A publication of the
Conference of Interpreter Trainers

International Journal of Interpreter Education

Volume 11, Number 2
December 2019

Conference of Interpreter Trainers
www.cit-asl.org

ISSN - 2150-5772

Table of Contents

Editorial

Research Articles

Open Forum

Commentary

Student Work

Dissertation Abstracts

Interpreter education in emerging settings

George Major

Auckland University of Technology

Ineke Crezee

Auckland University of Technology

We are delighted to bring you this 11(2) issue of the *International Journal of Interpreter Education* (IJIE) which features contributions by researchers and educators from Kenya, Norway, Belgium, Fiji, China and Canada. The movement of people around the world is continuing, and with it comes the pressing need for trained signed and spoken language interpreters in more settings and countries to mediate interactions between professionals, migrants and refugees. The continued flow of migrants and visitors to countries which did not hitherto provide interpreter services has resulted in an awareness of this need (e.g. Delgado Luchner, 2019; Lee & Choi, 2015). At the same time, the situation of interpreter education and professionalization is highly variable around the world (Bontempo, 2015; Ono, 2015; Phanwichatkul, Burns, Liamputtong, & Schmied, 2018; Roat & Crezee, 2015; Tekin & Esatoğlu, 2019). We see vast differences between countries that have a long standing tradition of spoken and signed language interpreter education, accreditation, and even pathways to specialization, while at the same time others are in the very emerging stages of developing the field.

While globalization can be seen to bring an "interconnectedness and interdependence among nations" (Asadzadeh & Ahmadi, 2019, p. 67), we would highlight similar parallels between interpreters and educators at different stages of training and professionalization. As this issue will exemplify, those from more established educational positions have so much to share with those at the beginning of the journey, but it is also reciprocal: sharing ideas opens our minds to new teaching approaches. But first, we would like to mention two conferences we have had the privilege to attend in recent months, and the connection between these and the focus of this issue.

The World Association of Sign Language Interpreters (WASLI) is driven by the spirit of interpreters supporting each other, and their conference, which was held in July 2019 in Paris, focused strongly on the sharing of ideas between interpreter researchers and educators at all sorts of stages of interpreter education development. The conference brought together deaf and hearing signed language interpreters, educators, and researchers from over 80 different countries, which is an incredibly inspiring environment to be in. Presentations ranged from analyses of the development of interpreter education in countries such as Uganda (Busingye Bonnie), the Philippines (John Xandre Balize and Christina Sison), and Malawi (Maria Chale and Heather Schmerman), to more critical debates on directions in the profession globally (e.g. Anna-Lena Nilsson's presentation on the accessibility and status of International Sign at an international level). The keynote presentations were live streamed and are still available for viewing on the RID website: https://rid.org/wasli-live-stream-2019-paris-conference/.

The third InDialog conference (held in Antwerp in November 2019) provided a platform for both signed and spoken language interpreter researchers to share their research and exchange ideas. The conference was co-hosted by two universities (University of Antwerp and KU Leuven) and organized under the auspices of the European Network of Public Service Interpreting and Translation (ENPSIT). Presenters reported on interpreter-mediated interactions involving professionals and migrants, tourists and refugees in a range of different countries, including Afghanistan (Lucía Ruiz Rosendo) and Turkey (Duygu Curum Duman; Jonathan Ross). Oladipupo Wumi Omobosola and Olufemi Adigun presented on signed language interpreter education in Nigeria.

Presentations showcased a wide range of methodological approaches and keynotes by Professors Sabine Braun and Claudia Angelelli. A number of researchers presented studies investigating empathy in interpreter-mediated interactions and the need for shared preprofessional learning between interpreters and medical or legal professionals. In addition to the provision of signed language interpreting throughout the conference, two professionals also provided respeaking services, with text appearing above the content in presenters' slides. From 2019 onwards, the InDialog conference will be hosted in a different European country every three years, again under the auspices of ENPSIT. The conference program can be seen using this link: https://www.indialog-conference.com/programme.php.

We think that this issue of *IJIE* also embodies this spirit of learning and sharing ideas between educators and researchers working in vastly different contexts. In this issue we are delighted to bring you two research articles as well as other thought-provoking contributions, including interviews, a commentary, and a student article.

In her paper entitled *Contextualizing Interpreter Training in Africa*, Carmen Delgado Luchner presents two case studies from Kenya, both implemented between 2010 and 2015. The first one involves a Master's degree program in conference interpreting, while the second refers to a Certificate program in community interpreting.

In *Cooperation as a Coping Mechanism When Interpreting between Deaf Refugees and Hearing Professionals*, Elisabet Trengereid Olsen reports on the nature of interpreters' cooperation: how they work with each other (including deaf/hearing interpreter teams) and all participants in order to prepare and ensure that information is accessible. This article highlights challenges involved in interpreting with deaf refugees when there is no shared signed language.

In the Student Work section, Evy Cox (a graduate from the KU Leuven, Antwerp campus) reports on *Accuracy: Omissions in Consecutive versus Simultaneous Interpreting* by examining interpreted renditions of student interpreters. This is the first Student Work section submission we have received in a while and we are so pleased to see this through the process to publication. The Student Work section is a wonderful avenue for emerging researchers to get their first taste of having their work published.

In their commentary piece, Hilde Haualand and Anna-Lena Nilsson from Norway offer a critical exploration of some terminology that we use to talk about interpreters and the interpreting process. They suggest a re-think of the terminology that we use to better highlight the actual work that interpreters do as well as the collaborative process between participants in an interpreted interaction. We think that this critical discussion will be relevant to educators from a wide variety of settings and stages of educational development.

We have four dissertation abstracts on a range of topics related to interpreter education, again by newer researchers in the field – from the United States, Germany and New Zealand. As always, we strongly encourage postgraduate students to submit the abstracts of completed dissertations in order to share new research in the field, and also to consider submitting work based on their dissertations.

This issue also features two interviews with interpreter educators from countries where signed language interpreter education is emerging. We are grateful to Debra Russell for being such a proactive commentary Editor and for sourcing a wide range of perspectives to enrich the journal. The first interview, with Joneti Rokotuibau (a signed language interpreter from Fiji and current regional representative for the Oceania region of WASLI), shows that interpreters in the small island nation of Fiji are working very hard to establish an interpreter education program, which may in the future position them as leaders in this field in the Pacific. As interpreter educators from a relatively privileged country in the same region (New Zealand) we believe we have an obligation to support and share resources with our colleagues at the forefront of emerging interpreter education, while at the same time marvelling at how much we can learn in return. Secondly, we present an interview with Professor Xiaoyang Xiao from Xiamen University in China. Professor Xiao is a spoken language interpreter and linguist who is working to develop signed language interpreting in China. Both these educators are pioneering and inspiring in the work that they do, and the close relationships they have with Deaf communities in their countries. We strongly believe, in the spirit of WASLI, that we should support, open our doors, share resources, and be open to learning new approaches.

We hope that you enjoy reading this issue. We would like to conclude with a proverb (albeit with the pronouns changed by us to be gender inclusive) which reflects the nature of IJIE as a platform for the exchange between interpreter researchers and educators internationally:

> It takes a wise [person] to learn from [their] mistakes, but an even wiser [person] to learn from others. (Zen proverb)

References

Asadzadeh, M. & Ahmadi, T. (2019). The role of translation in globalizing trade for developing countries. *MultiLingual, 30*(2), 66-71

Bontempo, K. (2015). Signed language interpreting. In H. Mikkelson & R. Jourdenais (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of interpreting*, (pp. 124-140). London, England and New York, NY: Routledge.

Delgado Luchner, C. (2019). A beautiful woman sitting in the dark. *Interpreting, 21*(1), 91-114.

Lee, J. & Choi, M. (2015). Recommendations for interpreter training for asylum interview settings: The South Korean case. *International Journal of Interpreter Education, 7*(2), 39-54.

Ono, N. (2015). Medical interpreter education in Japan: History, current status and prospects. 번역학연구, 16(4), 147-165.

Phanwichatkul, T., Burns, E., Liamputtong, P., & Schmied, V. (2018). The experiences of Burmese healthcare interpreters (Iam) in maternity services in Thailand. *Women and Birth, 31*(3), e152-e161.

Roat, C. E. & Crezee, I. H. (2015). Healthcare interpreting. In H. Mikkelson & R. Jourdenais (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of interpreting*, (pp. 248-265). London, England and New York, NY: Routledge.

Tekin, Ş., & Esatoğlu, A. E. (2019). Evaluation of the medical interpreter and patient guidance training in the migrant Hhalth services: The case study in Turkey. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 2*(2), 57-62.

Contextualizing Interpreter Training in Africa: Two Case Studies from Kenya

Carmen Delgado Luchner[1]

University of Geneva and University of the Free State

Abstract

This article explores the potential and limitations of interpreter training in Africa. It considers relevant features of the context, namely, the kind of multilingualism that characterizes postcolonial societies (with a coexistence of official, national, regional and vehicular languages within the same geographic space), and the social and geographic distribution of these languages within and across countries. My argument is based on two different interpreter training initiatives implemented in Kenya between 2010 and 2015: a Master's degree program in conference interpreting for Kenyan and international students with English, French and/or Swahili; and a Certificate program in community interpreting for refugees from Somalia and members of the Kenyan Somali community. The limitations of the programs illustrate the need for a nuanced, contextualized and diversified approach to interpreter training in Africa, and the risks of a one-size-fits-all understanding of interpreting.

Keywords: interpreter training, Kenya, community interpreting, public service interpreting

1 Correspondence to: carmen.delgado@unige.ch

Contextualizing Interpreter Training in Africa: Two Case Studies from Kenya

Several initiatives to train interpreters and professionalize the language sector have sprung up in Africa over the past decade. The most important of these, the Pan-African Masters Consortium in Interpretation and Translation (PAMCIT),[2] was launched by the United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON) in 2009 (Delgado Luchner, 2019) and today includes six universities in different regions of the continent. Additional localized initiatives have been established to train community interpreters. The pilot training course of the PAMCIT was launched at the University of Nairobi in collaboration with the University of Geneva. Several years later, a community interpreting course was implemented at Kenyatta University, once again in collaboration with the University of Geneva. In this article, I draw lessons from these two initiatives, in order to contribute to the growing debate around whether and how one can (or should) formalize interpreting practices in Africa. My focus is on the training of interpreters in and for the African context, using the Kenyan programs as case studies. As such, it does not provide a comprehensive overview of existing interpreting practices or training programs in Africa but rather presents recommendations based on past experiences.

My analysis draws on two key assumptions that have shaped the field of interpreting studies: the idea that conference and community interpreting are two separate professional categories (Pöchhacker, 2015), and the association of community interpreting with migrants and minorities (Hale, 2015). These assumptions are of limited relevance in the African context, which presents a very different brand of multilingualism than the one historically associated with European nation-states (Blommaert, 2009). Indeed, the coexistence of official, vehicular and local languages in the same geographical space that is typical of many sub-Saharan African countries (Djité, 2008; Mazrui, 2004) has implications for multilingual communication practices (Marais, 2014) and, consequently, for interpretation and interpreter training in Africa (Mazrui, 2016). Contextualizing interpreter training therefore implies training interpreters not only in Africa, but according to African countries' needs.

In this article I present an analysis of the relevant literature and context, followed by two narrative summaries of the training case studies. These are then analyzed in light of the literature and the language situation in Kenya, in order to derive more general training recommendations.

1. Key Assumptions and Definitions

Interpreting is an umbrella term that describes oral language mediation practices spanning a variety of settings (courtrooms, hospitals, conferences) and techniques (sentence-by-sentence, consecutive, simultaneous).[3] Two main professional groups have emerged from this multiplicity of practices: community interpreters, who mostly

[2] See http://pamcit.org.

[3] For a comprehensive list of interpreting settings and techniques, see Pöchhacker (2015, p. xxviii).

work using dialogue interpreting (sentence-by-sentence) or consecutive techniques, and conference interpreters, who today work mainly in simultaneous and only occasionally in consecutive mode.[4] The literature sometimes distinguishes ‘court interpreting’ as a separate professional category (Angelelli, 2004; Mikkelson, 2000). This distinction is meaningful in countries where specific accreditation procedures are in place for court interpreters; however, as far as the techniques used are concerned, court interpreting can be understood as a subcategory of community interpreting (Hale, 2015). In most countries, conference and community interpreting are not regulated. Consequently, many practicing interpreters have not undergone formal training. The proportion of untrained interpreters is higher in community than conference settings, because most international organizations employing conference interpreters rely on accreditation procedures and require formal training.

Not surprisingly, the creation of modern interpreter training programs in universities has largely been driven by the needs of these large employers: The first was founded in Geneva in 1941, initially with a view to training interpreters for the League of Nations and later the United Nations (Moser-Mercer, 2005), and many others have followed in the decades since, most of them located in Europe and catering to the increasingly diverse language needs of the European Union.[5] Until recently, conference interpreting research has focused mainly on Western contexts, and, to a lesser extent, Russia (or the USSR) and China. Studies of conference interpreting in Africa are a relatively new and rare phenomenon (see, e.g., Delgado Luchner, 2019; Ndongo-Keller, 2015; Wallmach, 2002). In community interpreting research, non-Western contexts remain equally marginal, and are generally only alluded to insofar as interpreted events in the West might involve migrants from these contexts (Angelelli, 2008; Blommaert, 2001; Inghilleri, 2005; Maryns, 2013; Pöllabauer, 2004). Thus, the current academic understanding of interpreting has largely emerged from a context in which conference interpreting is used in interactions between representatives of different states or speakers of different official languages within a state, whereas community interpreting is framed mainly in relation to migrants (Hale, 2015). The language needs for conference and community interpreting often differ, which means that interpreters’ language profiles are relevant to one context but not another. This further entrenches the divide between the two categories of interpreters.

The distinction between community and conference interpreting permeates the field, both in terms of training and of research, even though the two professions do not differ fundamentally in the techniques used (whispered and consecutive interpretation are found in both settings). However, they do differ in terms of social status, level of income, recognition and training (Hale, 2015). Conference interpreters generally work in close association with professions such as lawyers, doctors, or diplomats; their status above community interpreters is linked to the greater prestige of the users of their services (Inghilleri, 2005).

The international nature of conference interpreting and the existence of a global professional association (AIIC, the Association internationale des interprètes de conférence) has led to a considerable degree of harmonization of training and quality standards across countries (AIIC, 2004). Community interpreting, on the other hand, is deeply tied to the makeup of the local population and the functioning of a country’s public institutions. The close association of community interpreting with migration stems from the implicit assumption that the citizens of a country master its institutional language(s). This idea is rooted in an understanding of language that is closely linked to the modern (European) nation-state. Languages are seen as "distributed over countries", which in turn present a "stable nation-state institutional language regime" (Blommaert, 2009, p. 420), in which official languages and languages spoken by the population overlap. This might explain why the interpreting studies literature often gives preference to the term *community interpreting* over *public service interpreting*, which is considered simply as its synonym (Pöchhacker, 2015, p. xii), and why the community interpreting profession is described as best established in "countries that have a long history of immigration, such as Australia, Canada and Sweden" and less established in places such as Southern Europe or Japan "that have only recently begun to receive large numbers of migrants and refugees" (Hale, 2015, p. 67). This understanding of community interpreting cannot be transposed directly to the African context.

[4] Sign language interpretation is a type of community interpreting that relies almost exclusively on simultaneous interpretation techniques (Hale, 2015, p. 67); however, the scope of this article is limited to interpretation between spoken languages.

[5] One outcome of this evolution is the creation of the European Masters in Conference Interpreting (EMCI), a consortium of currently 15 universities funded in part by the European Commission and the European Parliament. See http://www.emcinterpreting.org.

Similarly problematic is the understanding of the interpreter's language combination as comprising an "A" and a "B" language (Delgado Luchner & Loiseau, 2014). In the context of conference interpreting, an "A" language is the interpreter's first language, defined as equivalent to a mother tongue or a language of which one has perfect mastery (AIIC, 2004). This conceptualization is based on the implicit assumption of a situation of "sociolinguistic normalcy" (Blommaert, 2009, p. 425), where the language of the home, the country/region, and the education system are identical. The "B" language is defined as the interpreter's "non-native active language" (Gile, 2005, p. 9), and generally considered to be slightly weaker than the "A" language, although conference interpreters are expected to have full mastery of their B language as well (Déjean Le Féal, 2005; Donovan, 2005). In community interpreting settings, language requirements vary, often following a pattern of supply and demand: Trained interpreters with a high level of mastery in both of their languages might be available for some language combinations but not for others.

2. The Kenyan Context

In Kenya, community interpreting practices are widespread but generally not formalized. The country is highly multilingual, with two official languages (English and Swahili) and more than 40 recognized local languages. Kenyans who have some level of formal education are likely to have at least partial mastery of three languages: their mother tongue, Swahili and English. In the Kenyan context, the term *mother tongue* is reserved exclusively for the local language, independent of one's level of mastery (Mbithi, 2014; Michieka, 2012). The mother tongue is often the first by chronological order of acquisition but not necessarily the one in which an individual is most proficient, given that language acquisition in the mother tongue often takes place informally.

As is the case in many other African countries, languages in Kenya are distributed socially, rather than geographically (Blommaert, 2009; Djité, 2008). The mother tongue is used in the family and the wider community, especially in rural areas. Swahili, on the other hand, is "Kenya's lingua franca of wage-employment, trade, and city street" (Lonsdale, 2009, p. 17), the language of "casual inter-ethnic communication" (Ogechi, 2003, p. 279). English remains dominant in Kenya's education system, throughout the public sector and in the formal economy. Kenya's current language constellation is a direct legacy of colonialism and the colonial education system (Djité, 2008; Lonsdale, 2009), and the power relationship between local languages and English is largely asymmetrical.

Although there has been an effort to promote Kenya's different local languages as well as Swahili in recent years, English remains dominant, not least because it is the main medium of instruction in the education system (Mbithi, 2014). A study among Kenyan university students showed that they prefer using English, and, to a lesser extent, Swahili, over their mother tongue (Michieka, 2012). This could in part be because students may find their mastery of their mother tongue, which has not been their language of secondary or postsecondary education, insufficient to discuss a wide range of topics, or that this particular demographic considers English and Swahili more prestigious. Indeed, language use is a matter of mastery but also "loyalty" (Szecsy, 2008), which in turn depends on the economic or social capital derived from using a specific language (Michieka, 2012). Differences in prestige and capital also explain why some mother tongues in Kenya, namely Gikuyu, whose speakers have dominated the politics and economy of Kenya since independence (see for instance Lonsdale, 2009), attract greater loyalty from their speakers than others.[6]

Swahili has gained popularity in Kenya over the past decade, in particular through social media and blogs (Jagero, Mohochi, & Indede, 2013). Politically, Swahili presents two considerable advantages over English: It is not the language of the former colonizer, and it has such a small number of native speakers in Kenya that it is seen as "largely ethnically neutral" (Miguel, 2004, p. 335). A particularity of Kenyan Swahili is the widespread use of

[6] While a comprehensive discussion of the sociolinguistics of Kenya goes beyond the scope of this paper, a detailed discussion of the language hierarchy between Gikuyu, Swahili and English can be found in wa Thiong'o (1986). The internationally renowned author and political activist started writing mainly in Gikuyu in the 1980s, often self-translating his novels into Swahili and/or English for regional and international distribution, thereby giving Gikuyu a heightened level of visibility.

English words or expressions (code-mixing), which stems from the assumption that most individuals are fluent in both languages. Code-mixing and code-switching are commonly used strategies in multilingual communities, because they are flexible adaptations to "disparate and variable sociolinguistic environments" (Langthaler, Witjes, & Slezak, 2012, p. 242).

Kenya's particular brand of multilingualism has several direct implications for interpreting: Both interpreting students and the users of interpreters are likely to present asymmetrical language repertoires (Blommaert, 2009), and the use of Swahili as a vehicular language (Lonsdale, 2009) might limit the need for interpretation in many day-to-day interactions. Nevertheless, many Kenyans, in particular in rural areas, are unable to communicate effectively in English or Swahili and interpreting practices exist in Kenya's hospitals, courts and public institutions. The challenges of court interpreting in particular have been documented in recent years through a number of descriptive case studies (Kiguru, 2009, 2010; Matu, Odhiambo, Adans, & Ongarora 2012; Odhiambo, Kavulani, & Matu, 2013). These studies indicate that most interpreters working in Kenya's courts have not undergone formal interpreter training (Odhiambo et al., 2013) and are not acquainted with relevant codes of ethics (Matu et al., 2012). However, there is a lack of countrywide data about the number of interpreters working for the Kenyan judiciary and the interpreters' languages and training.

In addition to a need for community interpreters, there exists a market for conference interpreting in Kenya and the wider East African region. This market centers around the international organizations based in Nairobi and Addis Ababa, although this market is considerably smaller than those in Brussels, Geneva, Vienna or New York (Delgado Luchner, 2019). The main languages used on this market are English and French.

Both conference and community interpreting thus exist in Kenya, and several initiatives to formalize training and professionalize the sector have sprung up since 2010. In this article, I examine two of these initiatives implemented in two Kenyan universities in partnership with the University of Geneva. The two case studies were carried out from a participant-observer positionality (Galibert, 2004), because I was involved in both courses as a trainer and researcher. The case studies are exploratory, and the contribution of this article resides in drawing on elements from both for the purpose of comparison, in order to obtain insights into interpreting practices in Kenya that transcend the divide between conference and community interpreting. The main question guiding this comparative analysis is how to better contextualize interpreter training in Kenya and, potentially, other African countries.

