EVIVA – EVALUATING THE EDUCATION OF INTERPRETERS AND THEIR CLIENTS THROUGH VIRTUAL LEARNING ACTIVITIES

Deliverable 3.2

Consolidated Specification of Evaluation Methods

Maria Tymczyńska
[tymczynska@wa.amu.edu.pl]

Marta Kajzer-Wietrzny
[mkajzer@wa.amu.edu.pl]

Sabine Braun
[s.braun@surrey.ac.uk]

Catherine Slater
[c.slater@surrey.ac.uk]

Petra Hoffstaedter
[petra.hoffstaedter@stw.de]

Kurt Kohn
[kurt.kohn@uni.tuebingen.de]

September 2013 (revised October 2013)

Project coordinator: Sabine Braun

The EVIVA project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This report reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Contents

1 Background and aims

The main aim of the EVIVA project is to investigate how different virtual learning environments (VLEs) and learning activities in those environments can be used to support the training of interpreting students and (potential) clients of interpreting services. The focus of the project is on the learning processes involved. A related aim is to establish how learners from different backgrounds (i.e. interpreting students from different higher education institutions and clients from different educational/professional contexts) approach learning in a given ICT-based environment, what they learn, and how this compares to the intentions of the VLE developers.

This aim of this report (Deliverable 3.2) is to outline the approach that will be taken to the Evaluation Studies in the EVIVA project in order to answer these questions. This report is based on the "Initial Specification of Evaluation Methods" (Deliverable 3.1) and subsequent discussions in the project team, especially at the second project meeting in July 2013.

Deliverable 3.1 included a comprehensive review of research literature relating to theoretical frameworks for interpreting pedagogy, the use of ICT-based solutions in the context of educating and training interpreters and their clients as well as evaluation methods for the different types of VLE that will be used in EVIVA. This review and the discussions in the team enabled the project to

- Confirm the VLEs that will be used as examples of each type (i.e. 3D virtual environments, video-based and videoconference-based environments);
- Make decisions about the way in which the VLEs will be evaluated, especially about the learning scenarios and activities that evaluation participants will conduct in each VLE;
- Specify the content to be prepared for each VLE for the purposes of the evaluation;
- Decide on the research methods for the Evaluation Studies in the EVIVA project.

The present report will outline each of these aspects in turn. The report is a key deliverable for the project and forms the basis for WP4 (adaptation of VLEs for use in EVIVA), WP5 (preparation of content for the evaluation) and WP6 (Evaluation Studies).

2 ICT-based solutions in the education and training of interpreters and their clients

Interpreting is a complex cognitive activity which imposes different requirements for different modes (multitasking). In order to ensure successful communication, both interpreters and their clients need to acquire the necessary knowledge, skills and strategies. In addition, both parties in the interaction need realistic practice opportunities for training.

By the end of their study programme, students of interpreting need to be able to:

- Work confidently in different modes of interpreting;
- Use appropriate interpreting strategies and preparation techniques;
- Deal with different types of interpreting tasks confidently, displaying stamina and using problem solving techniques (including stress management) under conditions of time pressure and cognitive pressure;
- Present mediated messages orally in a clear and appropriate fashion;
- Apply monitoring skills for interpreting purposes;
- Function professionally in all situations, i.e. have internalised rules of conduct and ethical behaviour, and manage positioning, sight lines, visibility, acoustics, non-verbal communication, etc.
- Monitor engagement and impartiality in interpreting situations;
- Where relevant, manage dialogic interaction and coordination.

Clients of interpreting services need to have a good understanding of the challenging conditions under which interpreters normally work and need to learn how work with effectively an interpreter (e.g. interpreter positioning, speaking through an interpreter, etc.) and how to ensure that their communicative message can be rendered appropriately into the other language(s). The SIGTIPS report (2011) emphasises the need for users of interpreting services to receive training in how to work with an interpreter. Ozolins and Hale (2009) argue that successful communication in interpreter-mediated situations is a shared responsibility of the clients and the interpreter(s).

Given the complexity of interpreter-mediated communication, the development of the relevant skills, knowledge and strategies for interpreting requires considerable practice and is arguably best achieved through a variety of learning and teaching methods, including interaction with a tutor and self-study with relevant materials, but also through practice in groups. At later stages, the training should also include clients of interpreters and practice in live settings. Ertl and Pöllabauer (2010) and Valero Garces (2009), for example, rightly emphasise the importance for interpreting students to experience practice in real-life situations to complement classroom-based training (e.g. through internships). Corsellis

(2008) argues that clients of interpreters, especially in the public services, should be trained for interpreter-mediated situations together with interpreters.

