

Preference in Hiring Interpreters - An Insight into Recruiters' Perspective
A case study on recruiters in a German international organisation in Thailand

NALINA HIRANPRUECK

A Special Research Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Arts in Translation and Interpretation (Interpretation)
Chalermprakit Centre of Translation and Interpretation
Faculty of Arts
Chulalongkorn University
Academic Year 2017

บทคัดย่อและแฟ้มข้อมูลฉบับเต็มของวิทยานิพนธ์ตั้งแต่ปีการศึกษา 2554 ที่ให้บริการในคลังปัญญาจุฬาฯ (CUIR)
เป็นแฟ้มข้อมูลของนิสิตเจ้าของวิทยานิพนธ์ที่ส่งผ่านทางบัณฑิตวิทยาลัย

The abstract and full text of theses from the academic year 2011 in Chulalongkorn University Intellectual Repository (CUIR)
are the thesis authors' files submitted through the Graduate School.

Preference in Hiring Interpreters - An Insight into Recruiters' Perspective

A case study on recruiters in a German international organisation in Thailand

Nalina Hiranprueck

MA Translation and Interpreting

Chulalongkorn University

nalina.hiran@gmail.com

Abstract

This research seeks to build upon the issue of recruiter's expectation toward interpreters, which is the realm less explored. As evident in previous research, criteria and expectations towards interpreters deviate among different stakeholders and user groups with different backgrounds. Though the major findings remained quite similar when it comes to the main criteria, the level of expectations is largely less among users of interpreting services, when compared to the interpreters. Thus, one can expect that recruiters are likely to anticipate differently than other stakeholders. This study is designed to understand the underlying rationality of interpreter recruiters in their choice of interpreters. With such objective, this work explores the criteria and elements influential to individual recruiters in their decision-making, using twelve frequent users of interpreting service from different sectors in a German international organisation in Thailand as a case. The result reveals seven key criteria substantial to the recruiters' selection of interpreters, namely (1) Logical Coherence of Utterance (comprehensibility), (2) Sense of Consistency with the Original (Faithfulness to the original), (3) Fluency of Delivery, (4) Thorough Preparation, (5) Trustworthiness, Reliability, and Accountability, (6) Cost Efficiency, and (7) Punctuality. The findings, hence, confirm the hypothesis that the recruiter's expectation deviates from other stakeholders, but at the same time reiterate the significance of the pre-existing key criteria identified by previous literature.

Introduction

Interpreting is a science that still requires exploration and completion through means of research in terms of market demands and expectations, cognitive processes, skills, techniques and practices (Pöchhacker, 2010). Such studies will not only bring about a richer understanding on how interpreters work and how they are expected to work, but also how they function when faced with difficulties, as well as how different factors affect the quality of their interpretation. However, the key benefit is that researching different aspects will shed light on how to efficiently design and support learning experiences for students and interpreting enthusiasts, allowing them to thrive as qualified interpreting professionals.

In Thailand, interpreting is a considerably under-researched field. The emergence of specialised interpreter training at the university level came only over a decade ago. Additionally, the fact that most professional interpreters are not in academia restricts the number and scope of research available, thereby hindering the understanding of the foundation upon which Thai interpreters deliver their services.

This study aims to present insight into a rarely-researched stakeholder in the interpreting realm, namely the recruiters, who function as decision-makers in the selection of interpreters, on the factors that influence their choice. The result from in-depth interviews in this study shows the similarities and differences between this group and other more heavily-researched groups, namely users and interpreters. The qualitative nature of the research offers a playground to delve into the elements that encourage and discourage recruiters to choose one interpreter over another.

Interpreters as Service Providers

The International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC, 2012) defines an interpreter as “[a professional, who] works with spoken words in a particular context, conveying a message from one language to another”. In other words, they provide “a service that lets people communicate across language barriers” (Setton & Dawrant, 2016, p.3). Hence, interpreters can be considered a kind of service provider, delivering language services to clients, who share neither the same language, nor socio-cultural background.

Client and users

Similar to other service providers, interpreters function in the web of stakeholder interplay. On one end there are users, both the speakers and listeners, who pose expectations and demand toward interpreters. The users' demands and expectations met when a satisfactory service is delivered. This is the reason why numerous research, such as those by Bühler (1986), Kurz (1993), Chiaro and Nocella (2004), etc. have analysed users to understand their needs and expectations. Such knowledge not only sheds light on how interpreters can improve the satisfaction of their service in the eyes of users, but also how to enhance their employability.

Interpreters and interpreter associations

Interpreters themselves are another group of key stakeholders. As it is commonly acknowledged that no interpreter should work alone, the interpreting partner plays a significant role in determining who they work with. Should interpreters fail to live up to the requirements of their counterpart, the prospect of future partnership may be greatly reduced.

International and national interpreter associations strategically influence interpreters with their membership requirements, professional standards, and code of ethics. In many developed countries, upon acknowledging interpreters as a high-skill profession, introduce national requirements for interpreters in specialised fields such as court, or healthcare interpreters.

Considering the importance of interpreters and their association's influence on the profession, much research has been done to gauge the interpreters' expectations of themselves and their peers. At the same time, standards enforced by interpreter associations and national authorities are usually reviewed regularly and systematically after a certain period of time.

Despite the amount of existing research, our understanding on the issues of user expectations are far from comprehensive due to the difference between specialised topics, socio-cultural context, and user groups. Moreover, the studies largely neglect an additional stakeholder group that not only plays a major part in interpreting service provision, but is the determinant of interpreter's access to employment, namely the recruiters.

Recruiters

Though it is indisputable that users are the key recipients of the interpreting service, it is not usual that they are responsible for selection and hiring. The term ‘recruiter’ in the general sense refers to a person or an organisation that “secures the service of [another]” (Merriam-Webster, 2017). Thus, in the frame of this research, ‘recruiter’ refers to a person directly responsible for hiring or sourcing the provider of interpreting services. They can be working for a recruitment agency, or for the organisation, commissioning the assignment to interpreters, and might be referred to as a supplier, a buyer (Kelly, Stewart, & Hegde, 2010) or an employer (Amratisha, 2008). Nevertheless, they function as the middle person between interpreters and their potential assignments.

This rationale means that recruiters do not necessarily belong to the user group. While some are also users of interpreting services, some might not even be present during the execution, yet they are the very person recruiting interpreters that are appropriate for each assignment. Thus, this group should be studied separately when discussing the preferences and expectations of stakeholders toward interpreters.

This research aims to build upon existing interpreting research by studying recruiters in Thailand. The researcher hopes that the study will offer some insight into the preferences and expectations of Thai recruiters. Such information would not only be useful for the interpreting academics sphere, but also constructive to interpreting practitioners in the field.

