Volume 13 No. 4 p 1309-1315
Journal of English Language Teaching
EISSN 2302-3198
Published by JurusanBahasadanSastraInggris
FBS UniversitasNegeri Padang
available at http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jelt

An Analysis of the Accuracy of Students' Simultaneous Interpretation Using a NER-Model

Yunita Iscahyani[1] and Yenni Rozimela[2]
[12]Universitas Negeri Padang
Correspondence Email: yunitaiscahyani@mail.com

Article History
Published: 2024-11-07

Keywords:
Accuracy, Interpretation, Simultaneous Interpretation, NER-Model

Abstract
This research aimed to find out the accuracy of students' simultaneous interpretation using the NER model and the types of errors the students made in simultaneous interpretations as found by the NER model. This research used a quantitative descriptive design. The study participants were 18 English Education students in Universitas Negeri Padang, especially batch 2021, who had already taken the Interpreting course. Documentation was employed as the primary technique for data collection. The findings of this research indicate that students' simultaneous interpretation in the interpretation course at the English Department of Universitas Negeri Padang was less accurate. The study also identified different types of errors made by students in simultaneous interpretation, including serious, standard and minor errors, grouped into recognition and edition errors. The result shows that students made recognition errors more frequently, reflecting a lack of understanding in recognizing important information directly.

How to Cite: Iscahyani, Y., & Rozimela, Y. (2024). An Analysis of The Accuracy of Students' Simultaneous Interpretation Using A NER-Model, Journal of English Language Teaching, 13 (4): pp. 1309-1315, DOI: 10.24036/jelt.v13i4.131273

INTRODUCTION

Interpretation is the process of translating spoken or signed language into another spoken or signed language in real-time, allowing people who speak different languages to communicate effectively. It involves conveying the meaning, tone, and nuances of the original message to ensure accurate and clear understanding by the audience. Interpretation serves the purpose of bridging communication gaps between individuals or groups with distinct languages. Ghaza'ee and Ali (2019) state that interpretation is divided into five types. They are clarified as: (1) simultaneous interpretation, (2) consecutive interpretation, (3) whispered interpretation, (4) relay interpretation and (5) liaison interpretation.

Several researchers have researched interpretation. Yulianti (2016) conducted a study to determine the factors that affect the perfection of interpreting by non-linguist interpreters. Smith and Dent (2018) conducted a study to find best practices for language interpretation. Perfect interpreting can make the listener feel comfortable

and trusting, and they can receive all the important information they need. Bontempo (2012) conducted a study to identify the skills, knowledge, and abilities deemed necessary for competent performance as a signed language interpreter.

Students in the English Education program at Universitas Negeri Padang are offered several elective courses in semester 6. From several elective courses, there is a choice of interpretation. According to Rozimela (2012), the goal of the interpretation course is to help students improve their interpretation abilities, so that they can take advantage of a variety of employment opportunities that call for these abilities. Through interpretation exercises, students enhance their language proficiency, particularly in speaking and listening. In the interpretation class, students learn and practice various types of interpretation, among the many types; students usually focus on learning consecutive and simultaneous interpreting. Based on the informal interviews the researcher conducted with some classmates in the interpretation class, they mentioned that simultaneous interpretation is more difficult than consecutive interpretation. Simultaneous interpretation is complicated due to time pressure, high concentration, language complexity, and short-term memory limitations.

Simultaneous interpretation is the most difficult one based on the lecturer's and students' opinions. Several researchers have researched the topic of simultaneous interpretation (Kurz, 2001; Hassanshahi & Shahrokhi, 2016; Wang et al., 2021). Simultaneous interpretation is a difficult task that requires both language and cognitive skills from students. Many sub-skills must be analyzed in simultaneous interpretation, such as accuracy, target text features, delivery features, processing skills, etc. One of the most essential things is accuracy because accuracy determines whether the interpreted message can be understood by the listener or not. Maintaining accuracy is the biggest problem because mistakes can result in misunderstandings and the loss of important information. Accuracy research is important because it guarantees efficient communication, promotes skill development, assures quality in professional contexts, identifies obstacles students confront, and enhances training initiatives. In the end, sustaining the integrity of cross-cultural communication and educating students to fulfil professional standards need a focus on accuracy.

