

ABBREVIATED TEST MODELS

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE, CONSORTIUM FOR STATE COURT INTERPRETER CERTIFICATION

Voting Members:

Robert Joe Lee, Chair, New Jersey
Helen Boddy, Minnesota
Brian Lynch, Florida
Maribel Pintado-Espiet, Massachusetts
Joseph Wong, California

Non-voting Members:

Lois Feuerle, Oregon
Tammy Quinn, Colorado
Wanda Romberger, Florida

October 15, 2001

INTRODUCTION

The Consortium is faced with a dilemma: while in theory it is desirable to write a standard performance test (i.e., two sight components [one in each direction], consecutive, and simultaneous [hereinafter referred to as the "standard model"]) to certify court interpreters in all languages desired by member states, the reality is that this is not presently and probably never will be feasible. According to ETHNOLOGUE, the most widely acclaimed listing of the world's languages, there are approximately 6,500 languages spoken in today's world, not counting dialects. While most of these languages are not yet spoken either at all or by large numbers of persons residing in the United States, the number of languages spoken in member and non-member states alike is increasing.

At the November 2000 annual Consortium meeting, the historic practice o/f choosing additional languages for which to write new tests pursuant to section 5.2 of the Agreements broke down for the first time. With the admission of numerous new states since 1999, growth to well over twenty states, and the fact that the most common languages shared among member states have already been addressed, the Consortium was not able to choose a single new language in which to write a first test. The cost of adding a new language to the Consortium's test bank is \$25-35,000. That figure includes around \$15,000 for a first test in a new language plus another \$10-15,000 for a second test in that language required per section 5.5 of the agreements. It also includes the costs of developing a bilingual glossary of legal terms since the Consortium has established a policy that requires the development of a bilingual glossary of legal terms in any language for which a test is being developed but for which no such glossary exists. Such costs are easy to justify for languages like Spanish which almost all states need, but are much harder to justify when only one or perhaps even a few member states need a test in a given language

Cost-benefit considerations are not the only concern. When state judiciaries do not develop testing mechanisms in all languages spoken by parties, witnesses, and others appearing in the courts, the interpreters who work in those languages suffer from second class citizenship. They do not benefit from the professionalization that interpreters who work in languages that are tested enjoy. This includes lack of both professional recognition (they are often labeled by terms such as "otherwise qualified") and professional treatment (they are often paid substantially less than "fully" certified interpreters).

A third concern is that the state judiciaries make two different standards available to the constituents they serve. Litigants who speak certain languages--usually the ones spoken by large numbers of individuals--are afforded a professional and legally sufficient standard of service. However, litigants who speak other languages--usually the ones spoken by small numbers of individuals--receive interpreters whose competence is unverified and widely suspected of being significantly inferior. In light of the states' experience with testing, the odds are that around 85-90% of the interpreters functioning in any language for which testing is not yet available really cannot perform the various modes of interpretation accurately and faithfully. This causes great concern for court managers who try to abide by fundamental concepts of equal protection under the law and equal access.

So what choices does the Consortium have? Is the Consortium left with a glacier-like rate of progress, adding only one or two new languages a year or every other year, or is there an alternative? Could an alternative test model be an acceptable solution? What is the best approach for developing one or more abbreviated models? Equally important, how should the Consortium determine when the standard model is to be followed and when any abbreviated model should be selected? The Technical Committee undertook as a priority project an exploration of alternative test models and how they might work. This report outlines the committee's findings and recommendations.

PURPOSE OF CERTIFICATION TESTING

It is important to keep in mind the purpose of writing and administering certification tests for court interpreters. The purpose of such tests is to identify persons who can demonstrate that they can accurately and faithfully perform the duties of a court interpreter. Historically, the Judicial Branch has had to depend on persons whose interpreting skills were based on reputation, experience, training, or other variables excluding performance testing. Experience has shown that only a valid and reliable test can identify persons who can really perform the duties required of court interpreters. We also have learned that not just any test will do; rather, the test must be a valid and reliable measure of the actual nature of the work performed.

So any test that can weed out people who cannot demonstrate ability to perform at least some of the highly sophisticated modes of interpreting would be welcome. The reason is that, without such a test, experience has taught us that many people can pass a written test that measures of possession of relevant knowledge, but that such knowledge cannot even predict professional ability, even when combined with experience. It is better to know for sure that an interpreter can perform even one mode of interpreting, than not to know it.

