

Session 1: Summary of the discussion

The following points were discussed:

The translation profession in the United Kingdom in 1986 — new developments. Catriona Picken

—Which criteria are ITI going to use for membership since these have not yet been decided upon? How are you ensuring the quality of membership? (Val Butterfield, Staines)

—What type of association is it to be? Is it an international association?

Answer: ITI intends to make its membership categories and requirements known at its first annual conference next May. It sees itself as far more than a trade association, and its aim is to bring together for their mutual benefit all the professions involved in any aspect of translation. Membership categories are to be worked out accordingly.

Four eyes are better than two. Peter Arthern

—From the floor: The use of statistical methods for assessing revision quality is absolutely essential. Peter Arthern was well aware of this and welcomed any suggestions from statisticians.

—Dr Vasconcellos questioned the weighting of the categories of reviser intervention which Peter Arthern was using to obtain a score for the individual quality of revisers' work. The categories were as follows, from negative to positive intervention:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| Substantive error left or introduced | (X) |
| Formal error left or introduced | (F) |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Unnecessary intervention | (U) |
| Necessary correction or improvement in readability | (C) |

She argued that the (U) category might possibly be the subject of training and that it should perhaps not be given such weight in the comparative assessment of revisers in a translation department.

—From the floor: Is revision itself too subjective, i.e. should it, in turn, be revised?

—John Kearey (Shell, The Hague) and Jacques Bodin (Union technique de l'Electricité): Is it possible to assess how much time is spent on revision, as it is an important economic factor?

—This led Jean Datta to raise the question of expense: Four eyes are more expensive than two! To what extent is revision cost-effective and would not many documents be better left untouched, particularly as all revisers introduced unnecessary changes to a varied extent. Also, should the reviser not be as responsible for his or her work as the translator is?

—Therefore, the status of the reviser was questioned: Should he or she be paid more than a translator?

—Peter Arthern: What is the difference between revising and post-editing, and will the growing use of MT bring about a new profession?

—Geoffrey Kingscott: Should the reviser be TL mother tongue or SL mother tongue?

—Muriel Vasconcellos: Should we not be reducing correction costs?

Continuing training for the language professions. Tony Hartley

—Mr Derry Cook-Radmore (European Space Agency): Should we not integrate revision with training? Also, revision on a word processor presented a problem in that any amendments on screen could not be distinguished from the translator's version in the same way as was achieved on paper by the use of red ink.

—Mrs Barbara Wilson, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London, suggested an ad hoc method. The reviser could use a printout of the translator's work and put a cross in the margin where an amendment had been made.

RAPPORTEUR

Guyonne Proudlock, freelance translator and research student, 73 Wavendon Avenue, London W4 4NT, UK.