There are several types of assessments in assessing interpretation, such as assessments of conformity of meaning, tests of terminological accuracy, tests of adherence to text structure, models, and so on. From the several types already mentioned, the researcher chose to use the NER model to assess students' accuracy in simultaneous interpretation, providing a comprehensive approach. The number model measures the frequency of numbers from the source text, the edition error ensures adherence to interpretation standards and the recognition error assesses the comprehension ability of important entities in the text. Combining these three models allows for complete assessment, identification of areas of improvement, consistency in assessment, and detailed feedback, thus providing a comprehensive picture of student performance in simultaneous interpretation. Statistical assessment has long been avoided because it is considered irrelevant and inapplicable to an interpreter's relative and subjective performance. However, a study tries to assess the accuracy of interpretation using the NER model. Meert (2012) analyzes professional interpreters in Brussels, Belgium. This present study is distinct from earlier research because it concentrates on analyzing the accuracy of students' simultaneous interpretation at the

English Education Department in Universitas Negeri Padang. So, the researcher conducted a study that analyzes students' simultaneous interpretation accuracy using the NER model.

METHODOLOGY

The data was the recordings of interpretation conducted by 18 students of the english department of Universitas Negeri Padang. The interpretation was transcribed and was analyzed by identify the errors made by the students. The errors were classified into recognition errors and edition errors. Prior to this, the number of words of each interpretation was calculated. Then, the result of this analysis was qualified to go through the next stage of analysis using the NER model. The table below shows the assessment form of the NER model.

Table 1- Assessment Form of NER-model

Accuracy = $\frac{N-E-R}{N}$ x 100
Assessment

After getting the accuracy percentages, the conclusion was drawn based on the result and discussion derived from the data. In order to categorize the students' accuracy in practising the simultaneous interpretation, the classification was used based on theory from Romero-Fresco et al. (2011): <98% (Substandard Performance), 98-98.49% (Acceptable Performance), 98.5-98.99% (Good Performance)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Research Finding

The model was applied to find out the accuracy percentages from the transcribed recording of each student who participated as the sample of this research. The data was gathered from 18 students, and the interpretations were categorized into two groups: eight complete interpretations and ten incomplete ones. Due to differences in completeness, the complete interpretations were present first, followed by the incomplete ones.

1. Complete Interpretation

According to Romero-Fresco et al. (2011), interpretation is considered good if the accuracy is above 98%. The accuracy level of the results is measured based on the extent to which the performance results are acceptable. From the eight completed interpretations, only one student achieved 98% of acceptable performance, while the other seven were not considered good. The results are displayed in the table.

Table 1-Complete Interpretations

No	Accuracy	Category	Number of Words	Error	
				Edition	Recognition
1.	94.87%	Substandard	249	4.00	8.75
2.	97.89%	Substandard	249	1.25	4.00
3.	98.09%	Acceptable	249	3.75	1.00
4.	96.68%	Substandard	249	2.25	6.00
5.	97.18%	Substandard	213	-	6.00
6.	97.65%	Substandard	213	-	5.00
7.	97.18%	Substandard	213	3.00	3.00
8.	96.00%	Substandard	213	3.50	5.00
Mean	**96.94%**	**Substandard**	**-**	**2.21**	**4.59**

2. Incomplete Interpretation

This part presents the analysis of incomplete interpretation. Incomplete interpretation results from students interpreting only half or less of the source language. Ten students did incomplete interpretation, with an average of 93.99%, which means the accuracy is still below the standard. The following table shows the results.

Table 2- Incomplete Interpretation

No	Accuracy	Category	Number of Words	Error	
				Edition	Recognition
1.	94.87%	Substandard	249	4.00	8.75
2.	97.89%	Substandard	249	1.25	4.00
3.	98.09%	Acceptable	249	3.75	1.00
4.	96.68%	Substandard	249	2.25	6.00
5.	97.18%	Substandard	213	-	6.00
6.	97.65%	Substandard	213	-	5.00
7.	97.18%	Substandard	213	3.00	3.00
8.	96.00%	Substandard	213	3.50	5.00
Mean	**96.94%**	**Substandard**	**-**	**2.21**	**4.59**

The research found that students' simultaneous interpretation accuracy, when assessed using the NER model, reached an average of 96.95% for complete interpretations and 93.56% for incomplete interpretations. These results indicate that students' interpretations generally exhibited low levels of accuracy, especially incomplete interpretations. This finding highlights the need for improvement in capturing specific details during interpretation, such as proper nouns, names, and time, which many students failed to interpret accurately.

Additionally, students struggled to convey the speaker's main idea, with many failing to interpret entire units of meaning. The NER model identified two main types of errors: recognition errors and edition errors. The number model measures the frequency of numbers from the source text, the edition model ensures adherence to

interpretation standards, and the recognition model assesses the comprehension ability of important entities in the text. The number model measures the frequency of numbers from the source text, the edition model ensures adherence to interpretation standards, and the recognition model assesses the comprehension ability of important entities in the text errors. The average number of errors for complete interpretations was 2.18 for edition errors and 4.59 for recognition errors. In contrast, incomplete interpretations had a higher error rate of 3.85 for edition errors and 11.02 for recognition errors. This shows that students face significant challenges in understanding the core message of the speaker.