Such suggestions are in line with constructivist principles of learning and especially the concept of 'situated learning' (Lave & Wenger 1991), which is rooted in the idea that learning should take place in professional contexts and in 'communities of practice'. The importance of 'situated learning' in translator and interpreter training has been highlighted by Kiraly (2000), Sawyer (2004) and Tymczyńska (2009). However, real professional practice is not always accessible for trainee interpreters. In such situations, ICTs can offer solutions for simulating real-life practice and can thus offer learners a similar experience of situatedness.

A further consideration is that ICTs are increasingly used in business settings and by public service providers to optimise access to interpreters, and financial pressures are likely to create a shift away from traditional on-site interpreting towards 'remote interpreting'. Future interpreters and their clients must therefore be able to work with ICTs. ICTs should therefore be integrated into their training in order to help them acquire the necessary digital competence.

Research into the use of VLEs in interpreter training has increased over the past decade and shows positive results (see e.g. Bendazzoli & Sandrelli 2005, Hansen & Shlesinger 2007, Hlavac 2013, Ibrahim-González 2011, Moser-Mercer *et al.* 2005, Mouzourakis 2008, Sandrelli 2005, Sandrelli & de Manuel Jerez 2007, Skaaden 2009, Tymczyńska 2009). However, it seems fair to say that the use of different ICT-based solutions with interpreting students has not to date been evaluated systematically. Furthermore, interpreters' clients are a group of learners that has received extremely little attention to date. Despite attempts at using ICTs for their training (Kalet *et al.* 2002, BMT2 project[1], IVY project[2]), little is known about the contribution that VLEs make to their learning experience. Accordingly, the questions that now need to be addressed are:

- how and what both target groups can learn in these different types of VLEs;
- how different environments can support different types of learning activities (how learners learn with prepared content and in role plays);
- how different environments are able to simulate real-life conditions to bridge the worlds of work and education (user experience);
- how such environments work for learners from diverse backgrounds (especially clients of interpreters);
- how different types of VLE can foster collaborative learning with both target groups;
- how ICT-based training can support the acquisition of digital literacy (as a 'by-product' of the use of ICTs).

[1] European Commission, Criminal Justice Programme, project JUST/2010/JPEN/AG/1566, 2011-13
[2] Lifelong Learning Project 511862-2010-LLP-UK-KA-KA3MP, 2011-12

To answer these questions, a set of evaluation methods was devised (see section 3 below. An associated aim was to confirm the actual VLEs that would be used in the EVIVA evaluation, and to specify the relevant learning scenarios and content for the evaluation. Each of these will be described in the remaining parts of section 2.

2.1 VLEs and learning scenarios to be used in EVIVA

One of the basic decisions to be taken in in the early phase of the EVIVA project was the decision about which VLEs would be used. Three **types of VLE** had been identified prior to the project start as being highly relevant for the interpreting context, namely 3D virtual worlds, videoconference tools and video corpora. The decision about which VLEs to use was made in line with the partners' own assessment of, and access to, different environments. A crucial criterion was that the environments must be adaptable to suit the needs of the EVIVA evaluation. The initial suggestions were to use the 3D virtual environment developed in the IVY project, the video corpora and corpus search site developed in the BACKBONE project, the video clips and exercises developed in the BMT2 project, and a videoconference-based environment. These suggestions were consolidated in the early phase of the project. With regard to the videoconferencing environment, it was decided to use Google+ Hangout (see Deliverable 4.4). The selected VLEs are summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1: VLEs to be evaluated in the EVIVA project

Type of VLE	**Specific VLE(s) selected for evaluation**
3D virtual world	• IVY 3D virtual environment (trainee interpreters and users of interpreting services ['clients'])
Video-based environment	• BACKBONE video corpora (trainee interpreters); • Building Mutual Trust 2 project video clips (clients)
Videoconference environment	• Google+, a common videoconference environment capable of multi-point conferencing (trainee interpreters and clients)

A further decision concerned the way in which the VLEs would be used in the evaluation. It was decided that the evaluation would focus on two **learning scenarios** or type of activity, namely *the learners' use of prepared content* and *live role play simulations*.

