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I. Introduction
For many years, it has been accepted practice that interpreters work in diverse subject areas and disciplines.

However, this "generalist" approach appears to be changing with a rising tide of specialization in our increasingly complex world.

The current article is a follow-up study to one entitled "A United Nations Interpreter Survey: The Specialist/Generalist Controversy I" which appeared in Multilingua 5/2, pp. 67-80, (Schweda-Nicholson 1986a). The data for this research project were obtained by using the same questionnaire which was completed by the UN sample. This time, however, the questionnaires were mailed to additional staff and (mainly) freelance interpreters domiciled in all regions of the United States. The interpreters who received the survey were selected from a number of sources: (1) the TAALS Yearbook; (2) Congrat-Butler's book, Translators and Translators; (3) the Annuaire de l'AILC; and (4) personal acquaintances of the author. To facilitate completion and return of the questionnaires, a stamped, self-addressed envelope was included. A brief cover letter explaining the purpose of the questionnaire as well as the author's interest in the specialist/generalist issue accompanied each survey. Since the questionnaire did not request names, the respondents were assured complete anonymity and confidentiality. Some participants, however, chose to sign their names. Moreover, some respondents wrote additional, more lengthy commentaries than the survey requested. A total of 168 questionnaires were sent to prospective participants. Eighteen of those surveys were returned by the post office because of incorrect addresses, and so on. Of the 148 which were delivered, 78 were completed and returned to the author, a response rate of 53.3%. The rate of return is considered high for this particular type of survey.

The raw data were analyzed and examined for patterns. The percentages of responses which fall into different categories within each question are presented, and respondents' individual comments often highlight the discussion. Moreover, interrelationships among responses have been found and analyzed.

Finally, the data gathered from the current survey are compared to the UN interpreters' responses. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest tenth of one percent.

II. Section I: Background Information
Question 1 asked the age of the participants. Within the current sample, 42.3% of respondents fall into the "31-45" category; 38.5% are 46-60 years of age; and 19.2% are 61 years of age and older. No one is between the ages of 20 and 30. When one compares this data with the UN responses, one finds that, in general, the UN sample is younger, with 17.9% in the 20-30 age bracket and only 1.8% in the 61 and older group. However, the two middle categories (31-45 and 46-60) are almost identical in the two samples.

Question 2 requested that the respondents indicate their nationality. Nineteen nationalities are represented, the largest of which is "United States" at 55.1%, not at all surprising.

The remaining 18 nationalities, many of which have only one or two representatives in the current sample, include France, the United Kingdom, Japan, Peru, Italy, Austria, Brazil, and Uruguay. Seventeen nationalities were represented in the UN survey; six major groups comprised 66% of the sample, and the others were very small groupings, as in the current...
study.

Question 3 asked the interpreters how long they have been members of the profession. Not one respondent among those domiciled in the United States checked "5 years or less". However, it is worthy of note that a full 55.1% marked "21 years and over". The percentages for the other two groups are as follows: 14.1% in the "6-10" category and 30.8% in the "11-20" range. Once again, in comparison with the UN Staff interpreters, one finds additional support for the fact that the current US staff and free-lance sample is generally older. Whereas 85.9% of the current group have been working as interpreters for 11 years and longer, 60.6% of the UN sample had been members of the profession for 10 years or less.

With respect to percentage of time spent in simultaneous, consecutive, and escort interpretation, responses were very diverse. Those that answered "Simultaneous Interpretation = 100%" constitute the largest group (13.9%). The second biggest response category is "Simultaneous = 95%; Consecutive = 5%" (12.8%). An equal percentage (5.1%) responded "Simultaneous = 50%; Consecutive = 50%" and "Simultaneous = 90%; Consecutive = 10%". Most of the other 41 percentage breakdowns indicated by the respondents have only one or two people in each category.

These very small categories constitute 65.1% of total responses. The author was surprised that the interpreters would take pains to go into such detail.

Court interpretation (which, of course, includes both simultaneous and consecutive) is also mentioned a number of times.

When compared with the UN data gathered for this question, one finds a much stronger emphasis on simultaneous interpretation among UN staff interpreters (57.1% indicated it is the only kind of interpretation they perform). This disparity between groups, however, is to be expected. It appears that there are more opportunities for consecutive and escort work in the free-lance market than in an international organization.