POSSIBLE MODELS

Introduction

The Technical Committee identified three basic principles to guide its review of possible models and ultimate recommendation. Any model the Consortium ultimately adopts should:

1. Include at least the simultaneous mode as it may be the most important mode of interpreting and it is the mode that is the least accessible to public scrutiny, e.g., by bilingual attorneys, judges, and other interpreters (see Appendix A for supporting statistics).
2. Predict ability to perform as many modes of interpreting as possible which are not directly included in the model (see the various tables in Appendix B for data on this issue);
3. Be easy and cost effective to both develop and administer;

The Technical Committee drew on the collective experience of its members to identify every possible model they knew of or could imagine. The first model discussed below is the only one that has been developed and used. Its origins and use are fully described in the next section, together with the committee's assessment of its strengths. Only two other models were identified, neither of which has been implemented anywhere to the committee's knowledge.

Model A: Simultaneous Plus Foreign-Language-to-English Sight

The first model considered by the Committee arose out of discussions held in the early years of the Consortium between New Jersey and Washington. The basic idea was that an abbreviated model should demonstrate some production in both languages of the test: some interpreting into English and some interpreting into the other language. This concern arose out of Washington's experience with so many speakers of several Asian languages whose pronunciation of English was extremely difficult or impossible for native English speakers in American courtrooms to understand.

In view of those discussions, the New Jersey Administrative Office of the Courts [hereinafter "NJAOOC"] undertook to test out this model and has since developed tests following this model in German (developed in 1998) and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (developed in 1999 [shortened herein to "Serbian"]). In each case, two expert linguists were identified to develop and grade the exams. For German, the consultants were **Dr. Lois Feuerle**, a practicing interpreter/translator based in New York City with a Ph.D. in German; and **Dr. Barbara Mozdierz**, a native speaker of German with a degree in interpretation, as well as a Ph.D. in Slavic languages, who had previously helped develop court interpreter examinations for Polish and Russian. For Serbian, the experts were **Branka Bogetic**, a native speaker of the languages and a practicing interpreter/translator and teacher of the languages for the U.S. Department of State, and **Dr. Barbara Mozdierz**.

In both cases, an existing simultaneous text produced by the Consortium was used as the base text for the simultaneous and an indigenous legal document in the second language was located. Both were adapted to meet the Consortium's standards for the nature of the source text and distribution of scoring units. The overall distribution of scoring units per the Test Construction Manual was followed.

This model includes another feature that New Jersey introduced when it bifurcated all testing under the standard model into two phases. Whereas all three parts of the standard model were originally given to all examinees at the same time, New Jersey ultimately began giving the simultaneous exam as a qualifying exam and the sight and consecutive components only to those who reached an appropriate score on the qualifying exam. In any case, New Jersey added **a conversational piece** designed to get candidates to speak extemporaneously. The primary purpose was to have some basis for assessing English proficiency when the simultaneous includes only English-to-foreign language production. A secondary reason was to have candidates engage in some production of both languages outside of an interpreting modality so their natural fluency and pronunciation could be

evaluated together with any production that occurred while interpreting.

The conversational segment consists of asking each candidate to answer two questions to be answered in English and one to be answered in the other language of the test. The questions are designed to give examinees sufficient opportunity to speak extemporaneously but briefly on subjects they are familiar with and in a manner that hopefully has a side benefit of helping candidates ease into the testing modality and reduce test anxiety. The aim is to have the examinee speak for up to about two minutes in English and perhaps one minute in the second language.

The first question asks the examinee to give two or three reasons for having chosen to become a court interpreter. When an examinee is particularly talkative and has spoken a lot of English before the proctor is scheduled to ask these formal questions, the second question to be answered in English is sometimes not asked. The second question asks for a brief summary of the candidate's use of the English language: how the candidate first learned the language, what formal education the candidate has obtained in the language, and what the candidate does today to preserve and enhance the ability to speak and understand English. The last question, to be answered in the other language, is the same as the second question to be answered in English, except to be answered in and with respect to the second language instead.