The rationale for this decision is closely associated with constructivist principles of learning, which have guided the conceptual design of the EVIVA project as a whole, and the Evaluation Studies in particular. As was pointed out above, the concept of situated learning is particularly important in the context of translator/interpreter training. Traditionally, situated learning in both training contexts has been discussed with reference to collaborative learning (e.g. Kiraly 2003). However, individual student practice should arguably also be situated as far as possible, i.e. take place in settings simulating real

professional situations (Tymczyńska 2009). For example, interpreting students, especially at the beginning of their training, need self-study materials at an adequate level of difficulty allowing them to practice interpreting in situated settings. ICT-based solutions for the training of interpreters and their clients should therefore support both individual and collaborative learning.

The use of ICTs in interpreter training provides, in fact, greater opportunities for interpreting students and their potential future clients—e.g. students in HE and vocational training studying law, medicine, hospitality, business and other subjects—to train together, by enabling them to interact live and simulate professional practice and thereby leading to a greater awareness of each other's role in the communication. Role plays in particular are a very useful tool for this purpose because they help learners to practice such skills as turn-taking, positioning, ability to handle unforeseen problems, etc.

Hence, the decision was taken in the project to base the evaluation on two scenarios, i.e. learning individually with prepared content and learning collaboratively through role plays. Table 2 below shows how the different VLEs are used with different learning scenarios in the evaluation.

Table 2: Learning scenarios used to evaluate the different VLEs

Learning scenario	**VLEs to be used**
Learning individually with prepared content	• IVY 3D environment ('Interpreting practice' mode for trainee interpreters and 'Exploration' mode for clients) • BACKBONE video corpora (trainee interpreters) • BMT2 video environment (clients)
Learning collaboratively through role play	• IVY 3D environment ('Live interaction' mode for both trainee interpreters and users of interpreting services) • Google+ Hangout videoconferencing (both trainee interpreters and clients)

2.2 Learning with prepared content

With regard to prepared content, interpreting students will work with selected samples from the BACKBONE video corpora (monolingual narratives in several languages) as an example of a video-based environment. Secondly, the students will use the monologues and bilingual dialogues that are integrated in the IVY 3D virtual environment (more specifically the 'Interpreting practice' mode). Since these materials were created on the basis of the BACKBONE corpora, the two VLEs chosen for the interpreting students offer content of a similar nature. However, careful consideration will be given to the selection of evaluation content in each environment, making sure that students work with similar but different content in each environment. In terms of learner guidance, the preparatory, skills-based and

reflective learning activities developed for interpreting students in the BACKBONE and IVY projects will be revised/adapted as necessary to suit the needs of the EVIVA evaluation.

The other group of learners, i.e. users of interpreting services, will use the video-based environment that was created in the BMT2 project. This environment offers a series of video clips for legal practitioners showing examples of interpreter-mediated situations to help legal practitioners learn about the specifics and challenges of interpreter-mediated communication. The video clips are supplemented by learning points and exercises. Moreover, this group of learners will also use the IVY 3D environment, but will focus on the content which was integrated into the 'Exploration' mode, and which provides an induction on how to work with an interpreter. Additional preparation will focus on creating guidelines for using the relevant VLEs, and on creating entry points to the VLEs on the EVIVA website.

2.3 Conducting live role plays

Whilst the work with prepared content involves individual learning, e.g. interpreting students practising interpreting with recorded content, the second learning scenario to be used in the evaluation takes the form of collaborative learning, involving interpreting students and/or 'clients'. The VLEs used for this purpose will be the IVY 3D environment ('Live interaction' mode) and Google+ Hangout as the selected example of a videoconferencing environment.

It was furthermore decided that two phases of role play activities would be conducted. The first phase will involve interpreting students only. The students will take the roles of the speakers and the interpreter. A series of role play outlines will be prepared to support this learning scenario. The role play outlines will include, for example, a description of a relevant situation, character descriptions of the speakers, and key points that the speakers could talk about. It was thought that the role play among interpreting students and their taking the role of the speakers as well as the interpreter would be beneficial for their understanding of interpreter-mediated communication, as it will encourage them to consider the interaction from the speaker's view and what challenges arise as a result of the interaction being interpreted.

In a second stage, in year two of the project, (potential) clients of interpreters, e.g. either students of subjects such as law, business or engineering, or professionals working in other relevant contexts, will participate in role-plays as speakers.