Expectations and Quality Criteria toward Interpreters

Interpreters

Expectations toward interpreters have been discussed for decades, from the pioneering research by Bühler (1986), who distributed questionnaires to AIIC members to gauge their disposition on the importance of sixteen key quality criterion of interpreting, namely (1) native accent, (2) fluency of delivery, (3) logical cohesion of utterance, (4) sense of consistency with the original, (5) completeness of interpretation, (6) correct grammatical usage, (7) correct terminology, (8) use of appropriate style, (9) pleasant voice, (10) thorough preparation of conference documents, (11)

endurance, (12) poise, (13) pleasant appearance, (14) reliability, (15) ability to work in a team, and (16) positive feedback of delegates. Forty-one AIIC members and six committee members of AIIC Admissions and Language Classification (CACL) rated “sense of consistency with the original” and “logical cohesion of utterance” highest among all the criteria respectively, indicating a greater emphasis on the content rendered and its comprehensibility, rather than form and aesthetic delivery.

Following Bühler’s 1986 work, subsequent research devised and modified the sixteen criteria to fill in research gaps. Chiaro and Nocella (2004) observed the small number of respondents in Bühler’s study and designed their research to cover a larger number of 286 samples, utilising the internet to reach the interpreters. Additionally, they identified a design flaw Bühler’s questionnaire that the itemised-category scale caused interpreters to be “incapable of discriminating and [interpreters] were giving equal importance to all the criteria” (Chiaro & Nocella, 2014, p. 283). The questionnaire design was therefore changed to rank order scale instead. For simplicity, the questionnaire was divided into two parts; namely the linguistic criteria and extra-linguistic criteria. Five extra-linguistic criteria differ from Bühler’s work, namely (1) concentration, (2) physical well-being, (3) mnemonic skills, (4) encyclopaedic knowledge, (5) absence of stress. While “consistency with the original” was ranked highest, the results from other criteria deviate greatly with “completeness” being prioritised over “logical cohesion”, followed by “fluency of delivery”, “correct grammatical usage”, and “correct terminology” as the second three most important factors. These three latter factors, though evident, are not specifically mentioned as having high significance by Bühler (1986).

Noticing the need for replication, the “Survey on Quality and Role” was conducted by Zwischenberger and Pöchhacker (2010), focusing on 704 AIIC members in late 2008. Drawing from Bühler’s original criteria with an addition of (1) “lively intonation” and (2) “synchronicity”, eleven criteria were posed in the questionnaire, utilising Bühler’s itemised-category scale to retrieve a comparable result. The results correspond to Bühler’s in 1986 with “sense of consistency with the original” and “logical cohesion of utterance”, being at the top. Pöchhacker (2013) noted that the divergence between Bühler’s (1986) and Chiaro and Nocella’s (2004) works may be due to different population groups, the former interviewing only 74 AIIC interpreters and the latter 286 interpreters belonging to several associations. Thus, the difference suggests that deviations could

occur among various interpreter groups and the results could not be generalised as the common expectations of interpreters. Similarly, Pöchhacker (2013), by no means claimed that his result is representative of the whole industry.

Users

In response to Bühler's (1986, p. 233) assumption that "the criteria as discussed in this paper reflect the requirements of the user as well as fellow interpreter in a (hopefully) well-balanced mixture", Kurz (1993) argued that the expectations of interpreters can by no means represent user expectations, which "can only be determined by asking the users themselves" (p.14). Her research thus focused on expectations among different user groups, utilising 8 of Bühler's criteria, namely (1) native accent, (2) pleasant voice, (3) fluency of delivery, (4) logical cohesion of utterance, (5) sense of consistency with the original message, (6) completeness of interpretation, (7) correct grammatical usage, and (8) use of correct terminology. Similar to Bühler's (1986) results "sense of consistency with the original message" and "logical cohesion of utterance" were unanimously ranked the highest respectively. However, Kurz's research shows not only the lower expectations among users in comparison with interpreters, but also that the assessment of different user groups deviates from one another when it comes to other criteria. Therefore, a more comprehensive study on user expectations is required.

Kurz's (1993) findings are confirmed by a large number of research, one of which is Moser's (1995) "Survey on expectations of users of conference interpretation" commissioned by AIIC. In his study 201 standardised open-ended interviews were conducted with users by AIIC interpreters in eighty-four meetings. "Faithfulness to meaning" was mentioned as more preferable, than literal reproduction, while the age group, gender, background, previous exposure to interpreting service, etc. can result in varying criteria and expectations among users.

Based on the aforementioned literature, expectations not only vary between stakeholders, but among user groups and individuals with different backgrounds depending on circumstances. Thus, one might not be able to generalise a list of results as to what is expected most from interpreters. However, such studies could identify trends and outline key expectations that interpreters should be aware of when performing their services as they will be, in any case, assessed with those expectations and anticipations by the related stakeholders.

Recruiters

Existing literature on interpreter and user expectations toward interpreters discloses that when it comes to recruiters, the results tend to deviate from the former groups. As recruiters are one of the major determinants of interpreter employability, investigating their work process and interpreter-selection criteria could provide an insight into what interpreters should be aware of and how they can sustain their employability.

Recruiters are largely overlooked and hardly ever mentioned by any interpreting research despite being one of the key persons in allocating interpreters to an assignment. Kelly, Stewart, and Hegde (2010) conducted market research on the interpreting market in North America mentioned that, by function, ‘recruiters’ could refer to those in supplier agencies or in the organisation commissioning interpreters, depending on where the interpreters are sourced. Though the quality criteria were not mentioned, the majority of supplier companies stated that qualified interpreters must have a degree in the field or at least forty hours of interpreter training, varying from interpreting skills, ethics, specific-terminology, standards of practice, and language proficiency testing. This corresponds to the result on the 120 commissioning organisations that the largest group of 37.6% expects interpreters to have more than forty hours of training.

Amratisha’s (2008) work on “The Role and Function of Interpreters in the Entertainment Circle in Thailand” also touched upon the recruiter function which includes two employers in her study. However, the research did not address the result of the entity separately. Thus, it is not possible to draw the result from her research from that of the users.

Recruiters of Escort Interpreters

The closest work on this is Srinonthaprasert’s (2015) study on “Characteristics of Thai Interpreters of Japanese Needed by the Japanese Heads of Manufacturing Industry in Eastern Sea Board”, in which the author addressed 13 managers of manufacturing industries, interviewing them on the criteria they devised in hiring their personal escort interpreter.

Unlike other prior literature on expectations toward interpreters, Srinonthaprasert’s result are not exactly relevant to the criteria imposed on interpreting professionals, as her subjects assume an additional role apart from being an interpreter, namely an employee of a Japanese company. Most of the criteria mentioned as priority by the recruiters focused on the quality of being a good

employee of a Japanese company. Additionally, the interpreters in question are supposed to perform translator as well as secretarial tasks. Nevertheless, the result includes elements related to interpreting, though of lesser priority, and partly corresponds to the quality criteria in earlier works on interpreter's and user's expectations namely (1) consistency with the original message (maintaining neutrality and interpreting meaning, not word-for-word), (2) fluency in delivery, (3) endurance/poise (ability to endure frustrations or pressure.), (4) reliability (having high responsibility, having confidence to ask when the content is unknown), (5) ability to work in a team (knowing his/her role in the team).