The assessment raters make of fluency and pronunciation¹ in both languages is made on the basis of language production from both the conversational piece and the interpreting segment of the test. This is administered only at the qualifying stage of standard model exams and not when examinees return for sight and consecutive. In the abbreviated model for German and Serbian, the whole exam is administered at the same time: foreign language-to-English sight interpretation, English-to-foreign language simultaneous, and the conversational component.

This model has the following strengths:

1. All types of scoring units are included.
2. Interaction between the two languages is measured, particularly language interference peculiar to the two languages, but also specific features in other categories of scoring units that may be a function of linguistic structure or lexicon that are often tested (especially in the area of grammar and verbs).
3. The interpreter can be evaluated for producing speech in both languages since the interpreter is interpreting into both languages. That assessment is stronger since it is based on speech production of both languages in both an interpreting and a non-interpreting context.
4. As there is no English-to-foreign-language sight or consecutive component, the test is easier and less expensive to develop and easier to administer than the tests that follow the standard model.

¹The New Jersey test program is different from the Consortium model in that these assessments of language proficiency consider only fluency and pronunciation and do NOT include criteria that the Consortium test model includes, namely, vocabulary and grammar.

New Jersey advises persons applying to take a German or Serbian abbreviated test that their results are *provisional* until such time that a test per the standard model is developed, if ever. Accordingly, they are treated as if they are fully "approved" (New Jersey does not yet "certify" interpreters) so far as utilization and compensation are concerned. Hence, should New Jersey (or the Consortium) conclude that it is possible or essential to develop the remaining parts of the test, approved interpreters understand they will have to take and pass English-to-foreign language sight and consecutive at that time to maintain their approval status.

The results of the tests through September 2001 are as follows:

German:

1. 9 persons tested
2. No passes
3. 2 conditionally approved and 2 eligible unapproved courts (below "approved," New Jersey has two other categories of outcome in order to increase resources when the supply of interpreters for a given language is inadequate to meet the Judiciary's needs: *conditionally approved* [scores in each part above 50 with an overall average of at least 60] and *eligible unapproved* [all scores are in the vicinity of 50 or higher])

Serbian:

1. 3 persons tested (including two who have worked for well over twenty years each and have "outstanding reputations")
2. All failed
3. No one has reached any level that New Jersey recognizes for being able to work in the New Jersey courts.

Both tests are proctored by NJAOC staff and mailed to the examiners to be graded. Each examiner grades the tests independently first and then shares the preliminary results by e-mail. After that interaction, they agree on all scoring units to be counted wrong as well as the scoring of the non keyword assessments. The official scoring sheet is mailed to the first examiner, who signs it and mails it on to the second examiner; the second examiner then returns it to the NJAOC. When the grading process is complete, the lead examiner sends the final official results in to the NJAOC and the results are placed on the official scoring sheet by NJAOC staff which is then sent to the examinee.

No problems with this process have been identified by any of the linguists involved or the NJAOC. All participants in using the model agree that it meets the purposes of certification testing.

Model B1: Simultaneous Only, Language Specific

Model B1 includes simultaneous only. Under this model, a consortium simultaneous base text would be taken as the base text for a test. Just as with the standard model and Model

A, that base text would be adapted to include consideration of whatever interactions may be appropriate between English and the other language. Not only would highly specialized issues represented by the language interference class of scoring units be included; considerations of how the source language might affect the target language would be included in other types of scoring units (especially grammar/verbs). This model would also include either New Jersey's conversational component or something developed by the Consortium that accomplishes the same goal.

The anticipated advantages of this model are as follows:

1. It is less costly to develop, administer, and grade than either the standard model or Model A. One should not underestimate how difficult and challenging it can be to find a suitable foreign language text for the sight portion, or how much balancing is required to ensure the appropriate distribution of scoring units over more than one test component.
2. It is still an exam that includes interactive features between the two languages, even though there is no production into English.
3. It provides for the assessment of ability to speak the English language.

Model B2: Simultaneous, Language Neutral

This model is the same as Model B1 in that the only mode of interpreting tested is simultaneous. However, it is distinguished from Model B1 insofar as there would be no attempt to include or account for any specific interaction between English and the other language of the test. This means that one whole category of scoring units, "False Cognates/Interference/Literalism," would be eliminated. It also means that no other categories of scoring units would incorporate any interactive linguistic features, e.g., a verb form in the target language that one is trying to test for when interpreting from English to a specific target language. This model would still incorporate the conversational piece described above to have additional data for assessing fluency and pronunciation of both English and the other language.