3. Methodology

The two case study summaries are short descriptions based on asymmetrical data sets. Whereas Case Study 1 is a summary based on an in-depth ethnographic study of a conference interpreter training course carried out between 2010 and 2015 (Delgado Luchner, 2019), Case Study 2 draws on my experience as a trainer on a community interpreting course (collected in the form of an ethnographic and pedagogical journal), publicly available information (project descriptions, newspaper articles), and a focus group discussion held with students after the end of the course (seven participants). Detailed analysis of the different dimensions of Case Study 1 can be found in earlier work (Delgado Luchner 2015, 2019), but Case Study 2 has to our knowledge not yet been the object of any publication.

Data were analyzed using the following macro-categories: training context, training objectives, admission requirements, considerations around language selection, in-class language coverage, and work prospects for graduates. These categories were chosen in order to allow for comparability of both case studies with a view to deriving implications for different segments of the interpreting market in Kenya. The case study descriptions contain information on each of these dimensions, which will then be addressed in more depth in the discussion.

4. Findings

4.1. Case Study 1: Conference Interpreter Training

The University of Nairobi launched its Master's in Conference Interpretation in June 2010. The stated aim of the training course was to prepare students to work as conference interpreters for private and international companies in East Africa and international and regional organizations (in particular the United Nations Office at Nairobi and the African Union).

The course aimed to include the six UN languages, plus Swahili, German and Portuguese. Throughout the pilot phase of the program (2010–2013), a total of 10 interpreters were trained. Of these students, eight were Kenyan nationals, who were training to work either into English (from French and Swahili) or between English and Swahili, while two came from 'francophone Africa' and were training to work between French and English.

In order to be admitted to the course, students had to have a first degree (BA or equivalent) and pass an oral entrance exam that included an assessment of their skills in all languages in their combination. The Master's was structured as a 2-year part-time course, or a "Module II" course in the Kenyan system (Mwiria et al., 2007). Its curriculum was partially based on the existing core curriculum of the European Master's in Conference Interpreting. The practical training component of the interpreting course, 25% of contact hours on the curriculum, was taught mainly by practicing conference interpreters who were not employed by the university: staff interpreters from the United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON) and the European Commission, or interpreter trainers loaned to the University of Nairobi by the University of Geneva.

Although all the interpreters involved in the practical training component were experienced conference interpreters, none of them was acquainted with the Kenyan or East African interpreting market, and they had little or no knowledge of Swahili, the main language of many of the students enrolled in the course. Recruiting trainers for Swahili was difficult because no formal training course for this language combination had existed before the University of Nairobi course was launched.

In addition to language coverage for Swahili, stakeholders experienced other language-related challenges. The A and B language mastery of some students was considered insufficient by trainers, which led to the belated inclusion of language enhancement courses on the schedule; terminological resources and training materials (namely source speeches for interpretation exercises) in Swahili were scarce; and the relevance of Swahili on the local market proved much more limited than initially expected. A survey carried out among the graduates of the first two intakes (Delgado Luchner, 2015) indicated that all of them had worked as interpreters on at least one occasion, although graduates highlighted a lack of opportunities for the Swahili/English combination.

4.2. Case Study 2: Community Interpreter Training

In the academic year 2014–2015 the University of Geneva and Kenyatta University jointly launched a Certificate in Community Interpreting for refugee students in three locations in Kenya (Dadaab and Kakuma refugee camps and Nairobi). The training course aimed to train community interpreters for the different NGOs and international organizations working with the refugee community in Kenya.

The certificate was language specific, limited to Somali/English interpreters. Somali is the dominant language in Dadaab refugee camp, and an important language amongst refugees in Kakuma and Nairobi. In 2014, when the Kenyatta University course was launched, Somalian nationals accounted for nearly 73% of Kenya's registered refugees and asylum-seekers;[7] today this proportion has declined to around 55%.[8]

A total of 17 students participated in the course, all of them trained to work between Somali and English, although two students also had Swahili in their language combination. Upon request from Kenyatta University,

[7] Source: http://www.unhcr.org/ke/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/03/KENYA-Statistics-Package-February-2018-1.pdf.

[8] Source: https://www.unhcr.org/ke/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/04/Kenya-Infographics_March-2019.pdf.

the group of students also included members of the local Kenyan Somali community in Garissa County, where Dadaab refugee camp is located.

In order to be admitted to the course, applicants had to have completed their secondary education (Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education) with a minimum average grade (C-). These admission requirements initially led to the exclusion of all but one of the female applicants. However, because tuition fees were sponsored through scholarships from a donor based in Switzerland, who required a minimum proportion of female students, the requirements were adapted in order to admit three female candidates who had completed their secondary education with a lower average grade, raising the number of course participants to 17 (4 female, 13 male).

The certificate was designed as a 1-year full-time course, with teaching shared between the two universities. Interpreting skills training was conveyed by the University of Geneva, and English language enhancement was provided by Kenyatta University. The curriculum had initially been designed to combine face-to-face and online classes, making use of the Kenyatta University campus in Dadaab opened in 2012.[9] However, after the Kenyan government in early 2014 announced plans to gradually close Dadaab, Kenyatta University had to discontinue face-to-face higher education programs on its Dadaab campus. Therefore, a fully online program emerged as the only viable option.

Neither the Kenyatta University nor the University of Geneva trainers involved in the course spoke Somali, although a Somali speaker based in Europe, who had worked as a community interpreter but never received formal training in this profession, was involved as external consultant to assess student's interpreting performances. In addition to language coverage for Somali, the course presented trainers with several other challenges, linked to the background of the student population or their language combination. The English mastery of some participants was low; terminological resources for Somali and, to a lesser extent Swahili, were scarce; and language variations in Somali led to disagreements among students (refugees from different parts of Somalia, as well as Kenyan Somalis), and between students and the language expert.

Somali/English is a relevant language combination for many NGOs working in Kenya, as well as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. However, we have no data about whether and where the graduates of this joint certificate were able to apply their interpreting skills.

5. Discussion

The two training courses described above are two attempts to formalize interpreter training in Kenya. In both cases, adjustments were made to take into account local circumstances. Swahili and Somali were the main languages used, and language enhancement courses were put in place in order to make up for perceived shortcomings in students' mastery of English and, in the case of the University of Nairobi, French. In both cases stakeholders showed a willingness to learn from their experiences. For instance, the inclusion of English language enhancement in the Kenyatta University course resulted from experience at the University of Nairobi, where language enhancement had to be added to the curriculum on the fly. The idea to draw on a language expert for Somali also resulted from experiences from the University of Nairobi course and the understanding that it would be difficult to find a trained interpreter for the Somali/English language combination who would also fulfill the formal requirements to be recruited to teach at a university. These strategies demonstrate stakeholders' ability to think outside the box, and to adapt existing models of interpreter training to the Kenyan context.

Nevertheless, the outcome for graduates from both courses was mixed. My findings indicate that despite a general need for interpreters in Kenya and East Africa, neither training course was able to produce graduates who could satisfy this need directly, because the two training courses aimed to train interpreters *in* the Kenyan context rather than *for* the Kenyan context. Although the case studies are specific to Kenya, many of the findings presented below can apply to other countries in Africa.

9 See https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2012/oct/15/kenya-kenyatta-university-somali-refugees-dadaab.

In the University of Nairobi case, external trainers and University of Nairobi lecturers had predicted a considerable need for Swahili/English interpreters based on the situation in other countries with several official languages, in particular Canada and Switzerland. However, as mentioned above, Kenyan multilingualism differs considerably from that of Canada or Switzerland. Like many other African countries, Kenya's language-scape is characterized by a "fundamental cleavage that divides members of a society on the basis of their linguistic repertoires" (Langthaler et al., 2012, p. 242). Most Kenyans who have had access to formal education speak English and Swahili. Even those with little formal education, in particular in urban areas, are often able to use Swahili as a vehicular language in day-to-day interactions. Therefore, only Kenyans who have not had access to formal education beyond primary school, and who are living in rural areas where a single language is dominant, are monolingual or unable to communicate in Swahili. For them, interpretation is only useful if it happens from and into their mother tongue. As such, the Swahili/English combination is largely irrelevant for oral interpretation in Kenya. Indeed, Swahili often replaces interpretation: It is shared by a larger and more socially diverse community of speakers than local languages or English, and therefore used widely in interactions between individuals who do not share the same mother tongue or level of education. The particularities of a vehicular language thus emerge as one important element to be taken into account when evaluating the interpreting relevance of language combinations in African countries.

Another assumption that requires closer scrutiny is the strong conceptual link between community interpreting and migration (Hale, 2015), which also permeates the Kenyatta University case study. Although many factors led to the selection of Somali refugees as the primary target group for the certificate, the framing of community interpreting as a practice linked to migrants no doubt facilitated this decision. The insistence of Kenyatta University on including members of the local community in the course indicates that this association was not necessarily accepted by nor natural for the Kenyan university involved in this partnership. Indeed, in Kenya and many other African countries, many citizens do not speak the language of their own public institutions. As such, although many African countries have large migrant communities who might require the services of interpreters, the overwhelming majority of potential community interpreting users are citizens. Therefore, in Africa, community and public service interpreting (PSI) are not necessarily mere "synonyms," as suggested by Pöchhacker (2015). Indeed, PSI (or public service interpreting and translation, PSIT) might be a more suitable term to describe the main stake of dialogue interpreting in Africa: enabling citizens to access their own public institutions. This also means that PSIT in Africa is not linked primarily to the rights of immigrants or refugees, but required so that all citizens of a country may exercise their basic rights to education, health and free expression in a meaningful way. Current conceptualizations of community interpreting are too narrow to make this argument convincingly, because they do not account for this particularity of contemporary African societies and its wide-ranging implications for political participation and democracy.

However, formalizing and professionalizing PSIT requires financial resources that are not readily available in any country. Developing nations in particular, face severe financial constraints, and multilingualism competes with arguably more pressing developmental priorities such as education, health care and security. Training alone is therefore only part of a complex equation in which several important constraints act on the professionalization of conference and community interpreters in Africa. Neither the University of Nairobi nor the Kenyatta University initiative specifically addressed the question of employability. The absence of a market need for Swahili/English interpreters made it difficult for University of Nairobi graduates to earn an income as conference interpreters, whereas the NGOs and refugees who would need Somali/English interpreters might not have the financial resources to pay for their services. As such, the debate on PSIT in Africa must consider economic constraints as well as language rights.

In light of existing constraints, professional translation and interpreting (including PSIT carried out by individuals who are trained and formally employed or self-employed in the formal economy) will most likely remain the tip of the iceberg of multilingual practices in Africa, which include the use of vehicular languages, code-mixing and code-switching (Langthaler et al., 2012), as well as ad hoc translation and interpreting practices between friends or family members (Noah, 2016, p. 159). Indeed, although professionalization might be both possible and desirable for certain subcategories of interpreters (conference interpreters, spoken language court interpreters, sign language court interpreters), informal practices might remain prevalent in other settings. The professionalization of interpreters should therefore be considered as a continuum and transcend the binary distinctions between "professional" and "nonprofessional". Diverse training opportunities should exist both within and outside the formal education system.

In addition, African multilingualism could be better leveraged in interpreter training courses. Hybrid curricula covering PSIT and conference interpreting skills would allow students to use all their languages, including their mother tongue, and acquire the relevant techniques for each of their language pairs (dialogue and consecutive interpreting between the mother tongue and the official language, consecutive and simultaneous interpreting between international languages used at conferences). Such training could follow a modular approach, allowing some candidates to go through only basic modules enabling them to work in a particular context, and others to receive comprehensive professional training applicable across settings and covering all main techniques. A greater polyvalence in terms of skills could also improve graduates' job prospects.

Furthermore, a conceptual dissociation of community interpreting from migration would be beneficial in the African context, because it would allow for better understanding of how public institutions leverage existing linguistic resources. Indeed, unlike European civil servants who rely on interpreters to communicate with foreign nationals, the civil servants working for public institutions in Africa come from the same multilingual space as their interlocutors. As such, many doctors, nurses, court clerks, lawyers and judges have language skills that would allow them to play a pivotal role in enabling access to public institutions. In some cases, however, these public officials hesitate to use nonofficial languages in the workplace, because they are unsure about whether or not they are allowed to do so, and official language policy often provides no clear guidance in this regard. For example, court officials in Burkina Faso and Senegal have very different assumptions about the use of nonofficial languages in the courtroom, although French is the only official language in both countries. Judges and officials in Senegalese courts often resort to using Wolof, the national lingua franca, in order to communicate orally with defendants or witnesses who do not master French; in Burkina Faso court officials exclusively use French and communicate through an interpreter even when they master the language of the defendants or witnesses (Tarr, 2017; Tarr & Sambou, 2017).

In this context, training does not necessarily have to focus only on professionalizing interpreters. Indeed, as argued elsewhere for the South African context (Marais & Delgado Luchner, 2019), one might instead attempt to 'interpretize' officials working in public institutions by making existing language practices more visible and formalizing them. This would give these individuals greater recognition for the language services they are already providing, for instance, oral translation of written documents (Ralarala, 2016; Molefe & Marais, 2013) in courts or police stations to help individuals file a complaint or fill in a form, while ensuring that all languages of the population are taken into consideration. Providing civil servants in highly multilingual countries with basic interpreting skills might also contribute to making institutions more language-sensitive in their service delivery.

6. Conclusion

Assumptions about interpreting that have emerged from a Western, in particular European, context, such as the belief that the A language is identical to the mother tongue, and that community interpreting and migration are associated, have to a certain extent shaped the two training initiatives presented above. Actors made some steps towards a contextualization of interpreter training in Africa; however, this contextualization did not fully take into account the Kenyan language situation. Both initiatives therefore failed to make a meaningful contribution to the specific local stakes of language mediation. These stakes are particularly high in Kenya and other African countries, where language has undeniably played a role in many recent conflicts. The discrepancies in access to socioeconomic and political capital between members of Kenya's different language communities have repeatedly sparked tension or even violence in the country. A better representation of different languages in the country's public institutions, through language-sensitive civil servants and skilled public service interpreters, might make an important positive contribution to social cohesion and political participation.

Institutions and individuals in Africa are already drawing on a wide range of multilingual communication practices. Public officials in different African countries use their mother tongue or a vehicular language to communicate with citizens in courts (Tarr & Sambou, 2017) and police stations (Molefe & Marais, 2013). In light of these practices, interpreting studies must broaden its conceptual scope to better understand how language barriers are transcended, both with and without the help of language mediators. As long as these practices remain informal and hidden from view, however, the mastery of a local language will not be tested or taken into account in the recruitment of civil servants. This means that language coverage in public services is left to chance, and that citizens of different language groups will not enjoy equal treatment. A better representation of different languages in public institutions, through language-sensitive civil servants and skilled public service interpreters, might make an important positive contribution to social cohesion and political participation.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Natalie Tarr and Gabriele Slezak for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

References

AIIC (2004). How we work. Retrieved from http://aiic.net/page/1403/.

Angelelli, C. V. (2004). *Revisiting the interpreter's role: A study of conference, court, and medical interpreters in Canada, Mexico, and the United States* (Benjamins Translation Library, Vol. 55). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Angelelli, C. V. (2008). The role of the interpreter in the healthcare setting: A plea for a dialogue between research and practice. In C. Valero Garcés & A. Martin (Eds.), *Building bridges: The controversial role of the community interpreter* (pp. 139–152). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Blommaert, J. (2001). Investigating narrative inequality: African asylum seekers' stories in Belgium. *Discourse & Society, 12*(4), 413–449.

Blommaert, J. (2009). Language, asylum, and the national order. *Current Anthropology, 50*(4), 415–441.

Déjean Le Féal, K. (2005). Can and should interpretation into a second language be taught? In R. Godijns & M. Hinderdael (Eds.), *Directionality in interpreting: the 'Retour' or the Native?* (pp. 167–194). Ghent, Belgium: Communication and Cognition.

Delgado Luchner, C. (2015). *Setting up a Master's Programme in Conference Interpreting at the University of Nairobi: An interdisciplinary case study of a development project involving universities and international organisations.* PhD thesis, Faculté de traduction et d'interprétation, University of Geneva.

Delgado Luchner, C. (2019). "A beautiful woman sitting in the dark" – Three narratives of interpreter training at the University of Nairobi. *Interpreting, 21*(1), 91–114.

Delgado Luchner, C., & Loiseau, N. (2014). *An A-B-C to determining interpreting candidates' language combinations.* MAS thesis, Faculté de Traduction et d'Interprétation, University of Geneva.

Djité, P. G. (2008). *The sociolinguistics of development in Africa*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Donovan, C. (2005). Teaching simultaneous interpreting into B: A challenge for responsible interpreter training. In R. Godijns & M. Hinderdael (Eds.), *Directionality in interpreting: The 'Retour' or the Native?* (pp. 147–

165). Ghent, Belgium: Communication and Cognition.Galibert, C. (2004). Some preliminary notes on actor–observer anthropology. *International Social Science Journal, 56*(181), 455–466.

Gile, D. (2005). Directionality in conference interpreting: A cognitive view. In R. Godijns and M. Hinderdael (Eds.), *Directionality in interpreting: The 'Retour' or the Native?* (pp. 9–26). Communication and Cognition.

Hale, S. B. (2015). Community interpreting. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of interpreting studies* (pp. 65–69). London, England: Routledge.

Inghilleri, M. (2005). The sociology of Bourdieu and the construction of the object in translation and interpreting studies. *The Translator, 11*(2), 125–145.

Jagero, J. A., E. S. Mohochi, E. S., & Indede, F. (2013). The usage of Kiswahili in blog discourse and the effect on its development. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 3*(14), 192–199.

Kiguru, G. (2009). Court interpreting in Kenya—the ideal and the practice. *Newsletter of the National Association of Judiciary Interpreters and Translators (NAJIT), 18*(1).

Kiguru, G. (2010). At the mercy of others' voices: An illustration of frequent interpreter language errors in Kenyan courtrooms. *University of Nairobi Journal of Language and Linguistics, 1*, 1–18.

Langthaler, M., Witjes, N., & Slezak, G. (2012). A critical reflection on knowledge hierarchies, language and development. *Multicultural Education & Technology Journal, 6*(4), 235–247.

Lonsdale, J. (2009). Henry Muoria, public moralist. In W. Muoria-Sal (Ed.), *Writing for Kenya: The life and works of Henry Muoria* (pp. 3–57). Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV.

Marais, K. (2014). *Translation theory and development studies: A complexity theory approach*. London, England: Routledge.

Marais, K., & Delgado Luchner, C. (2019). Motivating the translation-development nexus: Exploring cases from the African Continent. *The Translator, 24*(4), 380–394.

Maryns, K. (2013). Disclosure and (re)performance of gender-based evidence in an interpreter-mediated asylum interview. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 17*(5), 661–686.

Matu, P. M., Odhiambo, K., Adans, Y., & Ongarora, D. (2012). The court interpreters' role perception: The case of English-Dholuo interpreters in subordinate courts in Nyanza Province, Kenya. *Greener Journal of Social Sciences, 2*(4), 121–126.

Mazrui, A. M. (2004). *English in Africa: After the Cold War*. (*Multilingual Matters*, Vol. 126). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Mazrui, A. M. (2016). *Cultural politics of translation: East Africa in a global context*. London, England: Routledge.

Mbithi, E. K. (2014). Multilingualism, language policy and creative writing in Kenya. *Multilingual Education, 4*(19), 1–9.

Michieka, M. (2012). Language maintenance and shift among Kenyan university students. In *Selected Proceedings of the 41st Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. Association of Contemporary African Linguistics.

Miguel, E. (2004). Tribe or nation? Nation building and public good in Kenya versus Tanzania. *World Politics, 56,* 327–362.

Mikkelson, H. (2000). *Introduction to court interpreting*. Manchester, England: St. Jerome.

Molefe, M., & Marais K. (2013). The role of language practice in access to public service in South Africa: The case of Philippolis. In P. Cuvelier, T. du Plessis, M. Meeuwis, R. Vandekerckhove, & V. Webb (Eds.), *Multilingualism for empowerment* (pp. 72–90). Pretoria, Republic of South Africa: Van Schaik.

Moser-Mercer, B. (2005). The teaching of simultaneous interpreting: The first 60 years. *Forum, 3*(1), 205–225.

Mwiria, K., Ng'ethe, N., Ngome, C., Ouma-Odero, D., Wawire, V., & Wesonga, D. (2007). *Public and private universities in Kenya: New challenges, issues, and achievements*. Oxford, England: Jamey Currey.

Ndongo-Keller, J. (2015). Vicarious trauma and stress management. In H. Mikkelson & R. Jourdenais (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Interpreting* (pp. 337–351). London, England: Routledge.

Noah, T. (2016). *Born a crime: Stories from a South African childhood*. Random House.

Odhiambo, K., C. K. Kavulani, C. K., & P. M. Matu, P. M. (2013). Court interpreters' view of language use in subordinate courts in Nyanza Province, Kenya. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(6), 910–918.

Ogechi, N. O. (2003). On language rights in Kenya. *Nordic Journal of African Studies, 12*(3), 277–295.

Pöchhacker, F. (Ed.). (2015). *Routledge encyclopedia of interpreting studies*. London, England: Routledge.

Pöllabauer, S. (2004). Interpreting in asylum hearings: Issues of role, responsibility and power. *Interpreting, 6*(2), 143–180.

Ralarala, M. K. (2016). An analysis of critical 'voices and 'styles' in transpreters' translations of complainants' narratives. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, *2*(1), 142-166.

Szecsy, E. M. (2008). Language loyalty. In J. M. González (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Bilingual Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Tarr, N. (2017). The language of justice: When the colonial past is invited into the courtroom. *Études de Lettres*, 3–4, 155–172.