Though Srinonthaprasert's subjects are not interpreters in the conventional sense, as they perform various additional tasks and in the specific context as full-time employees in a Japanese company, some preferences and expectations highly related to the interpreting profession can be drawn from the research to elucidate such rarely-researched subjects as recruiters of interpreters.

The review of related literature on expectations and key quality criteria toward interpreters, the latter of which are summarised in Appendix I, suggests the need for further research on the topic in various dimensions. This study is determined build upon existing research in interpreting by studying the rationale of recruiters in Thailand. The researcher expects that the research will offer new insights into the preferences and expectations of recruiters.

The research questions are as follows:

Research Question: What influences the decision of recruiters in selecting and rehiring an interpreter?

Sub-question 1: What traits or qualities of interpreters are influential in determining their future prospects of receiving future assignments?

Sub-question 2: Which traits or qualities of interpreters discourage recruiters in rehiring interpreters.

Research Scope & Methodology

The qualitative nature of the research and the researcher's intention to delve into the underlying key quality factors that influence each recruiter in the selection of interpreters without restricting

them with pre-existing findings limits the scope of study to a small group of no more than 15 people. To accommodate this limitation, a single case-study research approach that allows “a detailed and intensive analysis of a single case” (Bryman & Bell, 2010) is chosen.

In this regard, a German international organisation, which is a regular employer of freelance interpreters in Thailand on average one day per week, is selected to be the case. Apart from the frequency, the fact that the company is involved in a wide range of sectors, namely climate change mitigation and adaptation, education, employment, energy, urban development, agriculture and food safety, and governance, makes it an ideal case, where the samples from different sectors and could provide diverse results should different criteria be imposed in choosing interpreters. Additionally, the absence of a central unit and guideline for hiring interpreters, and independent organisational structure where projects are autonomous and function as separate units, offers a playground for the research in that recruiter function is prevalent in almost every unit.

In this research twelve officers, assuming recruiter function within different units in the organisation, are interviewed on their process and criteria in selecting and employing freelance interpreters. The sectoral demographic of respondents includes Climate Policy (1), Vocational Education (1), Training (1), Transport (1), Logistics (1), Drug Policy and Law Enforcement (1), Economic Development (1), Sustainable Consumption and Production (1), Energy Efficiency (1), Renewable Energy (1), Waste Management (1), and Waste Water Management (1). They all work in different units, are frequent employers of conference interpreters, and mainly assign simultaneous interpreting services.

Data Collection

As the research could be considered the first of its kind, focusing explicitly on recruiters of interpreting services, the researcher did not wish to restrict interviewee answers to the predetermined criteria used in earlier research. Additionally, the underlying rationale behind the criteria devised by recruiters are of the research’s interest as one criteria might not connote exactly similar idea. Considering the concept, the data collection method must allow recruiters to express themselves and explain their decision, rather than be restricted to one or two words, a semi-structured interview method was therefore devised (Bryman & Bell, 2010). Likewise, open-ended questions are designed prior to the interview to serve as a guideline, yet not restricting the answers

of interviewees and allowing the researcher to follow up and build up upon the provided answers for a clearer explanation (Denscombe, 2010). Interview questions can be found in Appendix II¹.

The interviews of approximately twenty minutes are conducted one-on-one with the respondents to allow them to revisit and consider the underlying reasons of their choice of interpreters. After some questions on factual notes, respondents are asked to outline the interpreter recruitment processes devised, when hiring interpreters. This allows them to review their processes and facilitate the recollection of what influence their decision.

To maintain privacy and ensure the authenticity of their response, the respondents remained anonymous. Prior consent to record the interview was inquired prior to the interview date. Of the twelve respondents, nine agreed to have the session recorded, while the rest of the interviews were noted manually by the researcher.

Data Analysis

A careful review of interview data to extract underlying themes referred to by each respondent in their interview, also called a thematic analysis (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane 2006), was used to analyse the research data. Recordings of the interviews were transcribed word-for-word and analysed to extract the criteria used by recruiters in selecting interpreters. To ensure data accuracy, the extracted criteria are sent back to respondents for verification with a 100% response rate.

The extracted themes were then compared to see the relation between each respondent's rationality and priorities, which are analysed and discussed as the result of this study. Additionally, the criteria emerging from the research was also compared to those from previous research of interpreter's and user's expectations.

Findings and Analysis

Thorough examination of records and interview notes reveal the diversified nature of the criteria and elements devised by respondents when employing interpreters. The absence of a list of any existing criteria during the interview allowed recruiters the freedom to recollect decision-making

¹ It is important to point out that some interview questions might not be exactly relevant to the research as the researcher is at the same time assigned by the director of the organisation to develop a guideline for the use of interpreting service for the organisation.

their process. Unsurprisingly, the prevalent criteria valued by respondents correspond to that of the existing literature by Bühler (1986), Kurz (1993), Chiaro and Nocella (2004), and Zwischenberger and Pöchhacker (2010), namely (1) sense of consistency with the original, and (2) logical cohesion of utterance. Nevertheless, some deviations and possible connections could be observed and will be outlined below.

Reconfirmation of Existing Quality Criteria²

Fluency of Delivery

Fluency of delivery is reconfirmed by all respondents as very important and one of the decisive factors that form their decision on whether to hire an interpreter. Long pauses, hesitation, stutter, use of fillers, continuous repetition of words or phrases not only signify the weak command of the interpreter's language and affect the reliability of their interpretation, but also disturb the audience's concentration. Six out of 12 respondents identify the lack of fluency as an undesirable trait which discourages them from reemploying an interpreter.

Logical Cohesion of Utterance – Comprehensibility

The cohesion of an interpreter's rendition is also a decisive factor that all the respondents completely agree on. Usually mentioned as comprehensibility, it is expected that interpreters should be able to produce sensible and logical rendition, in that sentences and messages are in synchrony with each other and form a harmonious unit of ideas. The interpretation should be delivered in complete sentences with appropriate links that help the audience understand the message delivered by the speaker in another language. Such cohesion, however, must correspond with the message from the original source. Producing a cohesive interpretation with no relation to what the speaker is saying is claimed to be a possible cause of banning by five of the respondents.

Sense of Consistency with the Original – Faithfulness to the Original

Sense of consistency with the original is mentioned as a key criterion by all respondents. The ability to interpret in correspondence with the message conveyed by the source, without omitting key information or adding one's opinion carries substantial weight in determining an interpreter's

² Bühler (1986), Kurz (1993), Chiaro and Nocella (2004), and Zwischenberger and Pöchhacker (2010), Srinonthaprasert (2015)

performance. The degree of influence does not vary much among respondents as all of them mentioned the factor as a decisive quality that determines an interpreter's employability. Respondent 11 emphasises that the interpreter is to interpret the message of the speaker, not the message embedded in the presentation or speech draft. Interpreters who disregard the speaker are considered underperforming and will not be used again.

