, Lambert (2004: 302) regulated the role of source language visual presentation in SiT comparing to 'normal simultaneous interpreting'. She then assessed the subjects' output and figured out that the participants evaluated through SiT (82 %) outperformed the ones assessed by simultaneous interpreting (69 %). She consequently explained the results due to the fact that the participants paid more attention to the input

processing since “in sight translation attention does not have to be shared and less cognitive and memory load is required by this task” (Chmiel/Mazur 2013).

Another study carried out by Zheng and Xiang (2013: 160-183) concentrated on the empirical-experimental study on the processing of ‘metaphorical expressions’ in terms of sight translation. They designed ‘a within-subject experiment’ to test the cognitive challenges for the participants. They evaluated the ‘processing time’, ‘translation quality assessment’, and ‘questionnaires and retrospective interviews’. In the upshot, they concluded that the processing of metaphorical expressions took more time resulted in more ‘translation failure’. To put into another word, the metaphorical expressions slow down the process of production and the quality of translation since metaphorical expressions require “more effort than for their literal translations” (Zheng/Xiang 2013: 163). However, this effort is primarily devoted to the reading stage rather than to the production phase.

Li (2015: 169-198) designed ‘a sight translation course for undergraduate T&I students’. He believed that applying sight translation for the purpose of pedagogy improved ‘trainees’ acquisition of interpreting skills’ to prepare them to start their translation market. Li (2015) adopted ‘course development model’ by Graves’ (2000) to elaborate on five key components of sight translation. The components are as follows:

(1) ‘context definition’ such as professional (e.g. community interpreting, court interpreting, business interpreting, and so on) and pedagogical contexts (e.g. consecutive and simultaneous interpreting),
(2) ‘articulation of beliefs’ (on the basis of the experience of the author in theoretical understanding of translation and interpreting),
(3) ‘content conceptualization’ (such as SiT competence divided into bilingual competence, cross-cultural communication, transfer competence, professionalism, strategic competence, and psychological competence, SiT skills, learning environment, and social context),
(4) ‘goals and objectives formulations’ (e.g. analytical reading, public speaking from scripts, sight paraphrasing, SiT with a time limit, and timed SiT), and
(5) ‘course organization’ (such as pedagogical and controlled exercises and real world/ open ended activities). (Li 2015: 180)

Last but not least, Nilsen and Monsrud (2015) developed ‘reading skills for sight translation in public sectors’. They suggested that it was necessary to re-configure assessment/evaluation and educational programs on the basis of reading skills. They investigated ‘public sector interpreters’ reading speed in Norwegian’ to show a specific need for training reading skills among public sectors. The results of their study revealed that approximately (70 %) of the participants did not have enough skills in decoding as one of the critical component of reading. They believed that the appropriate level of decoding in reading process was ‘the average decoding reading speed of an adult reader whose first language is Norwegian’ (Nilsen/Monsrud 2015).

2.2 The Criteria of Sight Translation

There has been only a few bodies of research evaluating the performance assessment of sight translation criteria (Riccardi 2002; Sawyer 2004), and 'professional certification' (Roberts 2000). Of the proposed quality assessment criteria, those of Schjoldager (1996), Pöchhacker (2001), Riccardi (2002) and Lee (2008) are the important ones for professional and students' interpreting performance. According to Schjoldager (1996: 191), there are four macro-criteria for evaluating the performance of students' interpreting such as 'comprehensibility and delivery', 'language', 'coherence and plausibility', and 'loyalty'. By the same token, Pöchhacker (2001: 413) proposes four criteria as: 'accurate rendition', 'adequate target language expression', 'equivalent intended effect', 'successful communicative interaction' ranging from 'accurate rendition', 'adequate target language expression' (lexico-semantic core) to 'equivalent intended effect', 'successful communicative interaction' (socio-pragmatic sphere of interaction). Riccardi (2002: 121-123) maintains seventeen micro-criteria to assess professional and students' interpreting performance involving 'phonological deviation', 'prosody deviation', 'production deviation', 'pauses', 'eye contact', 'posture and lexical deviation' (Lee 2008). Having this in mind, proposing such criteria is beneficial and complete; however, applying them in the course of test setting might be problematic. The criteria proposed by Schjoldager (1996) and Riccardi (2002) are useful for both 'didactic purposes' and formative assessment since none of them explains how to evaluate and translate the performance quality of interpreting into numerical values.

Lee (2008: 168) provides three core elements for assessing the quality of interpreting performance through 'accuracy', 'target language quality', and 'delivery'. Accuracy alludes to the precise reproduction of the source text into the target language. The term 'accuracy' is in line with 'equivalent intended effect' and 'accurate rendition' proposed by Pöchhacker (2001). Accuracy covers, firstly, 'the quality of faithfully conveying the message of the speech with semantic and pragmatic equivalence' illustrating the same precise meaning of the source language into the target one. Secondly, it scrutinizes the deviations of the source language which must be regarded on the basis of the effect on the coherence and precise/logical translation of the message. Consequently, the level of accuracy might be echoed through deviations such as 'addition', 'omission', and 'misinterpretations' of the speaker's purpose.

Target language quality refers to the quality of the translation in terms of 'linguistic correctness', 'naturalness', and 'contextual appropriateness of language' (Pöchhacker 2001). This criterion is similar to the 'adequate target language expressions' suggested by Pöchhacker (2001). Also, target language quality reflects deviations such as 'incorrect pronunciation', 'accent', 'stress', 'incorrect grammar', 'unidiomatic language', 'interference from the source language', and 'inappropriate language in the target culture and for the target audience'.

The last criterion is 'delivery' which can be evaluated regardless of the source language. It covers 'the quality of good public speaking', and 'successful communication'.

Like the previous criteria, it also mirrors deviations such as 'inarticulate speech', 'pauses', 'hesitations', 'false starts', 'fillers', 'irritating noise', 'repetition', 'excessive repairs or self-corrections', 'unconvincing voice quality and monotonous intonation', and 'irritatingly slow speech rate'. In this respect, delivery time alludes to the continuation of the target language production and smooth translation of the target language without hesitations, inarticulate speech, and false start (Lee 2008).

3 The Purpose of the Research

This research paper seeks to compare the performance of professional and student interpreters to identify the vital and applicable skills acquired by the professional interpreters doing sight translation, but not found in the output of student interpreters' sight translation. Also, this paper tries to test the performance of professional and student interpreters' sight translations on the basis of four criteria such as 'reading speed, delivery quality, accuracy in terms of minor and major errors, and the quality of target language expressions'. The reason for choosing such criteria is to identify the qualitative differences between the performance of professional and student interpreters' sight translations in classroom context. Due to the shortage of the state of the art on sight translation and the ways to teach this issue, this research paper provides a beneficial guide for both professional and student interpreters to contrive curricula contributing student interpreters to possess the professional skills of sight translation and reach professional excellence.