Tarr, N., & Sambou, A. (2017). *Is the language of justice a just language for all? Comparing interpreting practices in Burkina Faso's and Senegal's penal courts.* Unpublished manuscript.

Wallmach, K. (2002). "Seizing the surge of language by its soft, bare skull": Simultaneous interpreting, the Truth Commission and country of my skull. *Current Writing: Text and Reception in Southern Africa, 14*(2), 64–82.

wa Thiong'o, N. (2011 (1986)). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature.* Oxford: James Currey.

Cooperation as a Coping Mechanism When Interpreting between Deaf Refugees and Hearing Professionals

Elisabet Trengereid Olsen[1]

Western University of Applied Sciences

Abstract

This article describes interpreting between deaf refugees and hearing professionals in community settings, with a focus on cooperation. Extensive communication barriers characterize these situations, as deaf interlocutors and interpreters do not share languages. The situations require interpreters with the ability to communicate visually and use unconventional forms of communication, not depending solely on formalized signed languages when interpreting. Based on interviews with signed language interpreters in qualitative focus groups, this article shows how interpreters in these situations convey meaning between the interlocutors, and how establishing cooperation with the hearing interlocutor is a coping strategy in that regard. The article also describes how cooperation between interpreters can unfold in situations with significant communication barriers.

Keywords: cooperation, signed language interpreting, deaf refugees, deaf interpreters, communication barriers

[1] *Correspondence to: Elisabet.Trengereid.Olsen@hvl.no*

Cooperation as a Coping Mechanism When Interpreting between Deaf Refugees and Hearing Professionals

If asked, I would say that deaf immigrants, like other immigrants in my country, are highly heterogeneous. The only thing deaf immigrants have in common is coming to Norway and relying on visual communication in interaction with others. They come from different countries, with different social structures, different life experiences, and different levels of language proficiency. Some are well educated; others are not. Some come from poverty, oppression and war zones, others from more stable environments. The concept 'fremmedspråklige døve' appears frequently in my findings and can be translated as 'deaf people with a foreign language.' This phrase includes all categories of deaf immigrants. The research presented in this article mostly addresses people in forced migration, many with minimal knowledge of spoken, written or signed languages. The most precise English label to use when presenting my findings is therefore 'deaf refugees', as the word 'refugee' refers specifically to people in forced migration to escape war, persecution or natural disasters (Oxford Dictionaries, 2018).

This article examines how interpreters cooperate with each other and with hearing professionals to convey meaning when interpreting between deaf refugees and hearing persons in situations with extra communication barriers.

1. Literature review

1.1. *Interpreting between deaf refugees and hearing people in Norway*

Interpreting between deaf refugees and hearing people is somewhat on the periphery of the field of interpreting and not a subject often mentioned in signed language interpreter training programmes in Norway. The main focus of training tends to be on interpreting between spoken Norwegian and Norwegian Sign Language ('Norsk tegnspråk' hereafter: NTS) (cf. Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, 2018; Oslo Metropolitan University, 2018; The Norwegian University of Science and Technology, n.d). Most hearing interpreters do not have NTS or other signed languages as their mother tongue or first language (L1); rather, they learn NTS as part of their interpreter training as adults. Deaf people, however, can also be interpreters, and the term 'interpreter' in this article largely applies to both.

Interpreting between deaf refugees and hearing Norwegians requires interpreters to balance both linguistic alignment and professionalism in situations with extensive communication barriers. In the interpreted situations presented in this article, the hearing consumers are all public officials. They meet deaf refugees as a part of their jobs in the welfare state: as police officers, health care workers, teachers, social workers, service providers, etc. The refugees on the other hand are private persons requiring a service. The two communicate through interpreters.

At first, the interpreters and newly arrived deaf refugees do not share languages, as signed languages across the world are different from each other. Still, the languages have one common denominator: they are visual. Signed languages' modality, spatiality and iconicity can open up communication across geographical borders, using different forms of modified communication methods. These methods make it possible for the interpreters to communicate with deaf refugees. They also require interpreters to have the ability to communicate visually and to use unconventional forms of communication, without depending solely on NTS (Olsen, 2015). Due to the lack of focus on this topic in interpreter training in Norway, the interpreters' competence is primarily acquired through 'learning by doing', and the field is characterized by this 'silent' knowledge among experienced interpreters.

1.2. Stages in cooperation

Various textbooks and studies on interpreting emphasize the importance of interpreters' cooperation before, during and after interpreting assignments. This is also essential in the situations described in this article. Metzger (1999) shows that the frameworks for human interaction are complex and consist of multiple layers. Preparation prior to an interpreting assignment is therefore useful. Russell (2008) also focuses on interpreters' preparation and cooperation in her study which deals with team interpreting practices in legal contexts. In interpreting teams, it is beneficial to do part of the preparation together, clarifying which interpreter does what before, during and after the assignment (Forestal, 2011). When the interpreters have extensive experience in working together, the need for clarification and preparation will be reduced but still exist (Hoza, 2010). Dean and Pollard (2013) identify four salient aspects of an interpreter's job, listed in a Demand Control Schema (DCS). The DCS involves environmental, interpersonal, paralinguistic and intrapersonal demands. Addressing different elements in the communicative setting, ranging from interpreted situations' physical context, to communication and human interaction, the schema is suitable as a starting point for cooperation and preparation. The paralinguistic demand stands out as particularly pertinent as it includes communication form and accent, both highly relevant for the situations mentioned in this article.

Interpreters working in teams actively provide each other various types of support when interpreting (Hoza, 2010). The support interpreter nods and feeds the primary interpreter signs or words. The support interpreter may also correct errors and suggest alternative solutions on how to interpret utterances. Hearing interpreter teams will change primary and support roles about every fifteen minutes. This is also the case with deaf interpreters, apart from some situations in which both interpreters are active primary interpreters at the same time (cf. Brück & Schaumberger, 2014). When the complexity and the length of an assignment require it, extended interpreter teams (with more than two interpreters) can also be convened.

The DCS (Dean and Pollard, 2013) is also beneficial to use as base for debriefing between interpreters after interpreting assignments. In debriefing it is relevant to discuss elements addressed in preparation and evaluate the assignment. Cooperation is an essential topic to be debated after interpreting.

1.3. Cooperation between signed language interpreters

Hoza (2010) describes cooperation as an interdependent process and a part of interpreters' teamwork. For signed language interpreters, cooperation is also enshrined in The Association of Sign Language Interpreters' ethical guidelines. These describe cooperation as a prerequisite for all interpreted situations (The Association of Sign Language Interpreters, 2019).

Increasingly more research studies involve deaf interpreters and address the cooperation between deaf and hearing interpreters (Forestal, 2005, 2011, 2014; Stone and Russell, 2014; Russell, 2017). Interpreting for deaf immigrants is one situation in which deaf and hearing interpreters cooperate (Bartley & Stone, 2008; Bauman, 2008; Boudreault, 2005; Stone, 2009). 'Deaf Extra Linguistic Knowledge' (DELK), a concept introduced by the National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centres, is of the essence here (Adam, Aro, Druetta, Dunne & af Klintberg, 2014). This concept describes advantages deaf interpreters have in sharing life experiences with deaf refugees, as members of the same minority within the hearing society. Using this competence, the deaf interpreters have a good understanding of some aspects of the refugees' situation and can potentially use this to support their interpreting (Sheneman, 2016).

1.4. *Community Interpreting*

The situations described in this article occur within community interpreting, a field well documented in research studies and literature. The research defines community interpreting as interpreting in public service institutions as opposed to conference interpreting which serves a different clientele (Carr, Roberts, Dufour and Steyn, 1995; Hale, 2007; Pöllabauer, 2013; Llewellyn-Jones and Lee, 2013, 2014). Preparation and background knowledge are significant when interpreting for deaf immigrants in these settings (Holm, 2015), as can be seen in Sinkaberg's work (2017) on deaf immigrants' inclusion into the Norwegian society. In her study, she shares experiences deaf immigrants have had with public services, including with the provision of interpreting services. She points out that interpreters experience communication hurdles in interactions involving deaf immigrants.

This section has provided a brief overview of research on cooperation and preparation, community interpreting, deaf interpreters, and cooperation between deaf and hearing interpreters. Other studies describe interpreting between hearing people and deaf immigrants. To the best of my knowledge, however, there are no studies addressing the fundamental question in this article: how do interpreters cooperate with each other and with hearing professionals in interpreted situations with extra communication barriers? To answer this question, I will explore interpreters' preparation before interpreting, the role of the support interpreter, hurdles in interpreting between hearing persons and deaf refugees, and the cooperation between deaf and hearing interpreters. First, however, I will describe the process of data collection.

2. Empirical background

This article is based on data from a master's thesis entitled *Mediated Interaction* (Olsen, 2015). The thesis focused on how interpreters create meaning when interpreting between deaf and hearing people, with an emphasis on deaf immigrants.

2.1. *Research design*

This is a qualitative study (cf. Halkier, 2010) based on responses from two focus group discussions involving a total of seven hearing interpreters who were chosen by strategic selection (cf. Grønmo, 2004). The focus group methodology allowed detailed exploration of the interpreters' experiences and reflections on interpreting. Before the focus groups met, I emailed invitations with information about the project and an interview guide that contained questions and key words that would be discussed in the focus groups (cf. Halkier, 2010). The main subject for the first focus group was interpreting between deaf and hearing people in general, debating obstacles and possibilities when interpreting. When analysing the transcript from the first focus group, interpreted situations involving deaf refugees emerged as a subject frequently mentioned as an extraordinary challenge. I therefore invited the participants back to another focus group interview to discuss this topic more in-depth. I also interviewed experienced interpreters with knowledge about the subjects raised in the focus groups.

2.2. *Analysis*

Both focus group discussions were recorded and then transcribed. The resulting 250 pages of text were analysed (cf. Halkier, 2010) using the Hermeneutical circle (cf. Gilje & Grimen, 1993) as a tool to see the details in the findings as important parts of a larger whole. Ideas that emerged repeatedly in the discussions were organized into categories based on content. In the end, all the utterances were categorized into four overall themes: Communication Tool, Cooperation, Role Execution and Culture. The content of these categories formed the background for the empirical chapters of the larger study. The category of 'Cooperation', which is the focus of this article, addresses the interpreters' need for cooperation and their thoughts on whom to cooperate with and how.

3. Findings and discussion: Cooperation as a coping mechanism

According to my findings, the interpreters use different coping mechanisms to give deaf and hearing consumers access to each other's utterances. Cooperation is an important aspect here and the interpreters cooperate with all the persons who are present in the situation. Cooperation with the hearing interlocutors is initiated to make the officials take on their assigned responsibility in the situation, instead of leaving it with the interpreter.

3.1. Continuity and the need for briefing

Continuity is a key theme in the data. The focus group participants state that interactions between deaf refugees and hearing service providers generally are not suited for assignment to random interpreters, where any given interpreter can interpret for any given deaf person. These situations require continuity: the same interpreters interpreting for the same deaf person in the same setting over time. When continuity is interrupted and a new interpreter is assigned to a setting where others have interpreted before, the interpreters maintain continuity by briefing each other. They do this as a part of their preparation, and this solid background knowledge will help the new interpreter provide better service in an already established situation. Ella describes it this way:

> I want Emma to do a good job there. So, if I know, I will tell her what they spoke about last time I was there. Then she will be better prepared, and she will not have to 'show up blank' so to say.

This briefing strategy also works in reverse, where interpreters take responsibility to be briefed when returning to a setting in which they have interpreted previously.

The interpreters also discussed the issue of sharing information. On one hand, information exchange is highly beneficial as preparation before interpreting in settings with significant communicative obstacles. At the same time, as professionals, interpreters are subject to a confidentiality agreement anchored in The Public Administration Act (The Association of Sign Language Interpreters, 2019). Consequently, interpreters will not share information with a colleague if the colleague is to interpret for the deaf refugee in a setting other than the one in which they interpreted themselves. The interpreters also connect this to the principle of privacy, which specifies that personal information is collected only for restricted use by services providers with a valid need to know (Langtvedt, 2015).

Julia also reflects on the quandary of how much information about a particular refugee's experiences should be shared with the next interpreter:

> It was super hard, when cooperating with other interpreters... Because when the consumers developed skills in sign language, and we got to know their history, we did not know what to share and (…) what not to share… Because, I needed the next interpreter to be completely blank when entering the situation. This was the only way to check if I had understood the story right. Without influencing my co-worker with my understanding of what the deaf refugee had said... It was a huge challenge. And also to consider; what to share now, what to hold back – and in the end; what should the consumers be allowed to keep for themselves?

Information exchange regarding context and persons present is a part of interpreters' preparation. Here, the interpreters balance the benefits of sharing that needed information with the risk of biasing the next interpreter's understanding, all while respecting the refugee's privacy and right to confidentiality. Clearly this boundary is not clear-cut and requires careful thought and judgement.

One way to reduce the need for frequent information exchange is to maintain continuity with a small number of interpreters in these settings. Interpreters who cooperate regularly in permanent teams will acquire similar knowledge about the context, case proceedings and the persons present without the need for other interpreters to brief them. Reducing information exchange will reduce the risk of potential violation of privacy and confidentiality agreements (Olsen, 2015).

3.2. Who is responsible for what

My findings show that the support interpreter plays an important part in situations characterized by significant communication barriers by suggesting possible renderings of what the interpreters label 'difficult sequences' from speech to signs. Leah describes it this way:

> (…) Collaboration is important and it is nice to be two, because when my creativity has stopped, maybe my support interpreter has some suggestions on how to continue the interpretation.

Successful cooperation with the hearing consumer depends first on assuring an awareness of the existing communication difficulties. Knowledge about deaf people, signed languages and interpreting in general society is scanty. Consequently, many hearing consumers are not familiar with the complexities of communicating through interpreters. For example, hearing consumers often think that signed languages are international. With that assumption, it is difficult to grasp that the deaf refugee and interpreters, who both sign, do not automatically understand each other (Olsen, 2015).

While the interpreters have responsibility for the communicative aspect of the interpreted conversation, the hearing consumers – as public officials – are responsible for providing the deaf refugees with adequate information about laws and regulations, their rights and how to access services. Since the interpreters are the ones who best understand both interlocutors in these situations, hearing consumers sometimes transfer their own responsibilities – purposely or inadvertently – to the interpreter, asking or even expecting the interpreter to explain words and concepts to the deaf refugee. To avoid this extra responsibility with its attendant risks and role confusion, Julia will brief the hearing professional on the complexity of the communication situation:

> In my opinion, one of the most important things we have done when interpreting for non-western deaf immigrants is to always work two interpreters together. Because the support interpreter does not function as an ordinary support interpreter. Since there is a lot of negotiations going on between the deaf and the main interpreter, the support interpreter needs to translate these negotiations to the hearing person. We do this to avoid the hearing person thinking: 'Oh, Lord, what are they doing? What am I missing out on here?' if not involved in the negotiations.

This 'counter-interpreting' or 'meta-interpreting' aims to maintain the provider's control of the situation through knowing what is being said by whom and how it is uttered. By involving the hearing professional in the negotiations between themselves and the deaf refugee, the interpreters makes it possible for the hearing official to grasp the extent of the linguistic obstacles the interpreters and deaf refugees are facing.

In situations like the ones addressed in this article, interpreters use various strategies to convey meaning between the interlocutors. Flexibility is one, which in these settings involves the use of expansion and omission when interpreting. Expansions use more words or signs than originally spoken, while omissions reduce the number of words or signs uttered in order to highlight the essence of what is being said (Olsen, 2015). This practice would seem to be in violation of interpreters' commitment to accuracy, and indeed, an interpreted rendition of the utterance should not change the meaning of that original utterance (cf. Jareg & Pettersen, 2006; Wadensjö, 1998). Interpreters face a dilemma. Straying too far from the source language will compromise equivalence, leaving the listener with an inadequate understanding of the original speech. At the same time, rigidly adhering to the principle of accuracy (Skaaden, 2013), maintaining all the details in the utterance, can lead to the speech being incomprehensible to new citizens navigating an unknown situation, unfamiliar with both the Norwegian language and the social system. In the other extreme, extensive use of expansions can help refugees better understand the context and implications of the service provider's speech, but it can also lead to interpreters essentially explaining concepts rather than interpreting them. In its appropriate use, expansions are about expanding utterances without changing the utterances' meaning (c.f Wadensjö, 1998). Julia explains that it is stressful to be expected to both explain concepts and interpret them:

> We soon found out that we could not be responsible for explaining 'all of Norway' to the deaf refugee. We needed the hearing person working there, or someone else, to put meaning in the concepts used in the situation. Then we could try to translate the utterances. Otherwise, it was overload on our behalf... Lots of processes going on at the same time... So, it was super beneficial for us when we got more and more hearing service providers to understand that; 'I'm the one who must go through all these concepts, just like I do when other refugees come into my office. Then these guys (the interpreters) just repeat what I say, using their hands instead of spoken Arabic.'

> Cooperation with the hearing consumer was like day and night for us. We did not have to concern about 'how to explain this concept?' (…) And then also, it is the hearing consumer who decides how to describe different concepts. And we would not be responsible for that part (…).

3.3. Hurdles when interpreting

It is well known that interpreters do the best job when qualified and fluent in the languages between which they are interpreting (Llewellyn-Jones & Lee, 2014). In my findings, the interpreters identify feelings of inadequacy when it comes to overcoming the significant linguistic hurdles in these situations. Sometimes the communication barriers are too extensive for the interpreters to fully understand and accurately render the utterances of the hearing interlocutors. The interpreters also reported that public officials often have unrealistic expectations regarding efficiency and progress in cases involving deaf refugees (cf. Olsen, 2015; Sinkaberg, 2017). Sara talks about how these expectations are difficult for the interpreters to fulfil, due to the communication barriers in the situation:

> We must be extremely conscious about what we are doing. Problematize as much as possible to the hearing consumer, I think, so they understand our struggles, and how little information we are able to render and convey for the deaf refugees in the beginning.

One example that arose in the focus groups is the challenge of obtaining informed consent, a common occurrence in both health-related and legal settings. According to the Research Ethics Committees (2015), 'a free informed consent' shall be given without limitations or external pressure. The person involved should be oriented about his or her participation in whatever process is at hand in a way that is understandable for the person. While stemming from a respect for the individual's rights, this practice creates a challenge for interpreters, who may find it difficult to know if the refugee has fully understood the situation, that consent is being given, or to what he is consenting. When expectations and reality collide like this, Leah raises the question about 'drawing the line':

> Who is to say; now the person is informed? Now the person is ready to give consent? (…) The hearing person is not able to do this, unless we have been very particular with information in advance about what is going on in these situations. Moreover, who is to decide, the thing that very often happens, that proceedings must be done without informed consent? The hearing official do not want to make decisions on behalf of the deaf consumer, without free informed consent... Because they are used to people being able to give it. But if that does not happen, the official needs to draw the line, and make decisions, I think. Otherwise, we are the ones doing it.

The choice here is to interrupt case proceedings or medical care until communication barriers are reduced to an extent that true informed consent can be given, or to continue without informed consent. Delaying the proceedings can be inconvenient in a system, requiring efficiency. At the same time, continuing without informed consent also has consequences. If deaf refugees are not fully informed in these situations, they are deprived of both autonomy and participation in decision-making. For Emma, it is important that the hearing official makes the decision to continue or stop until informed consent is fully understood and given:

> (…) The hearing person would in addition be responsible for deciding where to draw the line. 'This is enough information today'. Then we would not have to estimate; 'Is it ok now? Has he understood enough now?' In those settings cooperation is important!

Giving the hearing official insight into the communication hurdles can potentially result in a more realistic understanding of these situations, which is helpful for interpreters. The situations are also dynamic, in that the deaf refugees will continuously acquire NTS and knowledge about the Norwegian social structure. Even though the communication barriers are long-lasting and will always be present when it comes to spoken Norwegian, the obstacles involving NTS and written language are likely to reduce over time.

3.4. Cooperation between deaf and hearing interpreters

In signed language interpreting, authorities responsible for providing consumers language access anticipate that the interpreter's ability to sign should bridge the gap that naturally exists in any interaction needing an interpreter. However, as we have seen, this does not always happen. One solution for Sofia is to cooperate with deaf interpreters, for whom the signed language is their L1:

> Deaf people from Norway with a capital D are used to traveling both in the physical world and in the digital world, so they can easily communicate across geographical borders. They communicate in a way we can only dream of.

In my findings, the hearing interpreters value cooperation with what they referred to as 'deaf relay interpreters.' (cf. Adam et al., 2014). Today deaf people are training to be professional interpreters, which offers a unique opportunity for professional cooperation with hearing interpreters as equals.

In deaf/hearing interpreter teams, the hearing interpreter will render the speaker's utterances in signed language for the deaf interpreter who interprets this into a visual communication system customized for the deaf consumer. Conversely, the deaf interpreter conveys the signed message to the hearing interpreter, who subsequently interprets the information into speech for the hearing interlocutor (Forestal, 2011). There are two aspects that differentiate this collaboration between deaf and hearing interpreters from a collaboration between two hearing interpreters. The first difference regards the norms for switching roles between primary and support interpreter. When deaf and hearing interpreters work in pairs and the assignment requires simultaneous interpreting, both interpreters function as active primary interpreters simultaneously. Neither adopts the designated support interpreter role, as both are supporting and providing the interlocutors' utterances to the other, all at once (cf. Brück & Schaumberger, 2014). The second difference involves communication *between* the interpreters. Since at least one of the interpreters is deaf, the team will communicate using signs. When both communication between the interpreters, and the interpreting itself is in a signed language, it is important to separate 'feed' from corrections. The feed would typically be the source text, the linguistic exchange of utterances, while corrections are the support-interpreter correcting errors with the primary-interpreter. To separate the feed from corrections, one technique is to sign feed mid-centre in the signing space, while corrections are signed lower and to one side, much like how parenthetical comments are handled in natural signed discourse.