Completeness of Information

Though it is evident that faithfulness to the original source is high on the agenda, the question of "how faithful" the rendition should be, differs from merely conveying the core messages in a way that corresponds to the objective of the speaker, to delivering all the details uttered. While most of the respondents understand that it is impossible for an interpreter to deliver a completely identical interpretation to the original, particularly in simultaneous interpreting, absolute completeness is demanded by one of the respondents, stating that details are no less important than the core message. This statement, however, is presumably due to the high-sensitivity context related to law enforcement the respondent is working in, where examples and numerical details are always indispensable.

Correct Grammatical Usage

None of the respondents explicitly mention grammar as a key quality in determining an interpreter's performance. One Respondent even stated that

"English proficiency does not mean that the interpreter has to have perfect grammar. The ability to communicate the message to the audience accurately is enough. Perfect grammar is a plus." – Respondent 7

However, the same respondent later claimed she does not mean that completely chaotic grammar is acceptable. Imperfect grammar is tolerable as long as it is a minor mistake and does not annoy the audience. Two other respondents briefly mention grammar, when speaking about the interpreters' ability to communicate, and language proficiency.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that the point on grammar might already be included in the respondent's response when mentioning logical cohesion of utterance (comprehensibility),

especially in the context of Thai language, in which sentences cannot be formed comprehensibly without correct grammar.

Thus, although correct grammatical usage is not considered a decisive factor in the decision to employ interpreters, it is an element that is embedded in other key factors that cannot be overlooked.

Correct Terminology and Abbreviations

Different disciplines usually employ different sets of vocabulary and terminology. Correct terminology is deemed very important to all respondents, especially when dealing with an organisation's abbreviation. According to three respondents, interpreters who are familiar with the technical terms, organisation names, and abbreviations specific to the fields are preferable. Thus, they tend to reemploy interpreters who have experience in the field. In the case that new interpreters are hired, they will be provided with a list of organisation abbreviations and basic documents to study, since the correct use is very important to them.

“Incorrect use of terminology can be tolerated, but incorrect interpretation of organisation names and their abbreviations usually annoy our Thai partners. We have to make sure that the selected interpreters are able to use them correctly.” – Respondent 11

All other respondents did not explicitly mention correct terminology as being as important as the former three criteria but stated that experience in the field and knowledge on terminology are the qualities that they look for when recruiting new interpreters.

Use of Appropriate Style

Interpreting style should be tailored to each interpreting assignment and particularly to the objective of the event. All respondents consider interpreters to be communicators, whose task is to pass on the message into another language so that the audience understands that message. Thus, to get the message across, interpreters should not only render the source language accurately, but in the style that enhances the understanding of the audience and is appropriate to the setting. Formal events require a different register when compared to a training, where informal messages that facilitate comprehension are preferred.

Respondent 4 and 7 state this quality of the interpreters to be major concern at the same level as faithfulness to the original and comprehensibility, while others do not explicitly emphasise the quality to be a decisive factor, but a compliment to the employability of an interpreter.

Pleasant Voice

Though a pleasant voice does not appear in any of the previous literature as a key criterion in selecting an interpreter, it does play an important role in this research. Nine out of 12 respondents regard interpreter voice as a very important and a quality that gives the interpreter a competitive advantage. Similarly, they argue that listening to an interpretation is usually a tiring experience as high concentration from the audience is required. If the interpreter's voice is not pleasant to listen to, the rendition will tire the audience further, which will result in a lack of concentration and focus.

Respondent 4 defines a pleasant voice as being engaging, lively, nice and easy to listen to, while Respondent 8 mentioned coarse, high-pitched, monotonous, unnatural, affected voice as a quality to be avoided.

Thorough Preparation

Similarly, though thorough preparation was not emphasised in the existing research, appearing only in Bühler's (1986) and Chiaro and Nocella's (2004) studies, preparation is gauged to be a decisive factor by every respondent. They all claim to provide all the information regarding the event to interpreters as earliest as possible prior to the event.

“[organisation name]'s work is very technical and specific. All conferences, workshops, and meeting are very technical. Thus, preparation is paramount. If interpreters have not familiarised themselves with the content beforehand, they cannot perform with quality, and we definitely do not want that to ruin our event.” – Respondent 5

According to four respondents, it is easy to notice whether interpreters have done their research as everything is reflected in their performance. Once such negligence is detected, it is unlikely that any of the respondents will employ the interpreter again. However, this is also relative to the time an interpreter has to prepare before the event. Unpreparedness is acceptable, by all respondents in the case that the assignment is of short notice (one day before the event).

Poise, Absence of Stress, and Endurance

Poise, absence of stress, and endurance come up as decisive negative elements, three of the respondents who consider the ability to retain one's composure a decisive element upon selection. In fact, some interpreters were removed from the list of potential interpreters, because of their inability to do so.

“I feel that the interpreter was rushed, shaken, and restless when performing to the point that she panted. She struggled to retain her composure and we feel that she was in distress. Her rendition was, therefore, not nice to listen to and we sadly had to cut her out of our list, despite her ability to convey messages accurately and comprehensibly.” – Respondent 6

“In a high-stress environment it is understandable that one can panic and lose one's composure, but this should not happen to interpreters as it is their job to cope with such stress. Therefore, panicking is absolutely unacceptable.” – Respondent 8

Interpreters should possess the ability to work under pressure and tolerate unforeseeable or unchangeable unfriendly conditions within reason. Failure to do so will reduce the chance of them being reemployed.

Trustworthiness, Reliability, and Accountability

The fact that all respondents must rely on interpreters to perform well in their assignment makes quality decisive to their choice of interpreters. Trust is paramount and if respondents are not certain of an interpreter's performance, the interpreter will never be selected for an assignment.

There are numerous elements that positively and negatively contribute to trust between the client and interpreters, one of which is the reliability of the interpreters. All respondents acknowledge that most interpreters are generalists and might not have in-depth knowledge of the field they are interpreting and they should not pretend to be specialists. Four respondents stated that they are willing to support interpreters in understanding key terms and concepts, should it be needed.

“We have to be able to rely on our interpreters. Not only in the sense that they will do their job well, but also to ask [for clarification] when encountered with an unknown concept or when they are not sure of something. They have to be accountable for what they are interpreting. Simply interpreting from their understanding or coming up with something

and disregarding the mistakes are unacceptable habits. How can we trust them if they do that?” – Respondent 3

Feedback of Delegates

Though feedback of delegates only emerged in Bühler’s (1986) study, the factor is stressed heavily when interviewing respondents in this research. All respondents stated that they take feedback from participants and team members into consideration when judging the interpreter’s performance. Interpreters, who receive a lot of negative feedback and complaints from participants and the team are usually not reemployed. However, it is important to note that the mechanism in collecting feedback also varies between cases. While two respondents collect feedback on interpreters through event evaluation forms from every participant, the majority randomly ask two to five participants after the event.