4 Methodology

4.1 Participants

This research paper seeks to test the performance of sight translation over the two types of participants; namely, student interpreters (10) and professional interpreters (4) taking part in this pilot study. They were asked to sight translate three texts into Persian (English to Persian) as their mother language. The student interpreters are all in the first and second year of Master of Arts in translation and interpreting at the University of Isfahan, Iran. Four student interpreters (ST1, ST2, ST5 and ST10) had studied and passed interpreting courses for one year and then practiced sight translation during their studying at the University of Isfahan. Other participants (ST3, ST4, ST6, ST7, ST8, and ST9) had finished the first year of MA in interpreting. Applying more participants wasn't possible since there were only a limited number of Persian student interpreters studying interpreting courses at the University of Isfahan. All professional interpreters (PRO1, PRO2, PRO3, and PRO4) were trained simultaneous, consecutive, and conference interpreting; however, their profiles such as taking part at various conferences, training institutions, and their professional competence and experience were different. Their professional excellence was in terms of the number of conference events and the number of years of

experience doing sight translation. Among four professional interpreters, PRO 3 and 4 took part in more than 350 conferences; however, PRO2 had constrained conference interpreting experience with less than 25 conferences. The individual differences between professional and student interpreters such as interpreting competence and interpreting experience may constitute some restrictions on the interpretation of the obtained data. According to Lamberger-Felber (2003), the differences between novice and professional interpreters in terms of experience, training, and various methods are 'inevitable' and differ even for those with similar profiles and backgrounds.

	Age Group	Professional Experience in Conference Interpreting
ST1	24-26	Not Assigned
ST2	24-26	Not Assigned
ST3	24-26	Not Assigned
ST4	24-26	Not Assigned
ST5	24-26	Not Assigned
ST6	24-26	Not Assigned
ST7	24-26	Not Assigned
ST8	24-26	Not Assigned
ST9	24-26	Not Assigned
ST10	24-26	Not Assigned
PRO1	35	3 Years
PRO2	29	1 Years
PRO3	41	7 Years
PRO4	49	10 Years

Table 1: Participants' Specifications

4.2 The Corpus of the Research

The participants in this research were asked to sight translate three English texts of one corpus 'Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action' (The International Agreement on the Nuclear Program of Iran) between Iran and P5+1 (China, United Kingdom, United States, Russia, France, and Germany) into Persian. These three texts elucidate 'Preamble and General Provision', 'Enrichment, Enrichment R&D, Stockpiles' and 'Sanctions'. The reasons to choose such political texts are mainly due to their technical language illustrating the socially significant phenomena and their terminologies and the tendency of Iranian universities to political texts (Gholami 2009). According to Huseynova, "vocabulary [terminology] of political texts has a heterogeneous composition. The most common layer is the general lexica-political area." (Huseynova 2015: 150). Also, the intended political texts surround the formulation of the core problem between Iran and 5+1, the determination of the goals (to remove sanctions), and the explanation of the available points of view (nuclear enrichment). And finally, such texts pave the ways for professional and student interpreters to become familiar with the ins and outs of political genre.

4.3 Procedure

The participants were trained on what to perform phase by phase. They were given five minutes to cover three texts of 500 words. Also, they could use pen or pencil to underline any difficult and unknown terminologies during the reading phase. The participants who could not finish reading the whole texts in the allotted time were requested to demarcate at which point they ended reading the source texts prior to sight translate. As soon as they completed sight translation of the three texts, they were requested to underline the parts they encountered with problems such as the expressions of the target language and the comprehension of the source language. In this respect, the underlined parts of the source texts indicated participants' difficulty and they were compared with the errors in their transcripts.

Every participant sight translated under the supervision of the researcher in Isfahan, Iran. The sight translations were recorded by an iPad (Rev digital voice recorder) and were then transcribed by the researcher. In order to evaluate the transcriptions more precisely, the researcher transcribed deviations, fillers, pauses, hesitations, repairs, false starts, self-corrections and the incorrect grammatical points. At the end, on the basis of errors' categorizations, they were counted to use for analyzing the obtained data. The performance of the participants' sight translations were evaluated through their 'reading speed, target language expressions', 'accuracy', and 'delivery quality' as proposed in section 3 (the purpose of this research paper) and some important strategies such as 'delaying response' and 'lexical and syntactic compressions' (section 5.5) to see which of them will serve as the effectual strategy(ies) to abridge the time of delivery and improve the quality of the target language or also to increase time delivery of their sight translations. With this idea, four raters were partaken in deciding the precision of the target language expressions and the problems which the participants might have encountered. Due to the scarcity of the number of Persian conference and political interpreters in Iran, the raters were selected from the University of Tehran and Ferdowsi, Iran, on the basis of their longstanding experience in political interpreting. In the upshot, the raters were also professional interpreters who had a record of participating in 500 conferences in Iran centering on political issues.

5 Results and Discussion

5.1 Reading Speed

According to Koda (2005), proficiency in reading requires utilizing 'cognitive' and 'other resources'. In sight translation, reading speed is not the absolute license to show the capability of an interpreter and it does not determine the quality of reading. However, reading speed is a good gauge illustrating reading skills. The difficulty of a text can be influenced by a number of factors such as conceptual difficulties, unknown terminologies, overall knowledge of a reader, and suprasentential factors in which terminology knowledge and the overall knowledge of a reader are regarded as the significant factors in

reading comprehension (Miller 2007). In sight translation, reading speed and comprehension can be tested through the accuracy of the translated texts.

The reading speed manifested a great discrepancy between the professional and student interpreters. ST2, ST3, ST4, ST6, ST7, ST8 and ST9 were unable to cover the whole three texts in the allotted time span (five minutes), while ST1, ST5, ST10, PRO1, PRO2, PRO3, and PRO4 were able to thoroughly cover and read whole texts. The professionals also expressed that they found extra time to let them think over some translational issues such as dilution, reduction, implicitation, generalization, and particularization. On the other hand, those students who hadn't been able to read the three texts completely, only covered a word count of 380-490 (Text 1) (74.05 word per minute), 425-495 (Text 2) (75.38 word per minute) and 393-487 (Text 3) (75.21 word per minute) during five minutes. In this respect, ST7 can be considered the least capable reader covering 380 words (Text 1), 400 words (Text 2), and 393 words (Text 3) of the 500 words in the allotted time. To put it in a nutshell, appropriate reading speed is associated with a good comprehension of a text preparing the situation to smooth the sight translation.