The anticipated advantages of this model are:

1. This is by far the least expensive model to develop and administer. Probably any existing Consortium simultaneous test could be taken and revised to include the appropriate distribution of scoring units, a process that should be rather simple and inexpensive compared to the normal process for developing a new test. All that is left to do to have a test ready is to recruit and train examiners who will develop the dictionary of acceptable and unacceptable renderings and do the grading.
2. This test could be even administered before there is an assembled team of raters ***since it could be proctored to any interpreter of ANY language.***

The Committee has identified and discussed one concern that some members of the Consortium who were not involved in the Committee's discussions might present. As indicated above, there would be no scoring units from the category, "False

Cognates/Interference/Literalism” in this model. Some observers might wonder what impact the removal of that category of scoring units might have on test outcomes. In order to review that issue, the committee reviewed data from 149 examinees who had passed tests in six different languages administered in New Jersey. The Committee also obtained data for any examinees who had actually failed one of those tests but would have passed it if the Language Interference scoring units had not been included.

The data, which are reported in Appendix C, revealed that all but three of the 149 examinees who passed with all scoring units included in the score would have passed whether the scoring units within the Language Interference category were included or not. In addition, the data analysis revealed that another six examinees would have passed instead of failing. The Technical Committee concludes that the advantages this model offers outweigh the small number of false negatives and false positives.

RECOMMENDATION #1

The Consortium should adopt Abbreviated Test Model B2 as the model it will follow for abbreviated tests.

RECOMMENDED PROCEDURE FOR DEVELOPING ABBREVIATED TESTS

The Technical Committee has concluded that the model that best suits the Consortium’s needs and resources is Model B2, “Simultaneous, Language Neutral.” In order to produce tests under this model, the Committee assumes that the following features of the Consortium’s test development policy will be followed when developing abbreviated tests:

1. Process of selecting base documents articulated in §2.0 of the Test Construction Manual;
2. Overall distribution of scoring units identified in §5.0 of the Test Construction Manual;
3. As many of the other provisions of the Test Construction Manual as possible, noting on the record of the test development process any provisions that were not followed and the reasons therefor; and
4. Production of a dictionary of acceptable and unacceptable renderings which is dynamic throughout a test’s life.

In addition, the Committee assumes further that the Consortium’s policy that a bilingual glossary will be developed in languages for which one does not already exist will be followed. However, the Committee concluded that this standing requirement be modified so that the glossary developed for any language to be tested by an abbreviated exam include only a subset of all of the items in the glossary.

RECOMMENDATION #2

A subset of terms in the standard glossary should constitute the basis for developing bilingual glossaries of legal terms when applicable for abbreviated tests. The subset should be based on the text originally followed by Washington State less whatever terms are peculiar to Washington State (except for terms that can be made more generic).

RECOMMENDATION #3

The Consortium should direct that the conversational test component be developed as soon as possible with funding from the Consortium's budget.

At least two, but perhaps more, sets of questions from different topics should be developed to prevent candidates from preparing for a single set of questions. This way candidates cannot know in advance what questions they will have to answer and their responses will have to be spontaneous and unrehearsed. This may be either a review of New Jersey's test by independent experts, or the development of a similar or different model by independent experts. The most important element of the conversational component is to assess the candidate's ability to speak English in a manner that is appropriate and comprehensible. The Consortium should contract with an entity with demonstrated expertise in this area of language testing, direct that entity to evaluate the New Jersey model, and either adapt it or develop a totally new exam that will accomplish these goals.

WHAT THE RESULTS OF AN ABBREVIATED TEST COULD MEAN

There are two important implications² of using an abbreviated test model for state interpreter certification programs. The first is the status that persons who pass this test will be assigned. The second is how they will be compensated compared to interpreters who are certified under the standard model. The Technical Committee recognizes that individual member states, within certain limits, establish their own criteria for certification as well as structures of compensation. However, with the prospective introduction of an alternate test form, the Committee believes it should offer recommendations for how interpreters tested under an abbreviated model should be treated in comparison to those tested under the standard model. The Committee recommends that each member state carefully consider the ramifications in these two areas before adopting an abbreviated test for local usage.