General Knowledge

Encyclopaedic knowledge is mentioned solely as a criterion in the study of Chiaro and Nocella (2004) and is referred to by Respondent 3 as one of the basic qualities an interpreter should possess. Speakers can, at any time, refer to any facts, occurrences, or news both related and not related to the topic of their speech. Therefore, to be able to catch and interpret such references, interpreters should also keep themselves up-to-date.

Synchronicity

Zwischenberger and Pöchhacker (2010), and Moser (1995) include synchronicity or the lag time between the speaker’s utterance and the interpreter’s rendition as one of the criteria in their works. Based on the interviews, 10 respondents share the negative opinion towards long lag time. The speed of interpreters should be in synchrony with that of the speaker. Respondent 4 referred to lag time between the speaker and the interpreter as acceptable if the interpreter can maintain accurate, complete and comprehensible rendition, as long as the delay is not too long. Another respondent considers the acceptable delay to depend on the type of speech being delivered by the speaker.

“In the case that the speaker does not have any visual assistance, lag time of a couple of sentences is acceptable, on the condition that it is rhythmic and does not signify the interpreter’s distress. However, if visual aid is present, for example a presentation, the

interpreter should be at the same speed as the speaker for the audience to be able to follow the change of slides.” – Respondent 9

Despite the comments, all respondents agreed that a qualified interpreter should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speaker. This will make the listener’s experience real-time and more interesting than listening to the delayed speech.

New Quality Criteria

Apart from the quality criteria or factors that coincide with those of previous research, the interview offers some new insights from the recruiter perspective of what is important to them and influences their choice of interpreters.

Cost Efficiency

Cost efficiency is never mentioned as a criterion in previous literature. This might be because qualitative interviews are mainly conducted with interpreters and users, none of whom have the mandate to procure the service of interpreters. However, in this study, costs are mentioned by all respondents as a decisive factor that determines whether an interpreter will be hired. However, it is not the case that the cheapest always gets employed. Seven respondents state that they are willing to pay more to get a good interpreter, which means that cost is also relative to performance and quality of interpretation.

Attentiveness and Enthusiasm to Work

Attentiveness and enthusiasm are mentioned by eleven out of twelve respondents during the interview. Continuous follow-ups, especially to request for documents, agenda, and presentations are highly appreciated by the recruiters as it reflects enthusiasm and willingness to work and prepare before the day of the event. Respondent 10 states that such qualities are prevalent in all the interpreters that she usually employs, while ten other responses also confirm similar preference.

“We know that the interpreting profession is demanding, so to secure results, we are willing to provide the interpreters with any documents that might help them do their job well. And we do hope they also want to do the same for us. We like that attitude. There is no harm in asking, if we have available material, we are happy to give them.” – Respondent 10

However, such attentiveness is not always welcome by all recruiters. Respondent 1 regards some interpreters who ask for documents as insecure and sometimes disturbing.

“Usually we tried to recruit our usual interpreters, who have a good background in climate change, because the field has a lot of technical terms and abbreviations. These people are reliable in that they already know the project and the context that they won’t need a lot of information. On the other hand, the new ones are very difficult to work with as they are quite insecure and will ask for a lot of information and documents, which is a little bit burdensome.” – Respondent 1

Though only one does not prefer such attentiveness, interpreters might want to contain their requests to the appropriate degree that they do not risk annoying the recruiters with their requests.

Background Knowledge

Existing background in the field could enhance the chance of interpreters being employed. This does not mean that interpreters must have an educational background in the field. Exposure to the topics through previous assignments is considered an advantage when the recruiters have to select between several competent interpreters. Having knowledge on context, framework, and terminology could help interpreters in coping with the content and is usually reflected in the fluency, comprehensibility, and accuracy of the rendition. It is mentioned as very important by Respondent 1, who will choose a less experienced interpreter with topic-specific background, over more experienced one with less exposure to the field.

In addition to contextual background, the understanding in the recruiter’s organisational structure and work process both content-wise and administrative-wise is also considered a complimentary element.

Punctuality

Punctuality is also a factor that respondents report to consider when hiring interpreters. All the respondents prefer that interpreters arrive at the event venue 30 minutes to 1 hour before the starting time. Failure to arrive on time, namely before the start of an event, results in blacklisting in all cases. The buffer time should be maintained for the interpreters’ own preparation and in the case of unforeseeable events. Some presentation slides are only handed over on the morning of the

event. The reserved time would give an interpreter the opportunity to study them before the event begins. Respondent 1 recalls a meeting which had to shift to half an hour earlier due to the urgent assignment of a high-ranking official. It was fortunate that the interpreter of the day was already there to perform. The interpreter is the first candidate for the unit since.

Service Mind

Despite the non-existence of this factor in previous research, service mind comes up as very important in every interview with respondents and is regarded to be a criterion when selecting one interpreter over others. Interpreters are regarded as service providers by respondents and should be helpful and mindful on top of delivering their service. According to all the respondents, just “doing my job and go” is not a welcoming attitude. Though it is not the interpreter’s job to coordinate with the booth technician or to hand out audio devices to participants, willingness to reach out to ease the work of the organisers is always welcome and appreciated.

“We do know that handing out audio devices are not exactly the interpreters’ job, but those who see that we are short on staff and offer their help is preferable to those who disregard the issue and just sit in the booth or play around with their phone.” – Respondent 4

“We had once a pair of interpreters who sat in the booth for fifteen minutes and did not interpret because the sound did not come in. A participant complained that they did not hear anything so I checked the audio device and went to the booth and the interpreters were not interpreting. I asked them why they did not reach out to the technician. They said it is not his job to reach out to technician. It is the technician’s job to reach out to them. That was the last time we hired them.” – Respondent 5

Response to Feedback and Instructions

As service providers, interpreters should respect the opinion and feedback of the recruiters. Arrogance and unwillingness to change are mentioned to be traits that reduce the chance to be reemployed by five of the respondents, while three regard a positive attitude toward constructive comments as a positive quality. Negative or defensive reactions towards comments is usually discouraging for respondents to provide feedback or further instructions, as well as to reemploy interpreters.

“Interpreters might be competent and proficient in doing their job, but it does not mean their performance could not be improved. We are the one listening to their interpretation and sometimes we have comments as listeners or specialists in the field. This is not to blame them, but to help them to do it correctly next time. Helping them to perform well generates mutual benefits.” – Respondent 7

Flexibility

Nine respondents disclose flexibility as a positive quality of interpreters. Especially, regarding work condition, interpreters should be flexible with working under unfriendly conditions, e.g. no booth for simultaneous interpreting, having to work alone, low quality sound system, or no presentation provided before the event. Five respondents state that if possible they would have already provided the best setting for interpreters, but most of the time circumstances do not allow them to do so. Budget usually plays a substantial role in such situations.