In my findings, the hearing interpreters accentuated differences in their language skills and those of deaf relay interpreters, connecting this to deaf people's experience in communication across geographical borders. This is also a topic in international research studies (Bauman and Murray, 2010; Hiddinga & Crasborn, 2011; Zeshan, 2015). The Deaf community is characterized as a transnational community (Breivik, 2007; Haualand, 2006), in which deaf people connect with each other across geographical borders despite different backgrounds. As a visually-oriented minority within the hearing majority, deaf people will find mutuality and similar life experiences with other deaf people regardless of nationality (Haualand, 2006). This means that many deaf interpreters can connect more effectively than hearing interpreters when serving deaf refugees across varying signing systems (Forestal, 2015). This is also mentioned by Sofia:

> Sign language is their first language. They know the tiny little nuances, which I will never learn 100 %. Sign language is not my first language.

While hearing interpreters can of course also develop good skills in signed communication across geographical borders, deaf interpreters have the advantage of growing up using a signed language as their L1, which is a great asset in these settings.

4. Conclusions

As the title indicates, the focus of the article has been on cooperation as a coping mechanism in interpreted situations involving deaf refugees. Part of this picture is cooperation between interpreters. This cooperation includes both deaf and hearing interpreters who cooperate before, during and after assignments. Cooperation revolves around reducing communication barriers between deaf and hearing interlocutors. Since the hearing interlocutors in these situations are service providers, they are responsible for making sure that deaf refugees receive correct information no matter the context. To take on this responsibility, the service provider must be able to handle the situation with interpreters and deaf refugees. While cooperation will not transcend the communication barriers in these situations, it will help in figuring out who is responsible for what.

Even though interpreters make the greatest effort to facilitate clear communication in these situations, the quality of the resulting services is still up for debate. This area of interpreting is on the periphery of signed language interpreting as a field, characterized by extemporaneous experimentation rather than through proper training. As a result, the field lacks skilled interpreters who have been formally prepared for these kinds of assignments. To improve the current situation, the responsible authorities must establish specific training programmes for signed language interpreters, which leads to improved language access for the deaf refugees. In addition, it is necessary to better incorporate the Deaf community's communicative competence across borders through the training of more deaf interpreters.

The research I have presented in this article provides insight to topics of concern to interpreters, topics that emerged in the focus group interviews. In the continuation of this project, it would be interesting to observe interpreters and explore what they actually do when they interpret in these situations and how they communicate with deaf refugees. In my findings, the interpreters talk little about how cooperation with the deaf refugees unfolds, and it would be interesting to investigate this further. In future research projects it would also be natural to explore the other side of the issue I have raised in this article, that is, the deaf refugees' experiences when establishing a life in a new country. Research in this field would shed light on the real-life experiences of a minority scarcely mentioned in academic research studies, a topic of interest to society in general and to professionals such as interpreters and service providers in particular.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my colleagues at the Department of Sign Language and Interpreting at Western Norway University of Applied Sciences for their never-ending support. In addition, I would like to thank the interpreters who participated in the focus groups and gave me valuable insight into their professional lives. I also thank my mentor when writing my Master Thesis, Helge Folkestad, former Associate Professor at Western Norway University of Applied Sciences. And finally, my thanks to the anonymous reviewers for their comments, which greatly improved this manuscript.

References

Adam, R., Aro, M., Druetta, J. C., Dunne, S., & af Klintberg, J. (2014). Deaf interpreters: An introduction. *Deaf interpreters at work: International insights*, 1-18.

Bartley, A. & C.A. Stone (2008). Deaf interpreters in the community: The missing link? Paper presentert på Conference of Interpreter Trainers, San Juan, PR.

Bauman, H.L. (2008). Introduction: Listening to deaf studies. In H.L. Bauman (Ed.), *Open your eyes: Deaf studies talking.* 1–34. Minneapolis: University of Minesota Press.

Bauman, D. & Murray, J. (2010). Deaf studies in the 21st century: Deaf-gain and the future of human diversity. In M. Marschark & P. Spencer. (Eds). *Oxford handbook of deaf studies, language and education*. (pp. 210-225). New York: Oxford University Press.

Boudreault, P. (2005). Deaf interpreters. In Terry Janzen (Ed.). *Topics in Signed Language Interpreting*. (pp. 323-355). Northridge: California State University.

Breivik, J-K. (2007). *Døv identitet i endring. Lokale liv – globale bevegelser*. [Deaf identity changing. Local lives – global movements] Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Brück, P. & Schaumberger, E. (2014). Deaf interpreters in Europe: a glimpse into the cradle of an emerging profession. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*. 19(14), 87-109.

Carr, S., Roberts, R., Dufour, A. & D. Steyn. (Eds.). (1995). *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the Community*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dean, R. K., & Pollard, R. Q. (2013). *The demand control schema: Interpreting as a practice profession*. North Charleston: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform

Forestal, E. (2015). *Deaf Interpreters: Shaping the Future of the Sign Language Interpreting Profession*. Retrieved [01/20/18] from: http://www.streetleverage.com/2015/02/deaf-interpreters-shaping-the-future-of-the-sign-language-interpreting-profession/

Forestal, E. (2014). DI: the dynamics of their interpreting processes. In R. Adam, C. Stone, S. Collins and M. Metzger (Eds.) *DI at work: international insights*. (pp. 29-50). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Forestal, E. M. (2011). *Deaf interpreters: Exploring their processes of interpreting*. Capella University.

Forestal, E. (2005). The Emerging Professional: Deaf Interpreters and Their Views and Experiences on Training. In M. Marschark, R. Peterson and E. Winston (Eds.) *Sign Language Interpreting and Interpreter Education*. (pp. 235-58). London & New York: Oxford University Press.

Gilje, N. & Grimen, H. (1993). *Samfunnsvitenskapenes forutsetninger. Innføring i samfunnsvitenskapenes vitenskapsfilosofi*. [The prerequisites of social sciences. Introduction to the social science philosophy] Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Grønmo, S. (2004). *Samfunnsvitenskapelige metoder*. [Social science methods] Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Hale, S. B. (2007). *Community interpreting*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan

Halkier, B. (2010). *Fokusgrupper*. [Focusgroups] Oslo: Gyldendal Akademiske.

Haualand, H. (2006). Et samfunn uten sted. [A community without a place] S. R. Jørgensen, & R. L. Anjum (Eds.). *Tegn som språk. En antologi om tegnspråk*. (pp. 17-31). Oslo: Gyldendal.

Hiddinga, A. & Crasborn, O. (2011). Signed languages and globalization. *Language in Society*, 40(4), 483-505.

Holm, A. (2016). *Voksende behov for døvetolk for minoriteter*. [Growing needs for interpreters for minorities] Retrieved [10/16/19] from: https://fontene.no/fagartikler/voksende-behov-for-dovetolk-for--minoriteter-6.47.344739.e4efb7602b

Hoza, J. (2010). *Team interpreting as collaboration and interdependence*. Alexandria, VA: RID press.

Inspectorate. (2017). Samtykke. [Consent] Retrieved [04/23/18] from: https://www.datatilsynet.no/rettigheter-og-plikter/overordnet-om-rettigheter-og-plikter/samtykke/.

Jareg, K. & Pettersen, Z. (2006). *Tolk og tolkebruker: to sider av samme sak*. [Interpreter and consumer: two sides of the same case] Bergen, Fagbokforlaget.

Langtvedt, N. J. (2015). *Personvern*. [Privacy] Retrieved [05/24/18] from: https://www.etikkom.no/FBIB/Temaer/Personvern-og-ansvar-for-den-enkelte/Personvern/.

Llewellyn-Jones, P. & Lee, R. G. (2014). *Redefining the Role of the Community Interpreter: The concept of role-space*. United Kingdom: SLI Press.

Llewellyn-Jones, P. & Lee, R. G. (2013). Getting to the Core of Role: Defining Interpreters' Role Space. *International Journal of Interpreter Education*, 5(2), 54-72.

Metzger, M. (1999). Footing Shifts in an Interpreted Mock Interview. In E. Winston. (Ed). *Storytelling Conversation: Discourse in Deaf Communities*. (pp. 190-217). Washington, D.C: Gallaudet University Press.

Olsen, E. T. (2015). *Mediert samhandling.* [Mediated Interaction] (Master thesis), Høgskolen i Bergen, Bergen. Avaliable at: https://hvlopen.brage.unit.no/hvlopen-xmlui/handle/11250/2481543

Oslo Metropolitan University. (2018). *Tegnspråk og tolking*. [Sign Language and interpreting] Retrieved [05/24/18] from: http://www.hioa.no/Studier-og-kurs/LU/Bachelor/Tegnspraak-og-tolking

Oxford Dictionaries. (2018). *Refugee*. Retrieved [04/23/18] from: https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/refugee

Pöllabauer, S. (2013). Community Interpreting. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. (np.). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Research Ethics Committees. (2015). *Consent*. Retrieved [04/20/18] from: https://www.etikkom.no/en/library/topics/data-protection-and-responsibility-concerning-the-individual/consent/

Russell, D. (2017). Deaf/non-deaf Interpreter Teams: The complexity of professional practice. In Christopher Stone & Lorraine Leeson (Eds.) *Interpreting and the Politics of Recognition*. (pp. 138-159). Routledge: New York City

Russell, D. (2008). Interpreter preparation conversations: Multiple perspectives. In D. Russell and S. Hale (Eds.) *Studies in interpretation, volume 7: Issues in legal interpretation* (pp. 123-147). Gallaudet Press: Washington, DC.

Sheneman, N. (2016). Deaf Interpreters' Ethics: Reflections on Training and Decision-Making. *Journal of Interpretation*. 25(1), 1-21.

Sinkaberg, R. F. (2017). *Døve innvandrere og flyktninger i møte med offentlige tjenester - Kommunikasjon, trygghet og tillit*. [Deaf immigrants and refugees' encounter with public services – Communication, safety and trust] (Master thesis). The Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim.

Skaaden, H. (2013). *Den topartiske tolken.* [The bipartisan interpreter] *Lærebok i tolking*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Stone, C. A. (2009). *Toward a Deaf translation norm*. Washington DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Stone, C., & Russell, D. (2014). Conference interpreting and interpreting teams. In R. Adam, C. Stone, S. Collins and M. Metzger (Eds.) *DI at work: international insights*. (pp. 140-156). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

The Association of Sign Language Interpreters. (2019). *Tolkeprofesjonens yrkesetiske retningslinjer.* [The interpreting profession's professional ethical guidelines] Retrieved [10/10/19] from: https://www.tolkeforbundet.no/om/etikk/godtolk

The Norwegian University of Science and Technology. (n.d). *Bachelorprogram 3-årig, Trondheim.* [Bachelor programme 3 years, Trondheim] Retrieved [05/24/18] from: http://www.ntnu.no/studier/ltbatgtolk

Wadensjö, C. (1998). *Kontakt genom tolk*. [Contact through interpreters] Stocholm: Dialogos Förlag.

Western Norway University of Applied Sciences. (2018). *Teiknspråk og tolking.* [Sign Language and interpreting] Retrieved [05/24/18] from: https://www.hvl.no/studier/studieprogram/2017h-bergen/tst/

Zeshan, U. (2015). "Making meaning": Communication between sign language users without a shared language. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 26(2), 211-260.

Interview with Joneti Rokotuibau: Building Capacity in the Pacific Islands

Debra Russell[1]

University of Alberta, Canada

Joneti Rokotuibau

Fijian Sign Language Interpreters Association

Abstract

This open forum article highlights an interview conducted with Joneti Rokotuibau, a signed language interpreter from Fiji. She has recently been elected as the Oceania Regional Representative for the World Association of Sign Language Interpreters (WASLI). She highlights her path to becoming a Fijian Sign Language interpreter and teacher, and how she developed and interest in working with interpreters and the Deaf community. She also describes the ways in which signed language interpreting is developing in the Pacific Islands and how she is partnering with the national Deaf Association to bring about change. Her experiences offer interpreters and educators a glimpse in some of the many exciting developments in the region known as Oceania, which includes Fiji, the Solomon Islands, Kiribati, Tonga Samoa, Vanuatu, Tuvalu, Papua New Guinea, New Zealand, and Australia.

Keywords: interpreters and interpreter education; National Deaf associations; interpreting on television; Fijian Sign Language (FSL); policy frameworks.

[1] *Correspondence to: drussell@ualberta.ca*

Interview with Joneti Rokotuibau: Building Capacity in the Pacific Islands

Joneti Rokotuibau is an interpreter from Suva, Fiji. She has worked as a teacher of deaf students, as an interpreter and more recently as an interpreter trainer in the Pacific Islands. She was recently appointed as the Oceania Regional Representative to the World Association of Sign Language Interpreters (WASLI) for the term of 2019-2023. She looks forward to strengthening the interpreting skills of those she works with, in order to serve the Deaf communities more effectively. Her region is highly diverse, including countries with established interpreter training programs such as New Zealand and Australia, along with the many Pacific Islands where interpreters have had minimal opportunity to formally train as an interpreter or to be paid for their work.

Debra Russell is a Canadian certified interpreter, educator and researcher. As the previous David Peikoff Chair of Deaf Studies at the University of Alberta, her research interests include mediated education with interpreters, interpreting in legal settings and with legal discourse, and co-interpreting in Deaf-hearing interpreter teams. She is extensively published in the field of interpretation. Her interpreting practice spans over thirty-five years, and continues focus on medical, legal, mental health and employment settings. She has had a long history of leadership positions at the local, national and international level, serving several volunteer organizations. She is the past President of the World Association of Sign Language Interpreters (WASLI), and a Commissioner with the Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education (CCIE). She loves to travel, having presented in 62 countries while maintaining a committed yoga practice over the past 40 years.

Deb: Thanks so much for taking time to talk with me while you're here at the World Association of Sign Language Interpreters conference in Paris, France. I know that the IJIE is very interested in how interpreters are trained in Fiji and the Pacific Islands. I think Della Goswell and Jemina Napier provided training in Fiji a few years ago – was that the first training? What was important about that training?

Joneti: It's my pleasure to talk with you, Deb. Yes, that was the first formal training we experienced with overseas trainers, with two volunteer instructors in 2006. Ruth Spencer from New Zealand and Kate Nelson from Australia offered our first trainings. The course was 12 weeks long and each class was three hours. Then Jemina and Della came for one week to close out the course, and what I remember most was learning about the Code of Ethics and how ethics guide my work. The training taught me how best to relate to the Deaf people whom I am serving and how to establish the professional boundaries that bring my work up to the standard expected by the profession. A second aspect that was important for all of us in that training was learning how to give feedback to each other so that we could all keep on growing and enable self-evaluation and progress in performance. Then we had a week of training with Zane Hema in 2014, and most recently we hosted the WASLI 2018 conference and training workshops.

Deb: Sounds like that training provided an important foundation for Fiji. How did you become an interpreter?

Joneti: I became an interpreter through my friend, Inise Tawaketini. I met her through volleyball, and she told me that she taught deaf students. I asked her how she did that, and she said “through sign language.” I said, “What is sign language?” It was such a new concept for me. She got me very interested in working at the school. When I came into the school for the deaf I was so fortunate, because the school had a deaf Head Teacher, Mr. Olawale Alade from Nigeria, who was a qualified teacher of the deaf. Also, his wife was an interpreter. I think they are in England now. Both of those people became my mentors, and they helped me launch my work with signed language and deaf people. I can remember the week that I started; my hands were all over the place trying to sign properly and make sense, and the Head Teacher observed me, nodding his head positively. He believed in us and was so supportive of our learning on the job! That was April of 2001, so it has been almost 20 years for me now. I taught until 2007, when I was chosen as the signed language interpreting chairperson for the Fijian Sign Language Interpreters Committee. I knew that it was an important role, and since my heart is with interpreting, I took up that volunteer role and began working with the Ministry of Education, the principals, the teachers and the interpreters in the schools. I was so fortunate, because as the supervisor of the interpreters, I could apply the knowledge that I learned from Della and Jemina. Also Kate Matairuvula and Ruth Spencer supported my work. At the same time, after school I was working with the Fiji Association of the Deaf, volunteering as an interpreter in many different settings, so it was not easy.

Deb: So clearly you have a heart for teaching as you were passing that along to others what you had been taught. And then in 2018 something important happened in your region. What was that?

Joneti: We had the WASLI Oceania conference in Fiji! For me it was a dream come true! People who believe in the things they do came to share their knowledge and experiences with us, and it brought all of us to a whole new level, where we can now discuss things with the same mind set and work together. The conference was wonderful, and then we had two additional days for just our region to be in training. We had over 50 interpreters from our region, who were able to work with you, Debra, and the other trainers, to ask questions, and to share their experiences. It had a profound impact on the Pacific Islands, because all of you brought the training to our level and made it easy to understand. This learning has shaped the philosophy behind our work and allowed us to take the next steps in establishing the profession in our region.

Deb: I loved being at the conference and post-conference training in Fiji! I always learn more than I can ever give, and I thank you for everything that your group taught me. I recall the panel presentation, where we had to talk through some very sensitive issues, and we were met with such open minds and hearts in those conversations. It was amazing to me. And then there are some really interesting things about Fiji, such as the televised parliamentary proceedings at which deaf people provide interpretation, something that other countries have yet to do. How did that come to be?

Joneti: It was through a discussion with the Fiji Association of the Deaf and the interpreters. We wanted the Deaf community to identify who was best to do the work, and they suggested names of some deaf individuals. We all agreed this was best, as the deaf people would give the clearest interpretation of the complicated Parliamentary information to our Fijian Deaf community, many of whom have not had a formal education.

Deb: I think Fiji is way ahead of many countries that have only used hearing interpreters. It doesn’t matter whether the Deaf community has formal education or not. It is sometimes just not possible to understand the interpreter on TV, due to the pace, the lack of prosody, the lack of facial grammar. The hearing interpreter is often a second language learner of the signed language, whereas the Deaf interpreters have different strategies to manage the information and present it to the broadest audience. And somehow all of you knew that, and you collaborated with the Deaf association to find the best strategies for your community by pairing hearing and deaf interpreters. It is a great model that many countries could learn from.

Joneti: It’s vital that we work together – the interpreters and the Deaf Association – so that, as in this case, viewers can benefit from seeing the interpreting on television.

Deb: Yes that is the point, isn't it: to benefit those who are watching. Now you have been appointed as the WASLI Regional Representative, which is so exciting for WASLI! Do you have some ideas, hopes and dreams, for what you would like to see for your region over the next few years?

Joneti: I would like to see two Pacific Island countries in our region set up their interpreting associations; right now, Fiji is the only one that has an association. So we will work together, with the ASLIA and SLIANZ, the signed language interpreter associations, in setting our goals and determining how to achieve them. We want to be able to raise the financial resources needed, and the training materials, to support our Pacific Islands. I hope that we see the establishment of a diploma course for interpreters in Fiji where we can provide access to solid training, and then we'd like to establish a certification system. We are also planning a 2020 conference to be hosted in Fiji or Samoa, as well as considering a "train the trainer" model to help bring training to other islands.

Deb: Your region has such a good foundation of collaboration with the Deaf Association, and it strikes me that it will be important to work with them to prioritize the needs, as there are many competing demands - deaf children need access to schools, access to signed language, access to deaf people who can be role models. And, of course, interpreters. It seems wise that you are working to figure that out together. It does seem that Fiji is ready for a more formal training process, whereas the other islands are just getting started with deaf schools and trying to include deaf teachers in signed language education.

Joneti: Exactly. On some islands in the Oceania region, deaf adults and children have not been able to access government services, education in signed language, or services with interpreters, so we have to work closely with the Oceania regional secretariat of the World Federation of the Deaf.

Deb: When you look back over the past 20 years, what was your best interpreting experience?

Joneti: I think it was my work with four deaf students who came in from the Solomon Islands for the 2013-2017 school years: seeing them for the first week in school, seeing their fear. I was so blessed to work with them. I was able to build trust with those students, and I saw them go to the top of the class. Then knowing they went back to the Solomon Islands, full of confidence, high self-esteem, and independence. One of them told me this story, that when he was home for the semester break, he went to the market with his dad to buy him some tools. The father expected him to point and select his tools, but instead he asked for a pen and paper and wrote down all the tools he wanted. It was amazing for that family! His Dad couldn't stop talking about it. He was amazed at the independence of all the boys. The Solomon Islands have just eight years of compulsory schooling, and that it why the boys came to Fiji. They learned so much and they soaked up everything from the opportunity. It was the best experience for me!

Deb: Do you have any advice for people from overseas who sometimes want to come and teach? What might you tell them so that they can be better educators when working in international contexts?

Joneti: Sometimes it is the pace of the teaching that needs to be adjusted. We have our own way of doing things, and it may take time. We need to go through the same processes that other countries have gone through. Sometimes trainers want to rush things, but we need trainers who can come meet us where we are, ask our advice, ask what we need, and then plan for that. As interpreters, we will go through stages of learning and growth, we will get there, but the pace will be different.

Deb: That is such great advice. Sometimes those of us from Western or Northern countries want to move at a pace that doesn't fit the experience or the culture that we are visiting, so we do need to ask for advice and adjust to what is needed. Thank you for those words, Joneti. And if you had to give advice to a new interpreter, what would that be?

Joneti: Get involved in the Deaf community.

Deb: Get involved in the Deaf community; that is such a perfect ending to our interview. Thank you, Joneti.

Joneti: Thank you so much for taking time to ask about our region.