Identification	Text 1 (NWR)	Text 2 (NWR)	Text 3 (NWR)	Text 1 (ASR/wpm)	Text 2 (ASR/wpm)	Text 3 (ASR/wpm)
ST1	500	500	500	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more
ST2	417	450	428	70 wpm	75 wpm	72.7 wpm
ST3	389	400	420	65.3 wpm	67.3 wpm	71 wpm
ST4	448	433	430	74.9 wpm	73.7 wpm	73.20 wpm
ST5	500	500	500	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more
ST6	440	450	468	74 wpm	75 wpm	76.30 wpm
ST7	380	400	393	65 wpm	67 wpm	66.90 wpm
ST8	438	425	463	73.9 wpm	72 wpm	75.90 wpm
ST9	490	495	487	95.3 wpm	97.7 wpm	90.5 wpm
ST10	500	500	500	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more
PRO1	500	500	500	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more
PRO2	500	500	500	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more
PRO3	500	500	500	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more
PRO4	500	500	500	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more	100 wpm or more

Table 2: Reading Speed (ASR: Average Speed Reading, NWR: Number of Words Read and wpm: Word per Minute)

ST 3 and ST7 refused to cope with translating political contexts due to their prior lack of knowledge in political discourse. On balance, the reasons for reading slowly could be related to the difficulty of the given texts such as specialized terminologies and complex grammatical structures. Also, since English was not the first language of the participants,

therefore, their reading performance could not be comparable to their L1 (Persian) reading proficiency. Moreover, it can be concluded that reading for the sake of translating takes more time than reading for the sake of comprehending (Pym 2009). Davis and Bistodeu (1993) argue that successful readers may apply top down strategy concentrating on the meaning of the whole text (conceptual processing), whereas poor readers utilize bottom-up strategy focusing on the individual words (decoding) regardless of the whole message of the text (Koda 2005). To cut a long story short, table (2) demonstrates that the student interpreters comparing to the professionals need to advance their reading comprehension, strategies, and skills.

5.2 Delivery Time

As explained, delivery time alludes to the continuation of the target language production and smooth translation of the target language without hesitations, inarticulate speech, and false start. The following tables comprise the delivery time minute (DTM) of the translated text reproduction [Target Text Word (TTW)], the average delivery rate (ADR), fluency of the long pauses (FLP), frequency of the voiced pauses (FVP) such as 'uh' and 'um' and the applied repairs (RP) such as false starts, self-correction, repetition and so on. According to Marcias (2006), silent pauses refer to "any interruption in the flow of speech which is manifested in silent form."

Identification	DTM		TTW (Persian)	ADR (wpm)		FLP	FVP	RP
ST1	6.01		530	89 wpm		7	5	21
ST2	7.13		600	73.5 wpm		10	37	22
ST3	11.21		680	68 wpm		19	63	40
ST4	7.45	Avg.	550	81.4 wpm	Avg.	11	31	27
ST5	6.38	8.26	524	86.3 wpm	73.42	8	25	22
ST6	7.01		516	80 wpm		13	28	30
ST7	10.55		594	57.5 wpm		20	59	45
ST8	10.30		567	62.7 wpm		17	55	30
ST9	9.15		602	66.5 wpm		17	49	25
ST10	7.50		535	69.3 wpm		18	52	20
PRO1	6.14		490	90.4 wpm		2	30	11
PRO2	7.34	Avg.	503	83.5 wpm	Avg.	3	33	12
PRO3	5.02	5.75	460	103.7 wpm	97.05	1	7	9
PRO4	4.50		420	110.6 wpm		0	28	7

Table 3: The Specifications of the first Text

Identification	DTM		TTW (Persian)	ADR (wpm)		FLP	FVP	RP
ST1	6.03		525	87 wpm		9	15	18
ST2	7.45		615	75.3 wpm		15	42	15
ST3	11.55		658	79 wpm		14	59	33
ST4	8.10		651	85.6 wpm		13	42	37
ST5	6.05		513	85.4 wpm		11	31	26
ST6	7.03		570	92 wpm		15	35	29
ST7	11.30	Avg.	580	51.5 wpm	Avg.	18	61	41
ST8	10.50	8.32	683	52.5 wpm	77.23	15	57	37
ST9	9.20		587	74.5 wpm		16	51	33
ST10	6.10		600	89.5 wpm		19	59	16
PRO1	6.28		502	91.6 wpm		3	35	22
PRO2	8.14		571	86.5 wpm		7	38	18
PRO3	5.34	Avg.	468	105.4 wpm	Avg.	2	10	8
PRO4	4.58	6.08	415	115.2 wpm	99.67	0	30	2

Table 4: The Specifications of the Second Text

Identification	DTM		TTW (Persian)	ADR (wpm)		FLP	FVP	RP
ST1	6.28		538	88 wpm		14	20	20
ST2	7.58		650	78.4 wpm		19	38	16
ST3	12.51		666	93.5 wpm		17	55	37
ST4	8.38		659	86.4 wpm		15	44	39
ST5	6.47		533	81.4 wpm		14	38	30
ST6	7.13	Avg.	579	89.2 wpm	Avg.	18	36	34
ST7	12.30	8.79	591	61.7 wpm	84.32	19	58	44
ST8	11.50		702	95.5 wpm		16	59	41
ST9	9.38		623	78.5 wpm		19	59	38
ST10	6.41		618	90.6 wpm		22	65	25
PRO1	6.33		534	93.7 wpm		5	27	37
PRO2	8.02	Avg.	564	88 wpm	Avg.	8	40	23
PRO3	5.55	6.25	493	108.2 wpm	102.62	6	11	13
PRO4	5.13		402	120.6 wpm		1	36	5

Table 5: The Specifications of the Third Text

As tables (3), (4), and (5) illustrate, the average delivery time per minute of the student and professional interpreters for the three texts were 8.26 and 5.75, 8.32 and 6.08, and 8.79 and 6.25 respectively. ST1 and ST5 of the student interpreters' group reproduced the target language (Persian) almost quickly comparing to other student interpreters at 6.01 and 6.38 for the first text, 6.03 and 6.05 for the second text and 6.28 and 6.47 for

the third text being even quicker than PRO 1 and 2 at 6.14 and 7.34, 6.28 and 8.14 and 6.33 and 8.02 for the texts respectively. The delivery time per minute of ST1 and ST5 approached the average delivery time per minute of the professional category. But, the target texts of ST1 and ST5 underwent more deviations in the precision of target language expressions comparing to the professional group. With this in mind, the evaluation of the delivery time won't be the absolute condition for determining the quality of sight translated texts. Other factors and strategies such as accuracy, target language expressions, delaying response, lexical and syntactic compressions strategies influence the quality of sight translated target texts. As shown in these tables, the delivery time per minute of ST3, ST7, ST8, and ST9 transcended nine minutes. PRO3 and PRO4 were the only subjects finishing the three translations within six minutes. According to Lamberger-Felber (2003), 'intersubjective variability' is the remarkable trait even in the performance of professional interpreters of the same profiles. In professional interpreters' group, PRO2 made more frequent pauses (3, 7, and 8 times). Nevertheless, in the student interpreters' group, the number of frequent pauses are fluctuated between 7-20 for the first text, 9-19 for the second text, and 14-22 for the last text. In this direction, the prevalent frequent pauses were *æux* (in Persian), 'um', 'er', and 'ah'. However, ST6 and PRO3 for the first text and PRO1 and PRO3 for the last text used more repairs than other participants. By the same token, such negative correlation between the frequent pauses and repairs such as silent repairs can be found in Mead's study (2000).