“Like we trust them to perform their best, they will need to trust us that we tried our best to provide them support as much as we can. Complaining about the conditions does not help. They will have to deal with it.” – Respondent 1

Additionally, interpreters should also be flexible in terms of content changeability. Some abrupt, unforeseeable changes might occur. The speaker can decide to show another presentation instead of the one he sent prior to the event. In such cases interpreters need to be flexible and able to improvise and perform.

Apart from the aforementioned factors some elements are mentioned to compliment an interpreter as being “ideal to have”, but not elaborated or stressed as important in decision-making as follows;

- Knowing how to operate interpreting devices
- Having empathy towards the organisers
- Having common sense
- Having good interpersonal skills

The findings from this research partly parallels the major criteria devised in other previous works. Emphasis on the “Logical Coherence of Utterance (comprehensibility)” and “Sense of Consistency with the Original (Faithfulness to the original)” coincides with the qualities ranked as most

important in other studies, namely Bühler (1986), Chiaro and Nocella (2004), Zwischenberger and Pöchhacker (2010), Kurz (1993), Moser (1995), and Srinonthaprasert (2015).

However, in this study “Fluency of Delivery”, “Thorough Preparation”, and “Trustworthiness, Reliability, and Accountability”, which were less highlighted in previous research, are also referred to by all respondents as similarly decisive factors that determine an interpreter’s employability. Interpreters without one of the five qualities can be considered unqualified for reemployment.

Apart from the five key criteria discussed, four criteria are also outlined as important in the recruiters’ decision-making process “Completeness of Interpretation”, “Poise, Absence of Stress, and Endurance”, and “Use of Appropriate Style” are identified by a few of the respondents as equally decisive as the five key criteria. “Pleasant Voice” and “Feedback of Delegates” are also mentioned as factors that play a significant role, though not as substantial as other five.

New key criteria, which have not appeared in the previous literature on expectations toward interpreters, could additionally be identified namely as “Cost Efficiency”, “Attentiveness and Enthusiasm to Work”, “Background Knowledge”, “Punctuality”, “Service Mind”, “Response to Feedback and Instruction”, and “Flexibility”. Apart from “Cost Efficiency” and “Punctuality”, which respondents unanimously agree to be determinants for an interpreter’s employability, all of these new key criteria are mentioned by at least one of the respondents to be decisive.

It is worth noting that upon close consideration of the newly-emerged criteria and elements, it could be seen that most of the criteria result from the relation between the recruiters or organisers of event and the interpreters. It is evident that users and interpreters themselves will not consider factors as cost, attentiveness, flexibility, service mind, background knowledge, and other new factors, as they are not the one responsible for hiring, dealing, and negotiating with interpreters on a client–provider basis. Thus, the finding confirms the hypothesis that recruiters have a different set of expectations towards interpreters.

Conclusion

Despite their fields of expertise, the result of the twelve interviews does not seem to deviate distinctively from one another (1) Logical Coherence of Utterance (comprehensibility), (2) Sense of Consistency with the Original (Faithfulness to the original), (3) Fluency of Delivery, (4) Thorough Preparation, (5) Trustworthiness, Reliability, and Accountability, (6) Cost Efficiency, (7) Punctuality are the seven key qualities emphasised unanimously by respondents to have significant weighting in their choice of interpreters.

However, this synchrony is not representative of the organisation, nor a sector, let alone all the recruiters in the industry. Even among the twelve respondents within an organisation, different emphasis was observed among other identified elements. For instance, in the case of Attentiveness and Enthusiasm, which all respondents but one refers to as a positive influence to their decision-making, one cannot go so far as to conclude that the factor has positive influence in all other fields, or to determine that the deviation is caused by personal preference. Similarly, one cannot assume that Poise, Absence of Stress, and Endurance are just central to the decision of recruiters in the fields that Respondent 6 and 8 are working in.

Nevertheless, the fact that the result cannot be generalised should not overshadow the identified insights from recruiters, which can provide interpreters at least an orientation on how they can improve themselves to enhance their employability. Some factors, e.g. thorough preparation, or punctuality are nothing but general requirements that could be applied to any profession. While others, especially relating to interpreting, could be seen as points of improvement, which could only bring about benefits to interpreters.

The results of the interviews and this research is highly subjective and the qualitative nature of the study is not devised to generalise the expectations and quality criteria of all recruiters. The objective of the research is merely to offer an insight into the realm of recruiters which is still unexplored and indicate possible deviations from the expectations of interpreters and users.

The only fact that this research can confirm is that there is evidence, proven by a qualitative case study, that recruiters have different expectations and devise different sets of standards in their preference regarding interpreters. It calls for further research on the subject. Deviation from previous research is apparent and should be examined both qualitatively among different groups

of recruiters to understand the rationality of this group of stakeholders, which might differ from this very study. Additionally, quantitative research should also be executed to understand the weighting, interplay, and prioritisation of factors among the larger population. The information gain through research of such nature, would not only offer new academic insights, but help fellow interpreters understanding more about the market demand as well as how they could enhance their employability in the long run.

References

- AIIC. (2012, April 23). Interpreting is not translating. Retrieved from <http://aiic.net/p/4002>
- Amratisha, R. (2008). *The role and function of interpreters in the entertainment circle in Thailand (Special research)*. Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2011) *Business research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bühler, H. (1986). Linguistic (semantic) and extra-linguistic (pragmatic) criteria for the evaluation of conference interpretation and interpreters. *Multilingua - Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 5(4), 231-235.
- Chiaro, D., & Nocella, G. (2004). Interpreters' perception of linguistic and non-linguistic factors affecting quality: A survey through the world wide web. *Meta*, 49(2), 278-293. DOI 10.7202/009351
- Denscombe, M. (2010) *The good research guide: For small-scale social research projects*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Method*, 5(1), 80-92.
- Kelly, N., Stewart, R., & Hegde, V. (2010). *The interpreting marketplace: A study of interpreting in North America commissioned by InterpretAmerica*. Lowell: Common Sense Advisory.
- Kurz, I. (1993). Conference interpretation: Expectations of different user groups. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, 5, 13-21. Retrieved from <https://www.openstarts.units.it/handle/10077/4908>
- Merriam-Webster. (2017, December 3). Recruit. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/recruit>
- Moser, P. (1995, January). Survey on expectations of users of conference interpretation. Retrieved from <https://aiic.net/page/attachment/1044>

- Pöchhacker, F. (2010). The role of research in interpreter education. *Translation & Interpreting*, 2(1), 1-10. Retrieved from <http://www.trans-int.org/index.php/transint/article/view/80/62>
- Pöchhacker, F. (2013, April 24). Interpreting quality: Global Professional Standards?. Retrieved from <https://lourdesderioja.com/2013/04/24/the-issue-of-quality/>
- Setton, R., & Dawrant, A. (2016). *Conference interpreting: A complete course*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Srinonthaprasert, N. (2015). *Characteristics of Thai interpreters of Japanese needed by the Japanese heads of manufacturing industry in eastern sea board: A research in business administration for executives (Master's thesis)*. Burapha University, Chon Buri, Thailand.
- Zwischenberger, C., & Pöchhacker, F. (2010, March 15). Survey on quality and role: Conference interpreters' expectations and self-perceptions. Retrieved from <https://aiic.net/p/3405>