²A third concern that the Technical Committee wishes to identify but not discuss is the matter of

The Technical Committee has concluded that someone who has passed an abbreviated test model *is much more like an interpreter who has passed an exam under the standard model than any other type of interpreter*. Accordingly, the Committee urges member states to keep this in mind when contemplating how to handle these two issues. For example, New Jersey, which was the first state to develop and implement an abbreviated test, treats persons who are tested for German or Serbian the same way persons who are tested under the standard model are treated: those who pass are classified as either approved (Master or Journeyman levels) and others are allowed to work at a provisional level (Conditionally Approved or Eligible Unapproved levels); they are compensated at the same rate as persons who were tested under the standard model and are at the same classification level.

Here are the primary considerations that led the Committee to reach this conclusion:

1. These examinees have demonstrated their professional knowledge and skills (even if simultaneous only).
2. The fact that they have passed the simultaneous exam can be taken as a surrogate indicator that they have a high probability of passing sight and consecutive if those components were available in the language.
3. There is no reason to make judges, attorneys, or litigants overly concerned or alarmed about the ability of such interpreters to interpret accurately and faithfully just because they haven't taken an exam under the standard model. Why raise a red flag that need not be raised?
4. There is some assessment of the person's ability to speak understandable English.

Designation of Interpreters Qualified Under an Abbreviated Model

Member states have varying degrees of and requirements for certification. Some states are still developing standards for certification and do not yet have a formal certification process.

The Technical Committee has concluded that persons who have completed an abbreviated model should not be called "certified" in the same manner that persons who have completed the standard model are called "certified." Instead, they should be designated something like "provisionally certified," "otherwise qualified," or certified at a specific level. A clear distinction should be evident in the designation of interpreters who pass exams under the standard model versus interpreters who have passed an exam under the abbreviated model.

reciprocity. Presumably the issue of reciprocity regarding persons who pass an abbreviated model would be handled the same way interpreters who pass under the standard model are handled.

The Committee recommends further that all persons who are qualified under an alternate model be considered to be in a provisional status and that, should the standard model ever be developed for that language, they would be required to be tested under that model and those test results would supersede the results under the alternate model. Managers of state certification programs are encouraged to have some method of easily identifying all persons tested under an abbreviated model in the event a standard model exam is subsequently developed for the language in question and they need to be tested again.

Level of Compensation for an Interpreter Who Passed an Abbreviated Model

The second important implication of an abbreviated model is the impact it has on the level of compensation that the interpreter qualified under this model instead of the standard model would be paid. Because member states have compensation models that vary greatly, each program manager will have to decide how persons qualified under an abbreviated test model will be compensated.

The Committee has concluded that persons who pass under an abbreviated model should be considered, for purposes of compensation, closer to the proficiency level of interpreters who have passed an exam under the standard model than to interpreters who have not taken a performance test. The Committee recommends further that the member state carefully consider the following questions when considering how to handle compensation:

1. Does the state regularly share interpreters with other states? How will the state's compensation model affect those interpreters?
2. If the state has a pay range or scale based on qualifications, where will the successful abbreviated-model candidate be placed on that scale?
3. If "exotic" language interpreters command a higher pay rate than others due to market forces or scarcity of resources, what effect will that have on a state's decision making?
4. Who will complain about a given policy? Interpreters who pass a standard model exam may think it is unfair to pay the same amount to interpreters who pass an exam that is a "lesser" standard. In addition, interpreters who fail a test under the standard model could feel it is unfair that they do not have access to an abbreviated model. In any case, member states need to be prepared to explain and defend whatever policy they ultimately adopt.

PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING WHEN TO DEVELOP A TEST IN A NEW LANGUAGE PER THE STANDARD MODEL VS. THE ABBREVIATED MODEL

The last major issue the Technical Committee grappled with is developing a suggested procedure for the Consortium to follow when determining when the standard model should be used and when the abbreviated model would be employed for developing tests in new languages. The Technical Committee concluded that section 5.0 of the Agreements should be revised and expanded substantially.

RECOMMENDATION #4

The Consortium should revise Section 5.2 to read as follows: “At the discretion of the Consortium and subject to available funds, tests in new languages will be developed. The languages will be selected from those identified by member states according to the criteria set forth below. Tests in new languages will follow either the standard model or the abbreviated model as defined below, and the determination of which model will be used shall be made on the basis of the criteria outlined below.”