Interview with an Agent of Change: Dr. Xiaoyan Xiao

Debra Russell[1]

University of Alberta, Canada

Xiaoyan Xiao

Xiamen University, China

Abstract

This interview was conducted with Dr. Xiaoyan Xiao, a professor from Xiamen University in China. She describes her path to becoming a spoken language interpreter and linguist and explains how she developed an interest in signed language research. She also explains how signed language interpreting is developing in China and how she is partnering with the national Deaf association to bring about change. Her experiences offer interpreters and educators a glimpse into some of the many exciting developments in China.

Keywords: interpreters and interpreter education; National Deaf associations; translation; interpreting on television; Chinese Sign Language (CSL); policy frameworks.

[1] *Correspondence to: drussell@ualberta.ca*

Interview with an Agent of Change: Dr. Xiaoyan Xiao

Dr. Xiaoyan Xiao is a professor from Xiamen University in China. Trained as a spoken language interpreter and a linguist, she has taught Chinese-English interpretation in Xiamen University for over 20 years. After spending a sabbatical year at UCLA during 2007, she began to investigate signed language interpreting in China. During 2012 to 2013, she spent another sabbatical year at Gallaudet University as a Fulbright Research Scholar. These experiences have shaped her work in China with signed language interpreters. Dr. Xiao and her colleagues have received research grants from Chinese National Social Sciences Foundation, the Chinese National Language Committee, the British Council and EU Asia-Link.

Deb: Thanks so much for taking time to talk with me while you are here at the World Federation of the Deaf conference in Paris, France. Can you tell us a little about your journey to become an interpreter educator and how is it that you became interested in signed language?

Xiaoyan: I have been an interpreter educator for the past 28 years, and I came to this entirely by chance. When I graduated with my BA, my Dean, Professor Yuru Lin – a pioneer in China in terms of interpreting studies – asked if I would like to stay at the University and become a teacher. She was looking for people to join the interpreting team, and she wanted someone very young. So in 1991 I joined the faculty as its youngest member. I have continued working with the same team ever since, and now that Professor Lin has retired, I am head of the team. I still remember that she used to introduce me as the youngest member and now I am among the oldest! I have been very lucky in that sense, being part of a close-knit group at Xiamen University for so many years, and from the beginning it has been with interpreting. Even though I was chosen by the Dean, I found that this is really the thing I wanted to do.

As for signed language interpreting, I have to go back to 2007, when I was a visiting scholar at UCLA in the Linguistics Department. Colleagues invited me to go to a lecture on ASL syntax, and they told me that the lecture would be interpreted simultaneously. That is my field, and I had never seen signed language interpreting in action. I had read about signed language interpreting in journals, but no one in the interpreting field in China talked about it at that time. So I went to the lecture which was given by a deaf professor. He is actually here at the World Federation of the Deaf Congress now: Dr. Patrick Boudreault.

Deb: Oh yes, Patrick is from Canada!

Xiaoyan: Yes, exactly. So he gave a talk, and I sat next to the interpreter who was speaking while he was signing, I had never seen interpreting done in that way, and I was just fascinated. So I went back to China and tried to find what had been done there. I found that there was no one doing any research about this. There were a few documents about what interpreters should or should not do, sort of the typical pre-historic warnings and interpreters writing about their personal experiences, but no real research about signed language interpreters. At that time, the leaders in the movement were not interpreters but rather people from Special Education. That started my journey of research: not training signed language interpreters, as our university is still mainly involved with Chinese-English spoken interpreting, but working with people from the signed language interpreting programs, with deaf people and with the Special Education community in China. It's been 11 years now.

Deb: So your PhD is in linguistics, and your master's is in…?

Xiaoyan: I have a PhD in linguistics - systemic functional grammar – and I have two master's – one from my university in conference interpreting and the other from the University of Westminster in Applied Language Studies. We had European funding which allowed me to go to the UK and sit in some courses with the European master's program at the University of Westminster during 1999-2000.

Deb: What a rich background to bring to training interpreters at your University! The university offers a BA and an MA in Chinese?

Xiaoyan: Yes, we have a BA and MA. We had one of the earliest masters in Chinese-English, and now we have the MTI (Masters in Translation and Interpreting) and the BTI. My university also offers the MTI and the MA for interpreting studies in Chinese-English and other languages such as Japanese.

Deb: So you came to signed language interpreting eleven years ago and now you are partnering with signed language interpreters and Deaf associations. Can you describe what you see as the context for signed language interpreting and training in China?

Xiaoyan: Things are just at the beginning of professional training. We now have five programs. Some of them are three years (like an AA degree), and some have just been upgraded to a four-year degree, but they are all under the umbrella of Special Education. When I give a presentation and list the programs, most people in China have never heard of these colleges, as they are not well known in China. Not like Xiamen University, which is one of the top rated universities and hard to get into because of the location, with sunshine, seafood, and the beach. Many parents want their children to attend university in a good city. So, I have contacts with all five programs and work closely with some of them. I visited two programmes, and sat in on some of the courses and then had a chance to talk with their trainers.

When I first started to approach this circle of deaf educators and deaf people, they were suspicious. "What is your interest? Do you have a deaf kid, a deaf spouse? No? Then why are you interested?" Yesterday I went to the IVT (International Visual Theatre) here in Paris with Dr. Junhui Yang, who now teaches in the UK, and she said, "I met you in 2009 when you came to a conference on deaf education (in Suzhou, China). You didn't sign at all." At that time, I had been trying to do an experiment and talk to people, but they wouldn't cooperate. And then she said, "And now, you sign so much better! I see you are committed, that you are still here with us." I guess she meant, "You are not here to publish one paper and then disappear." So the attitude is different now, and the Deaf community is much more embracing of me. Especially after my time as a visiting Fulbright scholar at Gallaudet University with Cynthia Roy between 2012-13. It was there I was able to see how they train interpreters at the PhD, MA, and BA level. So when I returned to China, I thought we should do the same. Our interpreters are trained by Special Educators who don't necessarily understand how interpreting works. For example, some trainers are very obsessed with the so-called "standard signing," which is word-for-word. I said to them, "What is the purpose of interpreting and translating? You want to communicate! If you are signing word-for-word and deaf people don't understand you, it is not good communication. It doesn't matter that it is signing in a "standard" manner; they don't understand you!" So, there is still a lot of that in our Chinese context.

Deb: I think when programs are housed in Special Education and are not taught by people with training in conference interpreting or interpreting and translation, then we are already on a different philosophical track, where people don't understand that this is an act of cognition that involves two languages.

Xiaoyan: Yes, indeed. Then in 2008 I was very lucky to receive my first major Chinese National Social Science Foundation Grant, which was a very huge step forward in starting my formal research into signed language. For the first few years, I did surveys of deaf users of signed language interpreters and of signed language interpreters: any of them that I could get hold of all over the country. In those days, you had to individually hand out printed surveys, asking anybody at any gathering of deaf people to fill them out and post them back to me. One of my findings was that deaf people complained bitterly about the quality of interpreting, principally because they couldn't understand the interpreters' signing. My survey of interpreters also asked about the biggest challenges they faced, and guess what? The biggest challenge was that they couldn't understand deaf people's signing! They think they have learned signed language, they sign "standard" Chinese signs, individual words, but when it comes to a real situation, they don't understand deaf people! I thought, "What a ridiculous situation, you don't understand each other, and yet you call it interpreting! How can this happen?"

But gradually, as I got to know deaf people, understand the educators and see what was happening on TV, well, that led me to spend a few years looking at television interpreting. In 2012, China passed an accessibility law that required all cities – even small, remote cities – to have a TV station that provides signed-language-interpretation for the news at least once a week. The most recent figure, which grows every year, is that we have 290 TV channels that have regular signing on TV. The Chinese Central Television (CCTV) news channel provides signed language interpreting everyday between 6:00 pm to 7:00 pm. This is prime time, so that really draws attention to signed language interpreting. I went to the studio in Beijing, where I was required to get special permission to observe the interpreters and interview them. The interpreters arrive one hour early to have their hair and make-up done, after which they have a stack of materials to read. The interpreting is very form-based, with them attempting to sign every word of the live newscast. After that visit, I did a comprehension study of deaf college students, having them view an interpreted broadcast and then answer some very simple questions about the content. After watching the interpretation, seen in a tiny box in the corner of the screen, the participants only got 23% of the questions correct. For example, the broadcast had a police officer talking about the crack-down on fake medication, saying that a particular cancer medication had sleeping pills in it. So I asked the students whether the medicine works. Some students answered, "Yes, it is good for sleeping." This is what they got from the interpretation! As for the political stories and international news, they understood nothing from the interpretation.

Deb: It would be interesting to test the comprehension rate of the interpreters and what they understood from the spoken Chinese.

Xiaoyan: Yes, and it would also be interesting to ask the interpreters to watch the interpretations themselves to see whether they understand the signing without the spoken Chinese.

Deb: What happened next for you?

Xiaoyan: I was at the studio and I talked with the manager, who told me they rotate a group of five people from the local Beijing deaf school. None of them had formal training in interpreting. I told them I was a trained simultaneous Chinese-English interpreter, and I could never sit there for 60 minutes of simultaneous interpreting, with no preparation. The news is very dense, it is read at a very rapid pace, and has very complex linguistic structure; it's just not possible. And there is just one interpreter as the producer refuses to swap interpreters after twenty minutes. He said it was troublesome enough to put a signed language interpreter on TV, and that it was just too much work for them.

So, they are providing interpreters on TV in compliance with the law, but nobody could understand the interpreters. That led me to think about how we could get around this problem, how we could get people to change. So I talked with the experts in special education trusted by the administration and gradually some of them started changing their attitude towards signed language. There is a heavy investment in the standardization of Chinese Sign Language, because deaf people from different parts of the country sign differently. There were also people involved in developing CSL syntax. So the good news is that more people are beginning to understand what signed language is, it's almost an informal recognition of the language, even though it is not in the law. The group recognizes that it is a language of its own, that it is not Chinese per se. So the recent release of the Lexicon of Common Expressions in Chinese National Sign Language, not calling it The Chinese Sign Language as it was in the earlier version, is great progress already.

Deb: What role are deaf people playing in this linguistic work?

Xiaoyan: Deaf people are very much involved. The group headed by Prof. Gu in Beijing gathers deaf people every month from all over China, and they adopt one or two of the more common signs.

Deb: What are you working on now?

Xiaoyan: I am continuing to work with the coordinators of the five programs. I have reviewed their curriculum, and one of my MA students is now doing her thesis on curriculum design in signed language interpreting programs. (We have just finished a survey of 160 recent graduates from these programs.) We are also doing a review of Roy's interpreter education series and other key papers so we are hoping that that research can be shown to the signed language interpreting community. In China, the way is not to protest, but rather show how it could be. Also, at the CIT conference in 2012, I saw deaf interpreters for the first time. So when I returned to China, I introduced this form of relay interpreting at China's National conference on Interpreting Studies, which my team and I hosted in Xiamen in 2014, and people were very interested. And for the last National conference in Beijing in 2018, I asked for signed language interpreters to be used for my presentation, as I wanted to invite deaf people to attend, and the conference organizers were very accommodating, even paying the signed language interpreters appropriately! So changes are happening.

Deb: Well, it seems that you have all of the attributes of diplomat.

Xiaoyan: Sometimes I tell my deaf friends, "Don't be angry and fight, but show them. It is the way to get things done here. Try to make it look good on both sides, and everyone wins. One step at a time..."

Deb: So at your university do you teach any signed language?

Xiaoyan: Yes, I have been offering a course with deaf people for ten years now. It is called an Introduction to Chinese Sign Language Interpreting. The reason I have to call it interpreting is because I am in the English Department of the College of Foreign Languages. If I had offered the course under the title "Introduction to Chinese Sign Language," as I did when I first offered it, it would become a political debate about whether Chinese Sign Language can be considered a foreign language. I don't think we are ready to go there, at least not yet, in China. So in the course I invite deaf people – one, sometimes two – to co-teach with me. I do the design of the course, and they deliver the signing, and it has become very popular. Many students have said that they really enjoyed it and had no idea that *"...CSL could be so much fun, and that deaf people are so smart and humorous!"* And to that I say "Yes, they are just like us!" Students tell me that it is difficult to get into the class now, as it is so popular. It is open not just for my students but for students from business, law, chemistry, medicine, music, etc., so when registration opens, in just one day the courses are filled! I have started a level two now for the MA students. Right now my university doesn't have a deaf faculty member, so my co-instructors are my personal friends or from the local special education school. So I had to work with the headmaster to seek permission to have them come to teach, and we are able to pay them from my research grant. There is no position for a deaf instructor, not even a TA, unfortunately.

Deb: So what would happen if a deaf student wanted to come to your university and study with you?

Xiaoyan: I was talking with someone here who is an American deaf lawyer who wants to give scholarships for Chinese deaf students to study law in China, and that got me thinking about this question. First of all, they have to pass the national entrance exam, which will be very hard for deaf people from the special education schools, as our university only takes students who are among the top tier scholastically. I have been thinking about the possibility of finding a way for deaf people to work with me and become faculty, but there is no funding for interpreters. So I told the American deaf lawyer that if a student were admitted to my university to study law, they would need two interpreters and that the funding would have to include that. But where do you find qualified interpreters who understand law? That would be really hard. We are not at that stage yet.

Deb: So what can you tell me about interpreter associations in China, given that we just held the World Association of Sign Language Interpreters (WASLI) conference here in Paris?

Xiaoyan: There is a Chinese Association for Translators and Interpreters that now has a sub-committee on Interpreters, of which I am an executive member. The Chinese National Association of the Deaf (CNAD) has recently set up Chinese Sign Language Interpreters' Committee. I was invited as the deputy director. The Committee is headed by a deaf person, and one of the major projects we are working on is interpreter certification: that is writing up the standards for certification for signed language interpreters.

Deb: What will that look like given the training of signed language interpreters is challenging at this time?

Xiaoyan: I have been trying to persuade my colleagues to look at testing in a new way. The previous system of certification of signed language interpreters tested candidates by having them translate words and sentences. However, deaf people would complain to me about the interpreters, saying things like "He has the advanced level (there are three levels, beginner, intermediate and advanced), and he doesn't understand my signing!" So I am trying to work with the people in the SLI committee, which includes deaf scholars, to change the testing, but they are not interpreters themselves. Some of them are educators or have a linguistics background, so I am trying to persuade them to look at how we test in spoken language interpreting, as it is the same thing. We need to test signed interpreters on real situations, not words or sentences. So we are having a lot of communication about these issues, which makes me happy. It's a good team, and while we don't always agree, I am finding that I can use my expertise from Chinese-English interpreting to show that it's the same process for Chinese and CSL. The new certification system is due at the end of the year, and there is a lot still to be done. I think we need more input from outside the country. So we will see. I will try this summer while I am in Beijing for the training of signed language interpreters to talk with the team about the work and the best way forward.

Deb: What will you be teaching this summer?

Xiaoyan: I will teach basic theories of interpreting and explore topics like: what is quality in interpreting? What does it mean to be comprehensible? Really basic T and I theory. The class I will give is a three-hour workshop, within a number of different workshops taught in two sessions. There will be a total of 160 students altogether. Each province recommended about four of their best interpreters who are respected in the Deaf community and who are currently working, so at least they have the language skills. It will be like a foundational course for people who have never had training. The CNAD is providing the training. It's a good start.

Deb: How many deaf people are in China? How many interpreters?

Xiaoyan: The official number of deaf people is 20.54 million, and for signed language interpreters, well, for my second survey in 2017 I had 140 people respond, and some of the deaf educators doubted that there could be that many in China! I covered 28 provinces and autonomous regions (out of 32), and in every city, there has to be at least one or two good interpreters, doing the work. I think many are retired teachers or have deaf family members. But like many countries, some of our CODAs have no training and are making decisions that wouldn't be what we expect from a professional. For example, one time a CODA talked about how she tried her very best to get her deaf client off during a court matter. The CODAs are acting as interpreters, but they are not recognized or trained as such. So we are at the beginning.

Deb: It sounds like you are a great ally, and we need about 400 more of you in China as there is so much to do!

Xiaoyan: I am trying to get more people, and for them to think alike. I am in a WeChat group of over 300 – in China everyone is on WeChat. These 300 people are deaf and hearing educators, linguists, and so on, so we can build a community and share information. Fudan University, for example, is a really good university which has a CSL linguistic center headed by Prof. Gong. They have built a corpus of Shanghai Sign Language. They have quite a few MA and PhD students' theses on Chinese sign linguistics. My students in Xiamen U have produced 15 MA theses on SLI since 2008. In this way the WeChat group is a way to keep us informed about signed language work in China.

Deb: What advice do you have for those who read this and say, "Hey, I will go to China and help them set up interpreter training!" Would that be good, or is it better to allow the community and culture to find its own ways and solutions. So if someone were interested in coming to China and meeting with interpreters and so on, what would you say?

Xiaoyan: Find Chinese partners and see what they need. Don't just come and criticize and protest. It doesn't work that way in China. Be nice, try to develop allies. I think the future is positive for us. I have seen many changes over the past eleven years, especially regarding funding; there are many more opportunities. When I first started offering signed language classes, I met resistance, and now my faculty colleagues are much more supportive and appreciative of my work. They can see SL interpreting on TV and are open to what that means.

Deb: For readers that would like to learn from your work, what would you point us towards?

Xiaoyan: Here are three that you might enjoy reading:

Xiao, X. (2018). Sign language interpreting on the Chinese mainland: Status-quo, problems and prospects. *Chinese Translator's Journal.* 2018 (6). Beijing. (In Chinese. with X.Gao & X. Zhao)

Xiao, X. (2015). Chinese Deaf viewers' comprehension of signed language interpreting on television: An experimental study. *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting.* 17 (1). (In English. with X. Chen & J. Palmer).

Xiao, X. (2013). Sign language interpreting on Chinese TV: A survey on user perspectives. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology.* 21(1). (In English. with F. Li)

Deb: Thank you so much for taking time to speak with me and share this information about interpreting in a part of the world that is unfamiliar to many of us.

Xiaoyan: Thank you so much for your interest.

Working with Active Interpreters: A Commentary about Interpreting Terminology and Concepts

Hilde Haualand[1]

Department of International Studies and Interpreting, OsloMet – Oslo Metropolitan University, Oslo, Norway

Anna-Lena Nilsson

Department of Language and Literature, NTNU – Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

Abstract

This commentary is a critical discussion of some terms that are frequently used when we talk about interpreting. Several of the popular terms may actually downplay the work done by both the interpreters and the other participants in interpreted interaction. In order to accentuate the work done by the interpreter as well as the active contribution by all participants in an interpreted dialogue, the commentary suggests some other terms. We would rather have us talk about working with interpreters than to 'use' interpreters, that interpreters interpret from a signed language to a spoken language rather than 'voice for', and that we refer to processing time instead of 'lag time' or 'delay'. Interpreter educators, trainers and researchers in the field of interpreting are in a position where it is both possible and desirable to strive towards using terms that more accurately represent interpreting and the interpreting process than some of the terms currently in use.

Keywords: terminology, working with interpreters, participants, processing time

[1] *Correspondence to: Hilde Haualand, hilma@oslomet.no*

Working with Active Interpreters: A Commentary about Interpreting Terminology and Concepts

1. Interpreting terminology

The terms we use when we talk about interpreting reveal and contribute to consolidating how interpreters, interpreter trainers and others think about interpreters and interpreting. Some of the most common terms that are used may however downplay the work done by both the interpreters and the other participants in interpreted interactions. In this commentary, we wish to highlight and discuss some of these terms, and critically analyze what they say about how we view interpreting and people who communicate via interpreters. We will also suggest alternative concepts for the terms we discuss.

This commentary is in part based on the introductory chapter of the edited volume *Tolking – språkarbeid og profesjonsutøvelse [Interpreting – language work and professional practice.]* (Haualand, Nilsson & Raanes 2018). In that chapter, with our colleague Eli Raanes, we discussed the terms we had decided should be used in the book, some of which we now discuss in this commentary. The present commentary text is also inspired by the chapter "Towards a cognitive model of interpreting" (Wilcox & Shaffer, 2005), and several publications about (research on) interpreting as a professional activity from 2000 and onwards (Hauser, Finch & Hauser, 2008; Warnicke & Plejert, 2012; Pöchhacker 2012; De Meulder, Napier & Stone, 2018 and many more). Though the contributions in the edited volume *Tolking* are written in two Scandinavian languages (Norwegian and Swedish), the terms discussed in the volume have their counterparts in English as well. We therefore wish to extend our discussion to the English-using interpreting community.

For this commentary we have chosen three sets of terms that we will discuss critically, and also suggest alternative terms to use. None of the terms we suggest are entirely new, but as far as we can observe, they have not yet become part of the everyday jargon used when interpreters, interpreting students and interpreter educators talk about interpreters and what interpreters do. While it is perhaps futile to expect a rapid change in terminology among lay persons and *primary participants* (see below for a discussion about this concept), we do believe that interpreter educators, trainers and researchers in the field of interpreting are in a position where it is both possible and desirable to strive towards using terms that more accurately represent interpreting and the interpreting process than some of the terms that are currently in use.

The three sets of terms that we have chosen for a discussion here are: 1) to ‘use’ an interpreter, 2) reverse interpreting or voicing, and 3) lag time and similar terms. What the terms have in common is that they are part of everyday jargon when both interpreters and the people interpreters serve talk about interpreters and their work, but they may also conceal what actually happens in an interpreted dialogue.