Discussion

The findings of this research indicate that students' interpretation at the English Department of Universitas Negeri Padang performed typically less accurately when assessed using the NER model. Students also appear to make recognition mistakes more frequently than edition errors, suggesting that recognition mistakes are a common issue in their performance.

Based on the NER model analysis, this study shows that students' simultaneous interpretation accuracy is still below the standard. The average accuracy of students did not reach 98%, which, according to Romero-Fresco et al. (2011), is categorized as sub-standard. This shows that there are deficiencies in students' interpretation skills that need to be improved.

This study differs from Meert's (2012) study, in which the accuracy of the analyzed interpretations reached more than 98%. This difference is most likely due to the different research subjects. Meert examined professional interpreters, while this study involved students who are still in the learning stage, so differences in experience and expertise significantly impact accuracy results.

The research also found that students committed different types of errors in simultaneous interpretation, categorized as serious, standard and minor. These errors were then divided into recognition and edition errors based on their impact on translation accuracy. Based on the table analysis, it can be seen that students make recognition errors more often than editing errors, which shows a lack of understanding in recognizing important information in real-time.

In line with Meert's (2012) research, recognition errors are more common than editing errors. Recognition errors are considered more serious as they directly affect the understanding of the message conveyed. Therefore, more intensive training is needed to improve the ability to listen and understand vocabulary quickly. The NER model effectively identified these errors, aligning with Meert's findings and providing important insights for developing students' simultaneous interpretation skills.

The findings indicate that students in interpreting courses at Universitas Negeri Padang shows low accuracy when assessed with the NER model, with an average accuracy below the 98% standard set by Romero-Fresco et al. (2011). The results of this study differ from Meert's (2012) study of professional interpreters, whose accuracy exceeded 98%, most likely due to differences in expertise and experience. The students made more recognition errors than editing errors, indicating a lack of

real-time understanding and highlighting the need for more focused training to improve their interpretation skills.

CONCLUSION

Overall, this research provides important insights into students' simultaneous interpretation accuracy and the types of errors often occurring in the Interpretation process. Based on the analysis by the researcher using the NER model, this research shows that students' simultaneous interpretation in the interpretation class has not achieved good accuracy. This implies that students struggle to comprehend and convey the message provided by the speaker in its entirety. The research also identified that students made more recognition errors than edition errors, reflecting a lack of understanding in recognizing important information directly. Some mistakes may be made while determining the errors because the researcher is still in the learning process. Future researchers should use other assessment forms or models because analyzing simultaneous interpretation using other forms or models with the same data may have different results.

REFERENCES

Bontempo, K. M. (2012). *Interpreting by design: A study of aptitude, ability and achievement in Australian Sign Language interpreters* (Doctoral dissertation, Macquarie University, Faculty of Human Sciences, Department of Linguistics).

Ghaza'ee, A. S., & Ali, W. I. (2019). Difficulties and problems of simultaneous interpretation in Kurdistan region–Iraq. *Journal of Garmian University*, *6*(3), 272-294.

Hasanshahi, P., & Shahrokhi, M. (2016). The relationship between simultaneous interpreters' speed of speaking in Persian and the quality of their interpreting: A gender perspective. International Journal of English Linguistics, 6(3), 11-20.

Kurz, I. (2001). Conference interpreting: Quality in the ears of the user. Meta, 46(2), 394-409.

Meert, B. (2012). Accuracy in simultaneous interpreting performances: grading interpreters. www.academia.edu. https://www.academia.edu/13201035/Accuracy_in_simultaneous_interpreting_performances_grading_interpreters

Romero-Fresco, P., & Pérez, J. M. (2011). Accuracy rate in live subtitling: The NER model. Audiovisual translation in a global context: Mapping an ever-changing landscape, 28-50.

Rozimela, Y. (2012, November). Applying Simulation-Based Activities in Interpretation Subject. In International Conference on Languages and Arts (pp. 120-126).

Smith, C. E., & Dent, C. L. (2018). Improving language interpretation practices. Nursing2023, *48*(7), 1-4.

Sugiyono.(2017). Metode Penelitian Bisnis (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D). Bandung: Alfabeta.

Wang, J., Napier, J., Goswell, D., & Carmichael, A. (2015).The design and application of rubrics to assess signed language interpreting performance. The Interpreter and Translator Trainer, 9(1), 83-103.

Yulianti, N. K. D. (2016). The perfection of interpreting by non-linguist interpreters. International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences, 3(3), 22-26.