Finally, the last category is labeled as repairs such as repetition, false start, self-correction, and slips of the tongue. For instance, the sentence *This JCPOA, reflecting a step-by-step approach, includes the reciprocal commitments as laid down in this document and the annexes hereto and is to be endorsed by the United Nations (UN) Security Council* sight translated by ST1 as *in bærĵām bāztābe jek færajænde [hæmegāni]/self-correction → gām be gām/ bude væ moštæmæl bær tækalife [Jek ĵānebe] /self-correction → motænāzer/ be næh've mondæræĵ dær in sænæd væ pejvæste āān mibāšæd ke qærār æst tævæsote šorāje ænmijæt morede tæeid qærār giræd.* Repairs were found when interpreters made self-corrections as observed in ST1's sight translation (twice). As another example, PRO2 made the following sight translation of the source sentence *[t]he full implementation of this JCPOA will ensure the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear program* as *eĵrāje kāmele in bærĵām mowĵebe howsule etminān æz māhijæte [solh āmize (2X)] bārnāmeje hæste'ie Iran xāhād šod*. Repairs were found when the interpreters made repetition two times as indicated in PRO2's sight translation. The reason to use such repetition was mainly due to the fact that the interpreter was thinking on the words ahead along with his translation to produce an acceptable sight translation. Repairs also appeared when the interpreters paused for a while either voiced or silent. For example, ST7 made the following sight translation:

> (Source language) *Transfers of funds between EU persons and entities, including financial institutions, and Iranian persons and entities, including financial institutions*
> (Target language) *[Um long pause] næql væ enteqālāte māli [um small pause] væ næhād'hāje oroupā'ei [silent pause] æz ĵom'le moæsesāte māli [silent pause], væ æšxās væ [silent pause] næhād'hāje Irāni æz ĵom'le [um small pause] moæsesāte māli.*

As observed, ST7 made long (long and small) and silent pauses during his sight translation since he was not fully aware of political texts as stated in section (5.1). Also, repairs with more frequency in cases that the interpreters made false start. For instance, ST3 made the following sight translation:

> (Source language) *Financial support for trade with Iran (export credit, guarantees or insurance)*
> (Target language) *[False-start→ Toĵār] - teĵāræt (trade) - bā Iran bājæd hemājæte māli šævād, (Eᶜtebāre [false-start → vāredāti] - saderāti(export)-tæzāmin, jā bimeh)*

As indicated, ST3 utilizes two times repair (false-start) [*toĵār <teĵāræt*] and [*vāredāti< saderāti*] in the target language which might be applied to level of anxiety in the participant. On the basis of professional interpreters' group, PRO4 made the fewest self-correction repairs through amending the false-starts, repetitions, fillers and so on. On the other hand, PRO1 made a great number of repairs in his sight translations (11, 22, and 37 times). According to student interpreters' group, ST7 utilized (45, 41, 44) repairs, while ST10 for the first and second texts made the fewest repairs comparing to others (20 and 16 times). To this end, I can conclude that the third text was more difficult than the second text and the second text was harder than the first one (see Tables. 3, 4, and 5).

5.3 Accuracy Errors

Accuracy alludes to the precise reproduction in the reciprocal text of the source text message. The level of accuracy may be mirrored through some deviations such as 'addition', 'omission', and 'misinterpretations' of the speaker's purpose. With this idea, accuracy errors were divided into two error groups such as major, and minor group based on their significance. Major errors allude to miscomprehension of the source language, the utilization of nonsense phrases, unacceptable structures, significant mistranslation and omission, unacceptable neologisms (Williams 2009). Minor errors refer to grammatical pauses, prepositional usage, over-personification, the problems of lexical choice, shifts in meaning, addition, ellipsis, ambiguity, and stylistic conventions.

ID	Minor Errors				Major Errors			
	TXT 1	TXT 2	TXT 3	Avg.	TXT 1	TXT 2	TXT 3	Avg.
ST1	4	6	6	5.33	5	5	7	5.67
ST2	6	7	9	7.33	8	8	9	8.33
ST3	6	6	8	6.66	7	7	8	7.33
ST4	8	8	9	8.33	9	8	9	8.67
ST5	5	5	6	5.33	5	6	7	6
ST6	7	6	8	7	7	9	10	8.67
ST7	9	10	10	9.66	11	10	11	10.67
ST8	8	8	10	8.66	8	9	12	9.67
ST9	7	8	8	8.33	8	9	11	9.33
ST10	5	5	6	5.33	6	6	7	6.33
PRO1	4	3	5	4	4	4	7	5
PRO2	6	7	7	6.66	5	7	7	6.33
PRO3	2	3	2	2.33	2	3	5	3.33
PRO4	2	1	2	1.66	0	2	5	2.33

Table 6: Minor and Major Errors by Rater 1

ID	Minor Errors				Major Errors			
	TXT 1	TXT 2	TXT 3	Avg.	TXT 1	TXT 2	TXT 3	Avg.
ST1	5	5	7	5.66	4	4	7	5
ST2	7	7	10	8	9	8	9	8.66
ST3	6	8	9	7.66	7	8	8	7.66
ST4	8	10	12	10	8	9	10	9
ST5	6	5	7	6	6	6	6	6
ST6	7	8	7	7.33	8	8	10	8.66
ST7	10	11	11	10.66	12	11	11	11.33
ST8	9	9	8	8.66	8	9	12	9
ST9	7	9	9	8.33	9	9	12	10
ST10	6	5	7	6	5	6	6	5.66
PRO1	4	5	7	5.33	4	4	6	4.66
PRO2	7	8	6	7.66	4	8	6	6
PRO3	2	2	4	2.66	2	2	4	2.66
PRO4	2	1	2	1.66	0	1	4	1.66

Table 7: Minor and Major Errors by Rater 2

ID	Minor Errors				Major Errors			
	TXT 1	TXT 2	TXT 3	Avg.	TXT 1	TXT 2	TXT 3	Avg.
ST1	4	5	6	5	4	4	4	4
ST2	6	6	11	7.66	10	8	9	9
ST3	6	7	8	7	7	7	7	7
ST4	8	9	11	9.33	9	10	10	9.66
ST5	6	5	6	5.66	7	6	5	6
ST6	7	7	7	7	9	8	9	8.66
ST7	11	10	10	10.33	11	10	10	10.33
ST8	10	9	9	9.33	9	9	10	9.33
ST9	8	8	9	8.33	11	9	10	10
ST10	5	5	6	5.33	6	6	5	5.66
PRO1	5	4	6	5	5	4	5	4.66
PRO2	7	7	6	6.66	3	7	7	5.66
PRO3	2	1	3	2	2	1	3	2
PRO4	1	1	1	1	0	2	3	1.66