Appendix I: Comparison Matrix

		Interpreters		Users		Recruiters
	Bühler (1986):	Chiari and Nocella (2004):	Zwischenberger and Pöchhacker (2010):	Kurz (1993)	Moser (1995)	Srinonthaprasert's (2015)
1	Native accent	Native accent	Native accent	Native accent		
2	Fluency of delivery	Fluency of delivery*	Fluency of delivery	Fluency of delivery	Rhetorical skills	Fluency of delivery
3	Logical cohesion of utterance***	Logical cohesion***	Logical cohesion of utterance***	Logical cohesion of utterance***		
4	Sense of consistency with the original***	Consistency with the original***	Sense of consistency with the original***	Sense of consistency with the original message***	Faithfulness to the original	Consistency with the original message (maintaining neutrality and interpreting meaning, not word-for-word)
5	Completeness of interpretation	Completeness of information***	Completeness	Completeness of interpretation	Rhetorical skills	
6	Correct grammatical usage	Correct grammatical usage*	Correct grammatical usage	Correct grammatical usage	Rhetorical skills	
7	Correct terminology	Correct terminology*	Correct terminology	Use of correct terminology		
8	Use of appropriate style	Appropriate style	Appropriate style			
9	Pleasant voice	Pleasant voice	Pleasant voice	Pleasant voice	Natural, agreeable voice , Quality of interpreter's voice	
10	Thorough preparation of conference documents	Preparation of conference documents***				
11	Endurance	Endurance				Eudurance
12	Poise					Poise

13	Pleasant appearance					
14	Reliability					Reliability (having high responsibility, having confidence to ask when the content is unknown)
15	Ability to work in a team	Ability to work in a team				Ability to work in a team
16	Positive feedback of delegates					
17		Concentration***				
18		Physical-well being				
19		Mnemonic skills				
20		Encyclopaedic knowledge				
21		Absence of stress				
22			Lively intonation		Lively, non-monotonious	
23			Synchronicity		Synchronicity (Lag time)	
24					Rhethorical skills (Regular delivery, absence of hesitation, complete, grammatically correct sentences, clarity of expression)	

Linguistic criteria ***most important quality criterion
 Extra-linguistic criteria *important quality criterion

Appendix II: Interview Questions: Recruiters

1. Are you responsible for selecting and hiring interpreters for your unit? What is your role in the process?
2. What kinds of interpreter do you usually employ? (Language pair, simultaneous vs. consecutive)
3. What is the average cost you are paying per interpreter?
4. How many interpreters do you usually employ for an event? Which factors determine the number of interpreters?
5. Please describe how the normal process of hiring interpreter looks like.
6. Do you have a go-to interpreter? Why is she/he more desirable than others?
7. Have you ever blacklisted an interpreter? Or do you have interpreters that you are disinclined to use? Why is she/he less desirable than others?
8. If your go-to interpreters are not available, what do you usually do?
9. How can you be sure that a new interpreter will be able to perform with quality? What do you look for before hiring him/her?
10. How do you usually judge a new interpreter's performance?
11. Judging from your standard, what should a good interpreter be able to do?
12. What is a no-go?

Appendix III: Result Matrix

Criteria/Respondents	Respondent 1	Respondent 2	Respondent 3	Respondent 4	Respondent 5	Respondent 6
Fluency of Delivery	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
Logical Cohesion of Utterance/ Comprehensibility	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
Sense of Consistency with the Original/ Faithfulness to the Original	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
Completeness of Information	Core messages and important details that help enhance the understanding of the audience should be captured.	Core messages and important details that help enhance the understanding of the audience should be captured.	Core messages that are central to the understanding of the audience should be captured.	Core messages that are central to the understanding of the audience and the objective of the event should be captured.	Core messages that are central to the understanding of the audience and the objective of the event should be captured.	Decisive factor: All details should be captured. Details are no less important than core messages.
Correct Grammar Usage				Grammatical correctness is not an issue as long as the messages are conveyed and the mistakes do not annoy the audience.		
Correct Terminology and Abbreviations	Interpreters, who are able to render terms and abbreviation accurately are preferred.					
Use of Appropriate Style	Interpreters should be able to use appropriate register and level of language tailored to different context	Interpreters should be able to use appropriate register and level of language tailored to different context	Interpreters should be able to use appropriate register and level of language tailored to different context	Decisive factor: Interpreters must be able to use appropriate register and level of language tailored to different context	Interpreters should be able to use appropriate register and level of language tailored to different context	Interpreters should be able to use appropriate register and level of language tailored to different context
Pleasant Voice		Interpreters with engaging voice is preferred.	Interpreters with engaging voice is preferred.	Interpreters with the voice that is lively, engaging, nice and easy to listen to are preferred.	Interpreters with soothing and lively voice is preferred.	
Thorough Preparation	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
Poise, Absence of Stress, Endurance			Decisive factor: Interpreters should be able to maintain their composure under high stress situation.			Decisive factor: Interpreters should be able to maintain their composure under high stress situation.
Thrustworthiness, Reliability, Accountability	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
Feedback of Delegates	Decisive factor: Feedbacks are randomly collected from the conversation with some participants.	Decisive factor: Feedbacks are randomly collected from the conversation with some participants.	Decisive factor: Feedbacks are randomly collected from the conversation with some participants.	Decisive factor: Feedbacks are randomly collected from the conversation with some participants.	Decisive factor: Feedbacks are randomly collected from the conversation with some participants.	Decisive factor: Feedbacks are collected via evaluation form dispatched to all participants.
General Knowledge			One of the basic quality that interpreters should have.			
Synchronicity	Interpreters should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speakers	Interpreters should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speakers	Interpreters should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speakers	Interpreters should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speakers	Interpreters should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speakers	Interpreters should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speakers
Cost Efficiency	Decisive factor	Decisive factor: Willing to pay more for a good interpreter. Cost and quality of performance should be relative.	Decisive factor: Willing to pay more for a good interpreter. Cost and quality of performance should be relative.	Decisive factor: Willing to pay more for a good interpreter. Cost and quality of performance should be relative.	Decisive factor	Decisive factor: Willing to pay more for a good interpreter. Cost and quality of performance should be relative.
Attentiveness and Enthusiasm to Work	Not preferred that interpreters ask for documents and agenda to make sure of the quality of interpreting. They should be able to do it without.	Interpreters that are attentive and ask for information related to the event as agenda and objectives are preferred as it shows their enthusiasm for quality.	Interpreters that are attentive and ask for information related to the event as agenda and objectives are preferred as it shows their enthusiasm for quality.	Interpreters that are attentive and ask for information related to the event as agenda and objectives are preferred as it shows their enthusiasm for quality.	Interpreters that are attentive and ask for information related to the event as agenda and objectives are preferred as it shows their enthusiasm for quality.	Interpreters that are attentive and ask for information related to the event as agenda and objectives are preferred as it shows their enthusiasm for quality.
Background Knowledge	The interpreters who are experienced in the fields are preferred and mostly likely to be selected than the ones without.	Knowledge on the background and context of the fields that the interpreters are going to deliver their services is an advantage.		Knowledge on the background and context of the fields that the interpreters are going to deliver their services is an advantage.	Knowledge on the background and context of the fields that the interpreters are going to deliver their services is an advantage.	
Punctuality	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
Service Mind	Interpreters that are helpful, understanding, and ready to help within reason are preferred to those who are there just to interpret.	Interpreters that are helpful, understanding, and ready to help within reason are preferred to those who are there just to interpret.	Interpreters that are helpful, understanding, and ready to help within reason are preferred to those who are there just to interpret.	Interpreters that are helpful, understanding, and ready to help within reason are preferred to those who are there just to interpret.	Interpreters that are helpful, understanding, and ready to help within reason are preferred to those who are there just to interpret.	Interpreters that are helpful, understanding, and ready to help within reason are preferred to those who are there just to interpret.
Response to Feedback and Instructions		Arrogance and unwillingness to improve is a trait that reduces interpreters' employability.		Arrogance and unwillingness to improve is a trait that reduces interpreters' employability.	Arrogance and unwillingness to improve is a trait that reduces interpreters' employability.	Interpreters should have a positive attitude towards constructive comments.
Flexibility	Flexibility in terms of unchangeable work conditions and changeability of the content.	Flexibility in terms of unchangeable work conditions and changeability of the content.	Flexibility in terms of unchangeable work conditions and changeability of the content.	Flexibility in terms of unchangeable work conditions and changeability of the content.	Flexibility in terms of unchangeable work conditions and changeability of the content.	
Knowing How to Operate Interpreting Devices				It is an advantage for interpreters to know their way around devices, so that they do not create additional burden to organisers.		
Empathy toward Organisers	Interpreters should have empathy towards organisers and should not complain for things that we cannot change.					
Common Sense						
Interpersonal Skills						