Question 5 asked the respondents to indicate the highest level of education they have completed. Approximately one-third (35.9%) possess a Master's degree, 37.2% have a Bachelor's degree, and 11.5% have a Ph.D. Within the remaining 15%, 5% checked "MD/JD/DDDS", 4% have post-doctoral training, an additional 4% wrote that they have diplomas from interpretation schools (but did not check one of the categories provided), one respondent (1.3%) wrote "Ph.D and JD" and finally, one person (1.3%) did not answer the question. A comparison with the UN respondents shows that the UN sample is generally a better educated group, with a full 64.3% possessing a Master's degree.

This statistic is almost double that of the current sample. One can extrapolate from the data contained in this question and that analyzed for Questions 1 and 3 that those interpreters in our UN sample who are younger and have been members of the profession for 10 years or less tend to be more highly educated than the older, more experienced interpreters in the current survey. This finding is consistent with the trend toward more education in general and, more specifically, toward specialized interpretation training in a professional program.

Question 6 asked if the interpreters received "formal interpretation training at a college, university, or a special school". As in the UN survey, the responses to this question are almost equally divided: 52.6% checked 'yes' and 47.4% checked 'no'. Among the 52.6% who marked 'yes', one-half did not indicate the name of the school. However, the other half did.

Some of the schools represented include the Monterey Institute, ETI in Geneva, Georgetown, the Polytechnic of Central London, and the Dolmetscherschule in Zurich. One respondent wrote that when he/she entered the profession, no training was available.

Another indicated that he/she was the first graduate of ETI in Geneva.

As mentioned in the introduction, the current sample is drawn from both staff interpreters and free-lancers domiciled in the United States. Looking at the response data for Question 7, (which asked if respondents are staff or free-lance interpreters), one finds that the great majority of participants (69.2%) are freelancers, while 23% are staff members. Two individuals checked "Both", one indicated that he/she is a retired staff interpreter, one wrote that he/she is "only active in a casual way as part of my other activities", and two people did not answer the question. The fact that the current study is composed of mainly freelancers and the UN study was comprised of predominantly staff interpreters provides valuable data from which to draw contrasts and comparisons, especially when analyzing Questions 10-17.

Proceeding to Question 8, in contrast to the UN sample, 93.8% of the current respondents listed themselves as members of at least one professional organization; some listed several.

Only 37.5% of the UN group indicated a professional organization affiliation. In all, 14 organizations are mentioned by the current sample. TAALS is listed most often at 55%, AIIC is second with 48.7%, followed by ASI with
14.1%, and ATA with 11.5%. TIES, CCIA, and CITA are all tie with 6.4%. Seven other groups were listed by either one or two individuals. These statistics confirm the common belief that most staff interpreters are not members of professional associations since they do not rely on the outside market for employment. It appears from the current data that, in fact, membership in a professional organization is important for free-lance interpreters.

Question 9 asked respondents to list their working languages. It is not at all surprising that one notes a great variety of working languages among this sample of predominantly free-lance interpreters. Since a great majority belong to a professional organization which follows a peer-rating system that, in turn, is validated by self-rating with respect to language combinations in "A" "B" and "C" categories, it appears that most interpreters relied on their formal classification to provide their answers to Question 9.

This analysis examines the "A" "B" and "C" categories from three points of view. (1) the number of times a specific language was listed in each separate category; (2) actual language combinations which were indicated by each individual interpreter; and (3) the number of working languages of each interpreter.

Looking first at the data which represent how many times a language was indicated in the "A" "B" and "C" categories, one notes that there are more responses in the "A" language group than respondents in the survey. This phenomenon is explained by the fact that a number of interpreters listed more than one "A" language. In addition, if an interpreter wrote "to and from" for a language pair (e.g., English into Spanish and Spanish into English), those two languages are both classified as "A" languages for purposes of this study. A total of 10 "A" languages are indicated by the current sample. As in the UN data, the three most common "A" languages listed are English, Spanish, and French, respectively. In descending order, other "A" languages which appear are German, Russian, Italian, Japanese, Chinese, Dutch, and Portuguese. Nine languages are listed in the "B" category. English overwhelmingly dominates with approximately 50% of respondents including it as a "B" language. French and Spanish are tied for second place, each listed by 14.1% of the sample. In descending order, other languages included are Italian, Portuguese, German, Russian, Czech, and Polish. Not everyone in the sample has at least one "B" language, inasmuch as there are fewer responses than respondents in this category. Finally, one finds 8 languages in the "C" category which, like the "A" category, has more responses than respondents because some of the interpreters have more than one "C" language.