The historical practice, which is not addressed in the Agreements, that leads states joining the Consortium to believe they have "a right" to have the Consortium develop a test in a language of their choice per the standard model should be terminated immediately. However, any such understandings or commitments which have already been made should be either honored or, pursuant to review with and agreement by the affected state or states, reconsidered and revised.

RECOMMENDATION #5

The Consortium should add a new subsection to section 5 as follows: "The Consortium will use two basic certification test models:

- A. The standard model--This includes two sight components English-to-foreign language and foreign language-to-English), consecutive, and simultaneous.**
- B. The abbreviated model--This includes, at a minimum, a simultaneous component plus a measure of conversational proficiency in both languages.”**

The Technical Committee discussed at length whether to recommend mandating any or all

of the Consortium's written test to be administered as an integral component of the abbreviated test model. The Committee concluded that such a recommendation could not be supported at this time, but will review the subject further within its evaluation of the existing written Consortium exam and written exams developed by other entities. Just as the standard model may, in the discretion of an individual state, stand alone or incorporate results from any or all of the components of the Consortium's written exam or other written tests developed by a state, the abbreviated model may also include any or all of either of the aforementioned written components.

RECOMMENDATION #6

**The Consortium should add a new subsection to section 5 as follows:
"Tests shall be developed in new languages following the standard model when both of the following criteria obtain:**

- A. The language is requested by 25% or more of member states.**
- B. The Consortium has sufficient resources to develop two versions of the test per language under the standard model. In all other circumstances, the abbreviated model shall be used. These determinations shall be made at the annual meeting pursuant to recommendations presented by the Technical Committee or from the floor. States that are already members may submit to the Technical Committee requests for new languages to be added to the Consortium's test bank four months before the annual meeting. New member states may submit such requests any time during their first year of membership."**

RECOMMENDATION #7

**The Consortium should add a new subsection to section 5 as follows:
"When the Consortium determines that the criteria for developing a test per the standard model in a new language requested by a member state have not been met, that member state, alone or jointly with one or more additional member states, may pay the difference between the cost of developing the abbreviated exam and the cost of developing an exam per the standard model and the Consortium will then develop a test per the standard model."**

APPENDIX A

SIMULTANEOUS AS THE MOST FREQUENTLY USED MODE OF INTERPRETING

The NJAOC has conducted two time studies of court interpreters. The first study was conducted in 1993 and included all interpreted events served by full-time staff interpreters statewide in the Superior Court during the weeks of June 7-11 and 14-18. This study documented the number of events each interpreted assisted, the amount of time spent on each event interpreting in the three basic modes, and which specific modes were used.

This study found the following:

1. Simultaneous interpreting was occurred more than any other function in the average assignment and also lasted a longer mean time in the average assignment.
2. Consecutive interpreting came in second on both of those factors.
3. Sight interpreting was the mode of interpreting that occurred the least frequently (only 22% of cases) and took the least average amount of time per assignment of all interpreting modes.

FUNCTIONS THAT TOOK PLACE DURING INTERPRETING ASSIGNMENTS DURING THE 1993 TIME STUDY (N=691 assignments)

FUNCTIONS IN INTERPRETING ASSIGNMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF ASSIGNMENTS EACH FUNCTION TOOK PLACE	MEAN TIME OF EACH FUNCTION PER ASSIGNMENT
Travel time	61%	3.5 minutes
Sight interpreting	22%	2.4 minutes
Consecutive interpreting	57%	8.2 minutes
Simultaneous interpreting	66%	9.6 minutes
Waiting time after arrival	54%	5.4 minutes
Other functions	7%	0.5 minutes
Average assignment	---	29.5 minutes

The second study included the same variables and was conducted during the weeks of March 11-15 and 18-22, 1996. That study documented the following:

1. Consecutive interpreting now occurred in a greater proportion of assignments and lasted longer than simultaneous.
2. Sight interpreting occurred considerably less frequently and for much fewer minutes

in the average assignment.