Decisive factor for the selection of interpreters
Factor that is influential in the selection of interpreters
Factor that could be considered a competitive advantage in the case that there are more than one candidates.
Factor that discourages recruiters from rehiring interpreters.

Respondent 7	Respondent 8	Respondent 9	Respondent 10	Respondent 11	Respondent 12
Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
Core messages that are central to the understanding of the audience and the objective of the event should be captured.	Core messages that are central to the understanding of the audience should be captured.	Core messages that are central to the understanding of the audience should be captured.	Core messages that are central to the understanding of the audience should be captured.	Core messages that are central to the understanding of the audience should be captured.	Core messages that are central to the understanding of the audience should be captured.
Interpreters do not have to have perfect grammar, but should be able to communicate to audience in an accurate way. Perfect grammar is a plus.		Grammatical correctness is not an issue as long as the messages are conveyed and the mistakes do not annoy the audience.			
		Interpreters, who are able to render terms and abbreviation accurately are preferred.			Interpreters, who are able to render terms and abbreviation accurately are preferred.
Interpreters should be able to use appropriate register and level of language tailored to different context					
Interpreters should have a clear and the voice that the audience can listen to for a long time.	Interpreters' voice should not be coarse, monotonous, high-pitched, unnatural, or has an affected accent that annoys the audience.	Interpreters' voice should be pleasant to listen to.		Interpreters who sound confident and engaging are preferred.	The audience must not feel that they will have to tolerate the voice of interpreters. Therefore, interpreters' voice should be nice to listen to.
Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
	Decisive factor: Interpreters should be able to maintain their composure under high stress situation. Panicking is unacceptable.				
Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
Decisive factor: Feedbacks are randomly collected from the conversation with some participants.	Decisive factor: Feedbacks are randomly collected from the conversation with some participants.	Decisive factor: Feedbacks are randomly collected from the conversation with some participants.	Decisive factor: Feedbacks are collected via evaluation form dispatched to all participants.	Decisive factor: Feedbacks are randomly collected from the conversation with some participants.	Decisive factor: Feedbacks are randomly collected from the conversation with some participants.
Interpreters should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speakers	Interpreters should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speakers	Interpreters should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speakers	Interpreters should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speakers	Interpreters should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speakers	Interpreters should be able to interpret in synchrony with the speakers
Decisive factor: Willing to pay more for a good interpreter. Cost and quality of performance should be relative.	Decisive factor: Willing to pay more for a good interpreter. Cost and quality of performance should be relative.	Decisive factor: Willing to pay more for a good interpreter. Cost and quality of performance should be relative.	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
Interpreters that are attentive and ask for information related to the event as agenda and objectives are preferred as it shows their enthusiasm for quality.	Interpreters that are attentive and ask for information related to the event as agenda and objectives are preferred as it shows their enthusiasm for quality.	Interpreters that are attentive and ask for information related to the event as agenda and objectives are preferred as it shows their enthusiasm for quality.	Interpreters that are attentive and ask for information related to the event as agenda and objectives are preferred as it shows their enthusiasm for quality.	Interpreters that are attentive and ask for information related to the event as agenda and objectives are preferred as it shows their enthusiasm for quality.	Interpreters that are attentive and ask for information related to the event as agenda and objectives are preferred as it shows their enthusiasm for quality.
			Knowledge on the background and context of the fields that the interpreters are going to deliver their services is an advantage.		Knowledge on the background and context of the fields that the interpreters are going to deliver their services is an advantage.
Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor	Decisive factor
Interpreters that are helpful, understanding, and ready to help within reason are preferred to those who are there just to interpret.	Interpreters that are helpful, understanding, and ready to help within reason are preferred to those who are there just to interpret.	Interpreters that are helpful, understanding, and ready to help within reason are preferred to those who are there just to interpret.	Interpreters that are helpful, understanding, and ready to help within reason are preferred to those who are there just to interpret.	Interpreters that are helpful, understanding, and ready to help within reason are preferred to those who are there just to interpret.	Interpreters that are helpful, understanding, and ready to help within reason are preferred to those who are there just to interpret.
Interpreters should have a positive attitude towards constructive comments.	Arrogance and unwillingness to improve is a trait that reduces interpreters' employability.			Interpreters should have a positive attitude towards constructive comments.	Arrogance and unwillingness to improve is a trait that reduces interpreters' employability.
Flexibility in terms of unchangeable work conditions and changeability of the content.		Flexibility in terms of unchangeable work conditions and changeability of the content.	Flexibility in terms of unchangeable work conditions and changeability of the content.		Flexibility in terms of unchangeable work conditions and changeability of the content.
Common sense should be everyone's quality, not just interpreters.					
Interpreters should have good social skills and able to communicate in their daily life.					