Individual role play scenarios will have different levels of difficulty in that they will require low or high expertise and a varied amount of preparation from the students. For example, in a job interview, a role can be simple if students base it on their own experience, or more challenging in simulations of job interviews for high-profile positions (which the students are likely not to have experienced yet). However, role plays with similar diagnostic value (i.e.

learning outcomes) will be used (e.g. having the same features such as a debate focus with a conclusion to reach) so as to avoid bias in the evaluation.

In the first phase, the interpreting students will use role-plays with topics to which they can easily relate. Gradually, students will then work with more challenging topics so that in the second year of training they are able to interact with 'real' clients.

2.4 Learner guidance

It was also clear, e.g. from the experience in the IVY project, that learners will require guidance and training in the use of the different VLEs and the content.

For example, to ensure that the students are at ease with role-playing as a practice and evaluation tool, they should have an opportunity to engage in a 'dummy' role play to practise role playing in general. Alternatively, tutors may prepare 'a mock role play' for the students to interpret in order to show them what a good role play can look like. Furthermore, students will need preparatory activities and briefings for the BACKBONE and IVY materials, which will simulate preparation for an interpreting assignment.

In addition, students will need inductions to, and training in, each VLE to ensure that their use of the VLEs and their learning activities are not distorted by a lack of familiarity with the VLEs or the learning task at hand. To this end, guidelines and training instructions for using the different VLEs and the content will be prepared and given to the students prior to the evaluation. Moreover, induction sessions will be held with the students prior to using the VLEs. In such sessions, the VLEs will be demonstrated, and time will be given for hands-on practice.

As regards the IVY 3D environment, probably the most complex of all the VLEs used in EVIVA, students will use this environment first for role play and, at a later stage, for work with the prepared content. They will thus have the opportunity to familiarise themselves with the environment through using the IVY Live mode first, before working with prepared content in the slightly more complex IVY Interpreting practice mode.

Throughout the evaluation the recording, collecting and storing of the evaluation data will need careful ethical consideration; permission forms will be signed by students taking part in evaluation.

3 Evaluation methods

The development of appropriate research methods to support the evaluation of the selected VLEs was one of the major milestones in the first year of the project. The methods detailed in this section mostly refer to the evaluation of the VLEs with trainee interpreters. The participants from this target group can largely be recruited from the EVIVA partner institutions. The details of the evaluation with (potential) clients of interpreting services will be designed in the second year of the project, but it will share some of the methods reported below, especially the methods referring to collaborative learning.

In accordance with the decision made in the project to focus on two learning scenarios, the EVIVA evaluation will focus on two aspects: an evaluation of how the users of the chosen VLEs learn with prepared content and how they learn through role play interactions.

However, the following needs to be borne in mind: as was pointed out in section 2 above, very little is known about how learners in the context of interpreting use VLEs, what they learn in VLEs and what this depends on. From a research perspective, the first step must, therefore, be to develop a comprehensive overview of the overall conditions of using VLEs in this context, including the potential challenges involved. In other words, it would be difficult to isolate and examine a (limited) number of variables in a comparative or controlled-experiment approach. Moreover, practical and ethical considerations mean that comparative studies and/or controlled experiments are difficult to conduct in the given framework.

In view of these considerations, a case-study approach which would enable the consortium to obtain a rich set of data, especially qualitative data, was deemed to be the most appropriate strategy, and relying on multiple sources of data and methods for their analysis was considered to be crucial. In accordance with this, the project opted for a mixed methods approach to the evaluation. The following sections describe the methods of data collection and analysis that will be used to evaluate the use of the VLEs by interpreting students (3.1) and by users of interpreting services (3.2). Section 3.3 describes the procedure that will be used for the collection of the evaluation data.

3.1 Evaluation methods for the use of the VLEs by interpreting students

In terms of overall approach, consideration was given to the two learning scenarios and the logistical organisation of the evaluation for each of these. As regards the first learning scenario, the use of prepared content, it was agreed that each evaluation participant would work in both VLEs that were chosen for this learning scenario, i.e. each participant would work with the BACKBONE video corpora and the monologues/dialogues in the IVY 3D environment, using different but similar content in each VLE (see section 2.2 above). The second learning scenario, i.e. collaborative role play (in Google+ Hangout and the IVY 3D

environment Live mode), would follow the same procedure, i.e. students would carry out similar but different role plays in each VLE.