French dominates, as it was indicated by 38.5% of the respondents. Spanish is second (19.2%) and Portuguese is third (17.9%). Other "C" languages listed, in descending order, are: Italian, English, German, Russian, and Latvian. All in all, if one looks at the total number of times a language is listed across the three categories, one finds English (78), French (60), and Spanish (52). These findings are consistent with the UN data as well, where English, French, and Spanish ranked in the same order.

Continuing to Point (2), one discovers that 59 different language combinations appear. Since there are almost as many language combinations as respondents, one does not discover much repetition. However, the most common combination is "A" = English, Spanish, "C" = Portuguese, French, indicated by 5 participants.

Finally, for Point (3), the number of working languages per interpreter, the data show that 20.5% have two working languages, 35.9% have three, 29.5% have four, 11.5% interpret into and/or from five languages, and 2.6% have six working languages. These statistics are very close to those obtained from the UN sample, although the percentage of individuals with 5 working languages in the current study is greater. One other difference between the two groups (which is not really significant, but of interest nonetheless) is that a very small percentage in the current study listed 6 working languages, while no one in the UN group indicated that many.

As in the UN survey, it is possible to develop a profile of the interpreters who completed the questionnaire for the current study by examining the information provided in the Background Information section. He/she is between 30 and 60 years of age, is American, has worked as an interpreter for 21 or more years, works in simultaneous, consecutive, and escort interpretation, has a Bachelor's or Master's degree, has had some type of formal training, belongs to a professional interpreter organization, and has 3 working languages, which are most probably English, French, and Spanish. When compared to the profile of the UN interpreter, one notes some differences. The current sample (1) is older; (2) is more experienced; (3) works more in consecutive and appears to have a greater variety of interpretation assignments; (4) has fewer years of formal education; and (5) boasts more members of professional organizations. It will be important to keep these findings in mind as analysis proceeds to those questions which deal
specifically with specialization and future needs for interpreters.

III. Section II: Specialist vs. generalist

The second section of the questionnaire contains questions specifically related to the specialist/generalist issue.

Question 10 asked interpreters if they do, in fact, specialize. Of those responding, 29.5% answered 'yes'. Those individuals who answered 'no' constituted 87.9%. A very small percentage (2.6%) responded 'yes and no'. The interpreters who answered 'yes' were asked to indicate their areas of subject matter specialization. Thirty different disciplines are listed, the most common being law, economics, medicine, finance, and computer science, respectively. Other areas which are mentioned by as few as one or two respondents include advertising, energy, the military, agriculture, aviation, unemployment, personal injury, and physics. With respect to the UN interpreters' responses, 80.3% do not specialize. Among the 17.9% who do, the subjects listed most often were economics and politics.

The author thought it would be interesting to examine more closely the questionnaires of those interpreters who checked 'yes', indicating that they do specialize. She found that, of these 25 people, 17 indicate in Question 7 that they are freelancers. From the data, one can infer that a great majority of those interpreters in this survey who specialize (68%) are freelancers. This statistic is significant because many individuals have stated that the only people who can afford to specialize (from an economic point of view) are staff interpreters. In fact, some of the comments made by the interpreters in the current study indicate strong feelings against specialization. One such comment stated: "I consider specialization dangerous (routine; lost [sic] of contact with other fields, colleagues, etc.) even for mental health." Another respondent wrote: "The specialist is ok in a permanent position--the free lance must have more latitude... Free lance 'specialists' would starve." Two others stated: "I do not think there is enough work in interpretation in any given field to justify specialization" and "specialization would be very desirable, but hardly possible at the present time; few free lance interpreters can afford to turn down conferences because of subject matter." Along these same lines, another individual wrote: "W/an amount of work available today in U.S. do you believe a specialist could survive? I say: Absolutely not!!!" However, almost one quarter (21.8%) of the current response sample is composed of freelancers who do specialize.