1.1. Working with interpreters

The term to ‘use’ an interpreter, reveals problematic and partially outdated views on language and communication, the actual work done by the interpreter, as well as the contributions all participants make in an interpreted dialogue. ‘Using’ an interpreter indicates an old-fashioned view of both language and interpreting as a channel where a message is sent back and forth through the interpreter. Talk about ‘using’ an interpreter also conveys an underlying idea that the interpreter is a passive tool, through which language flows, which in turn is connected to the idea of the interpreter as a conduit (Reddy, 1979), telephone line or machine – a neutral tool not affecting the "message" sent through it. This, however, is an idea that has long since been abandoned (Roy, 1992; Wadensjö, 1992; Metzger, 1999).

To talk about the interpreter as being *used* also conceals the interpreter's own actions, the interpreter's active coordination of, and contribution to, the interpreted dialogue (see more on the active work done by the interpreter in our discussion on *processing time* below).

Also, the concept of ‘using’ an interpreter conceals some of the active contributions from all parties in an interpreted interaction. The interpreting scholar Cecilia Wadensjö has described interpreting as a *dance for three/pas de troi* (Wadensjö, 1992). This means that for an interpreted conversation to work, all of the participants have to contribute. For the professional participants in particular, the presence of an interpreter cannot be reduced to a situation where they merely ‘use’ the interpreter. Without being conscious or informed that the interpreter is part of the interaction (cf. Roy, 1992; Wadensjö, 1992; Metzger, 1999; and many others), participants' attention to the impact of an interpreter in the situation may be reduced. The presence of an interpreter should rather be considered a signal that they need to be particularly alert and prepared for a different, more complicated and possibly more challenging way of communicating with their clients or colleagues.

Stating that we *work with*, rather than use, interpreters, is also a way to empower the professionals in an interpreted dialogue, since it clarifies that the responsibility for their part of the communication ultimately rests with them, and not with the interpreter or the client(s). By *cooperating with* or *working with* the interpreter, it is possible for professionals to retain their responsibility. This however requires that the interpreter is conscious of their own responsibility, the professional’s responsibility and the division of labor (cf. Abbott 1988) that demarcates the boundaries between their work. Following this argument, we also suggest using the word *primary participants* rather than ‘users’ or ‘clients’ about the people who communicate via an interpreter. Warnicke & Plejert (2012) use the term *primary participants* in their study of the interpreter’s mediation in video relay service calls, where they show the active participation and coordination done by the interpreters. While the coordination may be more salient in a situation where the primary participants do not see or hear one another, we know that the interpreter has an active role in coordinating the talk in any interpreted dialogue.

To mark the difference in participant status between those who want to or need to talk to each other (the *primary participants)* and the interpreter, the term *ratified participant* can be used about interpreters (Pöchhacker, 2012). The interpreter is not a primary participant, but the interpreter's participation is justified by the primary participants' need for interpreting services. Informed professionals, of which deaf professionals possibly stand out as particularly experienced, *work with* their interpreters, as they know that communicating via interpreters is different from communicating without an interpreter present. As has been emphasized by for example Young, Oram and Napier (2019), recognizing that the primary participants *work with*, or *communicate via* an interpreter is not only an act to bring attention to all the participants’ contribution to the interpreted dialogue, it also requires an “orientation to deaf people’s cultural-linguistic identity because it would enable an equivalent recognition of all concerned as different language users” (Young et al. 2019, 104).

Considering the primary participants to be *different language users*, leads us to another term related to interpreting that should be avoided – ‘reverse interpreting’ or ‘voicing’.

1.2. Interpreting from a spoken language to a signed language

Historically, most of the work sign language interpreters did was conducted in the direction from a spoken into a signed language, perhaps with the exception of dialogue interpreting of for example doctor-patient conversations. Signed language interpreting was primarily a means to convey information from the hearing majority society to a deaf minority, so when interpreters in exceptional cases interpreted from a signed language to a spoken language, this was considered ‘reverse interpreting’. The use of this term fortunately seems to be declining. As higher education became accessible to more deaf people, gradually interpreting "in the other direction" became more sought after, even to the extent that deaf professionals in many cases are known to hearing non-signers through an interpreter (Young et al., 2019). The term ‘voicing’, or sometimes ‘voicing for’, is however still used to denote the particular task of interpreting from a signed into a spoken language. The Swedish and Norwegian terms that are often used are similar in that they literally mean 'speech-interpreting'.

It is our opinion that we are, again, faced with a term that tends to hide the work the interpreter is doing, instead indicating that all they do is to "add voice to the signs" that are produced by the signer. However, as the signed and spoken languages the interpreter works between differ in vocabulary, grammar and syntax, this is obviously not the case. The task they are fulfilling is to interpret (often simultaneously) from a signed into a spoken language. The terminology used should reflect this, and thus this task should be described as precisely what it is – interpreting from a signed language into a spoken language – for example from British Sign Language into spoken English. This process is indeed different than simply adding 'voice' to the signs, and it also requires an intense cognitive process that must take some time. The *time* required for proper interpreting takes us to the third term we want to discuss.

1.3. Processing time

When describing the work of interpreters, and how an interpreted interaction will take place, interpreters often say that there will be a 'delay' before the information reaches the other party, and terms such as 'lag time' or 'time lag' are used. (The French term 'décalage' is also used sometimes, particularly in relation to (spoken language) conference interpreting.) What all of these terms have in common is that they indicate that interpreting takes time, without actually acknowledging why this is so. In the edited volume mentioned initially in this article, Tiselius (2018) discusses a selection of models that aim to explain the interpreting process. Seleskovitch's interpretive theory of translation (Seleskovitch & Lederer, 1984), Russell's meaning-based model (Russell, 2005), Gile's effort model (Gile, 1995), and Cokely's sociolinguistic model (Cokely, 1992) are but a few of the models that reveal the work the interpreter does in order to interpret (simultaneously and/or consecutively) as well as coordinate the interpreted interaction. These models show *why* it takes time to interpret, and in order to make the continuous work conducted by interpreters more salient, we suggest using terms such as *processing time*, also used by for example Russell (2005, 136), and Tiselius (2018). This is a term that recognizes the interpreter's work more than 'lag time' or 'delay' do. *Processing time* may also serve to make others more conscious that the time difference between the primary participants' utterances and the interpreter's utterance is an inherent part of an interpreted dialogue, and a sign of the work being done by the interpreter(s). Acknowledging the *processing time* can also make primary participants more aware of the impact of the interpreter on the interpreted dialogue, cf. our discussion above regarding the primary participants' responsibility for making an interpreted dialogue work.

2. Summary

The increasing numbers of deaf professionals who have pursued educational and professional careers, many of whom have extensive experience of working with interpreters, have helped reveal that some popular concepts used about interpreting may conflate and conceal, rather than reveal, what is actually going on in an interpreted interaction. We would therefore like to see terminology used that in a better way reflects how people create meaning when communicating, what interpreters do in interpreted interaction, and also what the primary participants have to do in order for communication to work. Additionally, we would like to see terminology that reflects the fact that interpreters work between two languages - they do not merely "add sound to signs" - and that the act of interpreting between two languages requires *processing time*. Studies of interpreted interactions show that the interpreter is an active participant in the interpreted interaction, and this should be reflected in the concepts we use about interpreting and the interpreter's work.

References

Abbott, Andrew (1988). *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cokely, Dennis (1992). *Interpretation: A sociolinguistic model*. Burtonsville, MD: Linstok Press.

De Meulder, M., Napier, J., & Stone, C. (2018). Designated or preferred? A deaf academic and two signed language interpreters working together for a PhD defence: A case study of best practice. *International Journal of Interpreter Education*, 10(2), 5–26.

Gile, Daniel (1995). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haualand, Hilde, Nilsson, Anna-Lena, & Raanes, Eli. (2018). Tolker og tolking – en introduksjon. [Interpreters and interpreting – an introduction.] In Hilde Haualand, Anna-Lena Nilsson, & Eli Raanes (Eds.), *Tolking – språkarbeid og profesjonsutøvelse [Interpreting – language work and professional practice.]* (pp. 11-37). Oslo: Gyldendal.

Hauser, Peter C., Finch, Karen L., & Hauser, Angela B. (2008). *Deaf Professionals and Designated Interpreters*. Washington D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Metzger, Melanie. (1999). *Sign Language Interpreting. Deconstructing the Myth of Neutrality*. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Pöchhacker, Franz. (2012). Interpreting participation. Conceptual analysis and illustration of the interpreter's role in interaction. In Claudio Baraldi & Laura Gavioli (Eds.), *Coordinating Participation in Dialogue Interpreting*. (pp. 45-69).

Reddy, Michael. (1979). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In Andrew Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 284-324). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roy, Cynthia B. (1992). A Sociolinguistic Analysis of the Interpreter's Role in Simultaneous Talk in a Face-to-Face Interpreted Dialogue. *Sign Language Studies*, 74, 21-61.

Russell, Debra. (2005). Consecutive and simultaneous interpreting. In Terry Janzen (Ed.), *Topics in Signed Language Interpreting: Theory and Practice* (pp. 135-164). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Seleskovitch, Danica and Marianne Lederer. (1984). *Interpréter pour traduire*. Paris: Didier Érudition.

Tiselius, Elisabeth. (2018). Modeller för processer i tolkning. In Hilde Haualand, Anna-Lena Nilsson, & Eli Raanes (Eds.), *Tolking – språkarbeid og profesjonsutøvelse [Interpreting – language work and professional practice.]* (pp. 38-57). Oslo: Gyldendal.

Young, Alys, Oram, Rosemary, & Napier, Jemina. (2019). Hearing people perceiving deaf people through sign language interpreters at work: on the loss of self through interpreted communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 47(1), 90-110.

Wadensjö, Cecilia. (1992). *Interpreting as Interaction. On dialogue-interpreting in immigration hearings and medical encounters*. (PhD), Linköping University, Linköping.

Warnicke, Camilla, & Plejert, Charlotta. (2012). Turn-organisation in mediated phone interaction using Video Relay Service (VRS). *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(10), 1313-1334. doi:http://dx.doi.org/

Wilcox, Sherman, & Shaffer, Barbara. (2005). Towards a cognitive model of interpreting. In Terry Janzen (Ed.), *Topics in Signed Language Interpreting: Theory and practice* (pp. 27-50). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Accuracy: Omissions in consecutive versus simultaneous interpreting

Evy Cox[1]

Graduate of the KU Leuven (Catholic University of Leuven – Antwerp Campus)

Abstract

It is sometimes assumed that consecutive interpreting is more accurate than simultaneous interpreting due to note-taking (Andres, 2002; Gile, 2001a; Matyssek, 1989). So far, little comparative research has been conducted to confirm this belief. Omission in interpreting is a well-known phenomenon, which has already been studied from various perspectives. Omissions are a complex matter, especially because a certain degree of subjectivity can never completely be avoided, as will be explained more broadly in this research article. Furthermore, most research on omissions in interpreting consists of small-scale studies. The study described here set out to compare non-strategic omissions in both consecutive and simultaneous interpreting, with a focus on cognitive load. Nine trainee interpreters' consecutive and simultaneous target text renditions were transcribed and subsequently analyzed. The analysis adopted Kopczynski's approach (1980) which allowed for greater insight into the contrast between these interpreting modes. It also allowed the researcher to explore how the interpreter mentally approached the source text on a linguistic level. The analysis not only provided a way of categorizing omissions but also allowed for additional information to be extracted from it. The findings of this small study suggest that students' consecutively interpreted renditions were 15% more likely to show omissions than their simultaneously interpreted renditions. In this study, the memory factor may have played a larger role than the cognitive load factor. An attempt has been made to explain the findings and draw some implications for interpreter education.

Keywords: omission, accuracy, interpreting mode, simultaneous, consecutive, cognitive load, effort models

[1] *Correspondence to: evy.cox@outlook.com*

Accuracy: Omissions in consecutive versus simultaneous interpreting

1. Introduction

Omissions and quality in consecutive interpreting (CI) and simultaneous interpreting (SI) are frequently researched, interrelated concepts. Some scholars have suggested that consecutive interpreting is more accurate than simultaneous interpreting because the former mode allows interpreters to take notes to help them remember what was said (Andres, 2002; Gile, 2001a; Matyssek, 1989). However, there has not been much comparative research to support this assumption. To the best of my knowledge, not many studies have focused on omissions in both CI and SI. This study will contribute to filling this gap by presenting the results of a study on omissions in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting with the aim of assessing accuracy and quality in interpreting.

Previous research has shown an interest in the difficult notion of 'interpreting quality,' omissions, note-taking and other related topics. Nevertheless, the current research niche in comparative studies of these interpreting modes came to exist because each of those concepts has generally been studied separately. Gile and Korpal argue that more comparative research on consecutive and simultaneous interpreting should be done (Gile, 2009; Korpal, 2012). In this respect, Korpal stresses the value of comparative research in the field of omissions: "The comparison of the two interpreting modes with respect to omission would make it possible to formulate some general conclusions about the nature of the two modes." (Korpal, 2012, p. 111)

Korpal demonstrates the practical relevance of this type of research. If we learn more about the nature of both interpreting modes and how they correspond or differ, this may in turn have implications for interpretation and for their inclusion in interpreter training programs.

The aim of the current study was to compare the occurrence or the strategic use of omissions in both interpreting modes. To this end, the author conducted an experiment with nine interpreter trainees. The study was given an extra dimension by adopting Kopczynski's (1980) conceptual research model. I will start by providing a theoretical framework for the current research. Cognitive load, a central concept in interpreting, will serve as a starting point.

2. Literature review

2.1 Cognitive load in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting

Cognitive load in interpreting is considered an important factor influencing the overall accuracy of an interpretation (Gile, 2009), and cognitive load varies between consecutive interpreting (CI) and simultaneous interpreting (SI). In this paper, omissions are considered as a factor affecting the accuracy of delivery. Cognitive load might impact the frequency of omissions and so provide an explanation for differences in accuracy between the two interpreting modes. The internal and external factors that affect cognitive load, and, therefore, the accuracy of the interpretation, will be discussed in section 2.3. First, I present a short overview of the cognitive load active in both interpreting modes, based on Gile's Effort Models (2009).

2.1.1 Effort Models

Gile's Effort Models (2009) have become an influential research model with regard to the various cognitive effects in both consecutive and simultaneous interpreting (Seeber, 2015). Gile intended his Effort Models to present a pedagogical framework capable of clarifying interpreting errors by looking at mental processing capacity. This implies that there is still insufficient empirical evidence to support the underpinnings of the Effort Models (Gile, 1997, 2008, 2009; Seeber, 2015). Nevertheless, some studies appear to confirm some of the hypotheses upon which the Effort Models were built (Gile, 1999). More research is needed in order to make general assertions.

First of all, Gile makes a distinction between automated and non-automated mental processes. Automated mental processes require little or no cognitive effort (e.g., correct pronunciation in one's mother tongue). The non-automated mental processes, on the other hand, can exhaust available mental processing capacity. These non-automated processes stem from the content of the source speech, often unknown to the interpreter (Gile, 2009). Gile points out that the Effort Models provide a simplified representation, since interpreting in reality is not that clear-cut: mental processes can be gradually more or less automated (cf. Gile, 1995a).

Gile (2009) represents the non-automated mental processes in formulas (see Appendix 3). The production effort does not only comprise the reproduction in the target language, but also self-corrections made by the interpreter while s/he is listening carefully to his/her own interpretation.

Gile assumes that there is a cognitive load for each individual effort. Added together, they result in a total combined cognitive load. In other words, more cognitive processes imply a higher overall cognitive load. This places higher demands on the limited mental processing capacity of the interpreter. If the available mental processing capacity is exceeded, a decrease in interpretation quality occurs. That is why the total available mental processing capacity must be greater than or equal to the 'required' mental processing capacity. Similarly, the available processing capacity for each individual cognitive effort must be greater than or equal to the required processing capacity for that effort (Gile, 2009).

Gile suggests that the overall cognitive load is higher in simultaneous interpreting than in consecutive interpreting. Gile (2001b; 2009) describes two separate stages of consecutive interpreting, namely listening and production (Gile, 2001b; Gile, 2009). However, in simultaneous interpreting, both efforts take place at the same time, whereas in consecutive interpreting they take place successively. Consequently, the interpreter continuously has to keep up with the original speaker in simultaneous interpretation. For consecutive interpreting, this is only the case in the listening stage. This way, cognitive saturation is less likely to occur in the production stage (Gile, 2009). The memory effort also differs between the two modes: in consecutive interpreting, the interpreter has to keep the source text information in mind, processing it, for a much longer time than in simultaneous interpreting. The note-taking effort, however, aims to partially relieve the interpreter's memory and free up processing capacity (Albl-Mikasa, 2007; Gile, 2009).

2.2 Defining 'accuracy'

This article will discuss omissions in consecutive versus simultaneous interpreting within the broader framework of accuracy. Since 'accuracy' is a much-disputed topic in the field of interpreting studies, it is all the more important to clearly define the concept. There does exist consensus about the position of accuracy as part of the broader concept of 'quality'. I will start by discussing quality, followed by accuracy as a subcomponent of quality. I will then outline the definition of accuracy I will apply in this paper.

2.2.1 Quality

The overarching concept of 'quality' is afforded more discussion than its hyponym 'accuracy.' The subjectivity of quality (Kalina, 2005) and the variety of possible perspectives on the matter make a unanimous definition nearly impossible (cf. Kahane, 2000). Grbić attributes the complexity of empirical research into quality to the combination of three axiomatic features: the variability of performance; the relativity of judgments depending on the evaluators' perspective(s); and the relativity of the evaluation process with reference to certain criteria (Grbić, 2015).

In interpreting research, variability of performance takes the individual differences between interpreters into account. Interpreters find themselves in settings in which they have to make individual cognitive, linguistic, and ethical choices, amongst others. These choices shape 'quality' and thus hinder a uniform definition of the concept in relation to interpreting (Grbić, 2015).

The relativity of judgments depending on the evaluators' perspective(s) emphasizes the broadness of the concept of quality. It refers to the multitude of possible perspectives on quality. This equally stands in the way of a uniform definition (Grbić, 2015). When evaluating an interpretation, the evaluator has to choose from a wide range of assessment criteria. An overall assessment comprising all possible criteria would be hardly feasible. For example, assessment criteria could include commitment, professionalism, personality, and interpretation techniques, to mention just a few (Kutz, 1997).

The relativity of the evaluation process with reference to certain criteria involves the users of interpreting services, who all have a different view on what 'quality' should look like. This depends on the type of user, the social context, and personal opinion (Gile, 1995a). Over the years, much research on user expectations has been carried out (Bühler, 1986; Kurz, 2001, 2003; Pöchhacker, 2015, 2016). Researchers have found that, while there is consensus among users of interpreting services as to the quality criteria to be assessed (e.g., pleasant voice, thorough preparation, pleasant appearance, fluency, reliability, sense consistency, logical cohesion, completeness, correct grammar etc.), the importance individual users attach to those criteria differs (Gile, 2009).

As a result, some scholars have sought to approach 'quality' more generally. This way, they could capture the objective parameters that underlie the subjective choices made when assessing interpreting quality (Garzone, 2002; Kahane, 2000; Pöchhacker, 1993, 1994). However, research in this field so far remains mostly theoretical.

2.2.2 Accuracy

In this paper, 'accuracy' will be defined in accordance with Tiselius' dichotomy (2015). According to Tiselius, accuracy is measured in two complementary manners: first, as the sum of the various elements that build the interpretation (e.g., omissions, additions, fluency); and secondly, holistically, approaching interpretation as an intrinsic whole. The comprehensiveness and transparency of this model allow the existing and more confined approaches to be included.

With regard to Tiselius' first measurement method –the interpretation of elements – interpreters should strive for accuracy of interpretation. This means few if any omissions or additions, optimal fluency and so forth. It is an approach that underlines correspondence with the source, although it is not a novel one (cf. Gile, 1995b; Kopczynski, 1994; Pöchhacker, 2002; Shlesinger, 1997).

Various authors have designed classifications of those individual interpretation components regarding source-target correspondence. However, Barik's classification (1971), despite being one of the oldest, probably remains the most well-known. He compiled an elaborate classification of omissions, additions and substitutions/errors that was initially innovative. Nevertheless, due to the subjectivity involved, it was not found to be viable (Barik, 1971).

Given that the focus of this article is on omissions in interpreting, it may be useful to take a closer look at more specific classifications of omissions. Napier (2004, 2015) formulated one such classification and distinguished different types of omissions depending on the interpreter's awareness level: conscious strategic omissions, conscious intentional omissions, conscious unintentional omissions, conscious receptive omissions and unconscious omissions. Napier gives an example of a classification that captures the underlying objective parameters leading to omissions in interpreting (see 2.2.1): consciousness and intention. However, putting Napier's model into practice may present some difficulties, simply because it is difficult to determine the interpreter's level of awareness and intention.

Due to these limitations in other models, the classification that will be used as a guideline for analyzing the data in this study is Kopczynski's (1980). Kopczynski divides omissions into different types according to the linguistic phrases that are influenced by the omissions, as explained below. Kopczynski makes a distinction between the omission of the core of the phrase (for instance a noun or a verb) or its modifier(s) (e.g., an adjective modifying a noun or an adverb modifying a verb) (Kopczynski, 1980).

Kopczynski's (1980) analysis has resulted in two categories (noun phrase and verb phrase) being most commonly affected, and some categories (conjunctions, omissions within a conventional syntagm, and other omissions) being less affected. Omissions of complete and unfinished sentences are treated as a separate category. Within the different types of phrases, there are four overarching reasons as to why Kopczynski's approach serves as a guideline for this study. Firstly, Kopczynski's proposal goes beyond simply determining what kind of omission occurs most and which interpreting mode is more prone to omissions; his approach of subdividing omissions according to the phrases that are being influenced by them enables a view into how the interpreter mentally analyzes the source text on a linguistic level while aiming at a reproduction in the target language (Kopczynski, 1980). Secondly, his classification succeeds in providing objective parameters. He defines omissions in accordance with the linguistic phrases they affect. Thirdly, it is a methodologically feasible approach. And lastly, Kopczynski uses a descriptive model by examining the omissions made and creating a corresponding classification.