Based on the review of the literature collected in Deliverable 3.1, the discussion at the second project meeting, and the conclusion that a mixed-method approach should be adopted, it was decided that following methods would be used for data collection (section 3.1.1) and analysis (section 3.1.2).

3.1.1 Methods of data collection

Tracking and recording of student activity

Firstly, all activities that students carry out in the relevant VLEs during the evaluation sessions will be recorded using external video cameras and screen capture tools. This will serve to obtain recordings of all evaluation activities and later to analyse, for example, whether student introspection is supported by what students really do, i.e. to be able to triangulate different data sets. External video cameras will be used in addition to screen capture to ensure that all visual/audio data from the evaluation sessions is collected.

Introspective methods

The recordings of student activity will be complemented by introspective methods, especially reflective sessions during which the students discuss with their tutors any challenges/problems they encountered in their sessions and reflect on the strategies they used to overcome them. The aim of the reflective sessions is to ascertain whether/why students dealt differently with challenges in the different VLEs.

The students will receive the recordings of their evaluation activity in advance of the relevant reflective session, and both the students and the members of the evaluation team will watch and review the recordings individually before the session in order to prepare and earmark points that are particularly worthy of discussion. During the reflective sessions, the recordings will be watched as far as necessary to enable prompted recall about selected passages, challenges and strategies. The retrospective sessions will also be recorded for later analysis.

User experience questionnaire

The user experience questionnaire (UEQ, http://www.ueq-online.org/), which is a tried and tested questionnaire for interactive products such as VLEs, will be used to elicit feedback from a more 'technical' perspective. The UEQ enables researchers to conduct a quick assessment of the users' experience of the product in question. The questionnaire has been designed to elicit users' impressions, feelings and attitudes towards the product, after using it. The questionnaire includes a number of scales that measure both classical usability aspects (efficiency, perspicuity, dependability) and user experience aspects (originality,

stimulation). A similar approach was successfully used to evaluate the usability/user experience of the original IVY 3D environment (Ritsos *et al.* 2013).

Further, specific questions about the user experience for each of type of VLE that is used in the EVIVA context have been added. The questionnaire will be given to evaluation participants after each evaluation session (before the reflective sessions), and the same questionnaire will be used for all VLEs that are evaluated in the EVIVA project. The questionnaire is provided in Appendix 1.

The UEQ comes with a tool for data analysis, which will provide basic quantitative data on user experience. These will be further analysed in connection with other methods of data analysis, as described below.

3.1.2 Methods of analysis

Corpus-based methods

Corpus-based methods of analysis will be used in two different ways. On the one hand, they will be used to identify and annotate source text challenges in the prepared content (i.e. annotation of samples of the BACKBONE video corpora, which were also used to create the prepared content for the IVY 3D environment). A set of annotation categories will be developed for this purpose, based on the source text challenges specified in Braun & Kohn (2012).

On the other hand, corpus-based methods will be used to create multiple parallel corpora from selected student performances in different VLEs, and these will then be analysed to identify the strategies students use in the respective VLEs and to ascertain how conducive (or otherwise) a given VLE is to supporting the application of those strategies.

Learning/Discourse analytics

Selected student activity sessions will be analysed in more depth, triangulating all primary and secondary data and using computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software such as Transana, MaxQDA, Atlas.ti, Exmaralda or ELAN. In relation to learning with prepared content, the analysis will focus on the students' handling of given interpreting challenges, based on the annotations of the source material. In relation to collaborative learning, the focus of the analysis will be on the communicative interaction in the role plays.

A set of evaluation criteria was developed for this purpose, which was derived from interactionist frameworks of dialogue interpreting (Baraldi & Gavioli 2012, Davitti 2013, Mason 2006, Wadensjö 1998). Unlike more traditional assessment criteria for interpreting performance (e.g. Hartley *et al.* 2003, Kalina 2002), these criteria are descriptive and will enable the research team to analyse the moves and communicative actions of interpreting students in the different learning scenarios and VLEs. Moreover, the criteria reflect quality

dependencies between different dimensions of interpreted communication including relations between source text related challenges and interpreting performance. The set of criteria is provided in Appendix 2.

Visual analytics

Basic visual methods of analysis will be used to gain a better understanding of the data, to correlate data sets and to help with analytic reasoning. For example, timelines of the student activity sessions will be created in order to discern any possible patterns of user activity in the different learning scenarios and across the different VLEs.