Table 8: Minor and Major Errors by Rater 3

ID	Minor Errors				Major Errors			
	TXT 1	TXT 2	TXT 3	Avg.	TXT 1	TXT 2	TXT 3	Avg.
ST1	6	6	6	6	3	4	4	3.66
ST2	7	6	10	7.66	11	7	8	8.66
ST3	7	7	7	7	5	8	7	6.66
ST4	9	8	10	9	10	9	9	9.33
ST5	5	5	5	5	6	7	6	6.33
ST6	6	7	9	7.33	8	8	10	8.66
ST7	10	12	11	11	10	10	10	10
ST8	9	9	10	9.33	8	9	9	9.33
ST9	8	6	10	8	10	10	11	10.33
ST10	6	6	5	5.66	5	5	7	5.66
PRO1	4	5	6	5	4	4	4	4
PRO2	6	7	5	6	4	5	4	4.33
PRO3	1	1	4	2	1	1	1	1
PRO4	0	0	1	0.33	0	0	1	0.33

Table 9: Minor and Major Errors by Rater 4

The data maintained by the participants and the rater's results illustrated different degrees of accuracy as shown in table (6 to 9). Based on the raters' assessments, in student interpreters' group, ST1 made the fewest major errors comparing to the rest of the student interpreters' group, whereas ST7, ST8, and ST9 made the most major errors.

In like manner, the student group made far more major errors comparing to professional interpreters. On the basis of minor errors, ST1, ST5, and ST10 made the fewest errors, while ST4, ST7, ST8, and ST9 made the most accuracy minor errors. On balance, PRO4 made the fewest major and minor errors comparing to the total participants of this research. For instance, sentence (1) of the second text *Based on its long-term plan, for 15 years, Iran will carry out its uranium enrichment related activities, including safeguarded R&D exclusively in the Natanz Enrichment facility, keep its level of uranium enrichment at up to 3.67 %, and, at Fordow, refrain from any uranium enrichment and uranium enrichment R&D and from keeping any nuclear material* was the most complex sentence in terms of grammatical structures and terminologies to be sight translated since almost all of the participants failed to translate it accurately and smoothly. It is due to the fact that the stated underlined structures do not exist in Persian language and the interpreters need to break this long sentence into some small meaningful chunks to avoid being misinterpreted by the participants. To sight translate the following sentence, '*The United States will cease the application, and will continue to do so, in accordance with this JCPOA of the sanctions specified in Annex II to take effect simultaneously with the IAEA-verified implementation of the agreed nuclear related measures by Iran as specified in Annex V*, it is necessary for the interpreter to be familiar with political discourse and such terminologies like *Annex II* and *Annex V*. ST3 and ST7 could not sight translate the intended sentence into plain Persian as they were not familiar with these political terms and could not trace the overall context in their minds. Difficult terminologies, rhetorical complexities, and linguistic discrepancies can be nominated as instigators of the sources of error in this research paper. To sight translate the above sentence, PRO3 and PRO4 utilized lexical and syntactic compressions. For instance, PRO4 made the following translation: *ijālæte motæ'hede montæbeq bā in bærĵām eĵrāje tæhrim'hāje mošæxæs šode [lexical omission → Annex II] rā bā æsær bæxši hæmzæman bā eĵrāje eqdāmat tævāfoq šode mortæbet bā hæste'ei tævæsote Iran be næh've mošæxæs šode [lexical omission → Annex V] ke tævæsote æzhāns rāsti āzmāei šode bāšæd, [syntactic omission → will continue to do so] rā toqif misāzæd.*

With this in mind, the compression of lexical and syntactic choices is a responsive solution to improve the quality of delivery in sight translation. However, this strategy constitutes a great difficulty for the interpretability of the target language and also appends more processing efforts to the interpreter's shoulder.

5.4 The Quality of Target Language

The quality of target language refers to the quality of translation in terms of 'naturalness', 'contextual appropriateness of language' and 'correctness' (Lee 2008). The subcategories for target language quality include grammatical, phonological, morphological, syntactic structures as well as naturalness, register and style. In this direction, source language interference and the inappropriate selection of register in the target language for the target audience may negatively affect target language quality.

ID	No of Target Language Errors (Raters' Assessment)												
	T1	T1	T1	T1	T2	T2	T2	T2	T3	T3	T3	T3	Average
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R1	R2	R3	R4	R1	R2	R3	R4	
ST1	7	8	9	8	9	10	10	11	13	13	15	19	11
ST2	12	14	11	11	12	13	14	17	15	18	19	27	15.25
ST3	8	7	9	10	11	8	12	11	16	17	22	27	13.16
ST4	12	11	10	12	9	12	12	14	17	22	25	29	15.41
ST5	5	5	6	7	13	14	18	20	19	20	20	24	14.25
ST6	5	6	7	7	14	15	14	17	22	24	25	28	15.33
ST7	13	12	14	12	12	10	13	15	14	15	19	26	14.58
ST8	10	9	10	13	14	15	20	23	23	27	27	30	18.41
ST9	12	12	14	15	15	15	18	23	19	20	22	28	17.75
ST10	7	4	5	8	14	17	17	18	15	16	20	25	13.83
Pro1	1	2	2	3	2	2	3	5	3	5	3	8	3.25
Pro2	3	4	3	6	4	3	4	9	4	4	8	11	5.25
Pro3	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	3	1.75
Pro4	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1.25

Table 10: Target Language Errors

As stated, this study adopted four raters to assess the quality of target language expressions. Although the assessments of these raters were different, the average as shown in table (10) illustrates that student interpreters made far more target language errors comparing to the professional interpreters. Perhaps, the significant task of an interpreter is to synchronize reading and production in terms of coherence and linguistic features. However, some of the student interpreters corroborated that they did not pay attention to the target language expressions. For instance, ST9 made of the following sight translation of the sentence *Successful implementation of this JCPOA will enable Iran to fully enjoy its right to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes under the relevant articles of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in line with its obligations therein* as *eĵrāje in bærĵām in godræto be Iran midæhæd ke be towre kāmel hæqe xod bærāje enerzhie hæste'ei ĵæhæte mæqāsede solh āmiz rā tebqe mævāde zi'ræbt NPT [omission→ in line with its obligations therein] emāl nemjæd*. As observed, ST9 instead of translating the term *enable*, utilized the adjective *qodræt* completely unacceptable in the Persian translation since it connoted negatively. The term *enable* has a positive connotation in the Persian translation, however, the interpreter was unaware of the quality of target language expressions. Also, due to unfamiliarity with the ins and outs of the Persian language, ST9 avoided translating *in line with its obligations therein* and he would have preferred to omit this part from his translation. To take another instance, ST8 translated *The E3/EU+3 will refrain from imposing discriminatory regulatory and procedural requirements in lieu of the sanctions and restrictive measures covered by this JCPO*' as *gorouhe 5+1, æz tæhmile elzāmāte moqrærāti væ ājiene tæbᶜiez āmiz, be ĵāj'gozinije tæhrim'hā væ eqdāmate [left untranslated]*. He could not finish translating the