In his own research, Kopczynski's found that the participating interpreters tried to preserve the main information of the source text by omitting modifiers first. Nonetheless, he stated that more research was needed to test the hypothesis (Kopczynski, 1980).

Tiselius' second and complementary measurement method – approaching the interpretation as an intrinsic whole (Tiselius, 2015) – is the aspect that makes this approach so comprehensive. It allows the existing and more confined approaches to be included. Although Tiselius does not elaborate on this aspect of her accuracy dichotomy, I posit that Tiselius' 'interpretation as an intrinsic whole' can be compared to what Shlesinger calls the intratextual level of quality, concerning the acoustic, linguistic and logical aspects of the interpretation product per se (Shlesinger, 1997).

2.2.3 Accuracy regarding the present research

As mentioned above, this study is restricted to the component 'omission' within accuracy. The research data are analyzed in accordance with Kopczynski's approach to further test his premise (see 2.2.2). An additional distinction between functional and non-functional omissions is made, since not every omission implies a decrease in accuracy. Sometimes omissions are necessary to generate an accurate and acceptable interpretation (Barghout, Rosendo & García, 2015; Garzone, 2002; Korpal, 2012; Pio, 2003; Tiselius, 2015). Some authors distinguish functional and non-functional omissions in line with consciousness and intention of the interpreter (Barghout, Rosendo & García, 2015; Barik, 1975; Jones, 1998). The feature of consciousness or intention will not be examined in this study, however, since it is very difficult to identify (see 2.2.2). Therefore, all omissions that provoke a loss of significant information, and thus a decrease in accuracy, are considered non-functional. All omissions that boost the interpretation quality are considered functional. An example of a functional omission, collected from the analyzed data for this study:

> Source text for simultaneous interpreting: *[…] we need to find a way to cut the production of single-use and disposable plastics […]*
>
> Interpreting student (Dutch): *[…] we need to find a way to cut the production of disposable plastics […]*

It is not necessary to repeat 'single-use plastics' and 'disposable plastics' twice, since they mean the same thing. In Dutch, this would even be considered a stylistic error. Therefore, the interpreting student made a functional omission by omitting one of the two.

2.3 Influence of cognitive load on accuracy

This section discusses which factors influence cognitive load (see 2.1) and thus accuracy (see 2.2), and to what extent the impact on accuracy differs for each interpreting mode. Gile (2009) defines both occasional reasons and chronic reasons. The term 'occasional reasons' refers to triggers that hinder successful interpretation by leading to cognitive saturation, while the term 'chronic reasons' refers to inadequate cognitive skills or lack of knowledge. Only occasional reasons (Gile, 2009) were taken into account. These triggers act on cognitive load, which varies according to the interpreting mode, consecutive or simultaneous. Elements which would be defined by Gile as chronic reasons were not considered.

2.3.1 Factors influencing cognitive load in CI and SI

A lot of common factors that affect interpreting quality in general have already been mentioned in earlier research (Albl-Mikasa, 2007; Altman, 1994; Barghout, Rosendo & García, 2015; Barik, 1971, 1973, 1975; De Groot, 1997; Gerver, 1975; Gile, 1983, 1995a, 1997, 2009; Jones, 1998; Kopczynski, 1980; Korpal, 2012; Napier, 2004; Pio, 2003; Pöchhacker, 2016; Pradas Macías, 2003; Shlesinger, in Pöchhacker, 2016). However, research into triggers that affect consecutive and simultaneous interpreting differently or triggers that are unique to either interpreting mode is rather limited. So far, only a handful of studies have associated certain factors that are detrimental to cognitive load when working in a particular interpreting mode. For simultaneous interpreting those factors are ear-voice span, words without a direct translation, multi-word names, incomplete or ambiguous segments at the beginning of sentences, language pairs with major linguistic and/or cultural differences, pauses at ungrammatical points, large grammatical differences between languages, and poor technological equipment for simultaneous interpreting (Issa, 2018; Barghout, Rosendo & García, 2015; Barik, 1975; Gile, 2001a; Jones, 1998). By way of the term pauses at ungrammatical locations, Barik (1975) refers to the speaker pausing when his/her utterance is still incomplete or not complete enough for the interpreter to assign a certain meaning to it. In some cases, the interpreter is forced to start interpreting with insufficient information. For consecutive interpreting, those factors are the span between the speaker and the interpreter taking notes, enumerations and the manual nature of note-taking (Gile, 2001a; Gile, 2009). The role of long-term memory might also be added.

2.3.2 Impact on accuracy in consecutive vs. simultaneous interpreting

Less is known about how the above-mentioned factors affect accuracy in both interpreting modes. It is sometimes assumed that consecutive interpreting is more accurate than simultaneous interpreting due to note-taking (Andres, 2002; Gile, 2001a; Matyssek, 1989). So far, little comparative research has been conducted to confirm this belief. The existing comparative research points to the opposite conclusion. Gile (2001a) asked three professional interpreters to assess a number of consecutive and simultaneous interpretations, resulting in all three considering the simultaneous interpretations to be more accurate. Kopczynski (1980) conducted comparative research for the language pair English-Polish and found that in consecutive interpreting about 20% more omissions occurred at phrase level compared to simultaneous interpreting. Those results indicate that more research is required on the assumption that consecutive interpreting is more accurate than simultaneous interpreting (Gile, 2001a).

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

I set up this study with nine participants who were Postgraduate Conference Interpreting students at the KU Leuven Antwerp Campus and the University of Antwerp. All students had Dutch as their native language and three students specified English as their B-language (see Appendix 4). Two students had not taken part in the Master in Interpreting program at the above-mentioned universities although most students come to the

Postgraduate program for Conference Interpreting after completing a Master's program. Students who do not are designated "external" participants. I conducted this study as a fellow student and in the context of a Master in Interpreting thesis. With regard to interpreting experience, I took the position of those students who had previously completed the Master in Interpreting as a point of departure. The students had had approximately eighteen months' experience with consecutive interpreting and three to four months' experience with simultaneous interpreting. Table 1 shows the number of practice hours reflecting those periods of time. It was difficult to assess the overall training level of the two external students.

Table 1: Students' experience with CI and SI respectively

	Students of the KU Leuven Antwerp Campus	Students of the University of Antwerp
Hours of practice for consecutive interpreting	150	250
Hours of practice for simultaneous interpreting	60	80

3.2 Data

The students were asked to interpret two different English source texts into Dutch, one consecutively and one simultaneously. The source texts were two video recordings produced for this study. In both cases, the source speech was delivered under the same recorded conditions (setting, speaker, length of text, adjusted pace, sound conditions). The students made audio recordings of their own interpretations that were subsequently analyzed. The notes used for consecutive interpreting were collected as well. That resulted in 18 audio recordings and 9 sets of notes. The consecutive and the simultaneous interpretations took place in groups and on two different dates, with a span of about two months in between. This was due to practical reasons: it was impossible to gather all participants at one time and a limited amount of time was available for each session.

Great importance was attached to an equivalent difficulty for both source texts, appropriate to the students' experience with both interpreting modes. During the research study, the participating students clearly had much less experience with simultaneous interpreting than consecutive interpreting. Since the complexity of the source texts needed to match the students' experience with either interpreting mode, the source text for consecutive interpreting (STC) was more difficult than the source text for simultaneous interpreting (STS). Both source texts were about the same length, but the STC dealt with a more complex and international theme, whereas the STS discussed a human interest story that complemented the STC. Moreover, the STC contained more names and numbers (22) compared to the STS (13). The lexical density of the STC was 12% higher (58.18%) than that of the STS (46.21%). The lexical density was calculated by measuring the number of content words against the total number of words (http://www.analyzemywriting.com/index.html).

Both video recordings opened with a short introduction, which the students did not have to interpret. The STC then required a further 5:26 minutes, and the STS 5:52 minutes, with respective speech rates of 117.05 and 123.40 words per minute. The underlined terms in the source texts (see Appendix 1 & 2) were explained in advance. Furthermore, each student could enter a silent booth to start their consecutive interpretation immediately after having heard the source text.

Some methodological challenges must be mentioned. Firstly, the results (see 4) have a lower ecological validity due to the research setting. The students were asked to interpret as naturally as possible, but all of them were aware that it was part of a research study, although the research objective remained unknown until after the data collection. Also, there was no target audience, as there would be in a real interpretation setting. In addition, participants with more and equal experience in both interpreting modes would increase the validity of the results (cf. Sunnari, 2003). However, using professional interpreters was not feasible within the framework of this study. On the other hand, research using students provides direct insight into strategies, obstacles, and approaches specifically for students. This may inform potential changes within teaching practice. A third methodological challenge lies in the determination of the equivalent difficulty of both source texts, according to the participants' experience with these two interpreting modes. Lastly, the participants interpreted two video recordings and no live speech, although it may be assumed that this factor had little or no negative impact on the validity of the research (Pöchhacker, 2016).

3.3 Analysis

The audio recordings of the consecutive and simultaneous interpretations were transcribed and consequently compared to the original English source texts. As stated earlier, the omissions were categorized following Kopczynski's (1980) approach: they were classified depending on the phrases being influenced by the omission (see 2.2.2 and 2.2.3). In this research, 'phrase' refers to the linguistic phrase that was being primarily influenced. Kopczynski (1980) sometimes opts for an overarching phrase type that is being affected secondarily. This may result in a changed view of the mental linguistic analysis of the source text by the interpreter (see 2.2.2). This aspect and the descriptive nature of Kopczynski's approach imply that in this study different omission categories may have occurred. A separate category for the omission of complete and unfinished sentences was adopted. Also, as described under 2.2.3, only non-functional omissions were taken into consideration.

The actual data analysis was carried out as follows. The STC and STS served as a starting point. Both source texts were analyzed to identify all the essential information: that is, all information units that would entail a loss of potentially relevant semantic content when omitted in the interpretation. Those units of essential information were then classified according to their covering phrases, with an additional distinction between core units and modifier units.

Subsequently, the consecutive and simultaneous interpretation transcriptions of every student were compared to the essential information selected in the corresponding source texts. A detailed picture of all non-functional omissions per student per interpreting mode was thus constructed, classified in accordance with the affected phrases (core/modifier). These numbers can be found in the data table in the table rows 'S1' to 'S9'. Some examples of how this analysis was carried out:

> Source text for consecutive interpreting: *Today, about 700 million people live in extreme poverty.*
> □ noun phrase: core = poverty, modifier = extreme
>
> Interpreting student (Dutch): *Today, about 700 million people live in poverty.*
> □ omission of the phrase's modifier
>
> Source text for simultaneous interpreting: *So it's down-cycled, it's turned into lesser things.*
> □ verbal phrase: core = is down-cycled, modifier = /
>
> Interpreting student (Dutch): *So it's actually turned into smaller things*.
> □ omission of the phrase's core

For every student, the omission percentage of all essential information per category was calculated. The relationship between the number of omissions per phrase type (core/modifier) in a participant's interpretation, and the entire essential information per phrase type (core/modifier) in the source text was measured. An overview of all average omission percentages per interpreting mode can be found in the section 'Results' (see 4). They were calculated according to the formula for the arithmetic mean. An example:

> The overall mean omission percentage for the noun phrase cores in consecutive interpreting [PS = omission percentage of student]:

(PS1 + PS2 + PS3 + PS4 + PS5 + PS6 + PS7 + PS8 + PS9) / 9 = overall mean omission percentage

However, it is important to put those results into perspective. Some omission percentages had a very high absolute value, but a far less significant relative value. This was often due to the fact that the core or modifier type in question had a very small share of the entire essential information. The lower the total number of essential cores/modifiers of a particular phrase, the greater the impact on the omission percentages when such an element was omitted. In this way, some percentages increased without possessing a real linguistic value.

A further methodological challenge of the analysis was that an 'error' or 'non-functional omission' on paper was not necessarily perceived as such from the spoken interpretation presented to the listeners (Gile, 1999). Therefore, this report mentions only those non-functional omissions that were important enough to be perceived when listening to the interpretation, from the perspective of someone who has mastered both languages. A certain degree of subjectivity was inevitable.

Only the content of the audio recordings of the interpretations and of the video recordings of the source texts was transcribed, given the research parameters. Aspects such as intonation, volume, stress, accelerations or decelerations, pauses, and irrelevant slips were not taken into consideration. The transcriptions did not serve as a substitute for the original recordings.

4. Results

This overview of all average omission percentages per interpreting mode per phrase (core/modifier) is based on the individual analysis of all transcriptions of the consecutive and simultaneous interpretations. The percentages were calculated according to the formula for the arithmetic mean (see 3.3).

The following phrases were affected by omissions: noun phrase (NP), verb phrase (VP), prepositional phrase (PP), conjunctive phrase (CP), adjective phrase (AP), and adverbial phrase (AvP). In addition, other omissions (OO) and the omission of complete sentences (SO) were also taken into account. The category other omissions contains all omissions that did not fit into one these phrase types. Table 2 shows students' omissions compared to the total number of omissions possible.

Table 2: Students' (S) omissions compared to the total possible number of omissions (Tot.).

	Consecutive interpreting													
	NP		VP		PP		CP		AP		AvP		OO	SO
	C	M	C	M	C	M	C	M	C	M	C	M		
Tot.	93	80	38	15	17	17	8	8	4	5	6	4	6	28
S1	17	16	9	2	7	6	1	/	/	/	/	/	2	/
S2	25	26	5	2	6	6	2	/	1	1	3	1	2	4
S3	22	22	14	3	6	7	5	/	/	/	2	2	2	1
S4	12	14	8	1	7	6	1	/	/	1	1	/	2	1
S5	18	13	8	/	3	3	2	/	/	/	3	2	2	4
S6	18	30	9	2	6	6	4	1	2	/	1	1	2	/
S7	13	13	8	1	3	3	2	/	/	/	1	1	2	2
S8	20	16	10	2	8	7	3	/	/	1	1	1	2	2
S9	20	19	10	1	3	3	2	/	1	/	1	/	/	5
	Simultaneous interpreting													

	NP		VP		PP		CP		AP		AvP		OO	SO
	C	M	C	M	C	M	C	M	C	M	C	M		
Tot.	101	63	58	35	12	12	11	12	2	6	4	2	4	37
S1	7	11	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1
S2	9	9	2	/	2	3	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	4
S3	9	5	7	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1
S4	6	3	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	1	/	/	/
S5	6	11	8	2	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2
S6	4	3	2	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
S7	6	9	4	3	1	1	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2
S8	4	3	1	1	/	/	3	1	/	1	1	/	/	/
S9	11	8	6	3	1	1	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	1

NP = noun phrase; VP = verb phrase; PP = prepositional phrase;
CP = conjunctive phrase; AP = adjective phrase; AvP = adverbial phrase;
OO = other omission; SO = omission of complete sentences; C = core; M = modifier

Table 3 shows the mean values for the number of omissions per phrase type in CI and SI renditions.

Table 3: Mean values for the number of omissions per phrase type in CI and SI renditions.

Consecutive			Simultaneous		
Phrase	Core	Modifier	Phrase	Core	Modifier
NP	19.66%	23.47%	NP	6.82%	10.94%
VP	23.68%	11.67%	VP	6.51%	5.71%
PP	32.03%	30.72%	PP	10.00%	12.50%
CP	30.56%	12.50%	CP	27.27%	8.33%
AP	33.33%	20.00%	AP	/	16.67%
AvP	27.08%	33.33%	AvP	25.00%	/
OO	33.33%		OO	/	
SO	9.69%		SO	4.95%	

As stated earlier, the absolute and relative values here must be weighed carefully (see 3.3) using the data table (see Table 1).

5. Discussion

The findings discussed here only apply to the particular group of interpreter trainees who participated in the study (see 3.1). Other possible limitations of the study are discussed in section 3.3. In the case of consecutive interpreting, I compared interpreted renditions with students' notes, however it may be difficult to link a certain error to a certain cause, because reduction of quality can happen 'at a distance' in interpreting. This means a specific trigger may affect a distant speech segment that in itself is not a problem (Gile, 2009).

The large discrepancy between the degree of omissions in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting renditions in this study may be attributable to the fundamentally distinct nature of each interpreting mode. In simultaneous interpreting, the cognitive load is higher because more cognitive tasks have to be performed at the same time. In consecutive interpreting, on the other hand, the interpreter is confronted with the need to rely heavily on memory (see 2.1.1). In the consecutive mode, the interpreter has to keep all successive passages in mind, processing them, until the speech segment has ended. Therefore, (s)he uses note-taking as an aid to compensate for the shortcomings of the memory and processing capacity (Ilg & Lambert, 1996). However, it is impossible to capture all source text information in notes. When the notes of all individual students were compared to their respective omission analyses, almost 90% (88.23%) of all omissions in consecutive interpreting were also omitted from the students' notes. Thus, the main issue was that the students did not capture the omitted elements, either in their notes or their memories, even after considerable training (see 3.2). The high cognitive demands in simultaneous interpreting did not make this interpreting mode more prone to omissions than consecutive interpreting, even after a shorter training period (see 3.1). The memory factor may have played a larger role than initially thought (cf. Gile, 1997; Gile, 2001b).

Another finding is that for both interpreting modes approximately 4% more noun modifiers were omitted than noun cores. This result suggests that the interpreter trainees tried to preserve the core message when they experienced difficulties processing the information. It is possible that interpreters will focus on the essential information, and more specifically the core issues within the essential information, when their cognitive processing capacity nears saturation. That way, 'secondary' elements such as modifiers may be omitted first. That 4% contrast within the noun phrases was similar to Kopczynski's findings (see 2.2.2) and to the assumptions of other authors (Gile, 2001a; Shlesinger, in Pöchhacker, 2016). In the consecutive interpreting results, the opposite seemed to be the case for the verb phrases. The number of affected cores was much higher than the number of affected modifiers. However, the relative value of the verbal modifiers within consecutive interpreting was too low to draw any conclusions. In the simultaneous interpreting results, both the verbal cores and modifiers were represented in the total of essential information in the source text. Differences in meaning caused by omissions were barely noticeable.

In the consecutive interpreting, approximately one-fifth of all essential noun cores/modifiers and verbal cores were affected by omissions. That is one-fifth of the phrase types that have the biggest share of the essential information (see Table 1). Other phrase types have a rather low relative value due to their very small share in the total of essential information (see 3.3).

This research only focused on interpreting trainees. Professional interpreters are presumably more proficient at distinguishing between core and modifier. Therefore, the same research parameters using professional interpreters might result in a larger contrast. It was clear that all participants achieved the mean values for the most significant phrase types NP and VP, despite initial differences in previous education and English proficiency.

There was a significant difference between the interpreting modes. The total omission average (i.e., the overall arithmetic mean of all omission percentages of all individual students) was 19.51% for consecutive interpreting, and 4.13% for simultaneous interpreting. In other words, consecutive interpreting was 15% (15.38%) more prone to omissions than simultaneous interpreting. This finding aligns with Kopczynski's research findings: a contrast of 20% between interpreting modes at phrase level (see 2.3.2). These results underline the importance of more research in this interpreting area, if interpreter educators are to help student interpreters achieve more accurate renditions in CI and SI.

6. Conclusion

One of the aims of this research was to find out more about the mental linguistic analysis of the source text, which is carried out unconsciously by the interpreter. It is not possible to make firm statements about the mutual relationship between the numerous linguistic phrase types, because of the difference in their relative values (core/modifier) based on this small study.

The divergence between consecutive/simultaneous modes may have its origins in the cognitive load which is different in consecutive and simultaneous interpreting. Additionally it may concern the strategies interpreters apply to prevent cognitive saturation while retaining the core of the source text message.

This study has shown that student interpreters omitted more information when interpreting consecutively than when they were interpreting simultaneously. Awareness of this tendency may lead interpreter educators to offer trainee interpreters more consecutive interpreting/simultaneous interpreting exercises and perhaps asking students to reflect on what information they thought they had omitted and why. Identifying possible factors which play a role in omissions may help educators develop tailor-made exercises to help students improve.

More research needs to be carried out to explore or confirm the findings of this study. Further research may involve deliberately manipulated source texts to find out more about the mutual relationship between all linguistic phrase types. This may allow researchers to draw conclusions about the mental linguistic analysis that interpreters may be performing unconsciously. Within an educational setting, researchers may experiment with new interpreting strategies and exercises. They could teach and assess note-taking technique to see if students can achieve a more complete interpretation in the consecutive mode. They could also ask students to self-assess whether they have preserved as many modifiers as possible in addition to the cores in both interpreting modes.

References

Albl-Mikasa, M. (2007). *Notationssprache und Notizentext. Ein kognitiv-linguistisches Modell für das Konsekutivdolmetschen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Altman, J. (1994). Error analysis in the teaching of simultaneous interpretation: A Pilot Study. In S. Lambert & B. Moser-Mercer (Eds.), *Bridging the gap: Empirical research in simultaneous interpretation* (pp. 25-38). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Andres, D. (2002). *Konsekutivdolmetschen und Notation*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Barghout, A., Rosendo, L.R., & García, M.V. (2015). The influence of speed on omissions in simultaneous interpretation: An experimental study. *Babel, 61*(3), 305-334.

