

October 5, 2021

Greetings from Jefferson, Maine. I'm representing the International Federation of Translators, typically known as FIT.

In the most recent issue of MultiLingual Magazine, Tucker Johnson makes some interesting claims. Let's take a look.

(Slide 3)

Tucker predicts the impending disruption of industry-standard quality management systems. "They have to go," he says, "because they are implemented without any input whatsoever from the end users."

Well, that doesn't sound very good. Who would put together a quality-management system that does not get input from end users? How could that be an industry standard system? Let's look further.

How does ISO respond? How does ASTM respond to such a claim? Well, first of all, **if** there's a quality-management system that does not take into account end-user needs, expressed as specifications (or specs), well, we would certainly reject it, if there were such a thing, because specifications are everything in translation quality.

(Slide 4)

So, suppose, for the sake of argument, that there are translation-quality management systems out there that do not take into account end-user needs. How did we get into such a mess? Well, obviously, the people behind such a system missed a memo: the memo about Functionalism in translation, which comes from both the practical side and the theoretical side; a happy instance where both agree.

Tucker Johnson refers only to "metaphrase" and "paraphrase," which are terms for a literal translation, which nobody wants these days, and a free translation. But a contrast where the end user is not taken into account at all. This approach dates back at least to the 1600s. If you want to, you can look at Dryden, who was very influential there, when he talks about metaphrase and paraphrase.

But now, Functionalism is obsolete... No, it isn't. Because this was not Functionalism. This was a very distant ancestor of Functionalism. Functionalism came about in the late 1900s, became prominent in the late 1900s with various scholars, and has really caught on. The focus is on the end user, the audience, and the purpose of the translation. The intended audience and purpose. So that's modern translation theory, not metaphrase and paraphrase.

Anybody who uses metaphrase and paraphrase as their approach to translation didn't get the memo about Functionalism.

(Slide 5)

Also, anybody who uses a translation-quality management system that is not focused on end users didn't get the memo about modern quality management in general. The U.S. automobile

industry started taking notice of Deming and others who helped the Japanese automobile industry produce better and better cars and started implementing the principles of quality management, way back in the 1980s, 1990s.

So all of this is expressed in the premier quality-management ISO standard that most people have heard about. The ISO 9000 series, where quality is defined, not in absolute terms, ignoring the end user, but in relative terms, as "the degree to which a set of inherent characteristics of an object fulfills requirements." And those requirements are based on end-user needs.

(Slide 6)

So, how do we get out of the mess that Tucker Johnson describes? Well, we're in a session about translation-quality standards and now here's the connection. We embrace the upcoming quality standards from ISO and ASTM---international refers to ASTM---that are based on modern views of translation, in particular, Functionalism, and modern views of quality management, in particular, the ISO 9000 framework.

Translation requirements take into account end user needs through an expression of those needs as translation specifications. Each translation-quality metric, and there are many of them, since if we only had one we'd be back to the days of the notion of absolute quality when your intended audience doesn't matter; it doesn't matter why you're doing the translation. But we've gone way past that.

So, each translation-quality metric is specific to, or based on, a set of translation specifications.

(Slide 7)

So how do we make peace between translation-quality evaluation and customer focus? Well, it's actually easy. Tucker Johnson writes: "Mistakes are not important. Customers are important." Now, what could he mean by that? He makes it sound like there's a tension between translation-quality evaluation and customer focus. But that's only if you haven't gotten those memos.

So here's how I decode this enigmatic pair of sentences from Tucker. Taking him seriously, as he deserves to be taken. The question that he's probably getting at, and I look forward to a discussion with him on this topic, is validation. Validation in the sense of how it's used in modern quality management. Validation is essential.

Here's how you apply validation. You say, okay, here's my translation quality metric. Here's what it's measuring, what it's focused on. And you see whether the evaluation---Is this a good translation? Is this a bad translation?---matches the customer experience. You have to weed out aspects of customer experience that have nothing to do with the translation quality---and that's a feat in itself---but once you've done that, you say, well, if the metric says the translation is better, does the customer have a better experience? And if the metric says the translation is bad, does the customer have a worse experience? And if there is not that correlation, then, you fix the metric to better take into account the specifications, which are primarily about the intended audience and the purpose.

You don't fix the customer and say, "Oh, you didn't really need that kind of translation. We'll provide this translation according to our absolute notion." No, you don't fix the customer, you fix

the metric. Until there is peace and harmony between translation-quality evaluation and the customer experience.

Anybody who is still mired in the old use of translation quality from the 1800s, well, they need to get rid of those old notions and embrace the new version of translation quality expressed in the upcoming translation-quality standards. Thank you, Tucker, for setting the stage for these new standards. ISO 5060, a guidance standard, and ASTM, the number isn't out yet, but it will be a standardization of MQM, the Multidimensional Quality Metrics framework. And they, being based on modern views which work, should be around for a long time.

Thank you.