The combination of these methods will enable the research team to understand the impact of different VLEs on learning and the extent to which the participants are able to adapt to the specifics of the VLE they use (i.e. acquisition of digital competence).

3.2 Evaluation methods for users of interpreting services

As was pointed out above, the methods for evaluating the use of VLEs by (potential) clients of interpreters will be planned in detail in year two of the project. One of the most interesting aspects of this evaluation will be whether the many different educational and professional backgrounds from which this group is drawn will have an impact on how they use different types of VLEs and on their experience of VLEs in general.

Methods for eliciting information about the individual learning that interpreter clients carry out, using the IVY 3D environment's Exploration mode and the BMT2 video-based environment, will be similar to the methods described for interpreting students in 3.1 above. Especially, a combination of recording learner activity and introspection will be used to collect the primary data. It needs to be borne in mind, however, that this target group will be more heterogeneous and more difficult to reach for the consortium. Evaluation methods may therefore have to be adjusted to suit the situation, e.g. the availability of evaluation participants.

Where availability of participants is limited, survey methods may be priorities to obtain a quick assessment of the relevant VLE. Such methods were used successfully in the IVY project to elicit initial feedback on the IVY Exploration mode from clients of interpreting services. This can be complemented by 'knowledge tests', which would give the evaluation team insights into the types and areas of knowledge that clients were able to cover (or otherwise) using the relevant VLEs.

The final stage of the EVIVA evaluation will involve, where possible, joint role play interactions of interpreting students and (potential) clients, e.g. students from different subject areas and/or professionals from relevant contexts. Where possible, these evaluation participants will be asked to participate in subsequent reflective sessions.

3.3 Practical procedure

The evaluation will have three phases of data collection, which are outlined below. The analysis of the data will be conducted in parallel, with a final review and data triangulation phase once all data have been collected.

Phase 1: Collaborative learning through role play among interpreting students

The evaluation will start with collecting data in the videoconference environment and the IVY 3D virtual environment Live mode (role-plays involving students of interpreting). The rationale for this is twofold. On the one hand, the adaptation effort for the IVY 3D Live mode is lower than for the Interpreting Practice mode (for use with prepared content), and the chosen videoconferencing tool, Google+ Hangout, does not require adaptation. Moreover, work with the IVY Live mode is considered to be less complex than working with the Interpreting Practice mode. As was pointed out in section 2.4 above, it was therefore thought to be useful for learners to start with the Live mode in the IVY environment, before using the Interpreting Practice mode. On the other hand, it was thought that collaborative learning in the different VLEs would provide a stimulating initial experience for the evaluation participants, where they can assist each other in the use of the VLEs should the need arise.

Phase 2: Individual learning with prepared content

The first role play phase will be followed by the evaluation of the 3D and video-based environments with regard to supporting individual learning with prepared content, both with interpreting students and interpreter clients.

Phase 3: Additional role plays, involving interpreting students and clients

An additional stage of role play simulations both in the videoconference and 3D environment is also planned for year two to simulate collaboration between interpreting students and (potential) users of interpreting services, i.e. students and/or professionals working in business and public service settings.

4 Aspects to be resolved

The following issues will be considered in the remaining months of year one and at the beginning of year two:

- Several software packages for qualitative analysis of data are currently being tested to establish which will be the most appropriate for the purposes of EVIVA. The decisions on evaluation software and on the evaluation methods will be consolidated at the third project meeting in January 2014.
- The visual methods to be used in the data analysis will also be discussed in more detail at the third project meeting. This needs to be considered in relation to the amount of quantitative and qualitative data analysis that will be possible to obtain with the available resources in the project.
- Details also need to be worked out for how the interpreting students will work with the prepared content in the different environments, i.e. how much preparation (trial run sessions to get used to the environments) will be required, what training will need to be provided and what this should consist of.
- Finally, in year two, detailed plans will be made for the evaluation with clients from different backgrounds. The partners' networks have already been used to make useful contacts, which will be followed up towards the end of year two to recruit evaluation participants from this group before the plans for the evaluation with this group are finalised.

Appendix 1: User experience questionnaire

EVIVA Environments User Experience Evaluations

Consent Form

This is to certify that I hereby agree to participate as a volunteer in the European research project EVIVA – Evaluating the Education of Interpreters and their Clients through Virtual Learning Activities within the . . . . . .,
under the supervision of . . . .