Question 12 asked, "In your opinion, do freelance interpreters who specialize or those who are generalists receive more assignments?" An overwhelming majority (74.4%) indicated that generalists do work more often. Only 5.1% checked "specialists". A rather large percentage of respondents (16.6%) did write "no opinion", "I don't know", or did not answer the question at all. A very small percentage (2.6%) wrote that specialists and generalists receive "about the same" number of assignments. Those individuals who marked "specialist" did not elaborate by commenting further. Among those who checked "generalist", one finds several comments of interest. One participant wrote: "However, a good technical & scientific comprehension is essential." Another commented: "In the very limited market for professional conference interpreters a restriction to a specialization is not possible... Still another states: "Specialization is for dinosaurs." Finally, another individual wrote: "when I retain someone I am concerned with skill and fluency ONLY." Looking at the UN data in comparison, one notes that 57.1% believe that generalists are called to work more often. With respect to specialization, 14.3% of UN interpreters indicated that those who specialize are busier.

This is significantly higher than the 5.1% response of the current study.

Question 12 reads: "In an increasingly complicated and technologically dependent world, specialization is imperative in order to insure a high quality interpretation." Approximately one-third of respondents (32%) answered "yes". This statistic corresponds very closely with the response to Question 10 ("Do you personally specialize in a particular field or fields?"), which shows 29.5% as specialists. One can infer that those who are specialists consider it imperative to specialize in specific subject areas. More than one-half of the participants (57.7%) do not agree that specialization is necessary. The remaining 10.3% are either "undecided", wrote "maybe" "no idea", "yes and no", or did not answer the question at all. A number of comments are worthy of note. Among those interpreters who responded "yes", one wrote: "Ideally, all interpreters should specialize." Another commented: "There will be more demand in this area [specialization]." Several who checked "yes" qualified their responses. One stated: "Yes, but you cannot afford to refuse other assignments--too just isn't enough work to go around." Another indicated: "One should definitely specialize but only after becoming quite good at interpreting in general." Finally, one respondent commented: "...
but it [specialization] can be provided by a) pre-conference briefing, b) basic documents in conference languages, c) assiduous study of documents." Many comments were offered by respondents who checked "no" one person wrote: ",... absolutely NOT. A good interpreter is good at everything, a bad one is bad at everything." Another stated: "A reasonably well informed person given advance documents and one day's preparation would probably do better, or at least as well as the specialist." Still another wrote: "The technical and scientific language used by specialists all over the world is English. What these specialists need is very high quality generalists-interpreters who can be briefed on technical subjects." Finally, a respondent commented: "Overespecialized interpreters lose interest and skill." One individual who checked both "yes" and "no" states: "Both types of interpreters should exist." The UN responses to this question were more strongly in favor of specialization, with 39.3% answering "yes" 53.8% answering "no", and 7.1% responding "yes and no".

Proceeding to Question 13 ("With proper notice and documentation, I accept interpretation assignments in all fields/disciplines"), a strong majority (89.8%) checked "yes". Among these individuals, one commented: "I feel that a good interpreter can do anything." Another wrote: "Some subjects are more difficult, not impossible." Still another stated: "With proper notice and documentation, I can learn." Finally, one interpreter wrote: "The average number of new words at a technical conference is limited." Of the 8.9% who responded "no" one person wrote: "Only those areas which are relevant to my background or that I have time to prepare myself in." One person (1.3%) did not answer the question. The UN interpreters' responses correlated highly with those of the current sample, with 87.5% indicating that they work in all fields. Only 10.7% responded "no" and one person did not answer the question.

The final question in Section II asked the interpreters to indicate in which fields they work most often. Respondents were asked to check as many categories as apply, and were encouraged to list additional subject areas under the "other" heading. It is not at all surprising that the responses were very diverse.

Those fields which were checked most often are: international relations/foreign affairs (74.4%) and economics (74.4%), followed by medicine (48.7%), law (39.7%), engineering (35.9%), social sciences (34.8%), U.S. politics (26.9%), and hard sciences (21.8%). Under the "other" category, 25 additional fields were mentioned. Among them are: business, the military, agriculture, environmental issues, mining, electronics, computer technology, tourism, defense, space, social security, cinema, and artificial limbs. Examining the UN data, one discovers that the two top categories for staff interpreters were also international relations/foreign affairs and economics. Law and social sciences also ranked high on their list. It is not unexpected that the current sample indicates a greater variety of topics than did the UN staff interpreters.

