



Quiz

The Role of Interpreters in Legal Proceedings

1. What is the difference between an interpreter and a translator?
 - a. Translators are required to be NAATI-accredited whereas this is not a requirement for interpreters
 - b. There is no difference – the terms are interchangeable
 - c. Interpreters work with the spoken language while translators work with the written language
 - d. Both A and C
2. Why should solicitors brief interpreters on the case in which the latter will be interpreting?
 - a. Because the more contextual knowledge an interpreter has about the case, the better and more accurately they will be able to interpret
 - b. Because if an interpreter has contextual knowledge about the matter, they will be better able to establish a rapport with the client, which is crucial to interpreting well
 - c. Solicitors should never brief interpreters on a case as doing so is a violation of legal professional privilege
 - d. Solicitors should never brief interpreters on a case as the scope of an interpreter's role is simply to interpret mechanically with no further understanding of the subject matter

3. What was the upshot of the solicitor's disclosure to the interpreter of the grounds of appeal in the first example discussed by Dr Tran?
 - a. The disclosure to the interpreter of the grounds of appeal clouded the interpreter's judgment and thus affected the accuracy of her interpretation
 - b. The disclosure to the interpreter of the grounds of appeal breached legal professional privilege, causing the trial to miscarry
 - c. The disclosure to the interpreter of the grounds of appeal enabled the interpreter to have "the best interpreting session of her career"
 - d. None of the above
4. In the second example discussed by Dr Tran, why did the defence object to the first interpreter's interpretation of the phrase uttered by the accused as "Co Quang"?
 - a. The first interpreter's interpretation of "Co Quang" did not make any sense in the context of the accused's evidence-in-chief
 - b. The first interpreter's interpretation of "Co Quang" was an obscenity
 - c. Both A and B
 - d. The first interpreter's interpretation of "Co Quang" had the potential to incriminate the accused, as Quang was the name of a person who had been found guilty of a related charge
5. What effect did the first interpreter's briefing of the second interpreter have on the second interpreter's interpretation of the disputed phrase?
 - a. It had no effect – the second interpreter came to an entirely different, albeit still incorrect, interpretation of the phrase
 - b. The second interpreter came to the same interpretation of the phrase as the first interpreter, later admitting to Dr Tran that he might not have come to that interpretation had it not been for being briefed by the first interpreter
 - c. It had no effect – the second interpreter came to a different interpretation of the phrase, being the correct interpretation
 - d. The second interpreter initially came to the same interpretation as the first interpreter, however, upon subsequently listening to the recording of the accused's evidence-in-chief several times, came to the correct interpretation

Answers:

1. C 2. A 3. C 4. D 5. B