Barik, H. C. (1971). A description of various types of omissions, additions and errors of translation encountered in simultaneous interpretation. In S. Lambert & B. Moser-Mercer (Eds.), *Bridging the gap: Empirical Research in Simultaneous Interpretation* (pp. 121-137). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Barik, H.C. (1973). Simultaneous interpretation: Temporal and quantitative data. *Language and Speech, 16*, 237–270.

Barik, H. C. (1975). Simultaneous interpretation: Qualitative and linguistic data. *Language and Speech, 18*, 272-297.

Bühler, H. (1986). Linguistic (semantic) and extra-linguistic (pragmatic) criteria for the evaluation of conference interpretation and interpreters. *Multilingua*, *5*(4), 231-236.

De Groot, A. (1997). The Cognitive Study of Translation and Interpretation. Three Approaches. In J. H. Danks, G. M. Shreve, S. B. Fountain & M. K. McBeath (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in translation and interpreting* (pp. 25-26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Garzone, G. (2002). Quality and Norms in Interpretation. In G. Garzone & M. Viezzi (Eds), *Interpreting in the 21st Century: Challenges and opportunities* (pp. 107-119). University of Bologna/University of Trieste.

Gerver, D. (1975). A psychological approach to simultaneous interpretation. *Meta: Translators' Journal, 20*(2), p. 119-128.

Gile, D. (1983). Aspects méthodologiques de l'évaluation de la qualité du travail en interprétation simultanée. *Meta, 28*(3), 236-243.

Gile, D. (1995a). *Regards sur la recherche en interprétation de conférence*. Lille: Presses universitaires de Lille.

Gile, D. (1995b). Fidelity assessment in consecutive interpretation: An experiment. *Target, 7*(1), 151-164.

Gile, D. (1997). Conference Interpreting as a cognitive management problem. In J. H. Danks, G. M. Shreve, S. B. Fountain & M. K. McBeath (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in translation and interpreting* (pp. 196-214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gile, D. (1999). Testing the Effort Models' Tightrope Hypothesis in simultaneous interpreting – A contribution. *Hermes, 23*, 153-172.

Gile, D. (2001a). Consecutive vs. Simultaneous: Which is more accurate? Available at: http://jaits.jpn.org/home/kaishi2001/pdf/03-danielgilefinal.pdf

Gile, D. (2001b). The role of consecutive in interpreter training: A cognitive view. Available at: http://www.aiic.net/ViewPage.cfm/page377.htm

Gile, D. (2008). Local cognitive load in simultaneous interpreting and its implications for empirical research. *Forum, 6*(2), 59–77.

Gile, D. (2009). *Basic concepts and models for interpreter and translator training*. *Revised edition*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Grbič, N. (2015). Quality. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies* (pp. 333-336). New York: Routledge.

Ilg, G. & Lambert, S. (1996). Teaching consecutive interpreting. *Interpreting, 1*(1), 69-99.

Jones, R. (1998). *Conference interpreting explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Kahane, E. (2000). Thoughts on the quality of interpretation. Available at: http://aiic.net/page/197/thoughts-on-the-quality-of-interpretation/lang/1

Kalina, S. (2005). Quality assurance for interpreting processes. Available at: http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2005/v50/n2/011017ar.pdf

Kopczynski, A. (1980). *Conference Interpreting: Some linguistic and communicative problems*. Poznan: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.

Kopczynski, A. (1994). Quality in conference interpreting: Some pragmatic problems. In S. Lambert & B. Moser-Mercer (Eds.), *Bridging the gap. Empirical research in simultaneous interpretation* (pp. 87-100). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Korpal, P. (2012). Omission in simultaneous interpreting as a deliberate act. In A. Pym & D. Orrego-Carmona (Eds.), *Translation Research Projects 4* (pp. 103-111). Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group.

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

Kurz, I. (2003). Quality from the user perspective. In A. Collados-Aís (Ed.), *La evaluación de la calidad en interpretación: Investigación* (pp. 3-22). Granada: Editorial Comares.

Kutz, W. (1997). Gut für wen? Zur Bewertung von Konsekutivdolmetschleistungen. In E. Fleischmann, W. Kutz & P.A. Schmitt (Eds.), *Translationsdidaktik. Grundfragen der Übersetzungswissenschaft* (pp. 243-254). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Matyssek, H. (1989). *Handbuch der Notizentechnik für Dolmetscher. Ein Weg zur sprachunabhängigen Notation*. Heidelberg: Groos.

Napier, J. (2004). Interpreting omissions: A new perspective. *Interpreting, 6*(2), 117-142.

Napier, J. (2015). Omissions. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies* (pp. 289-291). London, England: Routledge.

Pio, S. (2003). The relation between ST delivery rate and quality in simultaneous interpretation. *The Interpreters' Newsletter, 12*, 69-100.

Pöchhacker F. (1993). Quality assurance in simultaneous interpreting. In C. Dollerup & A. Lindegaard (Eds.), *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2* (pp. 233-242). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Pöchhacker, F. (1994). *Simultandolmetschen als komplexes Handeln*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.

Pöchhacker, F. (2002). Researching interpreting quality: Models and methods. In G. Garzone & M. Viezzi (Eds.), *Interpreting in the 21st Century. Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Interpreting Studies* (pp. 95-106). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Pöchhacker, F. (2015). User Expectations. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies* (pp. 430-432). London, England: Routledge.

Pöchhacker, F. (2016). *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London, England: Routledge.

Pradas Macías, E. M. (2003). Análisis de la fluidez como parámetro de calidad en interpretación. In A. Collados-Aís (Ed.), *La evaluación de la calidad en interpretación: Investigación* (pp. 97-106). Granada: Editorial Comares.

Seeber, K.G. (2015). Cognitive load. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies* (pp. 60-61). London, England: Routledge.

Shlesinger, M. (1997). Quality in simultaneous interpreting. In Y. Gambier, D. Gile & C. Taylor (Eds.), *Conference Interpreting: Current trends in research. Proceedings of the International Conference on Interpreting: What do we know and how?* (pp. 123-131). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Sunnari, M. (2003). Expert and novice performance in simultaneous interpreting: Implications for quality assessment. In A. Collados-Aís (Ed.), *La evaluación de la calidad en interpretación: Investigación* (pp. 235-248). Granada: Editorial Comares.

Tiselius, E. (2015). Accuracy. In F. Pöchhacker (Ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Interpreting Studies* (pp. 3-4). London, England: Routledge.

Appendix 1: Transcription of the source text for consecutive interpreting

Good morning everyone, and welcome to the Annual Meeting of the World Bank Group and the International Monetary Fund. I would like to first acknowledge our newest country - the Pacific island state of Nauru, which officially joined the World Bank Group just two days ago. So on behalf of the institution, I'm very happy to welcome the Republic of Nauru to the World Bank Group. At our last gathering, we announced that for the first time the percentage of people living in extreme poverty around the world was projected to fall globally. Today, about 700 million people live in extreme poverty – a reduction of more than one billion people compared to fifteen years ago. But the weakening global economy threatens our progress toward ending extreme poverty by 2030. In the global economy, there are not many bright spots around the world – which I would like to illustrate briefly. The first one is the United States, that is one of the developed countries. Second is India, that is of the group of the middle-income countries. But of course, growth remains weak in Europe, and among emerging economies, Brazil is projected to show negative growth once again. So, keeping this in mind, we have just downgraded our global growth economic forecast this year from 2.9 percent to 2.5 percent. In this period of global economic slowdown, we're also facing major global challenges - forced displacement, climate change, pandemics, to name but a few. We're now working urgently and in new ways with partners to find solutions to these issues that affect us all. Let me elaborate on two examples. First of all, forced displacement, for instance. We're using innovative financial tools right now to fund projects that will create thousands of jobs for Syrian refugees and their Jordanian hosts. We're also working with Lebanon to make sure all children in the country – Lebanese and Syrian refugees – are going to school. We need to do much, much more to provide hope and opportunity for young people affected by conflict, especially in the Middle East and in Africa. The second example, climate change. We must deliver on the promises made at the Paris climate agreement. And yet we are seeing countries around the world about to sign agreements for the dirtiest source of energy, which is coal. So, we're working with countries right now to piece together deals that would make renewable energy cheaper than coal. Because of these global challenges and also because of the weak global economy, the demand for our services has never been higher outside of a crisis period. So we project that we'll provide more than 25 billion dollars in loans this year to middle-income countries – which is more than we had projected, and more than any other four-year span in the World Bank's history in a non-crisis period. The- this increased demand underscores the importance for donor countries to support our replenishment this year for the International Development Association, IDA. This gives low-cost loans or grants to the poorest countries. I want to give you only four realizations of IDA in the last years alone. IDA has supported the recruitment of- sorry, the recruitment and training of teachers; IDA has also supported ante-natal care for pregnant women; improved water services; and the construction or improvement of roads. IDA also helps developing countries enact policies that promote inclusive economic growth, which attract private sector investment, and invest in people's education and health. A strong IDA replenishment this year will be essential for us to work on our goals to end extreme poverty and boost shared prosperity. Also, to continue our intense focus on the poorest countries in the world, including in Africa and South Asia, and to broaden our work to tackle these global challenges. Thank you very much. I'll now take your questions.

Appendix 2: Transcription of the source text for simultaneous interpreting

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm a visual artist. I work with plastic bags, which I cut up and sew back together as my primary material for my artwork. And I’ve been doing that for about 20 years or so now. I turn bags into two and three-dimensional pieces, sculptures and installations. After about the first eight years, some of my work started to break down into smaller bits of plastic. After educating myself a little further about plastics, I realized that this was actually a bad thing. It's a bad thing that plastic breaks down into smaller bits, because it still remains plastic. And what we're finding is that a lot of it ends up in the marine environment. My initial reaction — and I suppose this would be a lot of people's first reaction to learning about this — so my initial reaction was, "Oh my God! We've got to do something about this! We’ve got to go out there and we have to clean this up." So I set up a project to go out with a cargo ship. And my intention was to raise awareness about the issue and to pick up the plastic. The plastic I would chip into little bits and mold into bricks that could potentially be used as building material in underdeveloped communities. I began talking to people, people who were already studying the problem of plastics in the marine environment and upon doing so, I realized that cleaning it up would only be a small drop in the ocean. Every year, about 300 million tons of plastic is generated around the world, and what I actually needed to do was take a step back and look at the bigger picture. And the bigger picture was this: we need to find a way to cut the production of single-use and disposable plastics, which are entering the marine environment every day on a global scale. I also realized I was very angry. I wasn't just concerned about the plastic that’s floating around in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. No, I was concerned about the plastic in the supermarket. All the food and the beverages that I purchase in the supermarket, they’re all packaged in plastic. I'm concerned about the plastic in the refrigerator, I'm concerned about the toxins in the plastic that end up in our bodies. So, then I came together with a group of other people who were also looking into the issue, and 5 years ago, we created the Plastic Pollution Coalition. So, we have set up many initiatives. One of these initiatives is all about recycling — just pretty much everybody’s final argument about being sustainable and being green: the idea of recycling. Now, you put something in a bin and you don't have to think about it again. What is the reality of that? Well, in the United States, less than seven percent of our plastics are recycled. And if you really look into it, particularly when it comes to plastic bottles, 5.8 percent of it is only down-cycled, or incinerated, or shipped to China. So it’s down-cycled, it’s turned into lesser things. A glass bottle, when it’s recycled, can be a glass bottle again, but a plastic bottle can never be a plastic bottle again. So this is a big issue. And I’m asking people to think about what the Plastic Pollution Coalition calls the “four R’s”: Reduce, Reuse, Recycle and Refuse. Whenever possible, refuse single-use and disposable plastics. Because there are plenty of alternatives. Like, for example, it's very easy to use a stainless-steel bottle or a glass bottle, fill that up with water, fill that up with filtered water, whatever, instead of having to purchase plastic bottles with water all the time. I guess what I’m trying to say to everybody here — and I know that you people know a lot about the issue already — but what I’m trying to say is that this is a huge problem for our oceans. And it’s also a problem that we, as consumers, have created, and we, as consumers, can solve it. We can solve this by raising awareness of the issue, by teaching people to choose alternatives. So whenever possible, choose alternatives to single-use plastics. In doing so, we can save our oceans, we can save the planet, and we can save ourselves. Thank you.

Appendix 3: The non-automated mental processes represented in formulas (Gile, 2009)

	Simultaneous interpreting (SI)	Consecutive interpreting (CI)	
		Listening stage (1)	Reproduction stage (2)
Formula	SI = L + M + P + C	CI(1) = L + N + M + C	CI(2) = Rem + Read + P + C

L = listening and analysis effort, M = memory effort, P = production effort, C = coordination effort, N = note-taking effort, Rem = remembering, Read = note reading

Appendix 4: Collected data from the participating interpreter trainees

Student	A-, B-, C-languages	Previously took part in the Master in Interpreting
Student 1	A = Dutch C = English, German	Yes
Student 2	A = Dutch C = English, Spanish	Yes
Student 3	A = Dutch C = English, French, Italian	Yes
Student 4	A = Dutch C = English, French, Spanish	Yes
Student 5	A = Dutch B = English	Yes
Student 6	A = Dutch B = English C = Portuguese	No
Student 7	A = Dutch B = English	Yes
Student 8	A = Dutch B = German C = English	No
Student 9	A = Dutch C = English, French, Italian	Yes

Dissertation Abstracts

In this section, we feature abstracts of recently completed doctoral or master's theses. If you have recently completed a master's or PhD thesis in this field and would like it to be included, please send an abstract of 200–300 words to citjournaleditor@gmail.com. We urge all academic supervisors to encourage their students to submit abstracts of their completed dissertations for inclusion in the next issue of the journal, in order to help disseminate new research relating to interpreter and translator education.

***In-between*: The social organization of American Sign Language-English interpreters in the medical context**

Laurie R. Shaffer

Department of Interpretation and Translation, Gallaudet University

Email: laurie.shaffer@unh.edu

Degree: PhD thesis, Gallaudet University

Abstract

Structural changes in the United States' social, political, and economic landscape have triggered changes in institutional practices in many sectors, and healthcare is no exception. The passage of health-related legislation, such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA, 1996), and the increased use of technology in hospitals and clinics over the following decades have impacted routine practice in the medical context. Some legislation, such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA, 1990) and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA. 2020), include mandates that have changed the landscape specifically for speakers of languages other than English and for those who are deaf. These federal statutes require that providers attend to patients' linguistic needs as requisite to addressing their medical concerns, leading to an increased presence of both spoken and signed language interpreters in medical facilities. This in turn has provided academics with amplified opportunities to examine the interpreter experience. Most studies of interpreting focus on the work of actively interpreting, yet in the lived experience of the working interpreter, there is a significant amount of time spent not actually interpreting, but instead '*in-between.'*

The *in-between* provided an entry point for this institutional ethnographic project that uncovered the structures, constraints, and resulting activity that social, political, and economic institutions produce in an interpreting event. The project examined questions of how various social institutions intersect with the everyday work of American Sign Language-English interpreters and illustrated how the work of interpreters is socially organized, how the local moment is actually orchestrated by institutions of power and how interpreters' local actions perpetuate or resist the pull of various institutional forces.

Institutional Ethnography is a deductive process with each set of data informing the direction of the project. To begin, two focus groups of five deaf persons who had experience as patients were conducted. The discussions in the focus groups led to interviews with four ASL-English interpreters who worked full or part-time in healthcare facilities. These interpreter interviews pointed to a need to then interview five interpreter service managers, some from within the healthcare system and some from external service agencies. Final interviews were then conducted with two policy experts on HIPAA, ADA and ACA. The analysis of the resulting data provided insight into the social institutions that are penetrating healthcare interpreters' work. Increased awareness among interpreters can lead to more critical thinking about work processes that may empower them, the patients, and medical professionals as they work together to create quality healthcare.

Keywords: medical interpreting, healthcare, institutional ethnography, decision-making

Developing assessment criteria for health translation: Pragmatic equivalence in English-Mandarin translated health texts

Wei Teng

School of Language and Culture, Auckland University of Technology

Email: wei.teng@canterbury.ac.nz

Degree: PhD thesis, Auckland University of Technology

Abstract

This study aimed to develop a set of assessment criteria applicable to translated texts, with a focus on the achievement of pragmatic equivalence in community translation (Taibi & Ozolins, 2016). The translation of healthcare texts, such as pamphlets, is of particular interest in this study, as these often perform the critical functions of both informing a target audience about a particular health issue and persuading them to take specific actions in managing their own health (Sin, 2003). The frameworks of functional translation theory, systemic functional linguistics and Vygotskian social constructivism were engaged to: explain the fundamental difference in purpose between religious/literary texts and healthcare texts; define the function of translation in healthcare; explain the significance of achieving pragmatic equivalence in these documents; and establish a set of initial translation assessment criteria based on the social construction of meaning.

Initial assessment criteria were developed for the evaluation of translated healthcare documents. Then fifteen English>Chinese translated healthcare texts currently in use in New Zealand were assessed using this initial criteria by fifteen professional translators and fifteen elderly Chinese immigrants in New Zealand. The assessment results revealed conflicting opinions regarding the quality of the translations. The translators had a higher tolerance for expressions that did not sound natural in Chinese, believing that these irregular expressions did not compromise the pragmatic equivalence. In contrast, the Chinese immigrants were more sensitive to atypical expressions, leading to them being neither informed nor persuaded by the content of the documents. In light of these findings, this study argues for the development of translation assessment criteria that contribute to student translators' awareness of the pragmatic functions of both original and translated texts. This study also highlights the importance of developing student translators' awareness that pragmatic equivalence is an achievement of both cross-cultural and cross-linguistic communication (House, 1981, 2001, 2006) and is an achievement of what Matthiessen (2001) terms "the maximum equivalence" on the level of context.

Key words: community translation; pragmatic equivalence; translation assessment

Caring: the experience of clinicians and interpreters in serving refugees in New Zealand

Philip Britz

Faculty of Health and Environmental Sciences, Auckland University of Technology

Email: philip.britz@gmail.com

Degree: PhD thesis, Auckland University of Technology

Abstract

This study explores the experience of interpreters and clinicians working with clients who are refugees. Using a hermeneutic phenomenological method informed by Heidegger (1889-1976) and Gadamer (1900-2002), this study offers insights into the experience of clinicians and interpreters working together to communicate with refugees and reveals how what the client 'says' is invited, received, understood, and converted from one language to another.

The twelve study participants included four registered interpreters, a registered mental health nurse, one health psychologist, two educational psychologists, two clinical psychologists, and two body therapists (neuromuscular therapy). Participants' narratives of their experiences of working with refugees were captured through interviews which were audio taped and transcribed. These stories uncovered the everyday realities facing clinicians and interpreters and provide an ontological understanding of their experience of working and communicating with refugees.

The findings of this study suggest a number of often unrecognized realities for interpreters. The interpreters 'care' [Sorge] for their refugee communities beyond the common understanding of professional service and will go beyond their call of duty to interpret. Ethnic communities are small and everybody knows each other, and as a result, there can be tensions for both client and interpreter in telling/knowing too much. Interpreters can be deeply impacted by the stories they hear, leading to the need for an opportunity to debrief.

The study also illuminates the experiences of clinicians in working with interpreters. Clinicians first need to build a relationship with the interpreter before they can effectively work together. Similarly, clients need to trust the interpreter before they will tell their story. Thus, the initial building of effective relationships is critical to clear communication later. Interpreters understand much more than the superficial meaning of words spoken; they grasp the cultural nuances which contain deeper levels of meaning. A wise clinician creates the opportunity to access this understanding.

While this study highlights the mutual experience of clinicians and interpreters in communicating and connecting with refugees, it also reveals that clinicians and interpreters bring different concerns and notions to the experience of interpreting and that these may be hidden from each other. This study argues that it is time for the larger system to provide greater recognition and support to the interpreters in their endless caring for, and about, the vulnerable client.

Key words: interpreting in refugee settings; hermeneutic phenomenology; clinical setting

Numbers: From stumbling blocks to training tools. A proposal and empirical evaluation of a systematic training programme for the simultaneous interpretation of numbers

Francesca Maria Frittella

Faculty of Translation Studies, Linguistics and Cultural Studies, University of Mainz/Germersheim

Email: francesca.frittella@gmail.com

Degree: Masters' degree in Conference Interpreting, University of Mainz/Germersheim

Abstract

Numbers are one of the main stumbling blocks for interpreters. However, no pedagogical solution has yet been developed to address this vexing problem. The present study proposes a systematic training programme for the simultaneous interpretation (SI) of numbers. The study comprised three stages. The first stage included a literature review and the development of a model of the complex cognitive skills involved in the SI of numbers. The second stage involved the design of the training programme. The overall structure, as well as the individual instructional design (ID) strategies, was chosen considering the specific task requirements of interpreting numbers, the general principles of cognitive skill acquisition and the impact of the learner's metacognitive skills and motivation on the training outcome. The third stage used the methods of design-focused evaluation to evaluate the impact of the ID principles underpinning the training programme on the learning process. Two groups of interpreting trainees (10 students in total) were instructed by the author. The data sources comprised trainees' written feedback, the trainer's observations, and course documentation.

The analysis revealed the strengths and weaknesses of the training programme as perceived by the participants. The findings confirm that the challenge represented by numbers in interpreted speech may be overcome through systematic training. The analysis suggests that the training programme may have facilitated participants' acquisition not only of skills related to interpreting numbers but also of general interpreting skills and techniques. If confirmed by future studies, this observation would imply that addressing problem triggers, such as interpreting numbers, may serve to achieve broader educational objectives. On the whole, the results highlight the potential of instructional-design research to advance the current state of interpreting pedagogy through the identification of generalisable principles of effective instruction.

Key words: simultaneous interpreting, numbers, instructional design, research-based education, cognitive skill acquisition