IV. Section III: Looking to the future

Two questions are contained in this section. They asked the respondents to speculate about the preparation of and needs for interpreters in the future, and to give their opinions on employment trends within the profession.

Question 15 reads, "If an interpretation trainee or a novice interpreter asked your advice on whether to specialize in order to maximize employment opportunities, what would you recommend?" Only 18% responded that débutants should specialize. Among the fields they recommend for specialization are: law, medicine, hard sciences, economics, computer science, finance, and international banking. One individual encouraged beginners to specialize "in all fields." Some respondents wrote additional comments. Several made observations which are typified by the following remark: "Be a well-rounded generalist with a field of specialization that really interests you." A very high percentage of respondents (79.5%) would advise newcomers to the profession not to specialize. However, among them, there was support for specialization at a later date, after gaining broad experience in a number of fields. Comments from these interpreters can be summed up by the following advice: "At first accept any available assignments, assess market and own strengths, then specialize", and "If you are going to specialize, do it late in your career. Give yourself time to become a good solid interpreter first." Additional respondents wrote: "[No, be a generalist] with the ability to quickly comprehend new areas", and "[No, be a generalist] but a very good one or you are doomed." Finally, one person wrote: "You may 'love' to work in the field of medicine-- per say [sic], but get only 3 jobs a year, ... as specialized as medicine is. This is simply not practical [sic]. So if you want to also make a 'living' and a reasonable one, you must have an opened [sic] frame of mind.

Theory and practise are two different things." The UN data for this question once again agreed very closely with that of the current study, with
only 19.6% recommending specialization for débutsants, and an overwhelming majority (76.8%) stating that beginners should be generalists.

The final question on the survey asked, "As more and more American businesses and other organizations increase their contact with the non-English-speaking world, do you think there will be more staff interpretation positions in the future?" Almost one-third of the current sample (29.5%) answered "yes". Many respondents chose to write comments. Of those who responded in the affirmative, one stated: "There will be more interpreters of all kinds." Another qualified the "yes" answer: "Few as 'pure' interpreters; they will be called to do also translation work and international PR assignments." One-half (50%) responded in the negative. Two interpreters mentioned that "the trend is to reduce staff." Others commented that people who act as interpreters will be employed in other capacities as well.

Their remarks are typified by the following: "I believe they will tend to hire persons who are capable of handling interpretation together with other responsibilities", and "they'll hire translators to double as interpreters." Some participants called attention to ignorance on the part of many American companies regarding the value of foreign language knowledge. Two of them wrote: "American business is not sensitive to the value of professional interpreters. It is generally insensitive to the value of foreign languages to be effective in international business", and "Alas, Americans hold language skills in low esteem; I suspect most associate them with immigrant status. I would not wish a child of mine to enter this field." Several respondents commented about the dominant role of English: "Most of the U.S. executives still think that all foreigners must speak English." Another individual wrote: "They all learn English". On the other hand, one respondent stated: "There will be more businessmen with language knowledge." From the financial point of view, one interpreter indicated that the economy is too tight for businesses to consider employing staff interpreters. Along this line, another commented: "Free-lancers are ultimately less expensive to recruit." Still another wrote: "It is doubtful that a 'service' activity such as interpretation will ever proliferate as a staff occupation in private business." Finally, one respondent volunteered: "Pragmatically speaking, specialization depends on the employer: at the State Department it is Arms Control and international relations for staffers plus anything else that may come up." The remaining 20.5% of respondents wrote "I don't know" or "trend not clear". One person wrote: "I hope not!" (obviously a free-lancer). Several did not answer the question. To compare with the current sample, the UN interpreters strongly believed that there will be more staff interpreter positions in the future. A full 51.8% answered affirmatively. Approximately one-third responded "no", 10.7% wrote "I don't know", and 5.4% did not respond.