whole sentence. Such target language production errors are taking place when the synchronization of target language production and the reading of the source text are not effectively allocated. In other words, such situation will occur when the interpreter cannot monitor reading and production at the same time. On the basis of raters' assessments, unlike the professional group, the problems made by the student interpreters were logical problems. Professional interpreters perused the source text at faster pace and more profoundly and they were never restricted by the form of the source text unlike student interpreters. Student interpreters mostly tended to use one-to-one correspondence, transliteration, or literal translation (conduit strategy) comparing to professionals. This may be due to the fact that they did not allow to emancipate themselves from the limitations imposed by the source text. The professional interpreters outperformed the students in terms of the quality of target language expressions. Based on raters' assessments, PRO3 and PRO4 were the best interpreters in this research paper. The errors made by PRO1 and PRO2 were mainly due to the lexical choices, syntactic structures and subject-verb agreement. In addition, the major errors of student interpreters were literal translation, unfinished sentences, awkward translations as a result of stylistic conventions and structure of the source language, choice of correct adjectives and lexical choices.

5.5 Strategies Shortening and Increasing the Delivery Time in Sight Translation

This research paper tries to inspect the strategies shortening and increasing the delivery time on the basis of the available transcriptions. The strategies mostly used by the participants were *delaying response* and *lexical and syntactic compressions* effectively increasing and shortening their sight translating deliveries respectively.

5.5.1 Delaying Response

Some of the participants fully read the sentence to its end and then started sight translating. They mostly lost their time to sight translate the whole sentence simultaneously. This strategy also increased the delivery time while sight translating. This is a case for participants ST3, ST7 and ST8 who preferred to read the whole sentence without synchronizing the reading and production at the same time. For instance, ST8 paused to sight translate the following translation into six times (average: five seconds).

> (Source Text) *The E3+3 will submit a draft resolution to the UN Security Council endorsing this JCPOA affirming that conclusion of this JCPOA marks a fundamental shift in its consideration of this issue and expressing its desire to build a new relationship with Iran*
> (Target Text) *Gorouhe (5+1) piš nevise ghæ^{c}t nāme'ei tæeid konændeje in Bærĵām (2nd pause: 4 sec) rā bærāje tæsvib be šowrāje (3rd pause: 4 sec) æmnijæt erāe xāhæd kærd ke tæ'kid minemājæd ke en^{c}eqāde in Bærĵām nešāngære (4th pause: 5 sec) jek degærgounije bonjādin (5th pause: 5 sec) dær bæræsije in mozu^{c} tævæsote šowrāje ænmijæt bude (6th pause: 4 sec) væ tæmājole šowrā bærāje bærqærari jek rābeteje ĵædid bā Iran rā e^{c}lām minemājæd (1st pause the whole sentence: 10 sec)*

To take another example, ST7 made the following translation:

> (Source Text) *The UN Security Council resolution endorsing this JCPOA will terminate all provisions of previous UN Security Council resolutions on the Iranian nuclear issue - 1696 (2006), 1737 (2006), 1747 (2007), 1803 (2008), 1835 (2008), 1929 (2010) and 2224 (2015) – simultaneously with the IAEA-verified implementation of agreed nuclear-related measures by Iran and will establish specific restrictions, as specified in Annex V*
> (Target Text) *ghæ^{c}t nāmeje šowrāje æmnijæt Sāzmān Melæle Motæ'hed (2nd pause: 5 sec); ke Bærĵām rā tæeid xāhæd nemoud (3rd pause: 6 sec) tæmāme mæfāde ghæ^{c}t nāme'hāje qæbli šowrāje æmnijæt (4th pause: 3 sec) dær xosouse mozu^{c}e hæste'ei Iran, (5th pause: 2 sec) 1696 (2006), 1737 (2006) (6th pause: 3 sec), 1747 (2007) (7th pause: 2 sec), 1803 (2008) (8th pause: 3 sec), 1835 (2008) (9th pause: 2 sec), 1929 (2010) (10th pause: 2 sec) væ 2224 (2010) (11th pause: 1 sec) rā hæmzæmān bā eĵrāje eqdāmāte tævāfoq šodeje mortæbet bā hæste'ei tævæsote Iran ke æz souje āzhāns rāsti āzmāei šode, be næh've mošæxæs šode dær pejvæst pænĵ læqv xāhæd kærd (12th pause: 3 sec) væ mæh'doudijæt'hāje xāsi rā bærqærār xāhæd nemoud (1st pause of the whole sentence: 20 sec).*

ST7 besides adding some redundant information throughout his sight translation such as *Sāzmāne Melæle Motæ'hed, Tæeid xāhæd nemoud* and *ke æz souje āzhāns rāsti āzmāei šode* paused 12 times (average 4.33 sec). The most frequent pauses of this participant were related to the sight translation of the English numbers into the Persian since both languages have their own sequence of numberings.

5.5.2 Lexical and Syntactic Compressions

Lexical and syntactic compressions serve as an efficient and applicable strategy to lessen the time of delivery and improve the quality of target language expressions. This strategy can be considered as the overall 'rescue strategy' (Kohn/Kalina 1996) empowering the interpreter to interpret the target text faster and without uncurbed time lags. Adopting this strategy is possible when the interpreter or translator processes the information of the source text at macro-level, crossing out the irrelevant and excessive information and attaining smooth and precise style in the target text. To achieve this strategy, the interpreter can use some linguistic simplifications such as paraphrasing, restructuring and sentence splitting. The biggest cause of the problem of target language expressions may be due to interpreter's tendency to maintain a full translation through one-to-one correspondence (transliteration or literal translation). Lexical and syntactic compressions improve the performance of student and professional interpreters via shortening the time of delivery and attaining linguistic economy. PRO3 and PRO4 were the only participants using lexical and syntactic compressions throughout their sight translations. As a matter of fact, they have internalized lexical and syntactic compressions strategy. To see the result, translation of the following sentence by PRO4 and ST3 are illustrated below for comparison.

> (Source Text) *This UN Security Council resolution will also provide for the termination on Implementation Day of provisions imposed under previous resolutions; establishment of specific restrictions; and conclusion of consideration of the Iran nuclear issue by the UN Security Council 10 years after the Adoption Day* (44 words).