The purpose of the research, and my role in it have been fully explained to me by . . . . . and I fully understand his explanation. The procedure has been explained to me fully and I have been able to have all questions answered to my satisfaction.

I understand that all data that is a result of my participation will remain strictly confidential. I understand that I may request a summary of the results of this study by contacting one of the researchers . . . . . .

I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and terminate my participation at anytime without prejudice.

Date . . . . . Participant's Signature . . . . . .

I certify that I have fully explained the investigation to the above individual.

Date . . . . . Researcher's Signature . . . . . .

USER EXPERIENCE - Assessment of your Online Interpreting Environment

ID: **Session date:** **Location:**

Online environment in which the interpreting session took place:

IVY-VE role play: ☐ Hangout role play: ☐ IVY-VE prep material: ☐ BACKBONE prep material: ☐

---

1. **Gender**

   Female: ☐ Male: ☐ Prefer not to say ☐

2. **Age Group**

   ->21 ☐ 22 -> 34 ☐ 35 -> 44 ☐ 45->54 ☐ 55->65 ☐ 65+ ☐ Prefer not to say ☐

3. **Select all that apply**

   Student ☐ Practising interpreter ☐ Retired interpreter ☐ User of interpreting services ☐

4. **Select your current highest completed qualification/degree.**

   Bachelor ☐ Masters ☐ PhD ☐ Other _____

---

5. **How would you rate your expertise with computer-based learning environments (Blackboard, Moodle etc.)?**

   No experience ☐ Novice ☐ Intermediate ☐ Advanced ☐ Expert ☐

6. **How would you rate your expertise with computer-based interpreting environments (e.g. BlackBox, Speechpool)?**

   No experience ☐ Novice ☐ Intermediate ☐ Advanced ☐ Expert ☐

The **questionnaire** consists of pairs of **contrasting attributes** that may apply to the environment. Please tick the box that best represents how you feel about the environment.

Example:

attractive	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	unattractive

This response would mean that you rate the application as much more attractive than unattractive.
Please decide **spontaneously**. Don't think too long about your decision to make sure that you convey your original impression. Sometimes you may not be completely sure about your agreement with a particular attribute or you may find that the attribute does not apply completely to the particular product. Nevertheless, please tick a box in **every line**.
It is your **personal opinion** that counts. Please remember: there is **no wrong or right answer**!

(A) Please assess the <u>environment</u> by ticking one tick box per line.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
annoying	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	enjoyable	7
not understandable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	understandable	8
creative	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	dull	9
easy to learn	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	difficult to learn	10
valuable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	inferior	11
boring	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	exciting	12
not interesting	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	interesting	13
unpredictable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	predictable	14
fast	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	slow	15
inventive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	conventional	16
obstructive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	supportive	17
good	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	bad	18
complicated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	easy	19
unlikable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	pleasing	20
usual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	leading edge	21
unpleasant	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	pleasant	22
secure	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	not secure	23
motivating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	demotivating	24
meets expectations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	does not meet expectations	25
inefficient	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	efficient	26
clear	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	confusing	27
impractical	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	practical	28
organized	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	cluttered	29
attractive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	unattractive	30
friendly	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	unfriendly	31
conservative	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	innovative	32

(B) How was your learning experience?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
My interpreting experience felt natural (same as in the real world)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	My interpreting experience did **NOT** feel natural (different to the real world)	33
I did **NOT** feel comfortable interpreting in this environment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	I felt comfortable interpreting in this environment	34
I felt the tool had a negative impact on my interpreting performance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	I felt the tool had a positive impact on my interpreting performance	35
I feel that the tool has helped me to improve my interpreting skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	I feel that the tool has **NOT** helped me to improve my interpreting skills	36

Further comment:

37. Did you encounter any technical problems during your session?

No ☐ Yes ☐

If Yes, please explain:

38. Describe some positive aspects of the environment you reviewed.

39. Describe some negative aspects of the environment you reviewed.

40. Describe some enhancements that you would like to see in the environment you reviewed.

(C) Please specify your <u>preferences and likes</u>:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
I think that gestures are **NOT** important in communication	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	I think that gestures are important in communication	41
I like to rely on facial expressions in communication	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	I do **NOT** like to rely on facial expressions in communication	42
In distance communication, I do **NOT** like to be visible to others with video or picture	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	In distance communication, I like to be visible to others with video or picture	43
I like to be represented by an avatar	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	I do **NOT** like to be represented by an avatar	44
The environment is **NOT** attractive for communicating with others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	The environment is attractive for communicating with others	45
The environment is attractive for role plays	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	The environment is **NOT** attractive for role plays	46
The environment is **NOT** attractive for interpreting practice	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	The environment is attractive for interpreting practice	47
I felt a sense of presence (feeling of 'being there') in the environment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	I did **NOT** feel a sense of presence in the environment	48
The avatars' gestures and movements were **NOT** useful for the communication	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	The avatars' gestures and movements were useful for the communication	49
The avatars' facial expressions were helpful	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	The avatars' facial expressions were **NOT** helpful	50
The video was **NOT** useful for the task	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	The video was useful for the task	51
Seeing more than one video image was distracting	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Seeing more than one video image was **NOT** distracting	52

Further comment:

53. Would you recommend this environment to a colleague?

Yes ☐ No ☐

THANK YOU!

Appendix 2: Evaluation categories

What is the purpose of this category grid?

- e.g. to show quality dependencies between different dimensions of interpreted communication
- e.g. to assess a speaker's or interpreter's output and performance

1	2	3	4	5	
Quality requirement categories for interpreting	**Speaker's output and performance**	**ST related interpreting challenges**	**Interpreter's output and performance**	**Scenario support: Role Play, Prep. Content, BACKBONE**	**Comments**
SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC CONTENT OF THE MESSAGE					
Coherence and logical consistency (comprehension and reproduction of discourse structure and links vs. lack of understanding, *contresens*)	x	Discourse markers High information load Weak coherence Insertions	Problems in this category may indicate high cognitive processing load, which could be a result of multitasking in the VLE	all	
Completeness of main ideas and arguments (vs. information loss, loss of nuances)	x	High information load High speed (of speaker)		all	
Additions, explanations and/or reductions (appropriate vs. inappropriate)	x	Reformulations	Unnecessary additions/ explanations may indicate a lack of certainty in the communication	all	
Accuracy (e.g. of ideas, facts, figures, names)	x	Unclear meaning, numbers and dates, enumerations, proper names, factual speaker		all	

		error, accent (of speaker), unclear pronunciation (of speaker), slip of the tongue			
Sensitivity towards cultural and situational factors		Reference to context, visual information Lingua-cultural concepts	(e.g. comprehension and treatment of culturally-bound concepts, awareness of the audience and its expectations)	all, particularly role play	
Pragmatic force, e.g. speaker intentions, stance and emotions	x (are they expressed clearly?)	Quoting/reporting	x (are they expressed clearly?)	all, particularly role play	Indicator of authenticity of situation?
Politeness (e.g. face management)				particularly role play	Indicator of authenticity of situation?
Negotiation of meaning (e.g. asking for clarification, asking for repetition)				role play	The way this is handled may also indicate whether the VLE is seen as authentic
LINGUISTIC PERFORMANCE					
Grammar and syntax		Complex structure		all; less control in role plays	
Use of specialist lexis, terminology and phraseology		Specialist lexis Abbreviations		all; less control in role plays	
Idiomaticity		Idiomatic phrases		all; less control in role plays	
Style/register				all; less control in role plays	

Efficiency of rendition (e.g. brevity of expression vs. long-windedness)				all; less control in role plays	
Language switching					
PRESENTATION/DELIVERY					
Voice quality (e.g. pitch)				all	
Intonation				all	
Articulation and accent				all	
Pace (e.g. too fast/slow)				all	
Verbal fluency (e.g. completion of utterances, flow of speech vs. unfinished utterances, hesitations, intrusive noises, reformulations/ repairs; pausing behaviour)		Structural self-repair		all	
COORDINATION					especially but not exclusively in dialogue interpreting
Macro-level: Construction of sequences/actions (or 'moves' in genre theory)	x			particularly role play	
Micro-level: Turn-taking (e.g. overlap, pauses/gaps/silence between turns)	x			particularly role play	

Stepping in and out of frame	x (in the role play)			particularly role play	Authenticity, perceived sense of presence
Space management (seating arrangement, positioning, eye-contact)				role play	
Equipment management (digital literacy)				all	
Ancillary actions (e.g. filling in forms)				particularly role play	