FUNCTIONS THAT TOOK PLACE
DURING INTERPRETING ASSIGNMENTS
DURING THE 1996 TIME STUDY
(N=1,227 assignments)

FUNCTIONS IN INTERPRETING ASSIGNMENTS	PERCENTAGE OF ASSIGNMENTS EACH FUNCTION TOOK PLACE	MEAN TIME OF EACH FUNCTION PER ASSIGNMENT
Travel time	83%	4.4 minutes
Sight interpreting	8%	0.5 minutes
Consecutive interpreting	76%	10.1 minutes
Simultaneous interpreting	69%	9.1 minutes
Waiting time after arrival	64%	5.6 minutes
Other functions	13%	0.8 minutes
Average assignment	---	30.4 minutes

APPENDIX B

ABILITY OF PERFORMANCE IN VARIOUS MODES TO PREDICT PERFORMANCE IN OTHER MODES

TABLE ONE

IMPACT OF PASSING SIMULTANEOUS
ON PASSING REMAINING PART(S) OF TEST

Language	PASSED OTHER PARTS		DIDN'T PASS OTHER PARTS	
	#	%	#	%
Haitian Creole	3	100%	0	0%
Polish	7	100%	0	0%
Portuguese	13	81%	3	19%
Spanish	111	79%	29	21%
TOTALS	134	81%	32	19%

TABLE TWO

IMPACT OF PASSING THE SIGHT ON
PASSING REMAINING PART(S) OF TEST

Language	PASSED OTHER PARTS		DIDN'T PASS OTHER PARTS	
	#	%	#	%
Haitian Creole	Not applicable--no sight component in NJ's test			
Polish	7	37%	12	63%
Portuguese	12	35%	22	65%
Spanish	107	33%	220	67%
TOTALS	126	33%	254	67%

TABLE THREE

IMPACT OF PASSING THE CONSECUTIVE ON
PASSING REMAINING PART(S) OF TEST

Language	PASSED OTHER PARTS		DIDN'T PASS OTHER PARTS	
	#	%	#	%
Haitian Creole	3	43%	4	57%
Polish	7	44%	9	56%
Portuguese	12	60%	8	40%
Spanish	112	51%	106	49%
TOTALS	134	51%	127	49%

TABLE FOUR
 SCORES OF PERSONS WHO PASSED SIMULTANEOUS
 BUT NOT THE REST OF THE TEST

LANGUAGE/ EXAMINEE	SIM SCORE	CONSEC SCORE	SIGHT SCORE
Portuguese			
#1	78	62	71
#2	75	69	86
#3	78	59	93
Spanish			
#1	89	63	78
#2	85	69	76
#3	82	68	83
#4	81	62	89
#5	79	68	82
#6	79	65	87
#7	78	67	78
#8	78	67	85
#9	76	63	74
#10	75	64	82
#11	75	68	70
#12	72	71	65
#13	72	65	78
#14	72	68	55
#15	72	59	78
#16	72	68	76
#17	72	69	70
#18	72	67	82
#19	72	63	80
#20	72	68	72
#21	72	63	76
#22	70	66	73
#23	70	71	68
#24	70	78	63
#25	70	67	78
#26	70	66	72
#27	70	69	78
#28	70	69	63
#29	70	70	68

No examinee in either Haitian Creole or Polish passed the simultaneous without also passing, for Haitian Creole, the consecutive, or for Polish, both the sight and consecutive.

APPENDIX C

IMPACT OF REMOVAL OF LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE SCORING UNITS ON SIMULTANEOUS SCORES

COMPARISON OF OUTCOMES FOR EXAMINEES WHO PASSED UNDER EITHER FORMULA

LANGUAGE (Version)	# OF EXAMINEES WHOSE OUTCOME WAS THE SAME	# OF EXAMINEES WHO FAILED INSTEAD	# OF EXAMINEES WHO PASSED INSTEAD
Arabic	2	0	0
Haitian Creole	4	0	0
Portuguese	7	0	0
NJ Spanish Test #1	60	1	3
NJ Spanish Test #2	47	2	0
NJ Spanish Test #3	26	0	3
TOTALS	146	3	6

Column 2: Individuals who passed the simultaneous both ways: with language interference scoring units included and with language interference scoring units excluded.

Column 3: Individuals who passed the simultaneous with language interference scoring units included, but failed with the language interference scoring units excluded.

Column 4: Individuals who failed the simultaneous with language interference scoring units included, but who would have passed with the language interference scoring units excluded.