PRO4:

> (Target Text) *In ghæᶜt nāme, læqve tæmāmije mæfāde ghæᶜt nāmehāje qæbli šowrāje æmnijæt az ruze eĵrā; iĵāde bærxi mæhdoudijæt'hāje xās væ xātemeh bæræsi mozuᶜe hæste'ei Iran tævæsote šowrāje æmnijæt 10 sāl pæs az ruze tævāfoq Bærĵām rā Moqærær mikonæd* (38 words).

ST3:

> (Target Text) *Dær in rāstā, ghæᶜt nāmeje šowrāje æmnijæt Sāzmān Melæle Motæ'hed, hæmchenin bærkenarije hæmeje mævāde ghæᶜt nāmehāje pišin šowrāje æmnijæt Sāzmān Melæle Motæ'hed æz ruze ævæle bæzgošāei; iĵāde šomāri æz mæhdoudijæt'hāje xās væ etmāme bæræsi moušekāfāneh mæsāele hæste'ei Iran tævæsote šowrāje æmnijæt Sāzmān Melæle Motæ'hed 10 sāl bæᶜd æz ruze tævāfoq mozuᶜe hæste'ei Iran rā moqærær xāhæd nemoud* (57 words).

The comparison of the translations made by ST3 and PRO4 clarifies that ST3 sight translated word for word of the source text regardless of eliminating the unnecessary information. However, PRO4 concisely sight translated the main message of the source sentence into plain Persian with fewer words (38 words) through eliminating redundant and ancillary information. He mostly used lexical compressions to transfer the overall message of the text. To be precise, he omitted the term *UN Security Council* since he had sight translated the intended term for the audience. However, ST3 sight translated this term three times which were mostly redundant. Also ST3, whether it was intentionally or not, added some irrelevant phrases to his sight translation such as '*dær in rāstā*, (in this direction) *bæræsi mu'šekāfāneh* (meticulously inspection) *tævāfoqe hæste'ei Iran* (Iran nuclear Agreement). This may be due to excessive sentence segmentations which increase the production effort (Gile 1995) and correspondingly cause production problems. These number of excessive segmentations made by ST3 may be originated from memory capacity and reading time. If ST3 could be able to cover (scan) the whole sentence in terms of significant information while perusing the next piece of information, he may have selected various units of translation.

6 Conclusion

The present research sought to examine the qualitative differences between student and professional interpreters' performance in terms of reading speed, the time of delivery, accuracy and the quality of target language through intersubjective variability. In this direction, most of student interpreters' performance fell short comparing to the professional group in terms of reading speed, accuracy, and the quality of target language. However, on the basis of delivery time, some of the student interpreters such as ST1, ST5 and ST10 outperformed professionals. In this research, PRO3 and PRO4 were the only participants illustrating a significant performance in all mentioned criteria. Professional interpreters made fewest major errors in terms of accuracy and their target language errors were mostly related to the minor inaccuracies of grammatical structures. According to table (10), student interpreters could not synchronize production and

reading at the same time since they made the majority of target errors originating from lack of knowledge, unfamiliarity with different genres and lack of skills of translation. The long delivery time of student interpreters were related to their inclination for word-for-word (literal translation). They were mostly unable to utilize syntactic and semantic compressions to make their sight translations short and also lessen the time of delivery.

Limitation of the Present Research

The present research was set up to introduce some of the important sight translation skills, however, it didn't inspect the nexus between the preparatory translation and the performance of sight translation and also didn't examine the effects of different preparation activities on the sight translation performance. With this in mind, more efforts are needed to set up the teaching curricula on the area of sight translation to make student interpreters professional. Also, more research is needed to inspect various and applicable strategies capable of being operated in sight translation training i.e. strategies which shorten the time of delivery and improve the quality of target language expressions.

References

Agrifoglio, Marjorie (2004): "Sight Translation and Interpreting: A Comparative Analysis of Constraints and Failures." *Interpreting* 6 [1]: 43-67

Chmiel, Agnieszka; Iwona Mazur (2013): "Eye Tracking Sight Translation Performed by Trainee Interpreters." Catherine Way, Sonia Vandepitte, Reine Meylaerts, Magdalena Bartłomiejczyk (eds): *Tracks and Treks in Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 189-205

Davis, James N; Linda Bistodeau (1993): "How Do L1 and L2 Reading Differ? Evidence from Think Aloud Protocols." *The Modern Language Journal* 77 [4]: 459-472

Dragsted, Barbara; Inge G. Hansen (2007): "Speaking Your Translation: Exploiting Synergies between Translation and Interpreting." Franz Pöchhacker, Arnt Lykke Jakobsen, Inger M. Mees (eds): *Interpreting Studies and Beyond*. (Copenhagen Studies in Language 35.) Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur, 251-274

Donovan-Cagigos, Clare (1990): *La Fidélité en interprétation*. Lille: A.N.R.T.

Gholami, Mahvash (2009): "Translation of Political Texts in Mass Media." *Translation Studies Journal* 7 [25]: 11-28

Gile, Daniel (1995): *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins

Graves, Kathleen (2000): *Designing Language Courses: A Guide for Teachers*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle

Huseynova, Sevil (2015): "Lexical Analysis of Political Texts on International Relations." *International Journal of English Linguistics* 5 [3]: 148-153

Ilg, Gerard; Sylvie Lambert (1996): "Teaching Consecutive Interpreting." *Interpreting* 1 [1]: 69-99

Koda, Keiko (2005): *Insight into Second Language Reading: A Cross-linguistic Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Kohn, Kurt; Sylvia Kalina (1996): "The Strategic Dimension of Interpreting." *Meta* 41 [1]: 118-138

Lamberger-Felber, Heike (2003): "Performance Variability among Conference Interpreters: Examples from a Case Study." Angela Collados Aís, Manuela Fernández Sánchez, Daniel Gile (eds): *La Evalución de la Calidad en Interpretación: Investigación*. Granada: Comares, 147-168

Lambert, Sylvie (2004): "Shared Attention during Sight Translation, Sight Interpretation, and Simultaneous Interpretation" *Meta*: 49 [2]: 294-306

Lee, Jieun (2008): "Rating Scales for Interpreting Performance Assessment." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 2 [2]: 165-184

Lee, Jieun (2012): "What Skills Do Student Interpreters Need to Learn in Sight Translation Training?" *Meta* 57 [3]: 694-714

Li, Xiangdong (2015): "Designing a Sight Translation Course for Undergraduate T&I Students." *RESLA* 28 [1]: 169-198

Marcias, Macarena (2006): "Probing Quality Criteria in Simultaneous Interpreting." *Interpreting* 8 [1]: 25-43

Martin, Ann (1993): "Teaching Sight Translation of Future Interpreters." Catriona Picken (ed.): *Translation: The Vital Link*. London: Institute of Translation and Interpreting, 398-405

Mead, Peter (2000): "Control of Pauses by Trainee Interpreters in their A and B Languages." *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 10: 88-102