V. Section IV: Conclusion

Question 17 asked the respondents for any additional comments they might wish to make on the specialist/generalist issue. Many took advantage of this opportunity to assess the situation and express additional personal viewpoints. As with some of the other questions, more than one respondent made a similar comment on a particular issue. Several remarks can be summed up in the following quote: "What is important is general knowledge and understanding NOT information in any one field or fields." Two respondents stressed the importance of knowledge in a specialized area. They wrote: "In my opinion, one must not major in languages to become an interpreter. It is far better to have knowledge and specialized background in other disciplines", and "I think that the profession of interpreter as such is doomed to disappear. For people other than linguists, it's better to be trained in a special field (law, economics) and add interp. skills as an extra asset." Related to the previous comment is the following: "With the improvement of machine translation technology one can easily imagine scientific and technical presentations being machine translated in the various languages and distributed in printed form to participants. Already now a good portion of scientific conferences forego interpretation altogether." One interpreter finds the variety of assignments most stimulating and assesses the situation this way: "Interpreting work, to me, is only acceptable when one has a variety of topics & disciplines to work with. Confined to one field, one would wish to become an active worker in it, rather than remain a passive (relatively!) conduit for interchange of ideas." Two interpreters in the current sample commented: "I think it is a false issue. A good interpreter can interpret in any field with a little preparation", and "do not polarize the position, please. Specialization is as useful as general culture." Along these lines, another commented: "Our profession is one of the last non-specialized ones, i.e. having people with a broad view and many interests. The last of the Renaissance Mind and we should keep it that way. Specialization should be IN ADDITION TO being a
VI. Conclusion

The current article has presented an analysis of response data gathered from non-UN staff and free-lance interpreters domiciled in the United States. When compared with data obtained from UN staff interpreters by using the same questionnaire, one finds similarities and differences in the results. All in all, however, among both free-lance and staff interpreters, there is agreement that being a generalist is far more desirable, especially from an economic point of view. Some respondents went so far as to say it is also better for one’s mental health to be a generalist. However, looking at the other side of the coin, almost one-quarter of the current sample responded that they do specialize, and the great majority of these interpreters are freelancers. In this way, one does find support (although not overwhelming) for specialization among free-lance interpreters.

Since these studies (Schweda-Nicholson 1986a and the current one) are the first of their kind, it is not possible to know how many staff and free-lance interpreters would have supported specialization 10-20 years ago. A recent article by Kurz (1988) argues for the “generalist” approach from the perspective of a European free-lance interpreter.

Only time will tell if the percentage of “specialist” interpreters will increase. One must keep the current data in mind, and plan for future follow-up studies which analyze the specialist/generalist issue as the interpretation profession evolves into the 21st century.

NOTES

1 It is important to note that court interpretation work is becoming more prevalent among free-lance conference interpreters. The Court Interpreters Act of 1978 provided for certification of Spanish/English Interpreters in the federal court system (Schweda-Nicholson 1986b). Moreover, the creation of the Federal Court Interpreters Advisory Board (FCIAB) in 1986 demonstrated the commitment of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to further improvement of court interpretation services (Schweda-Nicholson 1987). In its final report, the FCIAB recommended the development of an orientation program on courtroom procedure for conference interpreters who accept freelance assignments in the federal courts (Schweda Nicholson, in press). On another level, some states are introducing and passing legislation based on portions of the Court Interpreters Act. A model for state courts is the New Jersey Legal Interpretation Project.

2 Of course, one must remember that questionnaires completed by individuals listed in the TAAALS and AIIC membership directories were a major source of the current data.

3 One remembers that there is a nearly equal distribution of interpreters in the 31-45 and 46-60 categories; however, evidence from responses to Question 3 indicates that many in the 31-45 group must be closer to 45 than 31.
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SPECIALIST/GENERALIST QUESTIONNAIRE

Background Information

1. Your age: 20-30 /31-45 /46-60 /61 and over

2. Your nationality:

3. Number of years you have been an interpreter: /5 or less /6-10

4. Please indicate the percentage of your working time spent among the following interpretation categories: ___%Simultaneous ___%Consecutive ___%Escort (conference) (conference)

5. Highest level of education completed: /BA/BS /MA/MS /Ph.D.
III. Looking to the future:
15. If an interpretation trainee or a novice interpreter asked your advice on whether to specialize in order to maximize employment opportunities, what would you recommend? /Yes /No, specialize.
   If 'Yes', in what fields?

16. As more and more American businesses and other organizations increase their contact with the non-English-speaking world, do you think there will be more staff interpretation positions in the future? /Yes /No
   Comments:

IV. Conclusion
17. Any additional comments you wish to make about the specialist/generalist issue are welcome.

Thank you again for your participation. Kindly return your questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope at your earliest convenience.