Miller, Paul W. (2007): "Reading Comprehension, Vocabulary, and Background Knowledge: A Case Study." Jan Engberg, Marianne Grove Ditlevsen, Peter Kastberg, Martin Stegu (eds.): *New Directions in LSP Teaching*. Bern: Lang, 141-161

Nilsen, Anne Birgitta; May Britt Monsrud (2015): "Reading Skills for Sight Translation in Public Sector Services." *The International Journal for Translation and Interpreting Research* 7 [3]: 10-20

Pöchhacker, Franz (2001): "Quality Assessment in Conference and Community." *Meta* 46 (2): 410-425

Pöchhacker, Franz (2016): *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge

Pym, Anthony (2009): "Translator Training" – http:///www.tinet.cat/~apym/on-line/training/2009_translator_training.pdf (01.09.2010)

trans-kom **ISSN 1867-4844**

trans-kom ist eine wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für Translation und Fachkommunikation.

trans-kom veröffentlicht Forschungsergebnisse und wissenschaftliche Diskussionsbeiträge zu Themen des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens, der Fachkommunikation, der Technikkommunikation, der Fachsprachen, der Terminologie und verwandter Gebiete.

Beiträge können in deutscher, englischer, französischer oder spanischer Sprache eingereicht werden. Sie müssen nach den Publikationsrichtlinien der Zeitschrift gestaltet sein. Diese Richtlinien können von der **trans-kom**-Website heruntergeladen werden. Alle Beiträge werden vor der Veröffentlichung anonym begutachtet.

trans-kom wird ausschließlich im Internet publiziert: http://www.trans-kom.eu

Riccardi, Alessandra (2002): "Evaluation in Interpretation: Macrocriteria and Microcriteria." Eva Hung (ed.): *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 4: Building Bridges*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins, 115-126

Roberts, Roda P. (2000): "Interpreter Assessment Tools for Different Settings." Roda P. Roberts, Silvana E. Carr, Diana Abraham, Aideen Dufour (eds): *Critical Link 2.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins, 103-130

Sawyer, David (2004): *Fundamental Aspects of Interpreter Education: Curriculum and Assessment*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins

Schjoldager, Anne (1996): "Assessment of Simultaneous Interpreting." Cay Dollerup, Vibeke Appel (eds.): *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 3: New Horizons*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 187-195

Seleskovitch, Danica (1975): *Langages, langues et mémoire*. Paris: Minard Lettres Modernes

Setton, Robin; Manuela Motta (2007): "Syntacrobatics: Quality and Reformulation in Simultaneous-with-text." *Interpreting* 9: 199-230

Song, Zhongwei (2010): "Skill Transfer from Sight Translation to Simultaneous Interpreting: A Case Study of an Effective Teaching Technique." *International Journal of Interpreter Education* 2: 120-134

Timarová, Šárka; Ivana Čeňková, Reine Meylaerts, Erik Hertog, Arnaud Szmalec, Wouter Duyck (2014): "Simultaneous Interpreting and Working Memory Executive Control.' *Interpreting 1*6 [2]: 139-168

Viaggio, Sergio (1995): "The Praise of Sight Translation (and Squeezing the Last Drop Thereout of)." *The Interpreter's Newsletter* 6: 33-42

Viezzi, Maurizio (1989): "Information Retention as a Parameter for the Comparison of Sight Translation and Simultaneous Interpretation: An Experimental Study." *The Interpreters' Newsletter* 2: 65-69

Weber, Wilhelm K. (1990): "The Importance of Sight Translation in an Interpreter Training Program." David Brown; Margareta Bowen (eds): *Interpreting: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow*. Amsterdam: Benjamins

Williams, Malcolm (2004): *Translation Quality Assessment: An Argumentation-centered Approach*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press

Zheng, Binghan; Xia Xiang (2013): "Processing Metaphorical Expressions in Sight Translation: An Empirical-Experimental Research." *Babel* 59 [2]: 160-183

Author

Alireza Akbari is a PhD researcher of Translation and Technology at KU Leuven, Belgium. He has published several papers on translation studies and applied linguistics in the most prestigious journals (e.g. SAGE Publications and De Gruyter Mouton). Also, he has participated in various significant Translation and Interpreting conferences such as CIUTI Forum. He is now writing his PhD dissertation under the supervision of Prof. dr. Winibert Segers about 'Translation Evaluation Product of Political Translation through Holistic, Analytic, Calibration of Dichotomous Items and Preselected Items Evaluation Methods'. His main interests lie in the areas of translation evaluation products, theories of translation, legal translation, and sight translation.
E-mail: Alireza.akbari@kuleuven.be

Neu bei Frank & Timme

TransÜD. Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens

Herausgegeben von
Prof. Dr. Klaus-Dieter Baumann,
Dr. Susanne Hagemann,
Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Hartwig Kalverkämper,
Prof. Dr. Klaus Schubert

Andreas F. Kelletat/Aleksey Tashinskiy/
Julija Boguna (Hg.): **Übersetzerforschung.**
Neue Beiträge zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte des Übersetzens.
ISBN 978-3-7329-0234-7

Daniela Eichmeyer: **Luftqualität in Dolmetschkabinen als Einflussfaktor auf die Dolmetschqualität.** Interdisziplinäre Erkenntnisse und translationspraktische Konsequenzen.
ISBN 978-3-7329-0362-7

TTT: Transkulturalität – Translation – Transfer

Herausgegeben von
Prof. Dr. Dörte Andres, Dr. Martina Behr,
Prof. Dr. Larisa Schippel,
Dr. Cornelia Zwischenberger

Barbara den Ouden: **Translation und Emotion: Untersuchung einer besonderen Komponente des Dolmetschens.** ISBN 978-3-7329-0304-7

Larisa Schippel/Cornelia Zwischenberger (eds.):
Going East: Discovering New and Alternative Traditions in Translation Studies.
ISBN 978-3-7329-0335-1

Dörte Andres/Klaus Kaindl/Ingrid Kurz (Hg.):
Dolmetscherinnen und Dolmetscher im Netz der Macht. Autobiographisch konstruierte Lebenswege in autoritären Regimen.
ISBN 978-3-7329-0336-8

FFF: Forum für Fachsprachen-Forschung

Herausgegeben von
Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Hartwig Kalverkämper

Katja Klammer: **Denkstile in der Fachkommunikation der Technik- und Sozialwissenschaften.** Fakten und Kontraste im Deutschen und Englischen. ISBN 978-3-7329-0355-9

Fabian Fahlbusch: **Unternehmensnamen.** Entwicklung – Gestaltung – Wirkung – Verwendung. ISBN 978-3-7329-0202-6

Frank & Timme
Verlag für wissenschaftliche Literatur

Wittelsbacherstraße 27a, D-10707 Berlin
Telefon (030) 88 66 79 11, Fax (030) 88 39 87 31
info@frank-timme.de, www.frank-timme.de